

POOR LAW REFORM COMMISSION (IRELAND).

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

TAKEN BEFORE THE

VICE-REGAL COMMISSION

ON

POOR LAW REFORM IN IRELAND.

VOLUME III.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE AND INDEX.

Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of His Majesty.



DUBLIN:

PRINTED FOR HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY ALEXANDER THOM AND CO. (LIMITED).

And to be purchased, either directly or through any Bookseller, from
E. POSSONBY, 116, Grafton-street, Dublin; or
WYMAN and SONS, (LTD.), Fetter-lane, E.C., and
82, Abingdon-street, Westminster, S.W.; or
OLIVER and BORN, Edinburgh.

1906.

[Cd. 8204.] Price 8s. 1d.

CONTENTS OF THIS VOLUME.

	PAGE
LIST OF WITNESSES, ...	iii
MINUTES OF EVIDENCE,	1
ADDENDUM, ...	992
INDEX TO EVIDENCE, ...	993

CONTENTS OF VOLUMES ISSUED BY THE COMMISSION.

- VOL. I.—REPORT.
- VOL. II.—APPENDIX.
- VOL. III.—MINUTES OF EVIDENCE AND INDEX

POOR LAW REFORM COMMISSION (IRELAND).

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF WITNESSES.

NAME.	Where examined.	Number of Answers.
A		
ADKINS, JOHN, ...	Armagh, ...	9310-13
ADAMS, THOMAS, B., ...	Londonderry, ...	756-880
ADAMS, WILLIAM, ...	Tallamore, ...	12318-323
AGNEW, DR. SAMUEL, ...	Armagh, ...	6835-79
ALLEN, ROBERT, ...	Belfast, ...	10282-408
ANDREWS, Right Hon. THOMAS, ...	Downpatrick, ...	12110-282
ANDERSON, GEO., ...	Enniskillen, ...	6848-79
ARMSTRONG, SAMUEL, ...	Do., ...	6880-8
ATKINSON, A., ...	Rosbridge, ...	11702-44
B		
BARNETT, Alderman, Lord Mayor of Cork, ...	Cork, ...	25365-81
BARRINGTON, J. B., ...	Lisodick, ...	25623-64
BARRINGTON, MRS., ...	Do., ...	25664-69
BEACON, DR., ...	Newry, ...	12267-26
BEE, SAMUEL, ...	Beckfridge, ...	11726-408
BEGGIE, ALEX., ...	Schindell, ...	22069-66
BELL, DR. ELEANOR, ...	Belfast, ...	10282-707
Do., ...	Newry, ...	12143-66
BELL, W. R., ...	Do., ...	22155-97
BELMORE, Earl of, ...	Brackishan, ...	6141-223
BENNETT, GEO., ...	Dublin, ...	301-15
BLACK, ALEX., ...	Belfast, ...	10110-39
BLAIR, EDWARD, ...	Bantry, ...	28970-88
BORRITT, WILLIAM, ...	Dublin, ...	16593-634
BORRITT, THOMAS, ...	Waterford, ...	16630-77
BOYD, J. D., ...	Londonderry, ...	1207-028
BOYD, JOHN, ...	Belfast, ...	16357-94
BOYLE, C., ...	Lettickenny, ...	4032-3
BOYLE, JAMES, ...	Dunmurry, ...	4174-97
BRADFORD, WILLIAM, ...	Newry, ...	11993-12027
BRADSHAW, DR., ...	Carrick-on-Shannon, ...	and p. 415
BRADY, MICHAEL, ...	Cavan, ...	22003-30
BRADY, DR., ...	Wicklow, ...	8632-45
BRASHEAR-CRAIG, L., ...	Mallow, ...	10432-3
BRENNAN, HENRY, ...	Sligo, ...	93351-78
BRENNAN, PATRICK, ...	Ballyshannon, ...	22005-3
BROWN, MRS. ELLEN MARY, ...	Bantry, ...	22006-32
BROWN, WILLIAM, ...	Londonderry, ...	4301-21
BROWN, B. J., ...	Nam., ...	28833-74
BROWN, MICHAEL, ...	Castibar, ...	28973-3
BROWN, DR. D. J., ...	Londonderry, ...	1630-709
BROWN, FRAS., ...	Longford, ...	17365-320
BRYAN, T., ...	Belfast, ...	23828-35
BUCHANAN, MRS., ...	Dublin, ...	1613-58
BURKE, DANIEL, ...	Bantry, ...	12003-87
BURKE, RICHARD, ...	Omagh, ...	16691-144
BURKE, EDWARD, ...	Tallamore, ...	16633-61
BURKE, THOMAS, ...	Nenagh, ...	399-412
BURKE, PATRICK, ...	Lisnakeilly, ...	28802-32
BUTLER, JOHN, ...	Clonsilla, ...	6217-43
BUTLER, LAURENCE, ...	Nenagh, ...	15704-34
BYRNE, JOHN, ...	Dublin, ...	22023-37
BYRNE, MICHAEL, ...	Wicklow, ...	22705-192
BYRNE, E. J., ...	Do., ...	21173-312
BYRNE, MICHAEL, ...	Waterford, ...	22668-91
BYRNE, THOMAS, ...	Galway, ...	16165-475 &
C		
CALLAN, DR. MICHAEL, ...	Danish, ...	11319
CAMPBELL, J. R., ...	Belfast, ...	16326-420
CAMPBELL, CHARLES, ...	Downpatrick, ...	19421-32
CARLSON, OWEN, ...	Castibary, ...	19441
CARNEY, PATRICK, ...	Kilmarney, ...	20561-5
CARLSON, JOHN, ...	Uphill, ...	24478-525
CARLSON, T., ...	Nam., ...	
CARR, MICHAEL, ...	Galway, ...	
CARR, DR., ...	Lettickenny, ...	
CARRON, PHILIP, ...	Do., ...	

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF WITNESSES—continued.

Name.	Where examined.	Number of Answers.
CASEY, MICHAEL, ...	Longford, ...	15143-94
CASEY, PATRICK, ...	Ennis, ...	25223-47
CASHIN, SAMUEL, ...	Londonberry, ...	13486-64
CATCHEARE, WILLIAM, ...	Omagh, ...	5855-62
CAWADWICK, RICHARD, ...	Clevedon, ...	21487-71
CELAN, J. B., ...	Ballyhennessy, ...	4267-322
CLARK, MISS F. F., ...	Belfast, ...	11165-48
CLARK, PETER, ...	Omagh, ...	5516-83
CLARK, JOHN, ...	Belfast, ...	10478-509
CLARK, THOMAS, ...	Dublin, ...	16301-94
CLARK, JOHN, ...	Narragh, ...	13457-49
CLARK, JAMES, ...	Carrick-on-Shannon, ...	2332-91
CLARK, CHARLES, ...	Omagh, ...	6779-93
CLARK, PATRICK, ...	Enniskillen, ...	4730-7
CLAR, R., ...	Cork, ...	26030-115
CLIMBERS, R. S., ...	Omagh, ...	8925-75
CLIFFORD, T. D., ...	Limerick, ...	23043-83
COE, EDWARD, ...	Belfast, ...	11995-164
COGAN, D. J., ...	Wicklow, ...	19254-244
COHILL, CAPT. W. C., ...	Waterford, ...	39234-604
COLAHAN, DR. N. W., ...	Galway, ...	24536-87
COLGAN, DR. F. P., ...	Carlow, ...	15041-62
COLGAN, MICHAEL, ...	Dundragh, ...	4057-149
COLLES, JOSEPH, ...	Armagh, ...	4254-5
COLLES, THOMAS, ...	Do., ...	5614-21
COLLEY, BERNARD, ...	Sligo, ...	5622-30
CONDON, DR., ...	Ballyshannon, ...	25114-237
CONDREY, DANIEL, ...	Wicklow, ...	1619-35
CONKELLAN, PETER, ...	Castleblayney, ...	1093-77
CONKELLY, R., ...	Ballyshannon, ...	8995-195
CONKELLY, EDWARD, ...	Crosses, ...	5357-77
CONKELLY, THOMAS, ...	Nass, ...	27391-143
CONKELLY, FELIX, ...	Omagh, ...	17909-25
CONRAD, OWEN, ...	Wicklow, ...	5197-236
CONROY, PATRICK, ...	Roscommon, ...	19218-86
CONSIDINE, MICHAEL, ...	Ennis, ...	23436-45
CONVEY, CHARLES, ...	Magherafelt, ...	25996-19
CONWAY, REV. W., ...	Galway, ...	3056-97
CONWAY, JOHN, ...	Sligo, ...	24126-69
COOKE, DR., ...	Londonberry, ...	22446-60
COOPER, W. R., ...	Enniskillen, ...	1488-361
COSEY, PROFESSOR, ...	Cork, ...	2651-808
CORCORAN, THOMAS, ...	Slough, ...	21749-813
CORREY, J. J., ...	Malton, ...	22663-117
CORRY, VINCENT, ...	Enniskillen, ...	97245-15
CORRY, MATTHEW, ...	Lettcherkey, ...	924-69
COSGROVE, MRS. McDOWELL, ...	Dublin, ...	3753-89
COSGROVE, JAMES, ...	Galway, ...	413-67
COSTELLO, JAMES, ...	Crosses, ...	16743-825
COSTER, WILLIAM, ...	Bantry, ...	24814-50
COTTERAN, DR. JOHN F., ...	Ennis, ...	27129-61
COTTERAN, MICHAEL, ...	Trillick, ...	28740-70
COTTRELL, HENRY, ...	Dublin, ...	29755-7
CRAB, CHARLES, ...	Londonberry, ...	28884-3
CRAB, W. A., ...	Castlebar, ...	26020-62
CRAWFORD, COL. SHARMAN, ...	Downpatrick, ...	26805-20
CRAWFORD, THOMAS, ...	Monaghan, ...	1-36
CRAN, DR., ...	Glenties, ...	2105-67
CRANFORTH, DR. R. H., ...	Ballyshannon, ...	22613-4
CRANON, DR. F. J., ...	Cork, ...	12233-67
CRANWELL, THOMAS, ...	Londonberry, ...	7892-93
CRANWELL, WILLIAM G., ...	Dublin, ...	21030-85
CRANWELL, FLORENCE, ...	Bantry, ...	4413-47
CRANWELL, REV. E. T., ...	Dublin, ...	25317-46
CRANWELL, JAMES, ...	Do., ...	2676-716
CRANWELL, PATRICK, ...	Cavan, ...	17221-519
CULLAN, DR., ...	Castleblayney, ...	28849-441
CULLISTON, L., ...	Maryborough, ...	708-13
CULLINAN, MRS. M. J., ...	Trillick, ...	17156-68
CULLINAN, MARION, ...	Ennis, ...	4476-650
CUMMINS, DR. W. A., ...	Cork, ...	4005-85
CUMMINGS, MICHAEL, ...	Waterford, ...	18138-77
CUMMINGS, JOHN, ...	Galway, ...	12556-716
CUMMINGS, P. J., ...	Do., ...	22346-57
CUMMINS, CHARLES J., ...	Waterford, ...	27077-709
CURRY, JAMES, ...	Cork, ...	28954-35
CURRY, WILLIAM, ...	Narragh, ...	26679-83
CURRICK, TIMOTHY, ...	Limerick, ...	24394-411
DAGG, J. RAULF, ...	Nass, ...	24032-3
Do., ...	Wicklow, ...	20895-922
DALY, JOHN, ...	Ballyshannon, ...	28191-200
		13427
		25535-53

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF WITNESSES—continued.

Name.	Where examined.	Number of Answers.
DALY, JAMES, ...	Castleblayney, ...	8236-317
DALY, JAMES, ...	Castlebar, ...	23466-78
DALY, MICHAEL C., ...	Do, ...	23940-4804
DARCY, J. J., ...	Galway, ...	24223
DARLING, DR., ...	Armagh, ...	9179-324
DAVEY, ROBERT, ...	Sligo, ...	22528-68
DELAHAYE, DR., ...	Dublin, ...	17343-8
DELANEY, HUGH, ...	Newagh, ...	21833-464
DE LA POINTE, Hon. Mrs., ...	Clonard, ...	21006 & p. 727
DEANOND, JAMES A., ...	Letchinny, ...	3724-35
Do, ...	Dunfussagh, ...	4275
DEWSON, GEORGE, ...	Belant, ...	11501-84
DEWSON, J. H., ...	Do, ...	11365-91
DEWSON, T. W., ...	Dublin, ...	13506-17
DEWES, WILLIAM, ...	Kilbarney, ...	18378-420
DEWNEY, WILLIAM, ...	Londonderry, ...	1783-897
Do, ...	Latterkenry, ...	3618-928
DELAN, JOSEPH, ...	Dundalk, ...	12501-046
DONAGHY, JAMES, ...	Castleblayney, ...	8031-04
DONOVAN, ST. JOHN HENRY, ...	Trillick, ...	26501-032
DONOVAN, MISS, ...	Do, ...	26633-747
DONLTY, HENRY, ...	Newagh, ...	25026
DONNAN, JAMES, ...	Cork, ...	28728-48
DONN, WILLIAM, ...	Castlebar, ...	23311-41
DOTY, MARTIN E., ...	Weyborough, ...	18228-43
DOTY, J. D., ...	Westport, ...	19869-925
DOTY, MAURICE, ...	Waterford, ...	26406-78
DOVER, J. R., ...	Do, ...	20783-64
DOVER, Rev. J. C., ...	Dublin, ...	16330-62
DRONOGODA, T. B., ...	Navan, ...	13440-86
DUFFY, JOHN, ...	Ballyshannon, ...	4478-46
DUFFY, PATRICK, ...	Castleblayney, ...	7862-862
DUFFY, JAMES, ...	Do, ...	8075-28
DUFFY, MATTHEW, ...	Dundalk, ...	12913-33
DUNLEVY, JAMES, ...	Londonderry, ...	1943-37
E		
EASON, CYRIL, ...	Dublin, ...	16841-448
EDGEWORTH, T. N., ...	Longford, ...	18279-33
EGAN, Mrs., ...	Dublin, ...	17179-94
EMLE, Lady, ...	Limerick, ...	26137-67
ENNIS, M. A., ...	Westport, ...	19486-094
EVERARD, Col. N. T., ...	Navan, ...	12055-128
F		
FARR, DR. GEO., ...	Banis, ...	24808-090
FARRON, BENJAMIN, ...	Castleblayney, ...	8006-36
FARRINGTON, Rev. M., ...	Galway, ...	24334-68
FARRIS, J. E., ...	Cork, ...	28146-53
FARRELL, THOMAS, ...	Do, ...	28189-90
FARRELL, T. M., ...	Cavan, ...	8724-37
FARRELL, J. J., ...	Clonard, ...	21313-02
FARROW, THOMAS, ...	Ballyshannon, ...	4696-001
FARROW, THOMAS, ...	Belant, ...	10610-32
FIELD, JOHN, ...	Dublin, ...	16635-72
FIELD, EDWARD, ...	Naas, ...	17790-9
FILCHER, Capt. W. De S., ...	Dundalk, ...	12647-721
FISCH, Col., ...	Croom, ...	27512-16
FISHER, DR. L., ...	Navan, ...	13179-82
FISHER, F. R., ...	Dundalk, ...	13017-8
FISHER, WILLIAM, ...	Mallow, ...	29408-18
FISHER, J. J., ...	Do, ...	29379-004
FISHER, EDWARD, ...	Do, ...	29416-35
FISHER, Lady MARGARET, ...	Westport, ...	20188-001
FISHER, EDWARD, ...	Kilbarney, ...	27005-92
FISHER, FRED, ...	Trillick, ...	26230-68
FISHER, JAMES J., ...	Clonard, ...	21274-3
FISHER, JOHN, ...	Cork, ...	28201-95
FISHERSON, JOHN, ...	Roscommon, ...	23719-3033
FISHERSON, JOHN, ...	Limerick, ...	28612-34
FLANNAGAN, E. M., ...	Enniskillen, ...	6603-881
FLATLEY, Rev. J., ...	Galway, ...	24327-30
FLAVIN, M. J., ...	Trillick, ...	93217-44
FLANNING, JOHN, ...	Armagh, ...	8699-0178
FLANNING, MICHAEL, ...	Wexford, ...	18446-35
FLANNING, DR., ...	Omagh, ...	2816-59
FLINN, PATRICK, ...	Castleblayney, ...	28723-72
FLINN, THOMAS, ...	Do, ...	22783-9
FLINN, E. N., ...	Belmont, ...	22077-108
FOLEY, PATRICK, ...	Trillick, ...	26285-475
FOLEY, Mrs., ...	Trillick, ...	26497-029
FORD, Rev. Canon A. L., ...	Dundalk, ...	18753-79
FORSTER, JOHN, ...	Londonderry, ...	1593-814
FORSTER, The O'DONNELLIAN BLAIR, ...	Ennis, ...	89939-1

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF WITNESSES—continued.

Name.	Where examined.	Number of Answers.
POTTERILL, DR.	Dublin, ...	17002-31
POY, DR. GEO.	Do, ...	188-207
FRENCH, SARGENT, ...	Cork, ...	28400-60
PRYCE, ROBERT, ...	Banbridge, ...	11740-71
G		
GAFFNEY, PATRICK, ...	Carrick-on-Shannon, ...	22572-602
GAFFNEY, PATRICK, ...	Do, ...	22773-82
GALLAGHER, DAVID G., ...	Bantry, ...	29033-72
GALLAGHER, WILLIAM, ...	Londonderry, ...	2244-76
GALLAGHER, EDWARD, ...	Glough, ...	2807-921
GALLON, PATRICK, ...	Enniskillen, ...	0778-81
GALTIE, JAMES, ...	Glennel, ...	p. 721.
GAMBLE, WILLIAM, ...	Glough, ...	5128-56
GANNON, JAMES, ...	Navan, ...	12428-45
GANNON, FRAS., ...	Tyril, ...	12229-55
GARNEY, PATRICK, ...	Tullamore, ...	18827-12
GARRAN, EDWARD, ...	Mullingar, ...	14332-72
GARRAHAN, H., ...	Longford, ...	12295-328
GARRY, MICHAEL, ...	Ennis, ...	22127-23
GARRY, PATRICK, ...	Do, ...	24124-5
GERRY, P., ...	Longford, ...	10316-5
GILL, JOHN, ...	Bellast, ...	10826-903
GILLMAN, JOHN, ...	Cavan, ...	2076-89
GINTRELL, MICHAEL, ...	Mullingar, ...	14273-412
GLEESON, DAVID, ...	Waterford, ...	20047-60
GOGANEY, A., ...	Navan, ...	12470-81
GOGGIN, J. J., ...	Dublin, ...	14022-77
GOGGIN, JOHN, ...	Glough, ...	2891-5040
GRAHAM, DR. B. G., ...	Enniskillen, ...	4944-67
GRIMO, JOHN, ...	Londonderry, ...	12220-1200
GREEN, MR. M., ...	Nenagh, ...	2242-52
GREEN, CHARLES, ...	Downpatrick, ...	10902-104
GREEN, JOHN, ...	Do, ...	12302-14
GRIFFY, MICHAEL, ...	Ennis, ...	12475-90
GRUCE, MISS RICHMOND, ...	Glennel, ...	25106-222
GRUCE, JOSEPH H., ...	Do, ...	21513-403
GUTHRIE-MOORE, J. B., ...	Glough, ...	21526-82
H		
HACKETT, GEO., ...	Tullamore, ...	12474-767
Do, ...	Nenagh, ...	22212-22
HACKETT, DR., ...	Waterford, ...	20043-46
HACKETT, JAMES, ...	Glennel, ...	p. 729.
HALL, DR., ...	Monaghan, ...	7294-224
HALL, DR., ...	Bellast, ...	11318-52
HALLFERRY, JAMES, ...	Dundalk, ...	12603-5
HALLMAN, THOMAS, ...	Navan, ...	12304-32
HAMIL, EDWARD, ...	Dundalk, ...	12522-12024
HAMIL, PATRICK, ...	Bellast, ...	10100-23
HAMILTON, MRS., ...	Dublin, ...	484-202
Do, ...	Bellast, ...	10226-245
HAMILTON, ALICE, ...	Londonderry, ...	801-42
HAMILTON, DR. D., ...	Do, ...	2648-75
HANLON, PATRICK, ...	Caslow, ...	18772-606
HANNA, W. J., ...	Londonderry, ...	18637
HANSTON, JAMES, ...	Cavan, ...	2217-616
HANSTON, JAMES, ...	Sign, ...	2270-86
HARDY, T. H., ...	Armagh, ...	22149-2
HARDING, WILLIAM, ...	Ennis, ...	22421-21
HARDINGTON, DANIEL D., ...	Bantry, ...	22354-22
HARDINGTON, T. C., ...	Dublin, ...	22927-75
HARPER, S. P., ...	Limerick, ...	14429-29
HARRISON, H. J., ...	Maryborough, ...	22019-42
HARTMAN, MRS., ...	Limerick, ...	18077-112
Do, ...	Cavan, ...	22072-240
HARTMAN, DR., ...	Do, ...	27477-81
HARTMAN, FRAS., ...	Limerick, ...	27472-2
HARLAN, MRS., ...	Dublin, ...	22220-14
HAYES, PATRICK, ...	Limerick, ...	714-22
HAYES, THOMAS, ...	Limerick, ...	22224-224
HEALE, D. J., ...	Limerick, ...	12222-701
HEALE, MATTHEW, ...	Kilmore, ...	2700-212
HEALE, REV. JOHN, ...	Waterford, ...	27121-76
HEALE, WILLIAM, ...	Galway, ...	22746-20
HENDERMAN, FRAS., ...	Downpatrick, ...	24206-26
HENHARTY, DR. ANTHONY, ...	Glennel, ...	12228-201
HENNESSY, JAMES J., ...	Magherafelt, ...	22372-22
HENNESSY, DR., ...	Cavan, ...	2222-172
HENRY, T. P., ...	Glennel, ...	2222-212
HENRY, T. P., ...	Magherafelt, ...	2222-212

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF WITNESSES—continued.

Name.	Where examined.	Number of Answers.
HENRY, DOMINIC, ...	Sligo, ...	22393-414
HENRY, MARK C., ...	Castibar, ...	22342-27
HERBERT, THOMAS, ...	Do, ...	22729-34
HEWITT, THOMAS, ...	Trin, ...	12726-298
HIBBERT, T. B., ...	Galway, ...	24227-23
HIGGINS, WILLIAM, ...	Roscommon, ...	22904-25
HIGGINS, THOMAS, ...	Galway, ...	24433-77
HODGINS, WILLIAM, ...	Clark, ...	p. 942
HOGY, J. O'REILLY, ...	Enniskillen, ...	2222-3
HOGAN, P. J., ...	Ennis, ...	24923-299
HOGAN, JAMES, ...	Lisnack, ...	22368-257
HOPKINS, Dr., ...	Castlebar, ...	24101-2
HORE, JAMES, ...	Wexford, ...	22282-223
HOWARD, Major, ...	Omagh, ...	2415-245
HUGHES, PETER, ...	Dundalk, ...	12240-51
HUGHES, E. P., ...	Carlow, ...	12075-96
HUMPHREY, T. W. D., ...	Londonderry, ...	2705-234
Do, ...	Omagh, ...	2251-4
HUTLEY, DANIEL, ...	Cork, ...	24025-29
HUTLEY, THOMAS, ...	Lisnack, ...	25354-610
HUTTON, JAMES, ...	Downpatrick, ...	12421-500
HYLAND, DAVID, ...	Waterford, ...	20970-25
I		
IRVING, JOHN, ...	Dunlough, ...	4146-73
J		
JENNINGS, Dr., ...	Bantry, ...	22477-22 2
JENNINGS, THOMAS, ...	Longford, ...	p. 970
JENNINGS, PATRICK, ...	Castlebar, ...	12212-26
JOHNSTON, Dr., ...	Londonderry, ...	22742-53
JOHNSTON, E. H., ...	Cavan, ...	2277-23
JOHNSTON, JOHN, ...	Backbridge, ...	2446-78
JOHN, BENNY, ...	Cork, ...	11222-275
JORDAN, JEREMIAH, ...	Enniskillen, ...	27272-221
JORDAN, PHILIP, ...	Belfast, ...	2017-140
JOSCE, P. W., ...	Castlebar, ...	11605-11
K		
KAVANAGH, JOHN, ...	Londonderry, ...	2025-72
KAVANAGH, JAMES, ...	Kilbenny, ...	12721-21
KEAR, BERNARD, ...	Carrick-on-Shannon, ...	22642-22
KEARSEY, J. J., ...	Do, ...	22621-22
KEATING, PATRICK, ...	Clonmel, ...	21223-2
KEELAGHAN, JAMES, ...	Castleblayney, ...	2222-35
KEENE, N., ...	Wexford, ...	20234-22
KELLENB, D. C., ...	Cork, ...	p. 504
KELLY, Most Rev. Dr., ...	Do, ...	22241-222
KELLY, SAMUEL, ...	Trin, ...	12242-72
KELLY, J. H., ...	Bantry, ...	20234-22
KENNELLY, CHARLES, ...	Letterkenny, ...	2072-222
KENNELLY, RICHARD, ...	Neas, ...	12242-22
KENNY, JOHN, ...	Dublin, ...	202-72
KENNY, Dr. J. M. S., ...	Longford, ...	12721-27
KENNY, Dr. R. D., ...	Dublin, ...	12242-22
KING, Dr. LEONARD, ...	Londonderry, ...	1242-22
Do, ...	Enniskillen, ...	2472-224
KIRKMAN, PATRICK, ...	Monaghan, ...	2222-270
KIRKMAN, BERNARD, ...	Do, ...	2222-270
KIRKMAN, PETER, ...	Longford, ...	12242-22
KIRKMAN, JOHN, ...	Waterford, ...	p. 702
KIRKPATRICK, HUGH, ...	Enniskillen, ...	2222-22
KING, MATTHEW, ...	Downpatrick, ...	2222-22
KING, Dr. F. J. G., ...	Wicklow, ...	12242-22
KIRK, Dr., ...	Belfast, ...	1222-27
KIRK, M. E., ...	Monaghan, ...	2222-22
KIRK, Dr. T., ...	Enniskillen, ...	2222-22
KYDE, ISAAC, ...	Omagh, ...	2222-22
L		
LAFFAN, Dr., ...	Dublin, ...	2222-22
Do, ...	Clonmel, ...	2222-22
LANE, JEREMIAH, ...	Cork, ...	2222-22
LARSEN, Very Rev. Dr., ...	Longford, ...	2222-22
LARSEN, JOHN G., ...	Letterkenny, ...	2222-22
LARSEN, ALICE E., ...	Castlebar, ...	2222-22
LAVELLE, MICHAEL, ...	Do, ...	2222-22
LAVELLE, Dr., ...	Dundalk, ...	2222-22
LAVELLE, THOMAS, ...	Trin, ...	2222-22
LECKY, SAMUEL, ...	Londonderry, ...	2222-22
LEE, Rev. T., ...	Green, ...	2222-22

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF WITNESSES—continued.

Names.	Where examined.	Numbers of Answers.
LESTER, DR.	Dublin	14133-34
LEWIS, STEPHEN, ...	Nenagh	21948-2601
LINDSAY, H. B., ...	Keshmulla	4234-363
LEWIS, THOMAS, ...	Cork	127745
LOOKART, THOMAS, ...	Beckridge	28345-623
LONG, JOHN A., ...	Londonderry	11871-301
LONG, JOHN, ...	Dublin	1158-239
LONGHEAD, RICHARD E., ...	Cork	17217-26
Do., ...	Malton	27732-40
Do., ...	Do., ...	29315-25 & p. 261
LOUGHER, J. B., ...	Castlebar	23941-719
LYONS, D. E., ...	Galway	24319-42
LYNCH, DR., ...	Belfast	11354-38
LYNCH, WILLIAM, ...	Nenagh	12631-305
LYNCH, MICHAEL, ...	Kesh	27894-339
LYNN, DR., ...	Nenagh	28289-3004
LYONS, R., ...	Armagh	5083-705
M		
MACDONALD, REV. H., ...	Castlebar	23720-41
MACDONNELL, J. C., ...	Galway	24328-618
MACDONNELL, DR., ...	Silgo	22470-509
MACINTOSH, DR. JOHN, ...	Belfast	11169-64
MACKEY, PATRICK, ...	Longford	14783-272
MACKEITH, DR. M. B., ...	Belfast	16923-37
MACKEY, MICHAEL, ...	Kesh	23240-33
MACNAMARA, DR. G. U., ...	Do., ...	28248-98
MACQUEEN, S. M., ...	Londonderry	1742-4
MADDEN, JOHN, ...	Malton	28420-8
MAGUIRE, THOMAS, ...	Londonderry	2226-342
Do., ...	Dougal	4841-79
MAGUIRE, DR. E., ...	Dublin	112-80
MAGUIRE, J. E., ...	Armagh	9621-5
MAGUIRE, J. C., ...	Beckridge	11866-82
MAGUIRE, DR. EUGENE, ...	Dublin	523-92
MAGUIRE, MICHAEL, ...	Ballyshannon	4323-67
MAGUIRE, THOMAS, ...	Do., ...	4521-34
MAGUIRE, JOHN, ...	Enniskillen	6738-77
MAGUIRE, FRAS., ...	Do., ...	6738-46
MAGUIRE, JAMES, ...	Nenagh	13330-6
MAGUIRE, PATRICK, ...	Carrick-on-Shannon	22529-71
MAGUIRE, JAMES, ...	Nenagh	23967-68
MAGUIRE, MARTIN, ...	Limerick	26005-18
MAGUIRE, EDWARD, ...	Londonderry	2669-103
MAGUIRE, THOMAS, ...	Killenny	18430-69
MAGUIRE, JOHN, ...	Letchmerry	2477-408
MALONE, THOMAS, ...	Nenagh	13313-26
MANAHAN, WILLIAM, ...	Malton	29364-11
MAPOTHER, T. A. P., ...	Roscommon	22828-96
MARTIN, DR. S. E., ...	Nenagh	11966-63
MARTIN, MICHAEL, ...	Carrick-on-Shannon	22463-89
MARTIN, JOHN, ...	Galway	24073-125
MARTY, LIEUT.-GENERAL, ...	Gloucester	21325-73
MARTINSON, JOHN, ...	Cork	8065-223
Do., ...	Longford	14015-75
MERRAN, F. A., ...	Maryborough	18001-70
MELVIN, M. J., ...	Castlebar	22426-510
MERRITT, W. J., ...	Armagh	6030-42
MICHAEL, MICHAEL, ...	Kesh	23069-107
MILLER, ALAN, ...	Belfast	10427-77
MILES, JAMES, ...	Petrollet	23159-228
MISCAMPBELL, ALAN, ...	Belfast	9609-68
MITCHELL, WILLIAM, ...	Silgo	22415-45
MCKELLY, EDWARD, ...	Belfast	12674-11004
MORAN, THOMAS, ...	Castleblayney	8663-66
MOLLOY, MICHAEL, ...	Carlow	18328-74
MOLLOY, DR., ...	Crook	27482-511
MONTAGAN, R., ...	Armagh	9466-606
MONTAGUE, LORD, ...	Dublin	598-621
MONTAGUE, LADY, ...	Limerick	23094-136
MONTGOMERY, H. DE F., ...	Omagh	4930-8119
MOORE, JOSEPH, ...	Dublin	13928-13974
MOORE, ANDREW, ...	Millingar	13074-14009
MOORE, HATFIELD, ...	Tullamore	16380-800
MOORE, ROBERT, ...	Londonderry	1008-2029
MOOREHEAD, DR. G. A., ...	Tullamore	16708-63
MOOREHEAD, DR. T. H., ...	Dublin	16782
Do., ...	Castleblayney	316-308
MORAN, JOHN, ...	Carrick-on-Shannon	8341-72
MORRIS, DAVID, ...	Killenny	22794-801
MORRIS, MR., ...	Londonderry	26866-7004
MORRISON, JOHN, ...	Do., ...	1698-125
MOTILAN, MICHAEL, ...	Killenny	844-7
MULLEN, J. P., ...	Crook	18848-726
MULLAN, R. A., ...	Nenagh	21687-69
MULLAN, DAVID, ...	Castlebar	22157-33
MULLIN, J., ...	Galway	p. 864
MURPHY, H., ...	Longford	22291-4
		12309-15

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF WITNESSES—continued.

Name.	Where examined.	Number of Affidavits.
MURPHY, DR. D. J., ...	Cork, ...	28355-60
MURPHY, DANIEL, ...	Do., ...	28116-45
MURPHY, N. J., ...	Kilkenney, ...	18321-54
MURPHY, JOHN, ...	Bantry, ...	28003-26
MURPHY, JAMES, ...	Waterford, ...	20065-9
MURPHY, J. P., ...	Cork, ...	27864-72
MURPHY, J. T., ...	Belmont, ...	23280-303
MURPHY, TIMOTHY, ...	Bantry, ...	28766-601
MURRAY, MARK, ...	Mullingar, ...	14281-63
Mc		
MCARTHUR, JOSEPH, ...	Londonderry, ...	2717-28
MCARTHUR, DONALD, ...	Belfast, ...	11105-245
MCANER, J. S. F., ...	Do., ...	9708-001
MCANER, OSCAR, ...	Do., ...	11281-227
MCANER, MRS., ...	Do., ...	11430-45
MCARTNEY, JAMES, ...	Timon, ...	13719-36
MCARTNEY, JAMES, ...	Dundalk, ...	13019-32
MCARTNEY, PATRICK, ...	Waterford, ...	20781-819
MCARTNEY, CHARLES, ...	Limetick, ...	25317-44
MCARTNEY, CHARLES, ...	Do., ...	20060-93
MCARTNEY, DANIEL, ...	Bantry, ...	28033
MCARTNEY, PATRICK, ...	Omagh, ...	5704-95
Do., ...	Berrishill, ...	6789-623
MCARD, DR., ...	Castledowney, ...	3319-60
MCCLARNEY, HUGH, ...	Letterkenney, ...	3420-74
MCOSWELL, G. B., ...	Bunclips, ...	11779-95
MCOSWELL, J. B., ...	Downpatrick, ...	p. 430
MCOSWELL, P., ...	Armagh, ...	9536-35
MCORA, J. J., ...	Omagh, ...	8120-37
MCORRY, SAMUEL, ...	Londonderry, ...	1632-57
MCORRIS, RICHARD, ...	Cork, ...	18927-36
MCORRIS, WILLIAM, ...	Cork, ...	27776-602
MCOSWELL, JOHN, ...	Dublin, ...	674-8
MCOSWELL, EDWARD, ...	Castledowney, ...	7821-56
MCOSWELL, DR. H. H., ...	Dundalk, ...	12836-312
MCOSWELL, JOHN, ...	Dublin, ...	16846-658
MCOSWELL, CHARLES, ...	Castles, ...	23331-116
MCOSWELL, THOMAS, ...	Belfast, ...	10131-262
MCOTY, JOHN, ...	Newry, ...	11845-928
MCADDEN, BERNARD, ...	Londonderry, ...	1833-141
Do., ...	Letterkenney, ...	4034-6
MCORR, PATRICK, ...	Cork, ...	23783-94
MCOSWELL, JAMES, ...	Londonderry, ...	2073-61
MCOSWELL, E., ...	Dublin, ...	27120-49
MCOSWELL, JAMES, ...	Berrishill, ...	6747-62
MCOSWELL, THOMAS, ...	Cavan, ...	5401-659
MCOSWELL, JAMES, ...	Do., ...	8811
MCOSWELL, HUGH, ...	Ballyshannon, ...	4513-36
MCOSWELL, DR. J. J., ...	Dunmurry, ...	4133-254
MCOSWELL, HENRY, ...	Downpatrick, ...	18349-806
MCOSWELL, MICHAEL, ...	Waterford, ...	20721-35
MCOSWELL, PATRICK, ...	Do., ...	35165-79
MCOSWELL, WILLIAM, ...	Tralee, ...	26794-894
MCRAE, JOHN, ...	Belfast, ...	16922-626
MCRAE, ROY. B., ...	Galway, ...	24224-35
MCRAE, ROY. M., ...	Do., ...	24226-397
MCRAE, JAMES, ...	Bunclips, ...	11773-7
MCRAE, JOHN, ...	Limerick, ...	28683-941
MCRAE, MICHAEL, ...	Donagh, ...	22002-10
MCRAE, DR. THOMAS, ...	Londonderry, ...	1926-460
MCRAE, DR. J. P., ...	Downpatrick, ...	12441-06
MCRAE, GEO., ...	Londonderry, ...	2163-243
Do., ...	Donagh, ...	4877-040
MCRAE, DR., ...	Belfast, ...	11366-040
MCRAE, JOHN, ...	Sligo, ...	22116-36
MCRAE, DANIEL, ...	Raris, ...	26830-37
MCRAE, JAMES, ...	Armagh, ...	19443-60
MCRAE, JAMES, ...	Maryborough, ...	19882
MCRAE, WILLIAM, ...	Trillick, ...	17929-16000
MCRAE, PATRICK, ...	Cavan, ...	20219-116
MCRAE, B., ...	Do., ...	20357-06
MCRAE, NICHOLAS, ...	Mullingar, ...	8070-600
MCRAE, WILLIAM, ...	Cork, ...	6731-93
MCRAE, MICHAEL, ...	Galway, ...	14070-170
MCRAE, MICHAEL, ...	Letterkenney, ...	25440-55
MCRAE, P., ...	Armagh, ...	24633-31
MCRAE, DANIEL, ...	Omagh, ...	3929-37
MCRAE, DANIEL, ...	Do., ...	6037-35
MCRAE, DANIEL, ...	Do., ...	6096-625
MCRAE, DR. J. C., ...	Dublin, ...	166-87
		10873-742

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF WITNESSES—continued.

Name.	Where examined.	Numbers of Answers.
N		
NEARY, JAMES, ...	Roosomon, ...	28040-82
NEELON, DE, ...	Dewinstock, ...	12407-22
NOLAN, JOHN, ...	Enniskillen, ...	4811-43
NOLAN, DE. M. J., ...	Dublin, ...	18078-125
NORMAN, JAMES, ...	Malin, ...	29235-18
NORMAN, DE. COSGROVE, ...	Dublin, ...	81127-74
NOTMAN, DANIEL, ...	Wexford, ...	10978-29047
NUGENT, THOMAS, ...	Cavan, ...	8971-5
O		
O'BRIEN, JOSEPH, ...	Carrick-on-Shannon, ...	22700-3
O'BRIEN, JAMES, ...	Cork, ...	27979-28004
O'BRIEN, J. C., ...	Waterford, ...	20726-25
O'BRIEN, JNO., ...	Cork, ...	27929-78
O'BRIEN, CAPT., ...	Limerick, ...	25741-64
O'BRIEN, PATRICK, ...	Bantry, ...	29678-66
O'CALLAGHAN, DENIS, ...	Cork, ...	27741-4
O'CALLAGHAN, DE., ...	Londonderry, ...	2623-33
O'CARROLL, DENIS, ...	Killybegs, ...	18479-329
O'CONNELL, DE., ...	Belfast, ...	19754-848
O'CONNOR, THOMAS, ...	Trillick, ...	26549-54
O'CONNOR, BENJAMIN, ...	Bantry, ...	28771-94
O'CONNOR, JNO., ...	Cork, ...	27719-24
O'DONNELL, JAMES, ...	Cork, ...	27745-68
O'DONNELL, HUGH, ...	Ennis, ...	25180-88
O'DONNELL, HUGH, ...	Letterkeeny, ...	3709-23
O'DONNELL, JAMES, ...	Do., ...	4004-31
O'DONNELL, WILLIAM, ...	Enniskillen, ...	6715-9
O'DONNELL, P., ...	Trillick, ...	20748-33
O'DONNELL, R., ...	Newagh, ...	21865-88
O'DONNELL, R. J., ...	Belfast, ...	23586-10
O'DOWD, PATRICK, ...	Castiblar, ...	23617-60
O'DWYER, W. W., ...	Limerick, ...	23458-82
Do., ...	Malin, ...	25299-303
O'FARRELL, A. K., ...	Dublin, ...	28312-4
O'FLAHERTY, J. P., ...	Galway, ...	16888-8
O'FLAHERTY, THOMAS, ...	Trillick, ...	24221-90
O'GORMAN, D. L., ...	Malin, ...	26475-46
O'GORMAN, PATRICK, ...	Waterford, ...	28036-145
O'GRADY, JOHN SEYMOUR, ...	Nass, ...	20391-729
O'HARA, P., ...	Galway, ...	17037-799
O'HARE, WILLIAM, ...	Belfast, ...	24170-223
O'KEANE, J. P., ...	Do., ...	11204-30
O'KEEFE, JOHN, ...	Croom, ...	9082-10109
O'KEELY, R. P., ...	Nass, ...	27335-8
O'KEELY, CONOR, ...	Castiblar, ...	27340-90
O'LEARY, J., ...	Malin, ...	17827-65
O'LOUGHLIN, D., ...	Ennis, ...	22517-45
O'LOUGHLIN, ED., ...	Do., ...	29439-35
O'MAHONY, R., ...	Trillick, ...	24810-97
O'MAHONY, PATRICK, ...	Malin, ...	25108-20
O'MALLEY, JOHN, ...	Belfast, ...	20824-5
O'MALLEY, P. J., ...	Galway, ...	20146-004
O'MEARA, MICHAEL, ...	Dundalk, ...	22820-79
O'MEARA, DE. W. H., ...	Cork, ...	24527-80
O'MEARA, JAMES E., ...	Maghersfield, ...	12284-85
O'MEARA, JAMES, ...	Longford, ...	18967-19040
O'MEARA, P. J., ...	Dublin, ...	3860-3065
O'MEARA, JOHN, ...	Do., ...	19186-212
O'MEARA, DE., ...	Nass, ...	15790-698
O'MEARA, MICHAEL, ...	Killybegs, ...	37145-216
O'MEARA, PATRICK, ...	Cavan, ...	15585-647
O'MEARA, EDWARD, ...	Longford, ...	8916-31
O'MEARA, GEO., ...	Castiblar, ...	14732-81
O'MEARA, B., ...	Castiblar, ...	23692-39
O'MEARA, THOMAS, ...	Roosomon, ...	8189-225
O'NEAL, JAMES, ...	Armagh, ...	23023-76
O'NEAL, DE. J. P., ...	Chesham, ...	9551-84
O'NEIL, J. D., ...	Malin, ...	21055-172
O'NEIL, J. S., ...	Belfast, ...	29217-44
O'NEIL, CHAS., ...	Nass, ...	11063
P		
PATERSON, DE. THOMAS, ...	Londonderry, ...	13233-86
PATON, MRS., ...	Belfast, ...	2313-38
PATON, J. C. C., ...	Do., ...	11296-37
PAULSON, C. H., ...	Wexford, ...	11420
PAULSON, D. C., ...	Douglas, ...	18046-775
PERRY, WILLIAM L., ...	Londonderry, ...	4666-785
PETTY, JOHN, ...	Longford, ...	848-912
PETTY, E. B., ...	Nass, ...	2236-516
Do., ...	Tillamore, ...	14873-915
PEELAN, C., ...	Maryborough, ...	12254-53
		15591-88
		18178-85

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF WITNESSES—continued.

Name.	Where examined.	Number of Answers.
PHILLIPS, JAMES, ...	Longford, ...	12345-69
PIGOT, ROBERT, ...	Limerick, ...	25432-512
POPE, P. A., ...	Wexford, ...	20123-85
POPE, ALDERMAN, ...	Cork, ...	21684-702
POWERS, PATRICK, ...	Londonderry, ...	2104-54
PUGH, J. K., ...	Newry, ...	11964-81
POWELL, DR. CHAS., ...	Dublin, ...	17052-129
POWER, PATRICK, ...	Tullamore, ...	12795-23
POWER, THOMAS, ...	Waterford, ...	22831-5
POWELL, PATRICK, ...	Ennis, ...	25130-54
Q		
QUINN, JOHN, ...	Enniskillen, ...	6752-810
R		
RANKIN, DR. W., ...	Londonderry, ...	12738-41
REARDON, JOHN, ...	Limerick, ...	2703-84
REIDY, THOMAS, ...	Cavan, ...	24645-71
REILLY, P. M., ...	Longford, ...	27434-71
REILLY, FRAS., ...	Do., ...	14590-700
ROSE, M. F., ...	Armagh, ...	14710-21
ROGDAN, MISS MARY, ...	Cork, ...	9429-65
ROSE, J. W., ...	Belfast, ...	28201-500
ROGERS, WILLIAM, ...	Do., ...	11250-0
ROGERS, MATTHEW, ...	Omagh, ...	11440-02
ROGERS, REV. CHAS., ...	Dundalk, ...	24617-65
ROGAN, MICHAEL, ...	Mullingar, ...	4803-06
ROGATY, F. B., ...	Waterford, ...	15722-52
ROGER, REV. CHAS., ...	Wicklow, ...	14448-231
ROGNEY, ROGER, ...	Ballythannon, ...	20386-40
ROONEY, RICHARD, ...	Dublin, ...	19342-67
ROONEY, PATRICK, ...	Carleton-Rossington, ...	4578-35
ROSE, JOHN, ...	Longford, ...	10278-309
RODGERS, THOMAS, ...	Castletown, ...	22633-9
ROGAN, MISS, ...	Dublin, ...	12284-04
ROGAN, LEUT.-COL., ...	Tulce, ...	23208-401
RODGERS, EDWARD, ...	Bentley, ...	1680-707
ROSE, D. C., ...	Moonehan, ...	781-2
ROBERT, DR. GEO., ...	Clovel, ...	24277-65
RYAN, DR., ...	Cavan, ...	20426-31
RYAN, DENIS, ...	Waterford, ...	7261-325
RYAN, THOMAS, ...	Clovel, ...	21594-12
RYAN, JAMES J., ...	Do., ...	8330-49
RYAN, DR. J. F., ...	Galway, ...	50817-32
S		
SCALES, MAURICE, ...	Clovel, ...	21580-404
SCOTT, Major W. E., ...	Londonderry, ...	21405-24
SHANLEY, JOHN, ...	Rosemount, ...	24412-02
SHANLEY, THOMAS, ...	Cavan, ...	21703
SHANLEY, J. D., ...	Londonderry, ...	914-1022
SHAW, ALAN W., ...	Limerick, ...	22610-38
SHAW, THOMAS J., ...	Mullingar, ...	8701-810
SHAW, DANIEL, ...	Killarney, ...	2328-223
SHAW, JAMES, ...	Do., ...	28043-85
SHAW, DENIS, ...	Tullamore, ...	14523-75
SHENAN, JOHN J., ...	Killarney, ...	27177-94
SHENAN, PATRICK, ...	Cavan, ...	27105-308
SHENAN, FRAS., ...	Navy, ...	15234-79
SHENAN, LAURENCE, ...	Trin., ...	27108-50
SHENAN, WILLIAM, ...	Dublin, ...	8250-79
SHOOT, PATRICK, ...	Wicklow, ...	13528-35
SHOENALL, RICHARD, ...	Killarney, ...	13807-048
SIMMS, JAMES, ...	Londonderry, ...	17341-86
SMALL, J. P., ...	Armagh, ...	19423-40
Do., ...	Newry, ...	18783-79
SMILEY, DR., ...	Londonderry, ...	2860-7
SMITH, Rev. R. H., ...	Castletown, ...	0330-432
SMITH, THOMAS J., ...	Cavan, ...	15028-42
SMITH, EDWARD, ...	Do., ...	2728-36
SMITH, DR. BRICE, ...	Belfast, ...	7957-83
SMITH, DR. JOE, ...	Dublin, ...	8031-45
SMITH, Rev. J. PATRICK, ...	Do., ...	8735-82
SMITH, DR. J. C., ...	Cork, ...	11148-68
SMITH, LOUIS, ...	Magdalen, ...	37-113
SMITH, JNO., ...	Enniskillen, ...	505-22
Do., ...	Moonehan, ...	27056-070
SCHAEFER, THOMAS, ...	Dundalk, ...	3513-52
SCHAEFER, DR., ...	Londonderry, ...	0435-02
STACK, WILLIAM, ...	Waterford, ...	7198-840
STANTON, MATTHEW, ...	Castletown, ...	18005-16
STANTON, EDWARD, ...	Ballythannon, ...	2817-48
SCHWARTZ, JAMES, ...	Londonderry, ...	20825-60
		23856-08
		4006-12
		1461-87

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF WITNESSES—continued.

Name.	Where examined.	Number of Answers.
STEWART, WILLIAM, ...	Londonderry, ...	2024-5
STEWART, JAMES, ...	Castletar, ...	2551-5
ST. GEORGE, DR. GEORGE, ...	Belfast, ...	1607-681
STOKES, SIR WILLIAM THOMAS, ...	Dublin, ...	622-61
STONE, Capt., ...	Londonderry, ...	2325-47
STONER, ...		2368
STOFFORD, Lord, ...	Wexford, ...	10770-820
STRATHBURN, R. W., ...	Cavan, ...	5812-69
STRONG, SIR JAMES H., ...	Armagh, ...	1685-61
STRUBB, HENRY, ...	Ballyshannon, ...	4421-45
SULLIVAN, HENRY, ...	Kilmore, ...	27623-76
SULLIVAN, THOMAS J., ...	Do, ...	27079-107
SULLIVAN, DR. F. W., ...	Navan, ...	12257-427
SUMMERS, JAMES, ...	Naas, ...	17262-620
SWINNEY, SAMUEL R., ...	Millinger, ...	14294-324
SWINNEY, N. J., ...	Naas, ...	17221-86
SWINNEY, JAMES, ...	Dundragh, ...	4256-74
SWINNEY, ROBERT, ...	Ballyshannon, ...	4284-90
T		
TAYLOR, THOMSON, ...	Enniskillen, ...	7092-12
TAYLOR, REV. J. W., ...	Monaghan, ...	7671-799
TAYLOR, DR., ...	Bachbudge, ...	11823-47
TAYLOR, LAURENCE, ...	Galway, ...	24051-72
TEAKIN, DR., ...	Cavan, ...	8679-95
TEAKIN, P. J., ...	Millinger, ...	16514-47
THOMAS, MISS, ...	Waterford, ...	20989-22054
THOMSON, DR. JOE, ...	Londonderry, ...	2794-7
THOMSON, DR. E. C., ...	Omagh, ...	5694-815
THOMSON, JOHN, ...	Longford, ...	16070-12034
THOMSON, DR. NORMAN, ...	Wicklow, ...	19023-217
THOMSON, J. M., ...	Belfast, ...	11493-590A
THORNTON, WILLIAM, ...	Wexford, ...	62007-134
THORNTON, DR., ...	Enniskillen, ...	20180-7
THORNTON, THOMAS, ...	Monaghan, ...	6264-435
THORNTON, JAMES, ...	Maryborough, ...	7014-144
THORNTON, DR. JOE, ...	Ballyshannon, ...	18180-224
THORNTON, PHILIP, ...	Monaghan, ...	4469-77
THORNTON, JAMES, ...	Do, ...	7230-41
THORNTON, WILLIAM, ...	Enniskillen, ...	7763-90
THORNTON, JAMES, ...	Naas, ...	6990-7
THORNTON, WILLIAM, ...	Ramsey, ...	13182-213
THORNTON, CAMERON W., ...	Belfast, ...	22890-918
V		
VANHOOT, GEO., ...	Maryborough, ...	18244-32
VANHOOT, J. S., ...	Millinger, ...	14976-86
W		
WALKER, WILLIAM, ...	Belfast, ...	11042-61
WALLACE, ROBERT, ...	Carick-on-Shannon, ...	11042-64
WALKER, JAMES, ...	Dublin, ...	2761-25
WALKER, PETER, ...	Do, ...	16215-62
WALKER, JNO., ...	Waterford, ...	and p. 263
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Castletar, ...	26360-323
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Kilmore, ...	23546-80
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Downpatrick, ...	12523-271
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Navan, ...	12467-75
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	12554-84
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	4757-66
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	3221-89
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	1126-07
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	4841-76
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	2689-221
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	4276-86
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	21816-32
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	408-23
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	208-34
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	703-5
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	17320-49
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	1497-112
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	1622-5
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	7710-12
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	20014-66
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	14771-229
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	21482-260
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	22890-700
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	10004-32
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	18178-35
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	6235-89
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	7769-801
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	7869-8005
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	8692-600
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	10708-62
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	11296-428
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	21473-31
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	2630-69
WALKER, REV. H. H., ...	Do, ...	724-99

POOR LAW REFORM COMMISSION (IRELAND).

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

FIRST PUBLIC SITTING.—THURSDAY, JUNE 25TH, 1903.

June 25, 1903.

At the Ancient Concert Rooms, Dublin.

Present:—Mr. MACKS (Chairman), Mr. MURKAGHAN, and Dr. CORY FISHER.

CHAIRMAN.—The Secretary will read the warrant appointing this Commission.

Secretary reads warrant.

CHAIRMAN.—The Warrant which has been just read explains clearly the powers of this Commission, and it may be gathered that the scope of the Inquiry embraces an investigation into workhouses, fever hospitals, and infirmaries—an Inquiry to ascertain whether in some cases fewer institutions at less cost might suffice, without involving hardship to the sick or destitute; or whether in other localities additional hospital accommodation may not be necessary or highly desirable. This Inquiry is the result of an opinion that, owing to changes of circumstances, the administration of the Poor Law might be improved, and that at the same time expenditure might be reduced. Where so many interests are involved, the Inquiry must be patient and thorough; but it is also requisite that no undue delay should occur. The Commission intend to hold a sitting for receiving evidence at the chief or central town in each county, beginning at Derry early in the month of August, and, in addition to a general sitting for each county, supplemental sittings will be held at various other places where it seems desirable. It is the Commission's purpose, clearly understood that their functions are to make inquiries and to report to the Lord Lieutenant, and that no excessive powers have been given to them for carrying out any change, either great or small. As regards the procedure of the Commission, while it would be unprofitable for us here to discuss in detail the origin of the Poor Law or the opinions that were given at the time (though the history of the period will not be overlooked), it seems desirable to glance at the principal conditions that prevailed when the Poor Law was introduced. The population of Ireland in 1841 was 8,175,000, whereas in 1901 it had fallen to 4,458,000, or to practically half of what it was in the first of the great Famine years of 1845-6-7. Absolute destitution was widespread during the years preceding the passing of the Poor Relief Act in 1838. During thirty weeks of each year mendicancy was the sole support of the aged and infirm of the poorer classes in general, and the mendicants with those dependent upon them were at the time estimated to amount in numbers to the terrible total of 2,395,000 persons. This estimate was made by the Royal Commission of 1833, after a three years' inquiry, and on the Commission were some of the best-informed men of the time in Ireland, including the two Archbishops of Dublin. While those well acquainted with Ireland are aware of the very low standard of recruitment, not to say comfort of life, that exists at the present time for a large proportion of the inhabitants of the country, yet it is equally well known that such destitution as prevailed to such a shocking extent in 1833 is now met with in relatively insignificant proportions. This will appear when we come to examine in detail the statistics and classification of those to whom Poor Law

relief is now given. Upon the introduction of the Poor Law system in 1838, workhouses were designed for the accommodation of healthy destitute persons who were obliged to claim food, clothing, and shelter, because they were without any means of support and were unable to obtain employment and wages. In every workhouse certain portions were set aside as sick wards, or an infirmary, for such of the inmates of the workhouse as might get ill, just as we now have in many well-managed public schools an infirmary in such institution for any child that may become sick. In process of time the number of able-bodied destitute inmates fell away, while on the other hand the poor who became sick entered the workhouse infirmary in rapidly increasing numbers, because in no other institution could they in such large numbers obtain medical and surgical treatment. So far back as 1855 the Chief Commissioner who had charge of the introduction of the Poor Law reported that workhouses were occupied by the old, the feeble, the sick, the infirm, or the very young, and that there were then practically no able-bodied inmates in the workhouses. This state of affairs has continued, but even to the present day there is a widespread, but erroneous, idea that workhouses are largely composed by lazy able-bodied people. This is not so; but, in connection with traditional knowledge of the past, one is naturally disposed to generalise from individual instances of able-bodied pauperism that one knows. Again, strong impressions are made by the sad cases that are known of infants born in the workhouse. Were it much wonder that, within the bounds of charity, there should be strong indignation against the class known as "tramps," who keep traversing Ireland like a stage army, in endless procession, buying supplies on the march, and as far as possible using the casual wards of the workhouses as their resting-places. The Commission intend to make close inquiries as to both indoor and outdoor relief, and also as regards the condition and classification of all these various classes of workhouse inmates—the sick, the aged and infirm, the inmates of various kinds, the epileptic, mothers with infants, the children, the able-bodied, and the "tramps." Having regard to the public discussions and writings of the past two years, the Commission are confident of obtaining valuable and well-considered suggestions, not only from the local bodies that administer the law, but also from those unconnected with Poor Law administration, who have publicly shown their deep interest in a judicious settlement of the questions that are now at issue. A circular addressed to all local bodies has been prepared, and will at once be issued as soon as the Commission obtain offices. In this circular the local bodies are asked to favour the Commission with their views, and to designate some members of their respective bodies to give evidence as soon as inquiries are held respecting the areas with which they are connected.

I think we will now call some witnesses to establish the numbers and various classes of those who are provided with relief under the Poor Law.

June 22, 1905.

Mr. Henry Courtney.

1. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Courtney, you are the Principal of the Finance and Statistical Division of the Local Government Board?—Yes.
2. You hand in this return, showing the number of inmates and persons receiving indoor Poor Law relief, on what date?—3rd of January last.
3. That is the number who on that particular day were in receipt of relief?—Yes, the first Saturday of the present year.
4. Now, if you will take your own returns, and turn to the total page, the total inmates of all kinds in the workhouses on that day?—43,600.
5. Of that class how many were sick?—16,666.
6. And how many aged and infirm?—38,617.
7. How many mothers with infants were in the workhouses on that day?—819.
8. Mothers with infants, that only includes the mothers?—819 mothers. Then as regards the children and infants under fifteen years of age, how many?—6,824.
9. Of lunatics, idiots, and epileptics?—2,366.
10. Those include some sane epileptics?—Yes.
11. How many sane epileptics were in the houses on that date?—422.
12. Some of the lunatics are included in the sick?—Yes, about 1,790.
13. In addition to those you have already given us?—Yes.
14. You will not be able to give us these for some little time?—No.
15. But you will further on hand in a detailed account?—Yes.
16. We may take it there are about 4,000 lunatics, as a rule, in workhouses?—About 4,000.
17. Now, the total number of tramps on that Saturday, including men, women, and children?—621.
18. How many men?—416.
19. Women?—819.
20. Children?—85.
21. The only other class that would remain undischarged would be able-bodied—how many able-bodied have you?—4,514.
22. Out of?—A total of 43,600.

Dr. Joseph Smyth.

27. CHAIRMAN.—You have for a great many years been connected with the Poor Law administration in this country?—I have.
28. And for recent years you have been a Medical Inspector of the Local Government Board?—Yes.
29. You have formed some definite opinions as regards the classification of the aged and infirm?—I have.
40. Would you kindly let us know what they are?—I think the acute and curable cases ought to be separated from the chronic and merely infirm and aged and incurable.
41. In most workhouses, or practically all the workhouses you have visited, have you found that classification was not as complete or was not complete at all?—You might omit the word "complete"; there is no classification with the infirmaries; they are clogged with the aged, the infirm, the blind, the lame, the dumb, the deformed.
42. Chronic cases?—Yes.
43. And you would be in favour of keeping in these hospitals only?—I—Suitable hospital cases.
44. For treatment with a view to recovery?—Certainly; not to allow them to stagnate or clog up the hospital wards.
45. I gather that you object to the present system for two reasons, first, as regards the effect it has on the medical and nursing staff in having various classes to deal with?—It is demoralising to both and injurious to the sick; it drains them their rights.
46. You mean because it demoralises the nursing?—Not that merely, but it absorbs a considerable amount of the time and attention of the nursing staff, and it is also unjust to the infirm, who are not fortunate enough to get into the infirmary, and who are practically left in many places neglected; no provision is made for them.
47. That is because there is not enough room in the infirmary?—If they are not fortunate in gaining admission into the infirmary, they are neglected, because there is not proper provision made in the workhouse for the feeble and infirm. I presume the Guardians say:—"Oh, if they require any attention send them to the infirmary."

Mr. HENRY COURTNEY examined.

23. That is, you may say, one-tenth?—Yes, 10 per cent.
24. There are patients of various kinds in extern institutions, asylums for the blind, the deaf and dumb, and for special treatment in surgical and other hospitals—what are the numbers receiving external treatment?—On that day, 906.
25. In addition to that there are children in district schools?—Total, 418.
26. Boys?—229, and 189 girls.
27. Those are in the district schools of Trillick and Glenties, and those are the only Poor Law schools that there are in Ireland?—The only schools extern to workhouses which have been established.
28. Then a few children have been sent to schools certified under the Proper Children Act of 1896?—Twelve children altogether.
29. And those are twelve girls?—Yes.
30. Now for the boarded-out children—give me the numbers?—Males, 1,106; females, 1,115; total, 2,221.
31. You are preparing some further returns?—Yes.
32. You have given us returns of the number of tramps according to the workhouses on the map, which shows really the route of country they take?—On that particular day.
33. I have not quite studied that enough to ask you questions about it, but later on, I dare say?—I should mention that the official returns show that in some workhouses tramps do not remain over the Saturday.
34. And you think we have rather a smaller number in this return of tramps than we ought to have?—It is quite possible.
35. For instance, you think that if on the preceding Thursday the cesses had been taken, the number would have been greater?—I think so. There were no cesses or tramps in several workhouses on Saturday, the 3rd of January last, although many of this class had been relieved in these workhouses during the week then ended.
36. And the number per year is something like 5,000 collective days?—There were about 4,000 tramps, actually 3,006, relieved in the workhouses during the week ended on this particular day.

Dr. JOSEPH SMYTH, Medical Inspector Local Government Board, examined.

48. Well, now, without mentioning any case, if you could take some ordinary workhouse, roughly, that you have in your mind, take a number of patients, whatever it may be, a hundred or fifty, or any number that occurs to you as being a real number, will you tell me exactly how you would work out your classification; take the number of patients in the infirmary and the number of aged and infirm?—I think that in a hospital at present having 100 persons, there would be not more than twenty hospital cases, such cases as should be received into the wards of a hospital fitted up for treatment on modern lines.
49. Then that would mean that eighty should go out?—Of the remaining eighty, I would calculate that at least ten, that is 10 per cent., are unfit cases to be a burden on the rates.
50. At all?—At all.
51. In any ward?—And if they were required to go into the infirm wards of the workhouse, they would leave altogether, they would refuse to reside in the workhouse, and so the rates would be relieved of that number—30 per cent.
52. Well, then, you would have twenty left in the infirmary?—You would have twenty hospital cases, ten unsuitable cases for relief at all.
53. They would go out?—They would go out.
54. Of the number that would be in hospital you would have twenty left, and the others, what would happen to the seventy?—They would be suitable cases for the infirm or feeble wards; they would go to the parlour as destitute, who were infirm or deformed, or suffering from some physical defect or infirmity, and who would receive domestic care, cleanliness, and plain, homely comfort. I believe that they would obtain that at some saving to the rates from the present cost in the infirmary.
55. Do you contemplate that any bed-ridden aged and infirm people should be removed from the infirm ward?—Surely; certainly, they are there for life.
56. That would involve nursing for the infirm ward?—Well, at least, domestic care.

57. Take bed-ridden people?—Bed-ridden people, who would require nursing care, should be provided with it, and if in the infirmary wards hospital cases should arise, as in any institution, they should be transferred to the hospital.

58. As at present?—Yes, as is done at present.

59. Then the twenty would be left in the workhouse proper, and taking that workhouse with 100 sick, about what nursing staff would you have there, in the particular one you have in view?—You mean the staff that ought to be, or the staff that is?

60. The staff that is?—There probably would be from six to eight, or from five to eight.

61. That would be about the average. You would leave some of these nurses in charge of the hospital, and transfer some of them to the aged and infirm ward; you would not want all that for the twenty?—Oh, no.

62. Then with the seventy cases, you would transfer some of the nurses?—Yes.

63. Do you think that would be an economy?—I do.

64. You have looked into it?—Yes.

65. And you think it would be economical to have two nursing staffs and two sets of patients, the more severe cases, and what you might call the chronic cases, in separate wards?—There is a difference in the quality of nursing and an essential difference in the quantity of nursing required, and there must of necessity, when it is worked out in practice, be an economy, apart from the increased efficiency.

66. Owing to the lower dietary?—A number of people get treatment in the infirmary unjustifiably expensive at present; they get comforts, what to them are luxuries, at the expense of the outpatients, which they do not need and they ought not to get, and the temptation is very great to the medical officer, when he is surrounded by a large number of these people clamouring for comfort as they call it, and clamouring for extras which they see their bed-fellows getting, and they are very partisan in their views; they don't see that a bed-fellow might have a necessity for what is denied to them.

67.—One man is as good as another three?—Better; that is the man himself.

68. Then the result of what you say is, that you would separate the infirmaries and hospitals from the body of the poorhouse. I know that at the time of the passing of the Local Government Act of 1880, you had a great deal to say to the idea of district hospitals?—The 10th clause.

69. Would you propose to carry out that idea at all now?—I would, but before I would pass to that, you might permit me to supply an omission. The economy that could be effected at present in the consumption of stimulants, in my opinion, is enormous, and that would be effected very largely by the separation of the real hospital cases from the large mass of chronic and intractable lodgers and schemers.

70. Do you think the doctors as a class are not stimulated enough to resist the importunities for stimulants and extras from the patients who are not really in need of them?—In many places you expect too much from the doctor if you ask him to do all this; in many places they do, and it is contrasting where it is done with places where it is not done that supplies me with figures. I am quite satisfied the saving in the consumption of stimulants, apart from the moral and other good, would be enormous, because the opportunity would be removed and the excuse would be taken away, and it is the constant consumption of the bottle of porter to this person and that person, and the half glass of whiskey, which seems very slight, but which multiplied by every day in the year—

71. That makes the big bill?—If a man received four ounces of whiskey every day for years and years—

72. You know such a case?—Oh, yes, I do. And then these other people, who are the chronic, I know that for many many years they have been lodgers, not patients, in the infirmaries. I meet them in the villages and towns going about message to the post or for papers, and probably they have been there for twenty or thirty years. They are no more ill than you or I; they probably may have a little halt and not walk straight, or something of that kind.

73. Is there anything else you wish to say before passing on to the district hospital?—I think not, Mr. Chairman.

74. You say the poorhouse infirmaries were not intended for hospitals—you mean, of course, for modern hospitals—they were built for sick wards, according to the idea of the time?—They were not built for any hospital, ancient or modern.

75. Oh, they were?—Subject to your correction, they were intended to receive such persons as would be out of health amongst a population mainly considered to be able-bodied.

76. The old hospitals in existence at the same time were not much better, if at all better. Take the county infirmaries?—There is still the indication, even in the worst of the county infirmaries, there is still the basis of the hospital idea, which is not in the Poor Law infirmary at present, and the fever hospitals which were constructed subsequently, they indicated a hospital idea, I don't say modern, but good.

77. Then about the district hospitals, doctor?—Well, I would submit, sir, that the community ought to be afforded hospital provision. I consider provision for hospital treatment is a necessity for the poor who are not destitute, and I think that they ought not to be obliged to seek that hospital treatment for sickness or injuries through the gate of the poorhouse.

78. Quæ pæpæ?—As pæpæ; people who are not destitute either the poorhouse, and I don't know that it would be a wise thing to remove that wholesome feeling amongst the people in Ireland. I think it is to some extent a security against leaning on the infirmaries.

79. How would you carry out that change?—I would carry that out by suggesting that small district hospitals should be provided in the districts that are at present served by the Poor Law hospitals, and that these should be wholly dissociated from poorhouses; that these should be for really hospital cases.

80. And the twenty patients from the workhouse should go there?—Yes.

81. They would not remain in the workhouse?—They would not remain in the workhouse, and any one which might arise would be transferred to the hospital for treatment, and sent back again when relieved or cured. When I said acute and curable, I did not mean only persons who would be restored to perfect health, but people with incurable diseases, presenting a phase of disease that would be relieved or relieved. At present if a person has an attack of asthma once in three months, he is retained in the infirmary his lifetime; or if he have a moraine of the heart, it is a justification for his being retained.

82. These hospitals would be worked, according to your idea, to take the place of the workhouse infirmary?—Quite so.

83. Where would you meet them?—In the centres that are at present supplied by workhouses.

84. Take a union in your own district?—Naas or Athy. You would have a district hospital in the town, leaving the workhouse in the town, but sending the sick to the hospital in the same neighbourhood?—Yes; because I think the workhouse is pretty well situated for the convenience of the community, and I would class these small district hospitals as the county infirmaries are; put them all on the same level.

85. Would you touch the county infirmary?—I would put them on the same level and under the same administration.

86. That would be under the County Councils?—Yes. I would be sorry to see the county infirmary abolished, because they have done good work in the past, and are still doing so; undoubtedly, they have kept alive the high standard of Irish provincial practice.

87. You rather have a hope that private benefactions would come to the rescue?—Undoubtedly; at present that is a very great want in the country, that people who, though poor, are not destitute, but when disabled by sickness or injury, have no place but the poorhouse to go to, and they either that.

88. Or Dublin?—Well, Dublin cannot receive everybody, and besides, Dublin is at a great distance and it would afford a field for the wealthy and benevolent to contribute for the good of their neighbourhood, where they have resided, or where they have made their money.

89. Are you aware of what the practice is about county infirmaries, and the subscriptions to them?—Well, I am sorry to say that the subscriptions are in a small proportion, as far as I know, to the endowment.

90. Do you know whether they have fallen off or increased since the passing of the Local Government Act of 1880?—I cannot speak from personal knowledge.

91. But you would anticipate—you have faith in the generosity of the public—you would anticipate private benefactions?—Undoubtedly; confidently anticipate it.

92. The next matter which you have touched is the question of anatomy, or hospitals for the isolation, care, and cure of consumption?—Yes, sir.

June 22, 1903.
Dr. Joseph
Smith.

93. What do you suggest in that respect?—I should hope that one outcome of this Commission would be to make available a certain number of workhouse buildings.

94. Some workhouses might be closed?—Some workhouses might be closed and converted into sanatoria, if workhouses in suitable situations were selected, and though they were not constructed for such a purpose, still Ireland is a poor country, and I think we ought to try and make the best we can of the material at our disposal, even although it is not ideal; these buildings could be improved at a small cost, rendered much brighter and better ventilated, better lighted, new windows, new stairs. The top wards at present are in many places derelict on account of bad stairways. They could be made easier of access, and a balcony around the upper wards on the sunny side would not be expensive, and would enable the occupants of the upper wards to get out into the open air and sunshine.

95. I think you said also in your notes of evidence that these balconies would be convenient in case of fire?—Convenient in case of fire, which, in my opinion, is a very important consideration. I am sorry to say it is very absent in Ireland.

96. These consumptive homes, under what body would they be placed?—I would place the hospital control in the charge of the County Councils, consumptive hospitals and district hospitals administered by local committees.

97. And these committees appointed by?—By the County Councils; and there certainly should be on them a very substantial representation of the benefactors, subscribers, and others.

98. That would be an improvement for benefaction?—Yes, that is quite consistent with the principle of County Councils at present in the appointment of their committees; they give very large representations, in fact almost equal representation to others in their agricultural and technical committees.

99. As we saw from Mr. Curran's figures, there is a large number, in round numbers 4,000, of lunatics in the workhouses. What do you suggest with reference to them?—I would suggest that some of the workhouses that would be vacated would be appropriated for harmless lunatics who are clean, and only the clean, harmless lunatics; the wet, and dirty, the epileptic, the criminal and the dangerous, ought to be in an equipped asylum with a trained staff.

100. Then you would take them all out of the workhouses?—I would entirely separate the care of the lunatics from the treatment of paupers. I would have the two classes entirely separated, not in the one institution, not in the one building.

101. You also contemplate the possibility of boarding-out lunatics, as in Scotland?—I think the experiment might be tried; there is a great deal to be said for and against. I know that there are many who on moral grounds object strongly to the boarding-out system, but when I was in Scotland, as far as I came

across any person who had personal experience, they spoke very highly indeed of the boarding-out system.

102. Do they board out both sexes; do they make any distinction about age?—I don't know that they do.

103. There is no qualification as far as you know?—I don't know; and they are visited by the parish doctor, who is paid a small fee, and they are inspected by the parish officer, who would be represented here by the relieving officer.

104. And inspected by the Lunacy Department?—I believe so.

105. The only other matter is the question of children in workhouses?—I think children of all ages should be boarded out of the workhouses.

106. Except the very infants?—Of all ages, once they get out of the maternity ward they ought not to be returned, and that would set free the male and female school-rooms, the male and female children's dormitories, the male and female teachers' apartments, the male and female children's recreation grounds, and the nurseries.

107. Do you see any difficulty in arranging that children whose parents are in the workhouse should be boarded out?—Of course you would require legislation.

108. Do you see any difficulty?—I don't think there is any difficulty that could not be overcome; how it is to be overcome I am not prepared to suggest.

109. Dr. BROWN.—What would you suggest should be done with the infirm and incurable cases in small workhouses, where there would be only a few of this class?—I don't quite—

110. CHAIRMAN.—In the workhouses where there would be only eight or ten aged and infirm or incurable?—I should suggest that as far as possible such cases should be concentrated in one or more workhouses in the county, so as to help in your object of setting vacant workhouse buildings available for seasons and for harmless lunatics.

111. Dr. BROWN.—That may be one of the ideas why they are in the infirmaries at present. There are only a few of them, and it is not economical to have these treated separately with a separate nurse?—It would not require a qualified nurse of the standing which would be required under any hospital equipment.

112. CHAIRMAN.—What would be your idea with regard to admitting paying patients into cottage hospitals?—I think that people who can pay should not be a burden on the rates as they are at present, because even the payment which they do make does not discharge their liability; many would be delighted to have the opportunity of paying for their nursing, which they could not have at home, and quite willing to pay the fee for their medical attendance, and I think mainly, at any rate largely, the patients' payments should afford the remuneration of the medical officer of the hospital, and I would not be inclined to confine the appointments to one medical officer only; I think the appointments might be open to more than one medical officer in the town.

Dr. E. MAGENNIS examined.

113. CHAIRMAN.—You have been a Poor Law Guardian for a number of years, and you have had experience of Poor Law administration in the North of Ireland, I think chiefly in Armagh and Down?—County Armagh and County Down.

114. You have certain opinions now as to the expediency of dissolving some of the Poor Law unions in Ireland?—Yes, I have. I am afraid in filling your hat of queries, I perhaps, did not just make myself as intelligible as I might have done. My opinion on the workhouse system generally is that I would alter it completely, and perhaps if I were to give you shortly what I would do with the inmates of the workhouse, it might facilitate you.

115. I think that would be the quickest and best way?—In the year 1888, at the Larges Board of Guardians, I brought up a resolution somewhat after this style:—"That in the opinion of the Larges Board of Guardians, the time has now come when the Government should appoint a Commission to inquire into the working of the Poor Law system in Ireland, with a view of introducing some other method of dealing with our poor, or to make such changes in the present system as would lessen the heavy expenditure imposed on the ratepayers, and be more in accordance with the wishes of the people." That resolution was, I am sorry to say, defeated by a very large majority. And I mention this solely to show the public change of opinion on this

matter between that year and 1901. In 1901, I brought up at the Armagh County Council, a much more representative body, the same, or almost the same, resolution, and that resolution was not only passed unanimously by the Council, but a copy of the address that I then made was ordered to be sent to each of the County Councils in Ireland, the Boards of Guardians, and the Members of Parliament for Ireland. The mode of dealing with the poor, as they stand, briefly was this:—I would divide the poor in a workhouse into five classes, first, lunatics and imbeciles; secondly, children over three and under thirteen years of age; thirdly, sick and infirm, and children under three years of age; fourthly, able-bodied paupers; and fifthly, tramps or night lodgers or casuals. With the first class, that is the lunatics and imbeciles, I would simply deal with them by dividing them into two classes, sending one to the county asylums, and putting the other into some of the vacated workhouses, making them auxiliary workhouses when necessary and when possible, in order to avoid the extra expenditure on additional officials, and a number of the lunatics should be boarded out after the Scotch system, to which Dr. Smith has referred. The second class, that is the children over three and under thirteen, all these should be boarded out, and in this way children are removed from the baneful influences of workhouse life, and they are generally much better treated than they would be in workhouses,

Dr. E.
Magennis.

June 22, 1905.

Dr. H. Magrath.

and are under proper supervision by the local Guardian or the Inspectors; they are generally very well cared for. In my opinion, they are very well cared for, as a rule. And when one sees the children coming up for inspection that have been boarded out like that, it certainly impresses one that that system of dealing with them is a good one.

124. Yes, more intelligent and stronger than if they remained in the workhouse?—Much better.

127. More likely to make their way in life?—Oh, yes, very much better. The third class, the sick and infirm, and children under three years of age, these I would put all into the district hospitals or cottage hospitals, homes for the sick or infirm. I would not think of calling them workhouses or anything of the sort.

128. What number would you contemplate of those?—It would be a very difficult thing. I could scarcely agree with Dr. Smyth's classification of the two sick classes that he made, that is, the curable sick and the incurable sick. They may be in separate wards, but I think it would be much better if they were in the same building. The difference after all in the nursing is not so very great, and I think the expenditure would certainly be much heavier.

129. But those cases that Dr. Smyth referred to that were able to go out on messages in the villages and towns, those cases ought not to be in hospital?—There are a great number of these in workhouses that should not be there, and I am afraid the officials encourage those, as I probably would do myself if I were an official, inasmuch as they are glad of having some help at hand. Certainly the paid officials are too few, and they are very glad of having any of those handy people, even the doctors, to help them. Well, able-bodied paupers I would certainly not let them into the workhouse at all.

130. We had some figures given to us before you came in. They number exactly one-tenth of the inmates, 4,300 out of 43,000—what would you do with those 4,300?—I would certainly, if possible, keep them out of those places altogether, and I would appoint, in order that these people might have facilities for employment, I would appoint in each district a workmaster or superintendent of labour, and this workmaster or superintendent would have a book, just as they have in an ordinary registry office for servants, containing a list of the persons seeking employment, and a list of the persons wanting employees, and this workmaster or superintendent of labour might have power to afford provisional relief until a person would be able to get employment.

131. Where would they be lodged?—I would lodge them in recognised lodging-houses.

132. Paid for out of the rates?—Paid for out of the rates. This workmaster could give them a ticket.

133. Is it not possible that that might lead to a vast increase in the number from 4,300. If a man had not to go into the workhouse, but merely got the price of his lodging, don't you think it possible you would have a large increase in that class?—I don't think, with proper supervision, it would. I think that in Ireland we should have very few unemployed.

134. That is, there would be work for them, but there might be some who did not care for work?—There is work for all if they would work, and I think if this system were fixed up in some way that it would not be so demoralising on the people; after a few years the people would attain a higher idea of self-respect.

135. The next class that you referred to?—The next class are the tramps or night lodgers or casuals.

136. What would you do with them?—I certainly would have them under police control; there is no doubt at all that the present system of giving relief to this class of people is open to very serious abuse. The relieving officer must give admission to anyone applying, and he just takes the easiest way of doing it rather than have a row round his house, as they often have in the country places; he gives it to them without any word or comment. If these people were obliged to go through the ordeal of a police station—of course, in many cases it would impose a hardship on people who have never been in contact with the police, but really that is not so very much—if these people came and were interviewed by the orderly in the police barracks, who at times has very little to do, he would be able to discriminate the really deserving, and the criminals would hardly go near him; they would rather give him a wide berth.

137. Of course, the class you are thinking of is not the occasional man that is really in need of relief, owing to special stress of circumstance, but the profes-

sional tramp?—The professional tramp, and then the orderly could be empowered to give them men a ticket to a recognised registered lodging-house, entitling them to supper, bed, and breakfast. The cost would be about 5d., that is on an average, I think perhaps less.

138. Now as to the amalgamation of workhouse hospitals, county infirmaries, fever hospitals, and other hospitals in the county?—I have always thought that the county infirmary should be amalgamated with the workhouse hospitals.

139. You are proposing to abolish the workhouse hospital and have a district or cottage hospital?—Yes; district or cottage hospitals.

140. Then what would be the meaning of amalgamation then as regards county infirmaries—would you leave them as they are?—No; I would have them under the same government as the district hospital, amalgamate the management, have them governed by a committee, representative of the County Council and District Councils, and let those committees be as small as possible.

141. The District Councils would provide the really working-men, because they would be the residents of the locality?—Yes, and the others would be a sort of check.

142. If occasion required. Then, you think, would be a more economical system for the relief of the poor?—I have very little doubt about it. I think, too, there should be an isolation hospital in each county.

143. An isolation hospital, not a ward in a fever hospital?—Oh, no.

144. The isolation hospital would be for cases of—Of suspected infectious disease.

145. It would have to be in the immediate neighbourhood of the fever hospital?—Yes, or in the immediate neighbourhood of the district hospitals.

146. Dr. Broune.—Do you mean a hospital for that purpose?—Yes, I think it would be necessary in some places.

147. Would it not be expensive to keep up a hospital for a few cases coming in that might be suspicious?—Yes, but if you had a small building.

148. There are officers and staff, you know?—In connection with the district hospital.

149. CHAIRMAN.—As a rule, these cases of infectious disease are not discovered until it is very well known what they are; too late often?—Quite true. There certainly should be a sanitarian in each county for consumption. I don't think, however, that you could make sanitary a workhouse hospital for that purpose, or a workhouse. You see the workhouses were built at a time when there was very little known about sanitation, and the foundations of all the workhouses, as far as I know, are soaked with insanitary matter; their walls have become impregnated with it. The whole atmosphere of workhouses, as a rule, is bad; indeed, I have always thought that operations, in major operations, certainly, should not be performed, if they could be avoided, at all, in any workhouse hospital.

150. There is hardly any hospital where they were done to a greater extent, and I think they were fairly successful, were they not, in the workhouse that you were connected with yourself?—Yes, they have been; but you see the mode of conveyance now is so good that an injured person—

151. May be sent to Belfast, Cork, or Dublin, as the case may be?—Sent to some centre. I think the payment, or contribution in aid of the cost of the treatment of the sick or insane in hospitals, should be more insured upon.

152. How would you set about carrying out that scheme?—Take an example in county asylums. I think in each county system there should be an investigatory committee, a committee consisting, say, of three, whose principal duty would be to go round and visit the inmates occasionally, and to make inquiries about the inmates and their friends as to who would be able to pay and who would not be able to pay.

153. The doctor and a couple of the members of the committee?—Yes.

154. And do you contemplate a fixed payment or discretionary power to such a committee to fix payments according to the means of the person?—Yes; but I would always err on the safe side, and make it as small as possible.

155. You would graduate it according to the means. If a man was earning 23 a week, and a member of his family came in, you would make him pay the full cost, perhaps?—Yes.

156. And if a day labourer, earning 15s. or 16s. a week sent one of his children in, he would be only able

June 25, 1906.
Dr. J. C.
McWalter.

to pay—I—A very small amount, but at the same time it would make him feel that he was contributing towards the patient's support.

147. You would give a discretionary power to such a committee?—Oh, certainly; but I would always err on the safe side, and not charge too much. Another thing, too, if workhouses are to have existence, I should certainly say that they should not be so prison-like as they are.

148. Are you speaking from an architectural point of view?—Oh, no; I am speaking from perhaps a sentimental point of view.

149. From the regulations as to going in and out?—I remember when people going into the workhouse, whether they went in as able-bodied paupers or into the infirmary, considered they were going into a prison, out of which they could not get, except by some favour of the officials.

150. Or by taking their discharge on three hours' notice?—Some of them thought they could not get out under those circumstances. I certainly think the old people should be allowed greater freedom, and should have certain hours to return to the workhouse, but should be allowed to go out.

151. Certain privileges?—Certain privileges during the day.

152. You would leave those to the discretion of the visiting committee?—Of the visiting committee. On all these committees I would have as small a number as possible; the most workable committee is a small committee.

153. A committee of one?—Perhaps so. With regard to the dietary scale, I think there is a very great

waste. I think it is a mistake to have any hard and fast rule as to the dietary.

154. You would have a certain amount, according to the discretion of the superintendent of the building, issued, carved and cut for the requirements?—Under proper supervision, I think it would be a much cheaper way of doing it.

155. But of course you knew the difficulty, the difficulty is book-keeping. With the ration system, you cease the ration, and the storekeeper cannot issue more, but if discretion comes in, there is a great room for percolation?—I quite understand that, but I think that the comfort of the people—

156. It might lead to greater waste, but carving could be done, and matters of that sort, even with the ration system?—Yes, I think it would be much better, although it might tend to more book-keeping.

157. It could not well be a subject for book-keeping, so far as I see. Do you see any way in which you could have discretionary issues of food in a business-like way entered in books, so as to prevent percolation?—No, I don't know how you could. I am afraid I could not suggest any plan, but under a proper superintendent, who in turn is supervised by the committee, there should be very little—

158. In some of the large hospitals, undoubtedly, the lady superintendent has a very free hand in these matters, to the advantage of the funds of the hospital. I am sure, and the comfort of the patients; one patient would eat a great deal and another very little?—Exactly.

159. Was there anything else you thought of?—At present I don't know of anything else.

Dr. J. C. McWalter examined.

Dr. J. C.
McWalter.

160. CHATELAIN.—You are a Poor Law Guardian of the North Dublin Union?—Yes, and of the South Union also.

161. And you have had very large opportunities of forming an opinion on the administration of the Poor Law in large unions?—Yes.

162. Do you know anything at all of the smaller unions?—No, I don't profess to know anything of the smaller unions. I have not stated very minutely the points on which I desire to give evidence, but to save time, I might say that I agree with most of what Dr. Smyth and Dr. Maguire have said. The points I wish to emphasise are merely certain matters in which I notice, as a practitioner, who practices mostly among the poor, and as a Poor Law Guardian, that the Poor Law system does not give the relief it should to the poorer classes.

163. Do you mean to say that any class is left out, or do you mean to say that the relief is not suitable and adequate?—The relief is not suitable and adequate to the poorer classes.

164. As regards indoor or outdoor relief?—Both. If I might first mention the difficulty about the hospitals in Dublin. In the first instance, there is no hospital in Dublin except the workhouse infirmaries into which a sick person has a right to go. My view is that every sick person has a right to be made well just as he has a right to live; that is what I think the Poor Law was founded to accomplish, that every person had a right to live, and if he had no means of living, they should furnish him with it. In most of the Dublin hospitals it is more or less a compliment to get a person in; in some of them, such as the Richmond, they have a general rule that if a person presents a certificate from a medical practitioner that he is a fit case for hospital, they have a rule that they shall admit him. But the staffs of these hospitals, in the generality of cases, are paid by the fees of the students. There is a necessity, therefore, to present students with cases which are more or less interesting; therefore it is that the staffs are not anxious to make room for ordinary cases of sickness which have no general interest, like cases of acute bronchitis, and cases of that kind. That is the great thing in which there is a need for reform in Dublin. Take a poor man earning 15s. or 20s. a week—he has no proper accommodation at home, he gets an attack of bronchitis. It is a case of obvious necessity to get him into hospital, for if he gets into hospital he will be all right in a week or fortnight. At present, unless one goes under a certain commitment to one of the hospitals, you cannot get him in; your only resource is to send him to the workhouse hospital. You have then and there to make a pauper of him; he has to put on

workhouse clothes. And although at first there was a great feeling against the workhouse hospitals, and the families thought it a shame that it could be thrown in their faces that any of the family got relief in the workhouse, nevertheless, after persons have come from there, they don't find the place so bad, and afterwards, when they get a little tired, or anything, they ask for a ticket for the workhouse hospital. I think every poor working man should have an opportunity of going into hospital, where he would have a chance of being made well, and if a man were able to pay a small sum, he should be made to pay it. The Local Government Act, as far as regards the founding of district hospitals, was intended to overcome that vice. I made an effort to have it adopted in the unions here, but there were several very grave objections against it. They pointed out that under the Local Government regulations, if a district hospital were about to be founded, that it would be necessary to call in a number of strangers, and there is a spirit of exclusiveness amongst Boards, and they don't like that. Another thing they said was, you could not have a hospital inside the walls unless it was under the master's jurisdiction; they said, furthermore, you should have a distinct set of officials for the district hospital. Of course, the district hospitals, if they were carried out, would meet most of my views, but there are evidently very serious objections against carrying it out. Then it must be remembered, I think, that much the larger number of hospital patients in Dublin are in the infirmaries of the North and South Dublin Unions. There are 1,100 placed as hospital patients in the South, and between 800 and 900 in the North. Of course, much of this classification is not very exact. The Local Government Board have asked us to rectify it, but the fact is you can only put a person on hospital diet, or the common workhouse diet, and there are many cases not suitable for workhouse diet, and the medical officer then, through feelings of charity, keeps them on hospital diet.

165. These are intermediate diets?—Yes; but I understand when you discharge a person from hospital, he has to be put on hall diet.

166. Not necessarily?—The poor people don't know, and it may be as a matter of form he is put on hall diet, but he is inclined to run away. Then, of course, I contemplate that the persons in the hospitals should be allowed to wear their own clothes.

167. If the clothing were suitable?—Yes, certainly, clean, and all that; that I think is very important, almost the most important matter. In Dublin, in every working summer, there is a very great pressure; certain hospitals close for the purpose of cleaning. The Mater Hospital proceeds to close for two months. Well,

obviously, all the patients who go there from Dublin must be provided for elsewhere, and there is practically no place for them but the union infirmaries; thus you have hundreds of people every year made paupers, merely because they happen to be sick; they come back again and again, and the same of absence is lost and the sense of independence.

164. Then you would meet that by a district hospital?—Practically a district hospital, in which a person if sick, or certified to be sick by a practitioner, should be admitted, in which he should be asked to pay the bare cost of his maintenance. We calculate that it costs us between 3s. and 4s. in the union hospital. I would have a working man pay that much and no more. I would not ask him to pay a share of the establishment charges.

165. It is easier for a man to pay for the members of his family than for himself; if he is not earning, there is no money?—It is very hard; in some cases good employers allow their employees a certain amount, or a benevolent society; and thus if a man paid 1s. or 2s., it kept up an air of independence, and no one could call him a pauper. With regard to epilepsy, that has been touched on, and I need not say much about it. The Guardians of Month offered to provide an establishment for epilepsy, and it is a most desirable thing, but when we came to look into the matter, we found we could not take on ourselves the responsibility. Certain Guardians were sent from both unions, and although the Guardians offered to provide a house, there was no provision for maintenance. The only way in which it was proposed to keep these inmates was that probably the Government would give a grant of 4s. a head, and there would be private subscriptions. Some of us, most of the number, did not like to undergo the burden of providing 12s. a week.

170. You had no power to give any undertaking as to how much you would pay?—I think the workhouse would have power to give a certain sum—the absolute cost.

171. When the institution was there?—But there would be still a deficit, and therefore the thing fell through. A sanatorium for consumptives—that has been treated by other gentlemen, and I thoroughly agree with them; there is no doubt there is very great need for it. You send a patient to the workhouse hospital for bronchitis; they are inevitably cases in the preliminary stage of pulmonary consumption, and these cases run into decline, and they are a burden on you for two or three years, and then they die. Lastly, I am informed that, according to the Local Government Board orders, the question of the supplying of what we may term medical comforts to sick people, lies absolutely at the discretion of the relieving officer. I may not be quite accurate, but that is what I am informed.

172. I think you are going now into the Medical Charities Act?—Is not that touched on?

173. No, I am not at all empowered here to take any evidence about dispensaries or the Medical Charities Act?—On the need for increasing the facilities whereby lunatics can be transferred to asylums, there is very great need for facilities in that respect; we have had an enormous amount of trouble about that in both unions. In last July there was a circular from the Local Government Board, saying the cost of providing accommodation for lunatics lay on the County Councils, and both unions decided that they would transfer all lunatics to the asylum on Fern D., as it seemed to them to be the best way of dealing with the problem. There is no doubt it is very expensive in the asylum, but the Guardians said that was not their business—

174. You may take us as knowing all about that difficulty that arose between the Richmond Asylum and your Guardians?—Well, then, I need say no more.

175. What you do wish to say is that you think the lunatics ought to leave the workhouse?—Undoubtedly; and also that we should have facilities; not to be sending them there in a cab and getting them back again.

176. That you should not have them at all?—Presumably the Guardians might have power to remove for extra nursing, but I am informed they have not.

177. You have power to declare the relief as given by way of loan, and then you can recover the full average cost of maintenance?—That is very difficult and tedious; we want some more moderate method. You cannot send a case of delirium tremens to any hospital in Dublin, for they won't take them.

178. You could bring a man into the police court if he refused to pay?—There is a fearful scandal about

these cases; it occurs every possible time; no hospital in Dublin will take a delirious tremens case, and as a matter of practice, they are sent to the union hospital in a cab. The master has the responsibility of refusing them, but he does not like to do so; there is extra nursing for them, and they get brandy and everything like that. After they recover, some of them are sent to the asylum, and then they go away, come back next time, and don't pay a penny. Well, the outdoor relief; the greatest possible reform could be made there. The class of persons to whom one could give outdoor relief is limited. Last year the Guardians of the South Dublin Union were discharged 7s. 10d. for some leaves of bread they gave to the family of a man who was in prison. I need not tell you that Guardians have a morbid horror of overcharges; it frightens them fearfully, and the next deserving case that comes up is refused.

179. The limits are very clear and distinct under the law. Would you suggest that any other class should be eligible?—You cannot at present give it to a widow with one child. That is a deserving class, surely; you cannot give it to a woman whose husband is in prison; surely she above all requires it. You cannot give any help towards rent. I am informed in England it is competent for Guardians to pay 1s. or part of the rent of a room.

180. For what class?—Classes that are temporarily out of work; such classes as are relieved at present by the St. Vincent de Paul Society, and other societies.

181. Do you think your Guardians would support such a view?—I think so; they are most anxious. Even last Monday there was a girl and her brother, both working at some small industry. Their sight was gradually failing, and it had failed to such an extent that they were not able to earn enough to keep body and soul together. If they got some little relief, they would be able to work and supplement it, but, as I explained, we had no power to achieve them.

182. Did they go into the workhouse, do you know?—We were told that was the only thing for them. We had great trouble last year about measles; here in Dublin 840 children died of measles, and except you sent them into hospital you had no means of giving them relief that I could see, and that is an expensive thing. I am not sure, we may have power to appoint district nurses and give a little extra nourishment in these cases, but it has not been the practice.

183. That again is the Medical Charities and the Public Health Act?—We have a ward in the North Union altogether devoted to venereal diseases. I think those cases should be treated in the Lock; of course, it is a matter of opinion.

184. And a question of extent of accommodation?—Partly, but we have had a ward absolutely devoted to that particular class of disease, which was never intended to be treated in such a hospital in a city like Dublin; where you have a hospital receiving a Government grant, they ought to be accommodated.

185. Do you know the extent of the accommodation at the Lock?—I know it is limited. Some of us think that the authority of the master in a workhouse is altogether too absolute; it seems to me rather an elastic system. At present if I or any other Guardian chose to walk through the union hospital, the master can tell us to go out. He never has done so, but personally I don't like walking through a place in uniform; he could order me out, and therefore if I do choose to walk there, to a certain extent I am on sufferance.

186. I think he would be very indiscreet?—He would be decidedly indiscreet, but at the same time he has a legal power to do so, and a little consideration there would be desirable. I am not speaking of any master in particular; I am speaking generally, but the point is this, that if Guardians bring things to their notice, they will promise up to a certain point, and if you press them further, they will say: "Well, ladies and gentlemen, you have no power in this matter; it is in my own discretion."

187. AS SOON AS ANY definite case arose in which you thought the master was wrong you could deal with it?—A comparatively small thing was this; occasionally we find it desirable to prevent visitors going to the workhouse, but it is generally understood, for fear of any case of harshness arising, that individual Guardians shall give—it is not a permit—and the master has sometimes disregarded them, and he need not give us any satisfaction. It is not much of a matter, but at all events, those things make it evident to the master's subordination that he is the person to be obeyed, and not the Board.

June 25, 1893.

Dr. J. C. McWalter.

June 25, 1901.

Dr. George Fay.

Dr. GEORGE FAY examined.

183. CHAIRMAN.—Your evidence is mainly, I see, from the abstract you have kindly given us, directed towards the provision for infants and children, and for the epileptics?—Yes.

184. Kindly tell the Commission what your view is about the treatment of the young?—I think, sir, that all children should be nursed outside of the workhouse.

185. Beginning from what age would you say?—Soon after birth.

186. That is soon after weaning, we will say?—No; I speak now specially with regard to illegitimate children coming in, that they should be put out to nurse, and nursed, if necessary, upon artificial food, but that they should be taken away at the very earliest age from the surroundings of the workhouse.

187. Even at the age of a couple of months?—Even at the age of a week.

188. And placed in ordinary homes?—Placed with farmers; placed in the country; given to young married women of good sense, whose respectability could be certified by the district medical officer and the clergyman.

189. It has appeared in recent inquiries that there was a great deal of risk attendant upon sending children out as long as they were in what you might call the bottle-fed stage?—I quite agree.

190. Owing to dirty bottles and want of care in feeding?—And want of cleanliness. This has principally arisen in my experience, and I am in charge of a considerable number of children of this nursed-out variety, in charge of a foundling institution, and to my knowledge these dirty bottles and want of care are due principally to old women who make a profession of nursing. I would change that altogether. I would give the child to the wife of a young farmer living in the country.

191. Who had been carefully instructed on feeding them?—Who would receive careful instruction; and that the nurse when necessary be provided with proper food. I would not spare expense with regard to very young children of that age, because I think it is essential that they should be well fed, that is properly fed, and that they should have sunlight and fresh air; that is why I wish them away from any life altogether. The inspector should be, in my opinion, the mother of at least two children, and consequently conversant with what a child requires, and with the natural feelings of a mother towards a child; and I would require the inspector to have that child stripped and to examine the child's body—its head, to see there was no vermin; its body, to see that there was no rash; its genitalia, to see there was no discharge; all these things should be systematically done and regularly reported. If the child was found in any way diseased, the inspector should at once wait upon the dispensary doctor of the district, and acquaint him with the condition she found the child in; the physical condition of the child, the clothes of the child, and the way the child was kept, and the bottles and food, and all should be seen in. Delicate children, I suggest, should be kept in a home somewhat after the manner which I placed before you. The "Medical Gazette" of Paris gives an account of how they treat such children in the city of Paris.

192. You would have each of these children visited frequently in the course of the year?—Visited at least six times in the year, and always a surprise visit.

193. Then as soon as the child reached school age, it should go, of course, to the school?—As soon as they reached school age, they would become boarded-out children then, and all the children should be trained in handicraft if at all possible.

194. Would you give them the same instruction as the children of the same class receive in the country?—Yes; but I don't think children of the same class receive enough instruction in handicraft.

195. You could hardly propose to give those children a higher course of instruction than the ordinary children of the country receive?—I would, because the State here is in loco parentis, and the other children would gradually come to receive the same. I would level them up, not level down.

196. You would give them instruction of various sorts—technical instruction, and various other things. Then you point out that a child's after-life will be much more healthy, mentally and physically, by having been away from an institution?—And that they would avoid the vicious habits that are so frequently taught to children mixing among adults in workhouses.

197. Now as regards epileptics?—The present view with regard to epilepsy, that it is largely hereditary, I don't think is well-founded, because it may be gener-

ally taken, as a rule, that epilepsy that does not develop before twenty-five years of age is, as a rule, curable, and that cases developing after seven and up to twenty, yield the largest percentage of cures. I think that epilepsy is frequently the result, and especially in the poorer children reared in workhouses, of the filthy habits which they are taught by epileptics, and which they receive from those with whom they come in contact. I would divide epileptics into day epileptics and night epileptics, and I would certainly put the night epileptics out with farmers. Reynolds, who gave a great deal of consideration to the subject, considers that such cases are most amenable to treatment, and that agricultural pursuits are particularly suitable for them. I would have every epileptic under very careful medical supervision, and I would give rewards for the largest percentage of cures found with regard to them. Epilepsy is due to so many different causes, and, probably, more than any other disease, it requires careful medical examination; it is a brain disease; we hardly know what it is; the pathological lesions left are very variable; it may be due sometimes to constipation, sometimes female health will produce it, sometimes a slight irritation of the ear. It has been known to follow from inflammation at the root of a tooth; it has been known to follow, not infrequently, from worms. For that reason I say that the cure, which is so frequently obscure, should be always set out. I would certainly recommend confirmed epileptics being sent to the asylum, and epileptics should always be removed from the young, because there is a great tendency to imitation of all these nervous diseases amongst the young.

198. As regards the same epileptics?—Of the type you are referring to now, of the poor?

199. Yes, we have about 400 of them in workhouses?—Some cases epileptics are particularly brilliant men. It is a strange fact that epilepsy does not seem to much influence inheritance. Some mathematicians, and others, are epileptic; some very distinguished writers have been epileptic; but the class of epileptics that would come under the Poor Law surveillance would be principally those of weak intellectual powers; at least, the powers, if they were great, were potential; never developed. And I think those that get their attacks at night might be sent out to farmers. Agricultural pursuits are stated by Reynolds to be more efficacious in the treatment than anything else, and being away from other inmates—because amongst workhouse inmates there is a tendency to imitate epileptics, a tendency to tease and worry in different ways—by sending him out to the country you remove him from all those unpleasant and vicious surroundings.

200. Would you rather have such treatment than putting them in an institution together?—I would not put them in an institution together—I think it is bad—because if you judge the severity of the attack by the number of fits, and the duration of fits, and the after influence of the fit, whether it passes away quickly or not, and put a mild case amongst severe cases, the tendency of the mild case will be to become severe.

201. By a sort of apprehension?—Yes, I don't know how it is, but that has been the experience of medical writers. I, consequently, recommend their being sent to farmers. If a farmer gets a small sum, he will be very glad to take a man whose attacks are at night, and who would be of use and assistance on the farm. There is one thing with regard to children that I would like particularly to dwell upon—it is with regard to the milk. The milk supplied to the union workhouses throughout Ireland is disgraceful. The reports are continually coming to me. It has been my duty for many years to be reading the provincial journals. I find that very frequently the percentage of fat in milk is less than it should be.

202. In fact, I suppose it comes to this, that the percentage of water is more?—I would put it otherwise. They occasionally mix sweet milk with fresh, and it is then very difficult to detect, because all you have deficient is fat; the spent milk mixed with it, of course, the albumen and the solids, and when you reduce the percentage of fat in the way they systematically do in the country, you produce a peculiar disease of the small intestine; the mucous membrane becomes diseased. This was first made plain by the New Jersey Council in 1863; the children die of inaction. It is the same with all mammals; they all die when the percentage of fat in milk falls below a certain amount, or when the percentage of fat is not proportionate to the amount of albumen present in it.

Miss WELBY examined.

June 25, 1902.

Miss Welby.

228. CHAIRMAN.—You are a Rural District Council member and a Guardian in one of the large workhouses in Ireland?—Yes.

229. What is your view of the amalgamation of unions?—I am altogether in favour of it, but I suppose I ought to state that any evidence I give to-day is purely personal and unrepresentative. There has been a good deal of opposition shown on the part of the Board.

230. You are speaking your own individual view?—Yes.

231. As regards amalgamation of unions, you think a great deal might be done?—I do.

232. Has it occurred to you to what extent?—My personal experience is confined, of course, to the South Dublin Union. I did venture to say that even an amalgamation of the North with it—

233. Later on we shall be holding an inquiry in Dublin with reference to the particular area to be dealt with, and in the country. We would not now go into any question relating to a definite area, but general evidence on the various subjects. You have given a list of a number of things here that are quite proper for the present sitting. You say that owing to the falling off in population?—Yes; and, of course, facilities for locomotion—

234. That you believe a great many workhouses might be closed?—Yes.

235. As regards the insane and the epileptics, you have seen them in the workhouse, and you don't like it?—No, and of course the medical evidence has been so strong on that that I feel very mistrustful of anything I could say.

236. But your own observation leads you?—I—to quite agree with them.

237. You think a great many small workhouses might go because the maintenance of a small number of paupers leads to an unduly large official staff?—Yes.

238. On one matter, No. 5, you say you are in favour of local provision in villages for cases of sudden illness. Did you mean hospital accommodation?—If we could, but what I have always before me is the dread of suggesting any reform, that at once arouses opposition on account of the expense; but I live in a small village, and I see the dreadful shortcomings, owing to the want of a local nurse. We have a district nurse and midwife, but we seldom have our village without one or more cases of illness that require nursing. The housing of the people is so defective. I often find cases of patients lying in a house of one apartment; no proper accommodation, no way of separating them; sick and healthy together.

239. What you think is that either a cottage hospital or district nursing would be necessary for humane treatment?—Yes.

240. You mention the abolition of pauper ward assistants, except for scrubbing and cleaning purposes, but there is an order to that effect, and any violation of it, of course, would be noticed if it were brought before the Local Government Board?—Our wards in the South Dublin Union—

241. Without going into any particular workhouse?—The only workhouse I am intimately acquainted with is one where I have noticed a number of ward assistants.

242. You have noticed, even at the present time, that paupers are discharging, to your knowledge, nursing duties?—Well, perhaps not technically, but at any rate, they are in attendance upon the inmates, and I fail to see how it could be otherwise.

243. Well, now, the evidence that you offer to give about the Dublin unions we would be very glad to get from you later on, and about the question of the Guar-

dians that you raise, but it would not properly come up now. We have to issue notices to all Guardians and local bodies when any evidence affecting their own institutions will be received?—One witness, Mr. Chairman, mentioned the dietary as wasteful. I have always thought that myself.

244. Now, you have seen wasteful expenditure?—Yes; I have seen a whole barrow of good bread that was waste after one dinner, owing to the equal scale of rations, the quantity given, and once laid beside a pauper, it becomes waste if not touched, and is treated as waste.

245. How would you meet that?—By not giving the entire quantity at the start, and by allowing there to ask for more. That has been tried with success in English workhouses, and in one I heard of it effected a saving of a ton of bread in a month.

246. Could you give me the reference to that workhouse?—The Carling Workhouse.

247. I would like to find out whether they have any special books to meet such a system?—Then it is the custom in a workhouse I know is cut the bread in very rough chunks, that leads to waste, and in the case of many in the infirmary, makes it distasteful.

248. You think that a lady inspector would be a desirable appointment?—Most desirable. You see, we have such a very large proportion of women in the workhouses, and I have always noticed that in the workhouse I know best, it always shows evidence of man's hand everywhere. I might mention one detail only which came under our notice. When little infants were being sent out to nurse, it was the stewardess who got out their little suits, and we found that they were sometimes dressed without having those garments altered.

249. Then you would have three inspectors at each workhouse—the general inspector, the lady inspector, and the medical inspector?—Yes; I suppose it would be possible for one lady inspector to inspect more than one workhouse.

250. Oh, yes, from twenty to thirty. Then in the last paragraph you point to the importance of keeping children from meeting grown-up paupers?—Yes.

251. And you would like to keep separate the children that go in and out frequently; you would like to keep those separate from the other children?—Who are permanent. It may be a difficult matter, but still I think it would be possible; there must be a good deal of contamination with those going in and out.

252. You would be willing to keep on the schools and not have boarding out?—Oh, I prefer boarding out. I would prefer to have all of the children out of the workhouse.

253. That would make it unnecessary to have any distinction between the ins and the outs and the permanent, if they were all out. Is there anything else in connection with that last paragraph?—I mentioned putting a restriction on the intercourse between the children and their parents. I have come across a great many instances of entire families in the workhouse, and I presume the parents are still of a workable age. All that tends to perperize the whole family and whole generations, allowing them so readily to drift into the workhouse and remain there, and facilities given to them for intercourse with their children, and, at the same time, the feeling of home life and self-respect is gone.

254. Do you think you might safely take those children from their parents and board them out?—I would, unless in very very special cases, subject to the discretion of the Guardian.

Dr. LUFFAN examined.

Dr. Luffan.

255. CHAIRMAN.—You say that the population of Ireland has so much diminished?—It is half what it was at the time of the Famine; that the number of workhouses might be very much reduced?—Yes.

256. That really half of them ought to suffice?—Well, I should not like to say the precise number; but a very large number.

257. Owing to the increase of railway accommodation?—Yes; I think the railways might be made considerably more use of than at present.

258. Circumstances having changed so much since 1840, when they were started?—Yes.

259. As regard your own county, you mention certain things that might be done; but I think we will

keep that over until we get down to Tipperary, and hear what you have to say then. You think that for the County Tipperary there should be an auxiliary system?—Yes.

260. As opposed to an annex to an existing lunatic asylum?—Yes; on the ground that the whole trend of medical opinion, and the deliberate opinion of the English Medical-Psychological Society, which, I should imagine, would be a supreme tribunal on the subject, are very strongly opposed to still further enlarging asylums that are already too large for the most part, and that it is very much better, because more healthy, to place the helpless and incurable lunatics in auxiliary, because smaller institutions. On this point the English Commissioners of Lunacy themselves have taken

June 25, 1898.

Dr. Lister.

up the same ground. In their last Report they say:—"The Commissioners draw special attention to the need for classification of patients, and for the provision of cheaper institutions for the chronic and incurable classes of lunacy." At the London Epidemic Society, where the question of the prevalence of dysentery and allied diseases was under discussion, Sir Patrick Maxwell expressed himself strongly opposed to great institutions, and in the Report of the Tuberculosis Committee they declared that they felt bound—this is the Report which was adopted by the Medical-Psychological Society:—"We feel bound to enter our protest against the present tendency to build large asylums." Therefore, I am in favour of auxiliary institutions as opposed to building annexes to institutions that are already, from a sanitary point of view, too big. I should also quote the opinion of the great Simpson, who had worked out the matter very carefully; he found, with every increment of patients in the institution there was a distinct increment of unhealthiness. These constitute two or three of the leading lights in connection with auxiliary asylums versus annexes to existing ones. Local people will see great objection to the abolition of the workhouse; whether they may revolutionize in the abstract, when it comes to their own case they have a mighty objection to shut up the workhouse and all its fat belongings; but if here and there these workhouses were converted into auxiliary asylums the money-spending department would still remain, and patients would be very much facilitated.

241. It would break the fall?—It would never then break the fall; for I should say quite as much would be spent in the new department of the asylum as in the old workhouse.

242. Where would the economy come in for the out-payers if you kept the old building on under a new title?—I don't mean that everywhere you should keep the old building on; there would be quite a number of unions supporting a particular auxiliary asylum. Then, with regard to the amalgamation itself, of course the individual cases can only be associated by local inquiries; and further, I would say that the whole thing will only be made practicable by very strong powers vested for the moment either in the Local Government Board or some Board which for the moment would take its place. Local differences and local interests would render any extensive amalgamation quite impracticable otherwise. Mr. Balfour's Bill, some years ago, was assailed because it gave too much power; with all respect, I don't think he gave power enough to the central board. The whole thing would be unworkable unless something closely akin to despotic authority were for the moment put in the hands of some board, not necessarily the Local Government Board.

243. Some means of making a fresh start?—There would be no earthly means of setting it by a conference among the Boards; they would be quite willing to get rid of their neighbour, but extremely unwilling to commit *felix de se*.

244. As regards consumptive patients?—As regards consumptive patients, some of the localities, which are most favourable having regard to the climate, which, of course, is the thing necessarily most favoured for the treatment of such cases, might be selected for the establishment of a sanatorium; and in the meantime some small provision might be made for the separation of patients—I am afraid it would be a case of separation, not of cure, in the case of adapting a ward in one of the existing workhouses.

245. Where is it possible in the country you do have a separate ward for them?—I find, in my place, it is wholly impossible, except on the female side; we are able to do something on the female side, but nothing on the male side. When the nurse was introduced they took up the small wards—it was a very narrow, short-sighted policy not to build them a house; they have been of immense service to the institution, but, of course, they necessarily must occupy some little room, and that little room was, for economy sake, taken from the smaller wards which existed, and we have every day found how much more convenient and economical it would have been to have built a small cottage for them. But all the workhouses appear to have been built on one of two or three plans. I don't think there is any place where there might be adequate accommodation.

246. Unless the number of patients is very small it is difficult to get a separate ward; therefore you would say allocate one of the closed workhouses for consumptives?—Yes; at Mallow, which had a great reputation,

and, I suppose, some place analogous to Glengarriff. And in the interim there ought to be separate accommodation, and also for syphilitic cases—that would mean only a case or two; and ditto with consumptive cases.

247. But you have a great number of consumptive cases?—I don't happen to have, at present, a great number. I don't think there are a great number, unless in very large workhouses; I find it is only a case of from one to four.

248. You think that the able-bodied destitute of two or three unions might be accommodated in one?—Yes; if there was proper provision made by means of giving the able-bodied individual a ticket to go by rail, and having a committee of the united Boards of Guardians to meet occasionally, and see that they were sent on an once-a-week temporary provision for them until they were so sent on. I don't see anything to prevent the able-bodied inhabitants of several unions being collected into one.

249. He would not have any money; just get his ticket. And his ticket would not be paid for unless he travelled?—Yes. Then some temporary provision might have to be made to give him a meal pending his going on to his destination; that might have to be done and it might not.

250. Then, as regards children, you think they ought all to be boarded out?—Yes; but you should first have the place to board them.

251. Even when the parents are in the workhouse?—I am aware there are a good many nice points in connection with that; but the people who are in a workhouse don't very naturally help in the moral development of their own children, and in their case it might be even more important to separate them; but I quite realize that there are inconveniences in taking them out where the parents are in the house, because the worst thing would be for the parents to run away. Still, I think, on the whole, they ought to be out; but you must have a place to put them, and for that purpose the labouring population must be secured as the country, themselves, as it is in their houses they ought to be placed. I am widely opposed to placing them in great institutions; I prefer to put them into cottages, for this reason: it is a very well-known fact that the worst with a poor man can have is a servant who has been accustomed to fall and plenty in a comfortable home; they make very bad wives. I don't say necessarily they always do so, but they do so in a number of instances, because they don't understand that close economy that people in poverty do. And these children brought up in palatial surroundings are not likely to make as good wives as those brought up in cottages and accustomed to some industries. Looking at industry as the end of the whole performance, I think they would be a great deal more industrious and contented with their lot if they were out in the country and in humble houses, instead of in big mansions. For that purpose I think the Labourers' Acts should be made compulsory, because at present they are largely voluntary; and even respectable unions, like the one I am connected with, have merely housed a small fraction of the entire labouring population.

252. You mean the sanitary cottages are insufficient?—Yes.

253. I suppose you have very nearly gone up to your one shilling in the £ at the Cashel Board?—I think it is very near it. The expense of these cottages is outrageous, and that arises from the large way these Acts are drafted; the opposition given by large numbers greatly swells the expense.

254. Well, we are a little off the track now?—I am; but you must facilitate the erection of cottages and the putting out of labourers, if you want to have room enough for the housing of the children and the housing of the aged couples.

255. Still, when children are going to be boarded out there always is a demand for them?—There may be in some quarters, but I am not personally aware of the fact; on the contrary, I am inclined to think—but I am not able to speak positively—that there is an such great demand; you must have a large body to pick from. I am inclined to think there is not where they can be safely put out.

256. Now, about the aged couples?—If you had a wholesale, compulsory housing and lodging of the labourers, as I have called your attention to, these poor people would live in their own little houses and allotments to the end of their days, and be able to pester away at some trifling amount of industry in the shape of digging or helping to till their little plots, and they

could be kept out of the workhouse altogether. There is no reason why they should not, because very many of them are able to do some little thing.

257. You would give it by outdoor relief?—I would supplement—I would hope, if they had cottages of their own, they would be able to "induct" on their little allotments to the last, and I would supplement what they earned by some outdoor relief. On that subject the people suffer a great deal more than indoor people, because they live on what is almost humanly impossible to live on, owing to their anxiety to keep out of the workhouse. I doubt if outdoor relief is a benefit to the poor people who receive it.

258. You are speaking of grants of 1s. and 1s. 6d. a week?—Yes; those aged couples should receive something more than that; but they would be able to supplement it.

259. You assume that these people would have a house and bit of land of their own?—Yes.

260. Have they at present?—No; by reason of the defects of the Labourers Act; but if those were made compulsory, and cheaper than at present, couples could end their lives in their own houses.

261. Then you would suggest the provision of houses for the class who are at present in the workhouse as aged and infirm?—Yes, it would be the most effective way of dealing with them.

262. Without any family depending on them?—You cannot turn out the people who are in the workhouse at present, to cottages and allotments, because they would be unfitted for them; but by making proper and adequate provision for the working classes in the future we would weed out the infirm aged who are now in the workhouse, and render it unnecessary they should approach them at all.

263. Would you contemplate these people paying rent for the houses?—Certainly.

264. And at the same time getting outdoor relief?—That is a difficulty. Of course, the quarter-acre clause, I believe, is substantially in existence at present; at least, I have heard a letter read from the Local Government Board pointing out that the Guardians could not give relief to a person with a cottage and allotment. Some provision should be made to cover that class of cases.

265. I was not thinking of the legal bar, but thinking of the wide view of providing houses for an aged couple for which they would pay rent, and at the same time would get outdoor relief?—None the less, I would charge them the rent, and see it was paid, too.

266. You would stop it out of the outdoor relief, I suppose?—I suppose it would come to that; you would give with one hand what you would take with the other.

267. You are in favour of converting the workhouse infirmary into a district hospital in all cases?—I am; and I tried, myself, to get my own one converted, but the interests of the rival hospital caused the thing to miscarry. And I believe the interests of the county infirmaries are really at the bottom of much of the opposition to the conversion of infirmaries into district hospitals, because, of course, the raison d'être of those institutions ceases when the badge of pauperism is removed from the workhouse hospital. There is the greatest possible injury done to the poor by the failure of Sir John Lubbock's scheme; the people will not go into the workhouse hospital, and when they do go in, under great pressure, it is a halfway house to the workhouse; it fosters pauperism in two ways, by depriving the sick poor of the treatment they would receive in these hospitals, leaving even options to become permanent burdens on the rates; and it fosters it in another way by breaking down the barriers of wholesome pride which stand in the way of decent poor going into the workhouse. The workhouse infirmaries ought to be completely converted into district hospitals.

268. Under what management?—Oh, well, I think you know that the Act makes reasonable enough provision for it: they are to be managed by a committee of the Guardians and people nominated by them.

269. What would you do in the case where you break up unions?—Where you break up the workhouse by firm conviction is you will have to retain the hospital. You can get rid of the children and of the old, and you can carry on the adult able-bodied folk to the united workhouse, but you cannot get rid of the hospital; you cannot remove sick people on infirmaries distances.

270. I quite follow you in that; but under what management would the hospital that remained be?—Under the management of a committee nominated by

the joint Board; I think that would be efficacious enough; the new common Board would nominate a committee for each of the hospitals. It could not be managed by a Board of Guardians; they could not properly manage two or three hospitals ten miles off, but they can appoint a committee of the Guardians from that district, and add other persons that would be suitable, and let them govern the hospital.

271. And the old workhouse medical officer would continue to act?—He should continue to act; but I think it would be a very considerable improvement if half a dozen of the medical residents in the towns were appointed as a staff. I always was of opinion, and put it forward more than once, that the hospitals, furnishing as they do, great means of instruction, ought to be officered, not by one individual, but by a staff. Amongst other reasons I have in this, that the advantages that are offered at present to the dispensary man by reason of registrations, vaccination, and so on, give them such an advantage over the hospital men that in time no respectable man will take a hospital, because his chance of practice will materially diminish. That would be one reason why I would not put a man in a hospital if I could help it; I would appoint half a dozen, but for the purpose of administration the senior man probably would be the head.

272. We have so many workhouses where there are half a dozen medical officers that there is no difficulty?—That would be my view; there ought to be half a dozen men on the staff. If there are half a dozen in the town or within a reasonable distance they should comprise the staff of the place.

273. Paving words you are strongly in favour of?—I am in favour of them; but I have a very strong opinion that the medical profession has a right to be protected in connection with them. There are a great many philanthropic people that are never half so happy as when plauditing doctors. I remember on one occasion visiting a woman who had 200 acres of land, and was admitted to the local hospital, which lives largely on the admission of such people; and a man, a large proprietor in Co. Tipperary, appeared to think the whole case was met by informing me, "But she is paying the hospital." He never thought for a moment how inconvenient it would be to himself to be asked to supply a bullock for nothing. He did not at all see how unreasonable it was to ask a doctor to give his services for nothing, or rather, have a person who would be his patient, treated for nothing elsewhere. If the public at large want to keep respectable medical men, and at present there is a tendency for the leaders of the class to go into the public service—if they want to keep them they will have to mind their "p's and q's" better than they are exhibiting them. They will have to pay us better; and this system of treating people for nothing will have to be greatly curtailed. You must get rid of the workhouse surroundings. It is all very well where there happens to be a county infirmary in the town; the terrible grievance of passing under the Gaudine Furks does not exist for the poor there. But take the case of Nenagh, which is twenty-seven miles from Cashel; it is a most monstrous thing to think that the decent poor there are obliged to go into the workhouse hospital and be classed as paupers. It is most injurious, and the result is that numbers remain set who ought to be in hospital. With a dispensary doctor, who gets three or four tickets, it is, at the end of the week, a matter of physical impossibility that he could go ten or twelve miles to each of the cases. There are cases where the patients require to be seen twice a day; but if sending them into hospital involves the degradation that it at present does a complete case is made out for making the Gaudine Furks operative, instead of being, as they are at present, wholly inoperative. With regard to the system at present, I raised that question with your Board; and the Nivary people tell me they have, too. No patient in well-to-do circumstances can be legally admitted within the walls either of the workhouse hospital or fever hospital. I know that opinion is not held by others, but I will give my reason.

274. I have known one of the Inspectors of the Local Government Board derive considerable benefit from treatment within the walls of a workhouse?—They had no right to let him in. Originally the workhouse hospitals were intended exclusively for the pauper sick. The fever hospitals, which originally were county institutions, or which were built at the expense of the county very largely—when they were added, as they nearly in every instance were added, to the workhouse, there immediately arose the necessity for making pro-

June 26, 1923.

Dr. Loftis.

vision for the admission of others than paupers, and accordingly a section of an Act was passed by which the Guardians were allowed to admit others than the pauper sick.—Then the Act of 1878 allowed them to admit persons that were outside that sphere; persons who might be driving a carriage, and sometimes did, had to go into the hospital—get ill at a hotel or one thing or another. But the power was given to the sanitary authority, not the Board of Guardians. Now the sanitary authority is a distinct entity altogether, and I maintain that the Board of Guardians have no power at all. I raised that question with the auditor the other day.

275. It is a question more of interest from a formal, rather than a practical, point of view?—Those people have no right to admit persons in independent circumstances.

276. It generally happens in the fever hospital, where it is good for the public health, that an infectious case should be treated?—We have no right to be criticised for the benefit of the public health; the public health ought to be regulated according to the principles of justice and of right. We should not be singled out as the solitary victims of the public health, for we do a great deal for the public health.

277. The patient ought to give a good fact—I would re-echo that; but when people can get in without a fee they don't pay it. Then I wish to call emphatic attention to the wearing of pauper clothes.

278. Of course you know there have been various communications made from time to time by the Local Government Board, pointing out that it was most undesirable that the ordinary pauper clothes should be worn, but a special hospital outfit of serge?—They have recommended that as a kind of compromise; but that does not compromise the matter, because people have the same objections to these new-fangled garments as to the old pauper clothing; they act just as much as a deterrent. If the thing were left voluntary—because cases arise where it would be a considerable advantage to insist on their wearing workhouse clothing—they may bring in their own clothing in a state that would make it a great advantage to maintain other clothing. The governors of the hospital should have power to permit the patients to wear proper clothing. I have tried the Local Government Board over and over again, and cannot take a stir out of them. They insist on forcing clothes on the unfortunate patients, and it is one of the greatest grievances of which the despoiled poor have to complain. Now, with regard to the medical men themselves, I have referred to the advantage it would be to have a complete staff for these hospitals. I would say the senior member of the staff ought to have something more approaching fifty of tenure than at present. Dispensary men cannot be depended except for sufficient cases; but it is quite another story with regard to the workhouse medical men. On one occasion I got Mr. Atkinson's opinion. He held the other thing; but they don't agree with him.

279. There is no case on record, is there?—There is Dr. Kenny's case, in which he went into court. The disclosures which Dr. Moorhead was left to make himself, when they ought to have been made years before, were the outcome of that want of security on the part of the medical officers. If they had the proper fifty of tenure that they ought it would not have been left for Dr. Moorhead to have burst upon the country with an extraordinary disclosure as he did, with great courage, but very little profit to himself, I am sorry to say. Then the question of sudden calls is one I raised years ago with the Local Government Board, and it has been raised in England. I say no physician for a hospital ought to be sent for unless there was some suspicion that he was wanted; but as your rules are drawn out he can be sent for without any suspicion at all. I don't say that I have ever been sent for; as a matter of fact I have not.

280. I think that is a question, again, of a formal nature?—If you don't mind points like these you will not have the whole flood of light let in.

281. What I would like light on would be on practical matters?—With regard to the inmates, in the English workhouses—and this refers, not to the conversion of the workhouses into auxiliary asylums, but to increased accommodation for the sick—in the English workhouses, or rather in the infirmaries belonging to the workhouses, they have tried treating a few acute cases with most remarkable success. It is found that to have gone into an asylum bracketed not only the individual, but his family. There are many border cases where the party ought to be, and in this country

is, sent in; but in England lately a practice has grown up of sending him into the magnificent infirmaries they have in connection with many of the English workhouses, and the results are something surprising—the necessities, and not only the necessities of the individuals, but the saving of themselves and their families from a brand that means social and moral destruction in numberless cases. I, of course, must, in common with every one who has a workhouse hospital, have from time to time to deal with these acute cases; I have to keep them for a few days, in order to get them into the county asylum; but during that time we have no proper means of dealing with them.

282. What class of infirmaries in England do you refer to?—Infirmaries connected with great workhouses. And the outcome of this new departure there is certainly most gratifying in every way.

283. What department do you refer to?—I mean the treatment of the small number of acute cases of insanity in the workhouse infirmaries—acute mania, for instance. As I gather from the newspaper reports and the medical journals, in most of these cases—they amount to very few—they don't seek to convert themselves into asylums, but the treatment of the few border cases has been attended with a great amount of success, and it has saved the individual and family in many ways.

284. These are very fully equipped infirmaries?—They are splendid.

285. You would not propose, in your own infirmary and infirmaries of a similar class through the country, to do anything of the kind there?—I would propose to have a couple of wards where a few patients could be detained for a week or fortnight.

286. But you have not wards sufficient at present for consumptive patients?—No. With regard to the pay wards you refer to, parties who would be in independent circumstances should only be admitted on paying the full cost that would be incurred by the governing body plus a remuneration to the physician placed over them.

287. According to a scale?—According to a scale which would be ascertained on the inquiry, and which would take into account the legitimate rights of the medical profession, on the one hand, and those of the public on the other hand. With reference to my preference for auxiliary asylums over annexes to already sufficiently large or too large asylums, one of the great arguments used in favour of annexes is, and has been, that £s. a week would be paid out of the Local Taxation Fund if the party were in an annex, and only 2s. if they were in an auxiliary asylum. That can be met by the very simple statement that the Local Taxation Account is a limited quantity, and if all who propose to avail themselves of it did avail themselves of it, the account would become bankrupt in the morning. There is no such sum as would pay £s. a week for all the chronic insane people that might be stuffed into annexes to great asylums; the money would be very soon exhausted, and that account would cease to exist.

288. You are anticipating this. You believe this; but you have not seen the account, of course?—We have the account here. Here are some figures supplied by Dr. Kelly in connection with it; and further, I have here the account for three years, £204,000, and the expenditure was £261,000; next year, receipts, £207,000, and expenditure £260,000; and third year, £200,371 was the income derived from that local account, and the expenditure was £232,375; so there was only £6,000 of a surplus.

289. I don't think your inference is quite correct?—I am quoting from Dr. Kelly, because he worked it up very well in Cork. What I maintain is, that the money, being a limited quantity, would not bear all the burdens that are placed on it.

290. It is not a defined sum; it is still, it is produced by certain duties?—I know; and what, it is not unlimited, because these taxes don't produce unlimited amounts.

291. But you cannot say they produce a certain amount?—No; but the amount is as likely to run below the mark as above it, and we know from experience.

292. All you know from experience is how much you have got?—We may indefinitely conclude it cannot run above a certain number of thousands.

293. I don't know whether you are sound in that?—We can take a number of years, and see where it oscillates between a few thousands; we know it is not going to fly up to millions. About the nursing, I hold very strongly that all these hospitals, unless ones where they run down to thirty beds, ought to be avoided

of for the instruction of nurses; but that instruction should be very closely watched, whether the hospitals are situated in the country or in town. There should be a standard curriculum and a standard of examinations.

294. I think the question of training of nurses is altogether out of our view. Nourishing of the sick I thought you referred to?—That is what I mean.

295. But the training of nurses?—One is part of the other. You will nurse the sick better if you have a respectable supply of nurses, and you cannot have that unless you have adequate training facilities.

296. I don't think it comes into this. And some of the evidence you put down is evidence we would be very glad to have from you when we go to Clonmel or Cashel?—There is just one point I was forgetting, which the medical profession won't be much obliged to me if I finish without referring to, and I, I suppose, other officers, too; but, of course, on amalgamation the same course ought to be followed that has been followed in the Four Courts; for instance, when offices are abolished, that the people whose offices are taken from them should be adequately pensioned. There were some cases brought forward by Mr. Dunn, where officers in Donaghmore Union and elsewhere got the magnificent sum of 30s. when their offices were abolished. I say the officers should receive their full pension, with this proviso, that they should have the

option of being appointed to any other vacancy that would turn up.

297. That would imply, of course, a power of compulsory transfer?—Yes, of course; if it was left to the doctors they probably would not elect them. Provision should be made in the Act of Parliament that they should have full pensions, or have the option, when they were under twenty years in the service—the option of being appointed as a matter of course to some neighbouring vacancy.

298. In cases where unions were dissolved—in Mr. Munnaghan's own neighbourhood of Gortin and in Donaghmore, some of the pensions were very small; but it was because the particular officers had been only, perhaps, a year, or some short period, in office?—When an office is abolished in the Four Courts a man gets a full pension.

299. In these cases, I think the officers got full pensions otherwise than under the ordinary Superannuation Act?—I think it would have been more just to have given them the option of being appointed to some other union.

300. You may take it for granted that the Commission here would not be likely to recommend anything except generous treatment?—I mention that last on the list, for it is usual for "the point to christen his own child first"; for my own profession would be very ill-pleased with me, and I would be very ill-pleased with myself, if I omitted to mention that.

Mr. GEORGE BENNETT examined.

301. CHAIRMAN.—You are a Guardian in Dublin here?—Yes, sir. If you will allow me to start by saying that I don't represent the Guardians, I simply come on my own account, because there is a feeling on the matter. I am perfectly friendly with my fellow-Guardians; but, all the same, I don't represent the Board.

302. You are speaking personally. What view on the subject of our inquiry do you wish to put before us?—I should like to start at the beginning, about the election of Guardians. Constituted as our Board is, with a great many new men on it—men who have not been in that sort of business before—they are more approachable, and more come-at-able, and more impressionable than men of an older standing. I have nothing whatever to say against the men, but it is simply what would happen to you or myself: they have gone on for the first time into this place, and people come at them of their own class, and it is very difficult to put them off, and the result is, we don't get the class of officials we need. We need men of intelligence, for I hold that one man of moral force is worth three men without it. You have those there, but what can you do. We had a very striking illustration, lately, of a man we got into the place—a fine man, most promising; but he has no intelligence, no intellectual vigour, with the result that he is a perfect failure; and with a sprinkling, unless he is a very small one indeed, of low class non-intellectual officials, it is very hard to get business well done. That, I feel, is a very weak point with us: we have some very good efficient men at the top; our leading officials are very good men indeed.

303. What you are rather distressed about is the quality of some of the officials?—The quality of some of the officials.

304. And the mode of election?—And the mode of election. Owing to the constitution of the Board, which you understand just as well as I do, they are come-at-able, and they have not learned—I am sure they will after a time learn—to make up their mind not to promise anybody.

305. Have you any suggestions in the matter?—I think it would be well if your Board laid before our Board the necessity of being stiffer. I have men come at me, and I am courteous to all; but I never think of binding myself to any man. I hear all he says, and I make notes of it; but I go there, and I am sure other Guardians as well, free to vote or not, as I think proper. We have got some officials that have been a great mistake, and no good can be done with them.

306. Then as regards the medical staff?—With regard to the medical, it is in this way—I would like you to understand me, a great many of our officials require sick leave very often.

307. Doctors?—No; but a great many of our officials, when they require a medical certificate, have too little trouble in getting them: the medical man returns that so-and-so requires leave, his health requires it; but we get no light whatever on what is wrong with him.

308. They would not like to disclose their patient's ailments?—I think the Guardians should have some information; it looks strange.

309. Is there much of that going on?—There is. Our officials are not over-worked men; and sometimes we have a great string of laminae cried out: this man wants leave for a fortnight, that one wants leave for three weeks, and we never hear really what is wrong with the men; and it has been hinted by some of the Guardians that it was due to their own want of steadiness.

310. Have any representations been made by the Guardians to the medical officers on the subject?—I don't think so, we see very little of the medical officers.

311. Or by you personally?—I don't think so. I don't happen to know any of the medical officers. I had occasion to call once or twice to the next man about a patient, but I never made any representation to him, and they don't seem to come in our way. I have often thought we should have had them when we had not. It leads to irregularity. We want not only officials, but officials to do their business, and to be there in right form to do it.

312. I think there is no doubt there are important subjects; but the question is, whether the Guardians or individual Guardians might not be able themselves, without going beyond themselves, to do something towards remedying what they are wrong?—With your permission, I would mention it to them.

313. Oh, no, on your own discretion, please?—I shall be very pleased to do so on my own discretion. I think with regard to the supervision of the whole concern, such as visiting, it would require to be a very strict style of supervision, and it requires a man to go through that place who understands it from one end to the other minutely; he would want to have a general knowledge of the business, and to say:—"So-and-so is not what it ought to be; it requires an alteration." Returns have been made from time to time, and some have been made by myself, but I never heard any more about them. I have been complimented and told: "It was very good of you to do so-and-so," but it would have been better if they had acted on it; it requires a good deal of consideration. There was a part I would like to touch on, and that was with regard to outdoor nursing of children. I highly approve of that, but there should be regular visiting on the part of our lady Guardians often than they have ever been visited before, and the union should make such provision for the convenience of these ladies as would be necessary

June 25, 1896.

Dr. Lefter.

Mr George Bennett.

June 25, 1901.
Mr. George
Bossett.

They can do more in the way of selecting proper nurses, and seeing that the nurses are doing their duty, than any man that I know of; they can give the time and enter into the requirements of the children in the way that men cannot. Hard-headed business men won't do it, even if they had the time, and I think there should be more thrown on the ladies in the way of visiting, but of course there should be provision made for them by the Board of Guardians. There are homes and traps at the workhouse, and I don't see how they could be made better use of.

314. Did you ever raise the question at the Board of Guardians—I have referred to it several times; they did not oppose it exactly; not opposing a thing is one thing, and putting it into practice is quite another. Children in a high-class school or college are affected by the surrounding influences, and why should they not be affected in an adverse form by the influence of the union; they become low and demoralised, and if the thing is not done within a certain time, it cannot be done at all, for they form such habits as never can

be eradicated. That is my experience of human nature. We know they are the children, in the main, of parents who did not lead over regular lives, and the sooner they are taken away the better, and put in a way that they are treated properly; and nurses, I don't care how good they are, they require supervision, and supervision of a class higher than is administered by Poor Law officials and relieving officers. They cannot see what a child requires as well as a lady of intelligence will see; she sees very clearly, and in a far-seeing way, what they really require.

315. You have an active ladies' committee there, but you find a difficulty about locomotion for them?—That is it. Somebody said to-day the visits should be visits of surprise. Quite right; but they should be ofteners, and visits to the union need be ofteners. The tendency of human nature is to become lazy, and when we become lazy, sloth comes in, and that will gather about, and unless the sweeping is kept up severely and vigorously, things will get into a bad way.

Dr. T. H.
Moorehead.

Dr. T. H. Moorehead examined.

316. CHAIRMAN.—I think I know your views pretty well. I must now *perforce* ask you what they are. I shall be very glad to hear from you what you think as regards the breaking up of workhouses—I have not tendered any evidence about No. 1 or No. 2, but as regards No. 3, I am of opinion that if the Classes A and C were adopted, one workhouse would suffice for the destitute poor of the county. The aged and infirm classes are those I am particularly interested in. I have been studying their condition for the last twenty-five years to see if any steps could be taken to ameliorate their condition. I found that the people in the workhouse—the aged and infirm—were in a much more unsatisfactory condition—did not live as long nor enjoy as good health—as the people who were outside of the same class; and for a long time I was of opinion that that was due to bad food, bad clothing, and bad housing, but I am sorry to say that my experience is that even with better housing, abundance of food—more than they could get outside, and the best conditions that we can provide for them—that these same people are not in as good condition; they don't live as long; they don't enjoy as good health as those that are outside under worse conditions. Therefore I was very glad to see in your queries that the question of boarding out might be considered, because I have thought for a long time that if the old people could be boarded out it would be not alone a saving to the rates, because they could be boarded out much cheaper than they can be kept in the house, and it would be much better for them.

317. Have you thought of any safeguards?—I have thought of the objections to it, the objection, of course, that it might be abused, just as outdoor relief is abused; but I suppose the one could be got over as well as the other.

318. Have you thought of how?—I presume the expense on the rates would be a consideration.

319. A very important consideration?—My opinion is that the individual Guardians would be quite disposed to save the rates as far as they could.

320. I don't know whether outdoor relief is very heavy in the union you are best acquainted with?—I am not speaking of my union particularly. I don't know what it is. But in some unions outdoor relief is very heavy, and in those unions I think if people could get relief outside without admission to the workhouse when they are old and infirm, I think you might fear such a very large increase in the number of applicants that it would entirely do away with any *per capita* saving.

321. Could it not be limited to a certain class?—Certainly; the aged and infirm, and people who had no friends, and, as far as my experience goes, those are the only class of aged and infirm that come into the workhouse.

322. Would you say that people who had been for a certain time in residence in the workhouse might after that be boarded out?—Yes, that would be my idea; but then there is the question of supervision; that is another difficulty.

323. Of persons boarded out?—Yes; in my opinion, the dispensary medical officer would be the proper person to have supervision of them, and should make a quarterly report. I have always thought it unfortunate that the dispensary medical officer was not in

charge of the boarded-out children, because after all he is the man who would know whether they were properly cared or not.

324. The dispensary medical officer is the medical officer of health also?—Yes.

325. Have you not found that as medical officer of health he is rather at a disadvantage in reporting on nuisances, lest they might conflict with his practice?—He is at a disadvantage, but I must say for him, as far as my knowledge of him goes, he has done his duty.

326. In the public health way?—Yes, that is my experience of dispensary medical officers.

327. This would put a further strain on him?—Quite so. I think he is able to bear it. Of course, even as things are at present, I think two workhouses out of four would be sufficient.

328. What about the sick?—You could not abolish the hospitals; you have not more than enough.

329. Whenever there is a workhouse you would retain a hospital?—I think you must retain a hospital.

330. You could not ask the sick to go more than ten or fifteen miles?—Oh, no; and besides there are cases where that would be too far.

331. You would not propose to diminish at all the accommodation for the sick?—It appears to me that every day more people in this country will be availing themselves of hospital accommodation; as the hospital improves more will avail themselves of it; they are the repairing shops of the community, in fact.

332. What do you think of people paying their way?—I am entirely in favour of encouraging them to pay their way as far as possible.

333. And making it binding on them to pay their way?—If they are able.

334. Yes, after due inquiry?—I think there should be a sliding scale, a discretionary scale. People who are charged to remain in a long time should not be compelled to pay as much as people whose stay is short, and there should be some adjustment with regard to their means. I know people who would be willing and anxious to pay half the average cost, but are not able to pay the whole. There is the suggestion that one workhouse in each county, or in two counties, should be reserved for a tuberculosis sanatorium. In my opinion, that would not work at all, at least for some years. If we are to use sanatoria as an effort to stamp out tuberculosis you must bring them to the people's doors almost; the sick won't go long distances. I mean those suffering from tuberculosis.

335. Taken in its earlier stages?—Yes.

336. The dispensary doctor will become aware of cases of tuberculosis?—Yes, and he will get that case into a sanatorium that is near, but they won't go far away where they won't see their friends. Possibly in time they may, but not at present.

337. I suppose you find in your own union you have more patients from a five-mile radius than all the rest put together?—That is so, sir. If tuberculosis was stamped out, about one-third of the number of beds would suffice in this country.

338. You are not speaking of consumption, but tuberculosis in general?—Yes. I don't see any reason why it should not be stamped out and made less prevalent.

339. Dr. Bossett.—About tuberculosis, you are referring to tuberculous disease?—Yes.

340. You don't mean to say it is infectious in the same way as tuberculosis?—No; but it is the pulmonary cases that spread the disease.

341. But it would not require treatment in a sanatorium for tuberculosis of the glands?—No; the danger I come from is not a particularly tuberculous district, but I find two-thirds of the hospital cases are of tuberculous disease in some shape or form; that is enormous you know. I don't know whether the suggestion I made as to the convalescent home in each province would be practicable, but I need not tell you that it is often a very great difficulty.

342. CHAIRMAN.—To go to such a distance?—I presume they would be sent by the Board of Guardians.

343. But I mean away from the visits of his friends?—I think when a patient was convalescent and wanted change of air, there would be no difficulty in getting them away. It is very often a matter of getting subscriptions locally to get them away. If there was a workhouse in each province that would be adapted as a convalescent home it would certainly aid greatly in the recovery of patients.

344. And not free a great many beds?—Yes. I don't know whether it is practical, but I put it forward as a suggestion. Then there is the matter of hospital management by the Board of Guardians as at present constituted. I believe that the hospitals could be a great deal better managed, and more economically, by a few men who would take an interest in them and learn the business. At present the Boards are so unwieldy and interchangable that the Board of this week probably does not know what last week's Board has done. No man seems to think it worth his while to take an interest in the business.

345. You would be in favour of having a small committee for the district hospitals?—Yes. I understand a witness here suggested that the County Council should have control, and I would be entirely in favour of that.

346. The County Council through a committee?—Yes.

347. How should the committee be comprised?—I think they should be nominated men—business men—party Commissioners and purely business men. Most hospitals are situated in the neighbourhood of a town where there are always a sufficient number of business men who would devote portion of their time to this, and would understand the working of such an institution in the way that farmers cannot. The only other matter that was referred to by the Workhouse Association was the matter of the tramps. I am of opinion that the abolition of local workhouses would greatly check the tramp nuisance, and the Guardians should certainly have power to detain them longer.

348. Some evidence was given to-day that they should not be received at all—should be handed over to the local barracks?—Well, sir, I will tell you my experience. Some ten or twelve years ago, several magistrates and myself undertook to try and check the tramp nuisance, and we had every tramp that was brought up committed to jail, but after a short time the Guardians refused to permit the prosecution of these tramps to continue, on the ground that they were a greater nuisance outside the inside. However, the Guardians of my union recently adopted the practice of detaining them until twelve o'clock, and I find it is a very good plan; it has greatly diminished their number, because it does not give them a sufficient time to hunt the country round on their way to another town.

349. How much do they do a day—how much distance do they travel?—About twelve Irish miles. The establishment of local sanatoria for tuberculosis appears to be the most important thing we want.

350. You suggest a seaside place?—That is for general cases.

351. Would you for consumption?—I think not; not necessarily.

352. A good healthy site?—I really don't know whether that is so necessary. Give them open air; we can then train them in a very short time not alone to carry on their own cure, but to protect others.

353. Not to spread infection?—Not to spread infection. The Local Government Board issued some little time ago a most valuable poster, and I am sorry it is not indelibly impressed on every boarding in the land, because I find that since that was issued, it has made a great change in the views of the people as to tuberculosis in my county.

354. They look at it more seriously?—And they regard it as curable. The establishment of sanatoria is one of the most important things, to my mind, at the present time.

355. Dr. BISHOP.—Have you had many cases seeking admission for a short time and going out in a short time?—No; they have all remained until I discharged them.

356. CHAIRMAN.—They are generally far-advanced cases?—No, I have only discharged two as incurable. I advised them to go home, as I could do nothing for them; the rest have all remained until I discharged them.

357. Dr. BISHOP.—Why do you say they have sought admission more since the issue of the circular?—Because previous to that it was the worst thing possible to have a case of pulmonary tuberculosis coming into the hospital; they recognised it as incurable.

358. CHAIRMAN.—They thought it was something horrid that could not be cured?—Yes, notwithstanding they recognised it as infectious, and treated it as infectious, and I only wish we had notification.

359. I suppose the dispensary doctors do have practical knowledge of these cases and give them instructions?—As far as they can, but if we are ever to deal with it successfully, it must be in the same way as with specific diseases—notification and disinfection. That is all, sir, unless you have something to ask me.

360. Mr. MURPHY is rather wondering whether you have any views about classification as regards the sick, and aged, and infirm. Are they mixed up at all in your hospital?—In my place they are not.

361. What class of cases have you?—Acute remedial cases.

362. And you don't take in the bedridden or aged and infirm?—No.

363. Where are they looked after?—In the beds of the house. They are as well fed as in the hospital, and have paid attendants.

364. Are any bedridden?—A large number.

365. And they are sufficiently attended to?—Yes; and if necessary—if they get bad at night they can call for the night nurse to see them; or, if necessary, the nurse is sent down. I look upon the aged and infirm as the class most needing extra care. There is another matter; those classed as insane in the workhouse don't at all represent, in my opinion, the numbers when it would be necessary to send to the asylum. As medical officers we are obliged to class any person as insane who is not absolutely sane, for our own protection; but it does not at all mean that they are incapable of discharging the ordinary duties of life.

366. You think it would be safe to leave them there as regards themselves and others?—Yes.

367. Do you mean idiots?—There is no hard and fast line between sanity and insanity, or idiocy and sense; but there are numbers classed as insane and idiots who are merely a little weak-minded—not just as wise as their neighbours.

368. If you had to classify a number of persons you meet in ordinary life you might have to do that?—We might.

MISS BUCHANAN, P.L.S., CONTINUED.

369. CHAIRMAN.—You chiefly desire to refer to the subject of classification in workhouses?—Yes; I consider that the workhouse system, as it is at present, is radically wrong; that is, the mixing together of all ages of people on the ground of destitution. I consider that has a great deal to do with the generating of pauperism; therefore, I think if classification is to be of any real benefit it necessitates separation into different institutions as to make it thorough.

370. Removing certain classes from the workhouse to other institutions?—Exactly; and making the workhouse proper a smaller building, and simply for the able-bodied.

371. Lazy men, who cannot get work?—They are classified, too, of course. But if we could remove the inmates, the epileptics—I don't know if anyone suggested a colony in the country somewhere for epileptics. If there are only about 300 sane epileptics in Ireland, it surely would be possible to have perhaps two small colonies, where they would be treated with some chance of their improvement in the country, because I don't believe a home is the place for epileptics, where they are not allowed outdoor employment.

372. Where there are occupations?—Yes; and at present in the workhouse they are the most hopeless

MISS
BUCHANAN.

June 28, 1902.
Miss
Buchanan.

death, as they are absolutely given nothing to do; and I think we may safely say there are very few of them that don't go to the insane department before very many years.

373. Of course, I believe there is a tendency!—Always, I believe so; but still, they might be given a chance. Meanwhile, their life is perfectly terrible, because of that want of occupation, and the dismal surroundings of the workhouse, for people with a nervous disorder.

374. I think it was Dr. Foy who gave very interesting evidence on that point. He would wish to have the epileptics not together, or in an institution or colony?—That is, of course, difficult. If they could be scattered it would be difficult to get a person to take an epileptic, I fancy.

375. Yes, at all events, would suggest for consideration the formation of an epileptic colony, such as there is in existence in Germany?—And I believe there is one in England. The sick, I don't think I need enter upon; it has been gone into extremely fully by those who have given evidence before; but I certainly think that, instead of having a workhouse hospital at present, it ought to be a district hospital.

376. For large cities you would have it a city hospital, not a Poor Law hospital?—That I would not be prepared to give any opinion on.

377. But I mean you would have it so that it would not be in connection with pauperism?—It should not be a pauper institution. The children, of course, constitute the most important part, in one sense, of the Poor Law question altogether, and they should be entirely separated from all adult paupers after the age of three, or after they are able to be taken from their mothers.

378. Including parents, you would separate them from their parents?—It is a very important question to enter on. We have the orphans, and the deserted, and the practically parentless, which the law allows us to board out, and others, if they have a parent permanently bedridden or in a lunatic asylum. Those children should be boarded out. But many have given evidence that all children should be boarded out. That infers that we would take the children in workhouses away from their parents. Of course, that is a very questionable thing, because we relieve the parents of the responsibility of their children, which, after all, is, to my mind, a grave question, that will have to be considered very thoroughly. If we take these children from their parents and board them out—if the parents have any control the people with whom they are boarded out would consider them a nuisance, and they would be.

379. They would not have the parents going there?—They could not possibly have the parents interfering, therefore they must give up the children; but if a parent—as I believe the law is in England—is proved to be morally incapable of looking after his children, that is quite right; but it is difficult to prove. If we take, as some suggested, all the infants who are now in the nurseries with their respective mothers, and take those children and board them out from infancy, as some would do, we relieve that mother entirely; she goes out at once; and I don't think that is advisable at all.

380. It depends upon under what auspices she goes out?—Well, it does; but if she is allowed to go out free of that child I am afraid she will be in again next year. I think, myself, that it is a very grave question, indeed, to relieve these mothers of the responsibility of their children.

381. Have you considered the question of any religious organisation dealing with these women?—That is a very difficult question.

382. A very difficult class to deal with?—Extremely difficult; but I certainly think, instead of allowing them to go out that it is better to insist that they remain in, and sometimes the salvation of the woman is her love for her child. I don't think it is a wise thing to take away the child from the mother; and, going into the question of boarded-out children, it has not been found that the infants who were boarded out have succeeded remarkably well.

383. That is under one year of age?—Yes. If you leave that child until it is one year old it will be an exceedingly great hardship to take it from the mother; she might not mind parting with it at birth, but I don't think there is one of them that would not feel, at the end of the year, that it was a terrible thing to

wrench the child from her. On the question of boarding out, ideally, I think it is a splendid system for all the reasons which have been so fully gone into; but unless it is very carefully supervised it is productive of vast evils.

384. In what direction?—Because those children might not be at all carefully looked after. I, myself, have seen children, or rather, the people with whom they are, who ought to be reported to the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. We had those children removed. Some maintain that the lady Guardians ought to have charge of these boarded-out children. So they have; but with the many duties that a lady Guardian has to perform her visits must necessarily be few and far between. She can only go very seldom in the year, as far as we find it practicable; therefore, if boarding out is to be ideal, or anything approaching it, it should be done more, as it is done in England. I would say board them out in the country, not as is done so much in Ireland, within the union; not necessarily, at least. Put them far away; as, for instance, the children from the Bristol Workhouse are boarded out in the Lake district. They have their local committee of certified and responsible persons, and those persons only take a limited number of children.

385. The South Dublin Board send to Keshiderry, and round there?—We have a few, but the majority are boarded out within the union; and they are a perfect colony, so that the schools there are largely composed of these children. Therefore, the paper tent is not lost, as it ought to be. They should be boarded out in larger districts.

386. There is an obstacle to that?—There is not, except the will of the Guardians. But I think it should be insisted on that there was a local committee in charge of these children, under the supervision of a committee of the Guardians.

387. With very good inspection?—Very good inspection. The other children—there are numbers of children who have parents in the house, and we cannot board out every child; but these children should be ideally in small houses, not in a barracks of an institution, because every one agrees that an institution-reared child is not fitted for life. If they were boarded out in small cottage homes, if possible, not even close together, so that there would be only a few, and they would go to the local National school, and another lot a little bit away going to another National school, not to have them all together.

388. You mean cottage homes, owned and managed by the Board of Guardians?—Yes; with a house mother.

389. That is in operation in England. Do you happen to know anything about the existence of that system?—Yes; I believe, in Croydon, it is fairly extensive, all told; with everything, it comes to 10s. 6d. per head—pretty high. That, of course, is an objection to it.

390. And this is rather a poor country?—Yes; but probably it could be done cheaper in Ireland, on a less extravagant scale. And my idea was for the deserted orphans; they really constitute the class among whom the mortality is so high. But it is not unnatural to suppose it should be high, because most of the children were found, probably, at a street corner, where their chance for existence was very small. They don't have much chance of living, in any case; but if sent to women in the country who name their own children, they have an idea of how to feed a child with a bottle. As each deserted baby came it might be given one to each cottage home, and with a capable woman as mother, she might manage to give the child a chance, and make it more humane for the other children.

391. Do you think there is anything in that system superior to ordinary boarding-out?—No; I think it is only because we cannot board out every child.

392. Have you failed ever to get satisfactory homes for boarded-out children?—Oh, yes; I think for the numbers it would be quite impossible. We have about 700 children in one union.

393. But I mean for the number you have to board out at present?—It is not so easy to get homes; there are a great many people not fond of taking children.

394. In some unions there is competition for these children. You don't find that?—No.

395. If you went further afield?—Yes; some say that in Ireland the small farmer class won't have

June 25, 1905.
 —
 Miss Buchanan.

anything to say to them. It would not be so easy; but there must always be a very large number of children who cannot be boarded out.

395. What class would they be?—They are the class, for instance, by whom our workhouse schools are at present filled.

397. I mean if the law were changed?—There are children with parents in the house.

398. I thought you were discussing that possibility, if the law were changed?—I don't think the law ought to be changed to deprive the parent of the responsibility of the children altogether.

399. You would leave the law as it is in that respect?—I think it might be extended as far as it is in England; that is, if a tramp's child, or the child of people who were morally unfit.

400. Persons who were formally declared by the Board of Guardians by resolution to be unfit to take charge of the child?—Yes; it may be extended to that extent; but I cannot say that because persons go into the workhouse their children should be taken from them altogether.

401. You say that as regards illegitimacy, as well as legitimate children?—Yes; because I think the parents should not be deprived of responsibility for the children.

402. As regards the aged and infirm?—They should not be in what is called a workhouse. I am, of course, supposing that emigration takes place first, and we could use an old workhouse as a home for the aged and infirm, leaving the workhouse proper and the name of workhouse to the able-bodied. I consider that they should be much better treated, simply on the ground of old age, than they are at present.

403. Apart from their character and antecedents?—Yes. Then I would say that they should be most strictly classified, according to the deserving and the undeserving. Of course, that is difficult; but still, it could be done with care. More thorough investigation into the causes of their coming into the house in the first instance would give some clue to the class of people they are.

404. Our system is not sufficiently inquisitorial?—It is not; there are very few questions asked about what brought the people into the house at all. I think if that questioning were much more thorough we would know something of the circumstances which led to persons coming into the house, and if a person had never been in receipt of Poor Law relief at all up to a certain age, I would say they ought to be considered privileged; and then, according to how the people behaved while in the house, that is, the system of privilege wards in aged and infirm houses, they could be removed into them from a variety of reasons.

405. What about old married couples remaining together?—That is a point on which a good deal has been said in England, and I have found out of about six or eight places where it was tried only one has been a success. I think the privilege ward scheme

which I advocate would cover that, because if persons were put into a privilege ward they would be allowed to wear a respectable sort of garments, not the workhouse uniform; they would be allowed to go out every day.

406. It would be union clothes?—They would have to be, I expect; but they might be treated. They might be allowed to go out every afternoon between certain hours, and be allowed to receive visitors every afternoon. That, I think, would meet the difficulty of old married couples not meeting each other; if they were allowed to go out every afternoon together I should say they would do very well with that.

407. The advocates of that system propose they should live together always?—I know they do; but that would necessitate another sort of home. I think the privilege ward scheme would come near enough to meet the wishes of the old people; if they could see each other every day when they went out, and see their friends every afternoon in these privilege wards, I should think they would be very contentedly off. Some people advocate boarding out the old people.

408. What do you think of that?—I am inclined to think it would be exceedingly difficult to find homes where old people would be really comfortable. I think the same danger as applies to outdoor relief would apply; and I think that could not possibly be carried upon, because you would have everybody applying for outdoor relief for their old people. A great deal of that applies to the boarding-out of old people; but beyond that I don't think the old people would be very comfortable: it is different from boarding out children. Old people don't become attached to the people with whom they are, and the people with whom they are don't become attached to the old people very readily whom they never saw before; and I don't think they would be very happy.

409. As regards the matter that you referred to in your summary about Dublin, we might leave that over until we are considering Dublin specially. At the foot of that page you say that under no circumstances should children be left in the workhouse. Supposing their parents are in the workhouse?—That is where I say the children whose parents are in the workhouse should be sent to cottage homes.

410. Quite close?—Comparatively close.

411. The parents would be altogether cut off if the children went to a cottage home?—They would; but, of course, those parents go out, and then they must take the children with them. I would not allow children to come back to the workhouse to see their parents, but the parents might be allowed to go to see their children once a month. And I think, as long as there is any system of this sort there ought to be lady inspectors of workhouses, because there are so many departments that only a woman really can speak on with authority.

412. Is there anything else now that occurs to you?—I don't think there is any other point.

Mrs. ANNA MacDONALD, COCHBURN, P.N.O., examined.

Mrs. Anna
 MacDonal
 Cochburn.

413. CHAIRMAN.—I think I have a short abstract of your evidence. First, you would like to go into the question of pauper attendants on the sick, is it?—No; pauper attendants in the whole house; that is to say, on the aged, the infirm, the children, and the sick.

414. On any class?—Yes; of course, the pauper attendants must be able-bodied; and to have sufficient people to do the work, naturally, the officials—of whom there are not nearly enough—depend upon an able-bodied pauper to do the work; therefore that pauper gets in, and he, or she, gets tips from the aged or infirm, and, from my personal experience, they will do nothing without money, and there is very gross blackmailing: the unfortunate pauper inmates must give their little pennies, or their relations must bring in money, or kind. I know a kind of shop is kept of the good things that are brought into the house. These pauper attendants get extra diet; they are practically thoroughly well paid—extra; they are very highly paid, naturally, from all these tips—they remain a certain time, until they have collected a certain amount of money, then they go out and spend it all in drink and then come in again, and in some occult fashion, which the lady guardians, as far as I am aware, cannot find out, these women or men are in attendance on a ward

the next day or the day after they come in. It seems to me that they are a heavy expense to the rates; if they are able to work they should be out earning their bread. My experience is that once inmates have been appointed pauper attendants they never again want to earn an honest livelihood outside.

415. Are they chiefly, or to a large extent, the mothers of illegitimate children?—Very often they are. But there are also men who are drunkards themselves, or who have drunken wives. They are not the respectable class, but are also employed. I think a bad married woman is equally bad for the old people.

416. Now as regards punishing inmates for breaches of the regulations?—That is a matter on which I hold a very strong opinion. Unless it was a very serious case the person should be tried before the Board of Guardians.

417. Or a committee?—Yes; before certain of the Guardians, and then have them sent to the magistrate; but under no circumstances should they be allowed to be drafted by anybody, from the medical officer to the lowest workmaster, to another part of the house, especially to the lunatic department.

418. I don't quite follow that?—As regards the

June 26, 1892.

Mrs. Anna
MacDonald
Congress.

punishment, no inmate in a workhouse should be allowed to be transferred from any part of the house to the lunatic department of the establishment.

419. As an attendant there?—No, as a punishment.

420. Not classed as a lunatic?—Classed as a lunatic. They should not be allowed to be transferred unless at least two doctors certify they are lunatics. I do not think that one doctor should ever be allowed to certify that a person is a lunatic, or to send them to the lunatic wards. Have I made myself quite clear on that point?

421. I think I understand what you mean; you mean that there is, to your knowledge or to your belief, an instance of some person having been classed as a lunatic as a punishment for some offence alleged to have been committed?—Yes. And I think that the same protection should be extended to the pauper as would be extended to an ordinary individual outside that two doctors at least should certify that the pauper was a lunatic.

422. And you believe the pauper was sane?—Yes; or that the pauper were sane.

423. Mr. Macdonald—Is it your suggestion that it is the custom in some union that for punishment a pauper is removed from the same ward to the lunatic department?—My suggestion is that I am not satisfied that it was not the custom—that it has not, and does not occur.

Dr. ENGLISH.—It seems to me a strong statement.

424. CHAIRMAN.—It is a strong statement. Now, as to definitive classification?—Of course, the sick poor are quite apart; that is, the acute diseases in the hospitals. But I quite agree with the doctors who have already said that there are a great many in the hospitals who are not acute cases; but then, these poor bodies want attention: they really are ill, and they are old, and it seems to me that if there was a gentle letting down of them with their cup of tea and a simpler kind of diet, it would be happier for them and cheaper for the rates. Do you mean the classification morally or physically?

425. I was just taking the heading in your suggestions?—The respectable and aged in your unions mix with the others—they are all mixed together.

426. That there is no classification on account of previous character?—No. It seems to me that when they come into the workhouse we ought to know where they come from, what caused them to come in, and then put them into a ward, and if they had previously a good character, into a good ward.

427. Has anything ever been tried by the lady guardians or any person to try the experiment of making such inquiries, and having such a thing as a respectable or privilege ward?—Well, we have very often tried it as far as I know; but we have generally been very seriously beaten at the Board. For instance, yesterday we brought before our Board a very serious case, and we were beaten on that.

428. But it would be possible, of course, for the Board of Guardians, if they thought it expedient?—But you must remember the lady guardians are in such a small minority that it is not always so easy to do that; and it seems as if the law should do it for them.

429. What change could be made in the law?—First, the aged and respectable, after a period of good conduct in the house—

430. Presume when the Guardians shall deem to be aged and respectable?—Yes; and shall prove to be respectable.

431. I am afraid, if it came to drafting an Act of Parliament, you would find it very difficult?—Would it not mean an inquiry before the Admissions Board and a letter from the parochial clergyman, and so on—an inquiry through the relieving officer: the relieving officer always reports at the Admissions Board. It could be done that way, I think, without much extra trouble, and I would like a preliminary ward. I am not at all in favour of far ever drafting poor creatures who come into the workhouse, who have been naughty outside—giving them no chance. That is amongst the aged and infirm, of course. Then the boarding out of the aged and infirm, it seems to me, can be carried out.

432. You would like to try that?—I would; and I think it would not add any extra expense to the rates if the maintenance charge was added to the establishment charges. For instance, one union I know where every pauper costs £20; that would go very far towards the boarding-out of an old person.

433. Then about allowing respectable people to go

out—I suppose you mean in and out of the workhouse?—No; I mean the privilege of allowing them to walk out every day after dinner, say, and allowing them to come in before their tea.

434. I have known that happen, in fact, in some loosely managed workhouses. I have been asked myself for charity by such inmates, when they were outside?—You have to remember that these poor old bodies do want a penny or two pence if we have pauper students.

435. You could not let them out for that purpose?—No; but these are the respectable people, and I don't think one would find that with them. And if they came in drunk—in my own workhouse it has always been said, "Oh, they will return drunk"—then for that very act I would put them on a black list for, say three months, and then try again. I think it is a privilege they would not lightly risk, if it was given.

436. It might improve them all round?—I think it would.

437. Then epileptics and lunatics—would you propose to improve their condition in the workhouse, or would you propose to get them outside altogether?—Propose to get them out of it altogether. There are no skilled attendants, they have no industries, they have no employment of any kind to occupy their minds, and from personal knowledge I know they gradually become insane.

438. The next matter you have touched on is the high death rate in the nurseries?—The death rate of the infants is a very terrible death rate. It seemed to me to-day that Dr. Foy, in giving evidence, had more or less struck the keynote when he spoke of the milk, and from what he said the infants all seem to die of diseases which faulty milk would encourage, and it struck me then, even when he was speaking, that many things I had noticed the milk could account for. The position of the nurseries is wrong; they have not enough air; the children are not allowed to tumble about as children in cottages would.

439. I think you did get perturbations for them?—Oh, no, I gave one; I never got one. These little infants—cramped babies, I think, from what Dr. Foy said, died of the milk and of the mothers being with them so much. That is the great cause, when the children are illegitimate, of the high death-rate: the child is an incubus, the mother is a tight-minded girl; she must remain practically in jail while it is alive; she has no love for it, because she is suffering imprisonment on its account.

440. There are a great many exceptions to that; you will find a great deal of mother's love?—I have very rarely found it; I have found it in a woman of the most depraved class, but not often, and never with a woman with her first child.

441. Come, now, to the children's quarantine?—The quarantine I mean is the fortnight the children must be in the house before going to the workhouse schools; during that time they are allowed to mix with the paupers. They have a waxy life, poor little waxy souls; and they learn and carry on to the schools many evils.

442. They go to school at three?—No; I mean the children that come into the workhouse; I am not talking of infants. Any child who enters the workhouse has, for fear of infection, to be kept for a fortnight in the workhouse before being drafted out to Oshana; they are attended by a pauper, and in that time in their miserable little lives they learn a great deal of wickedness.

443. You think the observation ward ought to be a nursery?—I think it ought to be quite away with a paid attendant, and not a pauper attendant.

444. You would say, I am sure, that all the children's wards should have over them a good character paid attendant?—A thoroughly good character attendant, who would be selected by the person who was superintendent of the department. For instance, in our Catholic nurseries we have a nun; therefore I think she should always select the paid attendant for the children, and Miss West should select the paid attendant for the Protestant children.

445. If she gets a good woman she does not mind whether she appoints her herself or not?—That is a very important point—we do not always get in the best attendants.

446. Then as regards the boys and girls children?—It appears to me that it is a grievance that the men and

cute children should mix with the children who are in permanent schools; there again you bring in the real influence of the street, and the children who are in permanent schools have no knowledge of the outside world but what is given by the inn and outs, and it seems to me that some house or place should be kept to put the inn and outs children into.

447. Dr. BODGER.—Does not the quarantine step in some extent the inn and outs mixing with the other children?—Oh, no; at the end of the fortnight they are sent on to the schools.

448. The inn and outs very often don't stop a fortnight?—Well a great number of them do. These that are coming in permanently, come in and have the fortnight's quarantine, and the contamination occurs then which I complain of; it seems to me as if the inn and outs should not touch the permanent children.

449. CHAIRMAN.—None of these references of yours to children would apply if the children are to be moved out of the workhouse?—But it applies if there is a school attached to the workhouse.

450. But none of them would apply at all if they were boarded out?—Do you except the inn and outs?

451. If it was possible, as so many of the witnesses have recommended that children should never be allowed to stay in any workhouse, all these references about quarantine and the inn and outs mixing with boys and men, all this would be impossible?—The mixing of boys with men; what I wanted to call your attention to is that if a boy is remanded from the police court, he is sent up to the workhouse; he then is put into a male ward, where he sleeps; it is great fun for the able-bodied people they mix with, or even the old men, to teach them what is not right. These boys are either sent to an industrial school after a while or to the workhouse school, where they mix with the permanent, and teach them the wickedness they have learned.

452. Your suggestion is with a view of preventing the continuance of what you point out in the workhouse, but if the children are to be removed bodily from the workhouse?—I—They could not mix, but then you would have to classify the boys who have been remanded from the police courts from the inn and outs.

453. They would not go into the workhouse at all, I suppose; there would be no children's ward for them?—There is no boy's ward in the workhouse, but in the house for inn and outs you would still have to have a separation ward for boys who are under remand.

454. That is a class we don't recognise in the Poor Law at all. I don't know what brings them there?—A boy who is taken up for thieving, the magistrate remands him, and he goes to the workhouse.

455. In custody?—I am not sure whether he is in custody.

456. The magistrate who remands him would have to remand him to some other place if the Guardians had no place for children?—The Guardians have no place for such children in the workhouse, and still such remanded children are sent to them.

457. Dr. BODGER.—After all it is better that the boys should go there than to jail?—Much better; but it is of classification I am speaking. I am objecting to the poor little corner-boys mixing with the children who must become permanent.

458. Could the Guardians not make a ward for boys?—That is what I wish, but you must remember that in overcrowded workhouses you cannot make wards.

459. CHAIRMAN.—I think all this will disappear if the children are moved out of the workhouse; questions like this would have to be provided for in some other way?—Yes. Then there is the attendance on children by paupers; of course, in the large schools, if a pauper is allowed out to do even scrubbing, she is attending on children; the children are in communication with her, she sleeps with them; it seems to me as if that were a more important point than even the paupers attending on the sick, because it seems as if it were carrying on another generation, with pauperism as their only outlook.

460. It is vitally important to stop anything of that sort; had you any suggestion to make about that?—The bigger boys and bigger girls should do a great deal of helping, but after that I certainly would suggest paid hands; but the schools do not seem ideal for children to be brought up in.

461. You prefer boarding out?—Or certified schools. I certainly would prefer that the children should be sent out to the local parish schools for their daily education and for church, and so allowed to mix with the population, and to have another outlook added which would brighten their little minds.

462. You would not prefer that to boarding out?—Boarding out is a very vexed question unless a little more were paid; sufficient is not paid now to make it worth while for really respectable people to take a child.

463. What is paid in any case that you are acquainted with?—I think about 25, or 27, or 28 a year. It does not seem worth while, but some scheme could be drawn up that when a boy or girl comes to ten they could be put out to a farmer or a carpenter, or somebody who would teach that boy some industry, and the girl could be put to some mistress of a household, even if they had to be paid for, so that the girl could learn to become a domestic servant; and I am sure there are many mothers of families who would gladly take the girls at that age and train them. I know there are many mothers of families who would.

464. You would say higher payments?—I would say higher payments, and I would also try, as it were, to apprentice children over ten.

465. Dr. BODGER.—Is not ten very early?—It is not, to make them work so as to begin life.

466. CHAIRMAN.—You would make them half-timers?—I would; there is no home for a child in the large harrack school; they have no special friend; no one could be a friend to such an enormous number of children, and it seems as if they were put out under proper supervision they would begin to make some friends.

467. The concluding note on your paper is "The influence on their after life"?—My experience of their after life is that at the very first breath of adversity they come back to the workhouse; they have no home, because we have not given them a home; they have got no friends, because we have not given them a friend, and then they come back, and we say: "Where were you reared?" And the answer is: "In the workhouse." And often their mother before them. I know of one case now where the girl's mother was there before her, and she has no interest in going out; she does not want to go out; why should she; life would seem too vast for her. I think in every workhouse there ought to be at least one married quarter. In England, in any workhouse I have been in, there is not a very great demand for them, but still there has always been a couple in, and I think it is a hard case to separate them, if they wish to be together.

Miss WELLS, F.L.S., examined.

468. CHAIRMAN.—You have heard Mrs. MacDowell's evidence?—Yes, she spoke very largely on Crompton's evidence and left me very little to say.

469. Yes, it just occurred to me she was overcoasting on your special head?—I thought that myself.

470. Did you agree with her?—I did in all she said, and always have done so.

471. Was there anything that you wish to add?—About the maternity ward, I think there is very little classification in that; all classes of women come in there and are put into the one maternity ward, and sometimes the class of women that come into our union, they are of the servant class, as a rule, and when they become subjects for that ward they have to be kept

distinct months, for, of course, no one will take them when they come in in that state; they are mixing together often for months.

472. Then they are among the ordinary able-bodied?—They are.

473. They are not in the maternity ward?—They are on admission; they are booked to No. 30 ward, and the only class of work they are allowed to do is laundry work.

474. They go to the laundry with the ordinary able-bodied?—They do, they mix with them, and consequently, on the congested state of our house, the respectable women of the middle class and the very bad women are all mixed together.

June 25, 1902.

Miss Withick.

475. You would like to classify them?—The single girls, the respectable married women, and then, of course, there is very often, too often, the very bad, what are called widows, with one or two illegitimate children, coming in. I think they should be separated entirely; they are a great injustice to the respectable poor, and after that they are transferred to the nurseries. We have got a very large block of nurseries in our union.

476. Do you find the young girls who come into these nurseries with their babies remain long in the workhouses?—Too long; in fact, the law is we cannot allow them to go away to a situation without the infant.

477. So the incumbency of a baby prevents their getting situations?—Yes, except they are able to pay for nurses themselves; of course, in former times, there were situations provided for them, and then we found they did not pay the nurses and became a greater burden on the rates.

478. These girls could not pay for their children?—No; so now we have adopted the plan of not letting them out without their children.

479. That keeps them in, unfortunately. I suppose

if they go they come in again?—They do; they must stay with their babies until they are twelve months old at least.

480. As to the infant death rate?—It has been very high in our union, I think, consequently on the position of our nurseries for one reason.

481. Want of country air?—The nurseries are very cold in winter and too hot in summer in consequence of it being a wooden structure. They have not got cross ventilation, which is a great necessity in the nurseries. We had other buildings provided for them, and it was brought up at the Board, passed several times, and then other members came forward and rescinded our resolution and broke our arrangement; that is what we have to contend with on these large Boards; if we try to reform anything it is put to the vote, and oftentimes we have not got the majority, we are so few in number.

482. How many have you?—We have only four women, but we have ten or eleven good men who always come with us.

483. Are there any suggestions you would like to make beyond what you have already said?—I don't think so; I think Mrs. Congreve said everything for me.

Miss Hamilton.

Miss HAMILTON, P.L.C., examined.

484. CHAIRMAN.—Your experience is largely connected with rural unions?—Entirely with a country union. I wanted only to say something about the children and the old people. Miss Buchanan has said all I wanted to say about the old people. I think, of course, the amalgamation of unions in the country will be the best way to separate the different classes, but in the meantime I think we should have a great deal more done for the old people by these privilege wards, but unless it is made compulsory I don't think it can be done, unless there was some definite rule authorising it.

485. Have you thought it out practically yourself at all?—No, I have not; I am not prepared to say anything about it, but I think it could be done if we put had room.

486. Want of space would be the only thing that would stop you?—Yes, as far as I can see, in the country workhouses.

487. Did you ever think of boarding out the old people?—I don't think that would do; I don't know that they would be kindly treated.

488. Of course they would know exactly what they were entitled to get, and try to get it?—Of course they would, but people would not care for them so much as they do for children, unless they were their own old people.

489. Unless it paid them to have them, or they were connected with them?—It has been spoken about, having the children all taken out of the workhouses and all boarded out. I don't think that would be possible in a union where there are a great number of children; we would not be able to find homes for them; we find it hard enough to find homes for the orphan children.

490. At all events, you could go on until that difficulty arose?—But I don't think people would be willing to take the children of parents who are in the house.

491. Not if the parents could call in to inspect, of course, from time to time?—No; and there would be great difficulty in supervising so many.

492. It is not much more difficult to inspect sixty or a hundred children than it is fifteen or twenty?—When they are scattered all over the country, it is exceedingly difficult.

493. But generally the population is not scattered very much. I have noticed that in inspecting labourers' cottages you come along a certain line of country, and you have the sites all together fairly well?—I think cottage homes would be better; simple cottage homes, with not more than fifteen children in them.

494. There you would be dependent on having a very good motherly matron?—Yes.

495. That would be a difficult person to get?—It is just as difficult to get a good foster-mother.

496. I should not think it would be as much hardship for the children to take what is going in the ordinary way, but when you have an institution, you have to have it carefully managed?—I would rather have just simple cottage homes. I would keep the children of the ins and outs separate from the other children. I think it would answer better for girls and little children.

497. Do you think the children in the cottage homes would be better citizens in the future than institution-reared children?—Oh yes.

498. How many would you have in the cottage home?—Not more than twelve or fifteen.

499. That would be a large family of girls?—Then we would have some little children with the girls, and then girls sent on to the training school before sending them out as servants. A workhouse girl sent out to a place never does much good; she can only get a very poor place, and cannot get on at all, and they are not strong enough at that age to be sent out. I think if they were sent from fourteen to seventeen from a cottage home to the training school, they would have a good chance in life. We find the girls the greatest difficulty.

500. The boys are more easily absorbed by the farmers?—They are, and the boys do very well when boarded out, but the girls not quite so well, unless they are sent very young.

501. What is the reason why the boys do better than the girls?—I really don't know.

502. Perhaps the open air employment?—I think it is very likely; the girls as they become older are more likely to become household drudges.

The Sitting was adjourned.

SECOND PUBLIC SITTING—FRIDAY, JUNE 26TH, 1903.

At the Ancient Concert Rooms, Dublin.

Present:—Mr. MICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. COET BIGGER.

Rev. J. PATRICK SMYTH, LIT.D., examined.

503. CHAIRMAN.—You divide your evidence, I think, into three heads—the children, the decent aged poor, and the case of the mothers of illegitimate children?

504. Will you kindly give your views, first, on the case of the children?—I think all the children ought to be boarded out. I don't know that the very young ones ought to be, but when they are two or three years old—a child will not get much workhouse contamination before it is three years of age—certainly after that they ought to be boarded out. But I would like to emphasise strongly that if they are to be boarded out they ought to be sent to a cottage home, and I want specially to emphasise the word a separate cottage home; a home with a kindly housemother, the big and little children together, so that they could go to school together. In Warwick, a lady Guardian, whom I met the night before last, told me they are working that system; they feel very strongly that if you dump down a number of workhouse children in the same neighbourhood—fifty or sixty—and send them to a school, it makes a great deal of difference. The children feel the workhouse taint on them, the other children know that they are workhouse children. What they do is, they have a cottage home in the Lake district, with a housemother; they send fifteen children there. And somewhere in the South of England they do the same; they get shocked amongst the other children; they are never noticed, and they don't feel the pauper taint about them.

505. These places are small institutions?—Not more than fifteen children with the mother.

506. How do they get absorbed?—If you put fifteen children in a school where there are a couple of hundred children, they are not noticed much.

507. How did they get absorbed there?—I meant that they get a start in life; they are not noticed. What they intend to do is, ultimately, they want to get these girls trained; they will put big and little girls in the home together, the big ones to look after the little ones, and they intend to pass the girls on to training places.

508. It is still an institution, though a small one?—Yes; more a family thing. Miss Buchanan said yesterday she feared one of the difficulties would be the extra expense of doing that. My friend tells me they have gone carefully into the subject, and it costs £s. 1d. per week less to do that. They have not only tried it in Warwick, but they have written to ever so many. Five or six workhouses have tried it, and they have found there is a slight decrease, instead of an increase, in the cost, when it is carefully done. I was to have all the papers by this morning's post; but I am quite satisfied the facts are as I say, and I could afterwards hand in the papers to you. That was the chief thing I wanted to say about the children.

509. Would you prefer that system to the system of ordinary boarding out in farmhouse and other houses?—I think you trouble with the boarding out in farmhouses—at least, our Dublin experience seems to be—a number of children get boarded out, and for the convenience of visiting they are put in a comparatively small district; and, therefore, the pauper taint is there. A good many of the Dublin workhouse children are boarded out in some parts of Wicklow, and it is known they are workhouse children.

510. If they were wisely scattered in different homes?—I think, if you could have twelve or fifteen children, with a housemother over them—a nice, kindly mother over them.

511. What would your opinion be of boarding out a few children?—Your trouble then would be what you elicited yesterday—the great trouble of lady Guardians

visiting them; your lady inspector could not visit them more than once or twice a year. One lady I know in a Dublin workhouse has been trying to do it, and found it costs her about £5s. for a day's visiting; and if you scatter them it is very hard to get the visits sufficiently done. I remember, many years ago, when I was first ordained, in my very first parish I remember the workhouse schoolmaster saying to me, "We always find the workhouse child gravitate back again; there is nothing for them to do when they get out; they feel it is a home, and whenever they are out of work they come back again."

512. As regards the decent aged poor?—That I feel more important than any of the things we have before us; and if you would allow me, before speaking of workhouses, to say a word about one's outside experience as a city diarist. Since I came to St. Anne's parish—it is a parish where there is permanently brought before me—where there are aged sempstresses, old bookbinders, and other people, who never had enough money in their life to make provision for old age; they are decent, struggling people, but there is written on them "Past work," and you have not the heart to talk to them of going into the workhouse. A case was brought to my notice where a poor lady, who had been the wife of a civil engineer, is in bed in a Dublin workhouse, side by side with a woman who has had forty convictions against her. Of course, this is an extreme case, and the Guardians should not have allowed it to happen. These people are living about us in our parish starving, some of them; I don't know how body and soul is kept together with the odd shillings they get; and I have not the heart to speak to them about the workhouse. You cannot support them with church dues, the trivial things we have to give, and you don't know what to do with them. It is a fearful misery. As for the remedy, I don't think outdoor relief, as at present administered, would ever work with us; I am afraid there would be a great deal of jobbery and degradation, and it would be very costly; everybody would want it.

513. It is almost impossible in a large city?—I think so; and I see the chief reformers in the East end of London are very strong against outdoor relief—much more than I thought they would have said about it.

514. Then there has been a French system suggested of boarding out the old as you would board out children?—I should not wonder if that would work for women; I don't think it would work with men. An old man of sixty-five could not settle down in a home without being very unhappy.

515. I should think that it would be more the other way; the women would miss household control?—I thought the women might mind the children, and take up little interests. Of course, until there is some hope that old-age pension schemes should be formed in the future I should think that what we ought to have would be something like Irish National hotels for the aged—we are very fond of the word "National" in Ireland now, and if we put the word "National" in it will appeal to us much more strongly. Denmark has them, where the people wear their own clothes, have no workhouse connection, and are allowed out in the afternoon; and—it would obviate the difficulty you suggest, of begging from you in the street—they get £d. a week pocket money. I think it is quite feasible, and quite economical, and if it could be done without using up one of your present workhouses for the scheme it would be a great improvement. You cannot get over the workhouse taint; and even if you, by separating the different classes, should cut free, for example, Loughlinstown or Balbrathney, I am afraid that the

Rev. J.
Patrick
Smyth.

June 26, 1901.

Rev. J.
Fitzmaurice
Scrymgeour.

inmate of the workhouse would be still upon it, and I should not wonder if, in Ireland, where there are so many gentlemen's mansions out of use at present, it would be quite possible to buy one and add to it and improve it, and try and get that taint out of it, if it could be done. But if one must be economical I think even a workhouse would be much better than what we are doing at present. If we had one workhouse set free, very little structural changes would accomplish what is wanted, if you had classification of some kind.

515. Not apart a workhouse for the decent aged poor—I would have the common workhouse for the vicious, degraded, and idle, as now, and then Miss Buchanan's suggestion, yesterday, of privilege wards, or something like that, for the aged poor. I would very much rather they were not in the workhouse; that they were outside, in a house, and I don't think it would cost the State one penny more. You asked, yesterday, how we could work classification. I think a rough sort of classification could be done without much trouble; everybody over sixty or sixty-five, who for the last twenty years has never been on the Poor Law or in the hands of the police; that ought to remove them altogether from the common workhouse—that person ought not to be in the common workhouse. There might be a further classification done by a visiting committee; but I think it could be done with us at a very little cost; very little structural changes. In the Inebriate Hospital, at Dennybrook, I have been repeatedly visiting a poor old friend, who is absolutely dependent on charity. She belonged to a decent position in society, but those about her are servants of the very poorest class; but instead of having a big ward they have little cubicles six feet square.

517. A window to each?—No; they are only six feet high. The ward is open at the top; they don't want a window, they have got the light from the top. She was able to receive me, and give me a cup of tea, and close her door, and had the feeling that the place was her home, though she lived with the rest. If something like that was done, and these poor old people allowed to go out from 3 o'clock to 5 o'clock, with much of what Miss Buchanan said yesterday I very much sympathise. Don't let them wear a uniform, for it is unbecoming. Let them come back to meals, and give them 5d. a week for pocket money; and, although one feels that it is not good to make the position of a idle person in the workhouse as good as that of one who is struggling to stay outside, well, these are sixty or sixty-five years of age, and that makes a difference. Of course, if they release the liberty they ought to be tried by the Guardians, and degraded for a period into the common workhouse; and, similarly, you would let the inmates of the common workhouse be promoted up. But let me specially emphasise the point. We are not talking of something Utopian; that was forgotten in the evidence yesterday. Several workhouses have already tried it, and are working it with great success. Mrs. Haslam has given us some of the papers that have been read at meetings of the women Guardians, and in Miss Buchanan's paper there are the rules of Macdonald Union, which has been working this very system.—"All privileged inmates shall be selected by the Visiting Committee. All inmates are subject to the ordinary rules of the workhouse, with certain exceptions. All inmates are expected to attend punctually at meals, except 3 o'clock tea. Inmates are free to go

out as they wish after mid-day dinner. Inmates will not be required to dress in uniform. No inmate may bring into the ward, or receive from any source outside, the ward, either wine, beer, or spirituous liquor, and any inmate found in a state of intoxication will be summarily removed to other wards. Any inmate leaving any property of the Guardians outside the house will be removed from the ward. The friends of inmates, by permission of the master, may visit the inmates on week-days, from 3 to 4 p.m. The following are the qualifications for privilege wards:—Aged and infirm over sixty years of age. Those whose character is known to have been good. The destitute through no fault of their own. Those who have never been in receipt of relief. The longest residents in the union (those paying rates for a long time having a claim to consideration). Relief committees to recommend, after investigation, those whom they consider eligible. Applicants who approach nearest to the above requirements to have a prior claim." The Chairman of the Macdonald Board of Guardians writes:—"The scheme of Privilege Wards begun by the Macdonald Board ten years ago has been indisputably successful, and is now in full working order in many unions." That is all I wanted to say with regard to the subject that I think is one of the most important of all, dealing with the aged poor.

518. The other heading of your evidence is the case of mothers with illegitimate children—I wonder if your Commission would consider the question as to the case of mothers with illegitimate children coming in continually into the workhouse, whether your Board could not sweep that class away by handing them over to outside religious influences. There are different Magdalen homes in Dublin—some kept by nuns—and there are two or three of other religious bodies, two Church of Ireland ones. If one or two of these were used for first cases, for a girl who had only her first baby, she might be saved from falling any further, and if you could sweep that whole thing out of the way of your workhouse machinery, you would remove their complications and simplify things immensely. I suppose it does not come before you, the question of the changing of the law with regard to this whole question.

519. Nothing can be done after this inquiry except by legislation.—An inquiry about that difference in the law with regard to these illegitimate children—hastily.

520. Well, of course, if you have anything to say on it, I will hear it.—Is there a very curious thing that in England in such a case the woman has a remedy against the man. In any ordinary court she can get maintenance for the child; here she has no redress except to go into the workhouse, and the Guardians must attack the man at a very heavy cost, and they generally don't do it. I think, sir, that is all I have to say.

521. As far as you know, you think that religious organisations and communities would be likely to take these as boarded-out cases at so much a head?—I think so; it would be a great help to them in one of these Magdalen homes, which are supported at a great cost by voluntary subscriptions, if they had an annual receipt from other sources; it would help them.

522. It would mean that they would have to have a lying-in ward?—Yes, but still you generally pay them well for that.

Dr. Katherine
Maguire.

Dr. KATHERINE MAGUIRE EXAMINED.

523. CHAIRMAN.—The first suggestion you make is that the workhouse hospital should be put an end to as such.—And made into a separate institution, to be called a district hospital.

524. Under what management?—That, of course, is the difficulty. I think that if they were still to remain workhouse infirmaries they should be put under a committee, for which I think there is power under the Workhouse Acts. If they were in any way amalgamated with the county infirmaries, then they should be under the County Council, and worked by a committee.

525. In the same way that the county infirmaries are?—I think so, or something quite similar.

526. You wish to say something about the present state of nursing in workhouse infirmaries?—The societies that I represent are very anxious indeed that

workhouse infirmaries should be nursed almost, if not quite, as well as ordinary hospitals. We think that we should not allow the standard to fall below that of an ordinary hospital, and in consequence of that we think that any nurses who are called trained nurses ought to be trained nurses who would be accepted in any ordinary clinical hospital.

527. Do you think the present practice is not quite satisfactory?—I think not, as far as my information goes, and I especially notice that in the qualifications laid down by the Waterford Board of Guardians, which, I suppose, is sanctioned by the Local Government Board—

528. I notice your reference to that, but it was made under a misconception. That was merely for a few existing cases; it merely recognised certain interests

June 25, 1901.
—
Dr. Katherine
Maguire.

that appeared to be wanted—I don't mean that; I mean that they don't insist on the fever qualification for their trained nurses.

522. I thought it was the question of wardmaids!—No; it was the fever qualification, which we feel is very important indeed, especially for Poor Law nurses.

523. Dr. BROOKS.—Do you know whether in other institutions where they train nurses they get the fever qualification?—I think so; any nurse that would be called a trained certificated nurse ought to have the fever qualification.

524. CHAIRMAN.—We get a great number of certificates at the Local Government Board without the fever qualification, and we ask on these certificates that they have not the fever qualification?—I think that would be a great misfortune in workhouse nurses, unless it is absolutely certain they would never have any fever cases.

525. It is certain; the fever hospital is a separate institution?—Then there would be no possibility of the trained nurse being sent from one to the other.

526. The nurse appointed to the infirmary is a nurse for ordinary medical and surgical cases, and is not a fever nurse?—In that case we could not object. We also thought, if it were possible, the head nurse ought to have a midwifery certificate, if it was likely she would have midwifery work to do. You have some nurses who have that certificate.

CHAIRMAN.—We have a large number; all the Belfast nurses have the midwifery certificate.

Dr. BROOKS.—They have some midwifery training, but have not all the six months' course.

527. CHAIRMAN.—The Guardians, of course, when they get candidates with the midwifery certificate, are more anxious to employ them, and in that way it is an inducement to nurses to get the qualification?—Yes; I have known nurses who on that account got the certificate. There are some nurses who never have midwifery cases.

528. Yes, because the town nurse comes in at so much a cost?—The next point was the Local Government Board order about qualified nurses.

529. It is only the title you object to?—I should not wish to encourage a very large number of these so-called qualified nurses.

530. The qualification is the reason?—Another objection I would make is that you have not put down any qualification or any period of training for these qualified nurses.

531. That was deliberately done, for if a proper limit were put down at first, it would mean inability to get any nurses?—If you had put some such limit, you would have done a useful thing by encouraging these nurses to return for a further period of training.

532. Meanwhile we would have had no nurses of any qualification in the hospitals?—I cannot see that these qualified nurses have any qualification at all.

533. Dr. BROOKS.—Do you understand that before an institution is recognised for granting certificates, the Local Government Board examines the institution and goes into the opportunities of training?—But no period is set down.

534. CHAIRMAN.—We won't sanction what is an inadequate period, and you may take it that no one is recognised under a year; but certificated nurses are a good deal better than nurses without certificates?—It is not a pity to call her a qualified nurse, because the public will never recognise that she is not fully qualified.

535. The reason the nurse was called a trained nurse was to entitle her to half the Government grant?—But this nurse is not a trained nurse—not technically trained.

536. They are really trained, but they have not got the full certificate we ask for the purposes of the Act?—The full certificate you ask is only two years' training, which is the minimum for anyone who ought to be a trained nurse.

537. Dr. BROOKS.—That is in a large hospital, where there is clinical instruction?—I think it would be very injudicious for workhouse people to call their nurses anything but trained nurses, and have them really trained nurses. If you have one standard of trained nurses in workhouses and another in the clinical hospitals the confusion becomes greater. I think you ought to abide by that standard and not call these qualified nurses qualified; you could call them some other name.

538. CHAIRMAN.—What could we call them?—You could call them assistant nurses.

539. But they are often charge nurses?—I don't think you ought to allow these nurses to be charge nurses, they are not qualified.

540. But they are qualified?—Then they ought to be trained nurses.

541. We have a distinct grade; the proper thing might be perhaps to call the trained nurse lady superintendent or superintendent of nurses, but the others are qualified?—At the same time you will never make ordinary people understand that they are not really trained, which it appears they are not.

542. They are trained?—If they are really trained nurses why not call them so?

543. Because the word "trained" was used in the Act of Parliament, and we have to confine it to those nurses of whose salary the Government contributes half?—Are you not allowed to call any nurse who has a full clinical certificate a trained nurse?

544. No.—Then it would be much better to change the name of those nurses whose salaries are paid.

545. You would have to change the Act of Parliament; I think there is no real practical difficulty in the matter?—I don't think there is any difficulty either to the Guardians or the Local Government Board, but you often get names not so well qualified.

546. The Local Government Board look very closely into their qualifications; the complaints are that they look too closely. Now attendants?—I really do not know what the word "attendant" is intended to mean there.

547. It is a term that embraces both male and female?—Could you not call them wardresses?

548. So we do in correspondence if we are writing about a particular case?—Would it not have been better to put it into the Order; I think wardress is just as short as attendant.

549. You would have an endless variation of he and she through the Order, which the word "attendant" obviates?—"Attendant" is generally taken to mean a person who is assisting in nursing.

550. The Local Government Board are very strict on that; they are not allowed to do any nursing duties?—I know, but it gives a very misleading impression.

551. Not to the medical officer, not to the patient, not to the Guardians, not to the Local Government Board?—I am very glad to hear that.

552. The attendants are not all members of the nursing staff?—It is a pity to call them attendants then; it would be much better to call them wardresses or waiters.

553. If we are writing a letter about a man we call him a wardman, and if we are writing about a female attendant we call her a wardmaid, but for an Order where you have formal language it is much more convenient to have a substantive of common gender?—Still I think one might sacrifice something for the sake of names.

554. It is the very first time I have heard any objection raised; it is merely a question of words; no difficulty at all arises in the workhouse in the matter, with the central boards or local boards?—Then the pauper nursing.

555. There is no such thing recognised?—Well, is there no such thing in existence?

556. There are three or four hospitals where we are aware that it is going on, and we are fighting strenuously with these hospitals, and it must come to an end?—It is a pity that these are the largest hospitals!

557. There is absolute power to stop it, but you cannot take a corporate body by the throat all at once?—It is a pity that the hospitals where it is allowed are the largest ones.

558. The one I have in my mind is one of the smallest in Ireland?—Still I think it is common in the large.

559. It is practically known on the land?—I cannot, of course, speak as to the country.

560. Pauper nursing is practically at an end?—That would be an important thing if the hospitals were separated from the workhouse; it would stop pauper nursing.

561. The only duties that pauper aids?—I should call them wardmaids.

562. We apply that to the paid people?—Could you not call them pauper wardmaids?

563. Well, their only duties are scrubbing the floors and the stairs and sweeping steps and coals?—I quite know that is theoretically what they are supposed to do.

564. And if the Local Government Board find any breach of that they certainly take action at once; the Guardians, as a rule, are most reasonable; there is hardly any case where there is any resistance; the Guardians recognise themselves now that skilled nurses

June 26, 1901.
Dr. Katherine
Maguire.

ing is the proper and humane treatment, and they are falling in, bodily all over Ireland with the suggestion—Still I am afraid there are very large hospitals in existence where the nursing must be practically done by paupers.

572. I am not going to say there may not be a case or two, but they are very few!—Well, essentially, these hospitals where pauper nursing is in existence contain more patients than a great many of the unions in Ireland put together.

573. You won't find many; that is, I am afraid, all I can say!—The insane and imbecile, of course, I think there is no second opinion about.

574. The question that there was a divergence about yesterday was whether they should be sent to an auxiliary asylum or annexes to existing asylums?—That is a thing I don't think I should like to give a definite opinion about; I think probably that in some cases it would be better to send them to annexes and in some to auxiliary asylums; it would be cheaper, no doubt, to make auxiliary asylums in some cases and cheaper to have annexes in other cases; that would depend on the accommodation in existing institutions. Still I don't think these people should be sacrificed to cheapness. What I wish to lay stress on was imbecile children who at present have no teaching at all, and if put under a better system it would be comparatively easy to have one auxiliary asylum where there would be teachers for them.

575. We are getting figures of the number of children—I don't think they would be many.

576. It would be quite small?—Yes, but even such few as they are they might be improved, and that would be no expense extra to the Guardians.

577. They could board them out in institutions?—Yes, some of them, no doubt.

578. You mentioned Lady Meston's proposal?—About some epileptics; the number of some epileptics in Ireland is not very large.

579. About 400 in the workhouses. Do you think that all of those would be really eligible to go to any special institution? I think it was Dr. Fay who was very strongly in favour of not sending them to an institution, but of having a colony.

580. I meant a colony by an institution?—No doubt a great number of them ought to be; I don't think you could put all the 400 into a colony; some of them would be unfit for it.

581. Those subject to night seizures he thought ought to be put out with farmers?—Perhaps, if you could be sure that they only always take night seizures.

582. He seemed to classify them very clearly into day and night seizures?—I don't know that you could do it so absolutely as that; some get attacks by both day and night, and then there are occasional cases that get attacks of insanity with their fits, and it would be very

difficult to classify them as sane, and there should be some accommodation for them in the colony.

583. Lady Meston's offer would only have accommodated very few people; I dare say it would have met the requirements?—Not of more than Dublin.

584. But all the Boards of Guardians were asked?—Yes, with a view of finding out what contribution they would give, but at first Lady Meston's offer would only have been sufficient for Dublin, and we found that unless there was some certainty of Treasury aid—a grant in aid from somebody—it would be very expensive, but a large institution is generally cheaper than a small one per head.

585. Infants, you think, should not be boarded out until what age?—Either two or three.

586. You would not send them as soon as they were weaned?—Yes; or when they are about two I would board them. At the age of two a healthy child ought to be able to eat anything; but I think they ought to be properly provided for in the existing unions, and I don't know that they by any means always are. I believe if you investigate the death rate of infants brought up by hand in unions you would probably find it was high too.

587. Do you know the results of boarding out children under a year old and bottle-feeding?—Yes, but I believe in the workhouse also the results of bottle-feeding are not very good. Was there not an inquiry about that?

CHAIRMAN.—There was one Dr. Higger held.

588. Dr. Bauman.—It is very difficult to hold such an inquiry, because they don't stay in the workhouse, but amongst the minor the death rate is nothing like so high in proportion to the out-door?—Then about the children, I have a paper from Mr. Bauman that perhaps it would be a good plan to give in evidence (pending), regarding the certified schools that have been very slightly used.

589. There are only twelve girls of certified schools?—The society I represent is very anxious that you should increase that as much as possible. The only other point was the possibility of contributing to children in day industrial schools as part of out-door relief, if day industrial schools were in existence.

590. How would that work?—That was Mr. Bauman's suggestion; you do relieve widows with more than one child.

591. The Guardians have it in their discretion?—It was thought that if some contribution was made towards the maintenance of such children in day industrial schools the mothers would be set free to work for the children and the condition of the family would be materially improved; it would be a form of out-door relief not liable to abuse.

592. Such children as go now to national schools?—Yes, but, of course, the mother would be set much more free by a day industrial school where they would get their meals.

LEED MONTAGUE EXAMINED.

593. Before commencing my evidence I wish to say that it is far from complete, owing to the short notice I had of the scope of the Commission, and of the date of the sitting, and to my being absent at the time and much occupied with other public business. There are several points I have not been able to touch at all, while others involve complicated details in reference to which I have not had time to collect the material facts and figures, and upon which, consequently, I could only give a bare outline of my opinions. The time of the sitting also, unfortunately, prevents some of the most experienced members of the Irish Workhouse Association giving general evidence on this occasion, as they are detained in London in connection with the Land Bill.

594. CHAIRMAN.—I hope we will have the pleasure of hearing you and them later on, because there will be other sittings.

I am a landowner in County Limerick, and was for many years an ex-officio Guardian of Glan Union until dissolved in 1893, and subsequently of Rathkeale Union until 1899. I am also President of the Irish Workhouse Association, founded in 1896 with the following objects:—(a) The improvement of the Irish workhouse system by all means consistent with a due regard for the interests of the ratepayers; and especially (b) the improvement of the condition of the sick, the aged, the children, and other helpless classes; (c) the discouragement of vagrancy. The association is non-

political and unsectarian, and, acting in conjunction with other bodies with similar aims, has been the means of securing some valuable reforms, as detailed in the memorandum prepared by our secretary, Miss Stephens, which I hand in. I appear on behalf of the association at the request of the committee to give evidence as to the Poor Law reforms they advocate, which may be described in general terms as being:—1. To secure by more thorough classification methods of treatment better adapted to the different classes of workhouse inmates, and where possible in separate institutions, especially (a) lunatics and others mentally defective, (b) the sick, (c) the children, and (d) the aged and infirm. 2. To promote such an extent of amalgamation, as a general policy, as would conduce to this better classification. Vagrancy, we consider, should be dealt with on a radically different system from that now adopted. I proceed to deal with these different branches of the subject in answer to the eight queries issued by the Commission, but before doing so I must explain that our association confine itself to unions outside Dublin, and that most of our suggestions refer only to rural unions.

No. 1. This is a local question which will require different answers in different counties. My committee are not all agreed as to the extent to which amalgamation can be carried as a general policy, and, personally, I should regard with grave apprehension any wholesale change such as was advocated in County Curran at the

June 28, 1902.

Lord
Monsieus.

time of Mr. Trevellick's Commission in 1879, viz., closing all the workhouses of a county except one, and amalgamating all the unions, because I believe this would entail either great hardship to the poor or a wholesale increase of outdoor relief and serious increase of pauperism, which, experience shows, invariably accompanies indiscriminate relief of this kind. There would also be considerable administrative difficulties in the way of such a large change. But we are insistent in desiring such amalgamation as would conduce to better classification by setting free workhouses for the treatment of particular classes, and we believe that in most counties there are one or more small unions which ought to be dissolved for this purpose without any hardship to the poor. The "orrible" accommodation of existing workhouses was stated by Mr. Trevellick's Commission in 1879 to be 147,522, and the actual accommodation was then estimated at about half the certified figure. Allowing for unions dissolved since 1879, I believe there were two.

535. There is—We may safely estimate the actual accommodation now to be at least 70,000. The average daily number relieved in all the workhouses in Ireland (1900-1) was 45,136, while the maximum number of inmates during the last twelve months, viz., to 5th February 1902, I find from figures kindly supplied to me by the Local Government Board are only 45,370. Reducing the number of workhouses in the proportion of 75 to 45 would give 102, and I therefore estimate that 57 workhouses could be dispensed with, or, roughly speaking, two in each county, without any increase of outdoor relief, and still leave ample room in the remaining 102 workhouses for those more thorough classification we desire.

536. If you closed one workhouse, allocated it to a special class only, say, turned it into an auxiliary lunatic asylum, then all the aged and infirm of that district would go to another workhouse?—Yes.

537. Would that be liable to lead to any increase of outdoor relief?—Not, I think, in the case of amalgamation of such small unions, which is all I contemplate here.

538. Take Newcastle, for instance, in your own neighbourhood, supposing it was made into an auxiliary asylum?—For my own county?

539. Or any other purpose you like?—I have not really looked into the question closely as regards my own county; I was only taking a general view of the question, but in regard to the County Limerick there is one small union that I believe might be dissolved without any hardship to the poor or any danger of increasing outdoor relief.

540. I think we will wait until we get to Limerick to hear that; the question is whether closing one workhouse would not result in the infirm poor of that union looking for outdoor relief?—If the union were large there might be that difficulty.

No. 2. This is also a local question, and I need only add to my last reply that we consider auxiliary asylums for (a) chronic lunatics, and (b) district schools for pauper children not eligible for boarding out, as purposes for which dissolved workhouses could be utilized with advantage to those classes themselves, and that by their removal better classification in the workhouses that remained would be greatly facilitated. We wish to have a more thorough classification of classes that would reside in the workhouses after removing those classes that can be sufficiently dealt with in separate institutions, and the poor that would be set free by removing those classes could be utilized in that way for more thorough classification. In connection with this subject I may add that there is one class which my association may perhaps more anxious to have removed from the workhouses than any other, but which, owing to the smallness of its numbers, cannot be provided for in separate institutions by any amalgamation within the different counties such as is contemplated in these queries. I allude to the same epileptics who, owing to the representations of our association and others, have been separately committed since the year 1900. According to the last Local Government Board report issued (for 12 months ending 31st March, 1901) there are only 216 in all Ireland. Admittedly, they require separate and special treatment as much as lunatics, and our committee urge that they could best be provided for in a single national institution, receiving the same expenditure, which would only amount to about 25,000 a year. I may say upon that, Mr. Hicks, that I believe Dr. Katherine Maguire gave some evidence with regard to epileptics, and I don't attempt to go into the details

as to the distinction between those who are sane and those who are insane, and those who have occasional seizures when they become insane; that would have to be considered by experts. Speaking for myself only, I consider that this class and all lunatics and others mentally defective should, in Ireland, be maintained by the State (as in most foreign countries), and not by any Poor Law or other local authority. I don't think the argument as regards making the locality responsible for the amount of its pauperism applies in this case, because these cases are not subject to any influence of that kind; the community must deal with them, cannot leave them unattended, and therefore I think it is a matter of national concern and not a matter of merely local concern, and I think they would be much better dealt with on national lines and without there being necessarily any increase of cost, and that the charge should be apportioned in proportion to the probable valuation of different counties instead of by number. I also think the auxiliary asylums should be inspected by the Lunacy Inspectors, but that the latter in turn should be under the Local Government Board as regards district, as well as auxiliary asylums. Obviously, these lunatics and people of that class should be inspected by Lunacy Inspectors.

541. They are at present?—They are supposed to be 542. Oh, no; they are 1—I think the inspection is very far from perfect.

543. I see the returns continually?—They are supposed to be inspected, I am quite aware, but I don't think the inspection is nearly as frequent and as thorough as it ought to be; I rather fancy the Lunacy Inspectors agree that it is very difficult to carry out under present circumstances.

544. With only two Inspectors?—Yes, and having regard to the way in which they are all scattered.

545. Yes, 150 workhouses, and asylums besides, but they are all inspected by the Lunacy Inspectors, and really wonderfully frequently having regard to their small number?—I am not importing any neglect on the part of the Lunacy Inspectors, but I don't think they can be properly inspected under present circumstances.

No. 3. By such an amalgamation as I have described it should be possible to provide in separate institutions for the two classes mentioned in my last reply, but this would be hardly feasible "without the dissolution of any union." The question is asked in that query whether with or without the dissolution of any union. But, as already explained, we wish to secure separate treatment for other classes also; let, the sick, and, 2nd, the aged and infirm. It is unnecessary to argue the first point, as the principle of substituting "district hospitals" for "workhouse hospitals" has been already recognized in the 80th clause of the Local Government Act of 1895, which was originally suggested, I believe, by Dr. Joseph Smyth, of Naas, then a member of our executive committee, and which our association was mainly instrumental in getting adopted. That clause has hitherto been inoperative, and the question how it can best be made effective has not been formally considered by our committee, and would differ according to local circumstances, especially as regards the crucial question of distance and means of communication. Moreover, general evidence on this point will be given by members of the medical profession connected with our association. On its behalf, therefore, I will only say that we regard two points of vital importance in this matter:—(a) The separation of the hospital from the workhouse not necessarily by removal to a distance, but by separate entrance and separate staff and administration; and (b) the absolute suppression of "pauper nursing" not only in name but in reality. This can only be ensured by the paupers being replaced by "paid attendants"—a change which, according to the returns I moved for two years ago, had only then been effected in 30 unions out of 150. There can be no doubt that the "attendants" often discharge nursing duties, and if "paupers" are employed as "attendants" it obviously opens the door to "pauper nursing." If paupers are fit to act as attendants they are worth their hire, and should be paid; otherwise they are little better than slaves. If they are not fit they should not be employed.

546. I think you were present when this matter was referred to when Dr. Katherine Maguire was giving evidence?—I heard part of it. In reference to that point I have no personal knowledge on the subject, so I did not attempt to go any further into detail on it, but no doubt her will have further evidence on the point. Before leaving the hospital question I should like to explain my personal opinion in favour of a

June 26, 1921.

Lord
Montagu.

large hospital consolidation in rural districts which, in some cases, might include a whole county. If that were carried out it would probably be advisable to combine with the county infirmary.

507. Do you mean one large building?—I mean to embrace the county infirmary within the system. I don't necessarily contemplate having only one hospital for a whole county, but in some counties—some of the smaller counties—one hospital might suffice. In other cases you might require two, and you might utilize the county infirmary as one and perhaps one workhouse of a disordered union for another.

508. One hospital system for the county, but the county infirmary and the Poor Law infirmary managed by the same body on the same system?—Yes, that is what I should like to see. This would greatly raise the standard and increase efficiency. I estimate the maximum number, excluding Dublin and Belfast, at 25,000, or about 400 on the average per county, large and small. The question of distance is very material in regard to the cases of temporary sickness, which are the most important, if not the most numerous, but apart from this the more members would not in many counties be too great for a single hospital. The distance difficulty might be got over by cottage hospitals or district nurses, either or both, which would be much less costly than the existing arrangements, and of much greater advantage to the sick poor.

509. Have you calculated that out in Sperrin?—Not as regards cottage hospitals; I think the district nursing system would be much more economical.

510. That is having nursing in their own homes where the homes would be suitable?—Yes, and, of course, subject to the case being suitable; in cases of infectious disease they ought to be removed. But there are a great number of cases in which people might be nursed in their own homes, and it might have the effect of stopping things at an earlier stage; very often people are reluctant to go to hospital, and won't go until they are very bad, whereas if they were nursed in their own homes the disease might be arrested. As regards cottage hospitals I have made some inquiries on the subject which seem to me to show that they might be very economically managed, and I believe that is the experience in England, but I have not any figures; I might, I hope, go into that on another occasion. The principle of nursing the poor in their own homes is already recognized not only in the "Jubilee Nurses" but in the appointments of dispensary district midwives, but the former are too expensive for the great majority of districts, and the latter have merely any training in general for fever nursing, and are most inadequately paid, and even such as they are, 276 out of 747 dispensary districts in Ireland, or more than one-third, are without them. Their salaries and salary should be raised, and half the latter paid by the State, like the "trained nurses" of the workhouse hospitals. (2) Our committee have not agreed on any policy in detail for the aged and infirm, but generally desire they should be treated separately in institutions of the poorhouse as distinguished from the workhouse type, and that the deserving amongst them again should be sub-classified for better treatment. The distance difficulty would, of course, be much less serious in their case, and in numbers they are also fewer than the sick. I estimate the maximum at 10,000, excluding Dublin and Belfast. There would, therefore, in many counties be no insuperable difficulty in providing for, at any rate, all the deserving members of this class in a single institution, and I would suggest that in Roman Catholic districts the management of such almshouses should be entrusted to the nuns. These reforms would, I believe, encourage Guardians to restrict outdoor relief within narrower limits by freeing the aged poor from the extreme severity of workhouse treatment, though still affording that test of destitution, the want of which renders outdoor relief at once so easily on the whole—however miserable the pittance given in each case—and so demoralizing. One other class certainly requires special treatment though not specially mentioned in the query of the Commission or specially considered as yet by my committee, viz., the infants with their mothers, many of them unmarried. This, however, is essentially a woman's question, and I doubt not will be dealt with by women Guardians in their evidence. I will only, therefore, make three observations on it; 1st, that special arrangements should be made to preserve young women with their first child from contact with habitual offenders; 2nd, that their wards and nurseries should be supervised by lady inspectors, who, indeed, would be a great means of improving many details of work-

house administration, as has been found in the case of the two at work in London for some years past; and, 3rd, there should be a minimum limit of age for boarding out or be fixed at two or three years old. At present there is no minimum limit of age; there is a maximum limit; I think there should be a minimum; it is rather a woman's question where the line should be drawn, but I would say infants under two or three should not be boarded out. I think these require much more attention than at present. The amount of inspection and supervision that is now given is far from being sufficient, even in the case of boarded-out children, and is quite inadequate in the case of infants. There remain only the vagrants, who, as stated above, my committee think should be dealt with on reformatories lines altogether apart from the other classes of paupers, and that this should be done by the police, whose duty it has long been to prosecute them, the offence being punishable by a single magistrate out of Petty Sessions by imprisonment without the option of a fine. But I leave this subject in the hands of Mr. Walter Kavanagh, who has made a special study of it, and whom my committee have asked to give evidence before the Commission. I am afraid Mr. Kavanagh will not be able to attend here this time.

511. Have you any idea how the police should look after vagrants?—Mr. Kavanagh has a suggestion to make on that point; I leave it to him to explain. As regards the numbers, the figures that were kindly supplied to me by the Local Government Board show about 5,000, I think, under the general head of "all other classes."

512. 4,500?—The figures I had were the maximum; I take the maximum in order to be sure we are estimating sufficient accommodation for the workhouses; the total numbers were 45,000, and the number under all other classes was nearly 5,000, and I take these to be mainly vagrants.

513. No; there are only 800 vagrants?—Yes; but then in those figures the vagrants are counted several times over.

514. You are speaking of the nights each vagrant spends in the workhouse?—My point is this, that I find the number of vagrants on any one night, the maximum is 600 odd.

515. I have not the figures as late as these but in the week in which that 600 odd came I think you will find that for the whole week the number referred to about seven times that amount; evidently they go from workhouse to workhouse, they change their shade every night. I think you will find 600 on one night, and the number in the week is 4,000.

516. Dr. BIGGS.—That is the 600 multiplied by seven because they spend seven nights in different workhouses, the same 600?—The figures I refer to, where all other classes are shown, are also for the week, and therefore I estimate that the 4,000 odd were mainly vagrants.

517. CHAIRMAN.—That is not so; we had it all yesterday from Mr. Courtney?—I have the figures from Rathfriland in further detail, and they seem to correspond more or less with the figures I had.

No. 4. I have incidentally answered portions of this question in my reply to No. 3. In addition, I think, speaking for myself alone, the following changes would be desirable in connection with the reforms I have advocated.

Legislation.—(1) Vagrants and parents of the "in and out" class should be deprived of the custody of their children, and the latter should be adopted and educated by the Guardians in district schools. (2) The Irish law as to recovery of cost of maintenance of illegitimate children from the putative fathers should be assimilated to the English "Bastardy Law," as explained by Mr. William Holden in a paper read at the Belfast Poor Law Conference in November, 1921. I believe you have already had some evidence on that.

518. Yes, this morning.

Administration.—The "district schools" should be of a regular "industrial" type, and should be inspected by the Inspector of Reformatories and Industrial Schools instead of as now by the Local Government Board Inspector, whose functions are of a totally different nature. I see no distinction in principle between the children in these schools and the class in industrial schools.

519. Would you rather have boarding out or the district schools?—As regards the boarding out of the class who are eligible for boarding out I greatly prefer boarding out under proper supervision.

520. Would you approve of changing the classification of children who could be boarded out?—Of course

June 25, 1903.

Lord
Mestral.

you are aware it has been somewhat enlarged last year by a small Act that I introduced enlarging the definition, but I don't think that the class of men and women, and the children of men and women, who would be the next class that I suppose might be boarded out, could practically be dealt with in that way; but I think in that case it would be better that they should be in district schools, because there would be great difficulty in keeping them from interference by the parents, and they would be more under the control of the Guardians in district schools. I have not gone very closely into the question, but I don't see at present how you could enlarge the class of children that are eligible for boarding out, and until the system of supervision is made more effective I think it would be dangerous to increase the class, but it is difficult enough now to ensure proper homes under proper supervision with the existing arrangements, and until more numerous and more efficient bodies visiting committees can be organised, which I hope will be the result of the recent appointment of two lady inspectors, until that change has been carried very much further I don't think that boarding out could be safely increased.

Charity.—Outdoor relief should be an electoral division charge, as under mismanagement a system of log-rolling is encouraged; the cost does not come home to individual Guardians, and there is a tendency to leave the whole selection too much in the hands of the relieving officer, with the result that there is not sufficient investigation of the applicant's circumstances, and the relief becomes largely indiscriminate. I may say with reference to this that I have had no personal experience of the working of Boards of Guardians since the Act of 1868, so I am only giving hearsay evidence more or less, what I hear from people who are concerned.

621. How the expenditure goes up in the part of the country you are familiar with?—I believe it has, but that is one of the questions I alluded to that I should have liked to have gone into much more closely, and I hope to do so on another occasion. On the other hand, many of the indoor classes might be charged with advantage on a wider area than the union, as I believe is done in London. I have already expressed my opinion that lunatic and some epileptics should be national charges. I have incidentally answered queries 5, 6, and 8 in my other replies, so far as I have evidence to offer, and other points in them will be dealt with by other witnesses from our association. I have only to say in reply to No. 7 that my committee are strongly in favour of a system of paying patients, and

the establishment of separate wards for the same. This we regard as of vital importance in confining to public health and arresting the spread of infectious disease, as well as rendering available for the poorer ratepayers the only hospital within their reach and removing from it the stigma of pauperism. In conclusion, I may say I regard the workhouse as a necessary evil with which we cannot altogether dispense, but which we should steadily endeavour to restrict to those classes which cannot be dealt with by the other means which I have suggested. But we cannot acquiesce in the present haphazard system under which the workhouse is in many respects a nursery, or factory, of pauperism, and the work of our association has been directed to eliminating from this deplorable system those classes which can be treated by educational or reformatory methods, as well as those for whom a more humane treatment is demanded by Christian principles and the public opinion of all civilised countries. I hope to have an opportunity of going more fully into this broad general question on a future occasion. The idea should be to humanise Poor Law relief without pauperising the poor, and in my opinion this can only be attained by classification carried out to its extreme logical conclusion, which is the careful and sympathetic investigation of the individual case, and this investigation in turn can hardly be achieved without the co-operation of voluntary helpers outside the ranks of the Poor Law authorities, local or central. And until we can succeed in more largely enlisting the assistance of the public and the philanthropic classes outside the officials and the regular system of Poor Law relief, I don't think we can attain to the level that has been reached in many Continental countries. That would be the ideal which I should aim at; that we should be able to treat our poor on the more humane system on which they are treated in many foreign countries, such as Denmark and Austria, and I believe also in Switzerland and France, though the system, of course, differs in these different countries, but I believe with the assistance of the public outside, and by arousing the public conscience and getting people to recognise their corporate responsibility, not merely for the maintenance of these people and keeping them from absolute starvation, but for combating with the great mischief of pauperism, with these aids we may approximate to that ideal. But until we can reach something like the foreign standards in these matters—a standard which has not been reached in England any more than in this country, I believe—I am afraid that we shall not get within measurable distance of our ideal.

Sir WILLIAM THORNTON SPOKE examined.

Sir William
Thornton
Staley.

622. **CHAIRMAN.**—Your evidence is chiefly as regards hospitals of workhouses?—Yes, it is. The first matter I wish to mention is the opinion I hold, and that the society I represent holds, that the hospital should be separated from the workhouse proper; a complete separation made.

623. Different staffs?—Yes, I think that this involves separate authority as regards the workhouse proper and the hospital, that the hospital should be under the control of a doctor and a matron or superintendent, who is a fully trained nurse, and that they should be independent of all district workhouse control.

624. Would you have some committee of management?—Yes; there should be a committee of management, but I think it is desirable, from a sentimental point of view, to separate this hospital as far as possible, because a great many people at present won't go into a workhouse hospital who would, I think, enter it in future under changed circumstances when it is known to have no direct connection with the workhouse itself. Then in that case the medical officer of the workhouse proper and of the hospital should be distinct officers; they should hold distinct offices.

625. It may be the same man?—In certain districts, of course, the same man would occupy both offices, but he would act in each independent of the other and receive separate payment. Mr. Kavanagh proposed a plan in consultation the other day, which he has authorised me to suggest in his name as he is not present, and that is that the medical care of the workhouse proper should be placed in the hands of the dispensary doctor of the district, who would receive some increase in his salary for doing it; that would help perhaps to meet the increased expense of having two medical officers and two salaries, where there is now only one. This person who is not destitute, I am strongly of opinion, should be allowed to con-

tribute to the cost of their support to a degree proportionate to their means.

626. You would leave that discretionary with the medical officer and committee?—I would.

627. Dr. Broom.—You don't propose separate wards?—I think it would be desirable if possible, but I am aware that in a great many districts it would be practically impossible; but where the hospital was of sufficient size to allow segregation of cases I think it would induce respectable people to enter if not put with those who are in the hospital without paying. That is a matter of sentiment, because I am aware they would be just as well treated without a separation of that sort. With the increased efficiency of medical and surgical treatment and the removal of the term "Union Hospital" persons would be induced to seek treatment who at present go to Dublin hospitals. At present large numbers of union patients resort to Dublin hospitals for treatment, being either sent there at the expense of the union or imposed on Dublin charities supported mainly by Dublin people. The average cost that is paid by unions to Dublin hospitals for every patient is 6s. a week, at the rate of 3s. a day, and when you add the travelling expenses of the patient to and from his union, and very often the expense of an attendant coming up to take charge of him, a considerable sum of money is expended that could be economised if these cases were treated in their own districts.

628. **CHAIRMAN.**—A great many are cases that might be treated in their own unions?—Yes, a great many of them are cases that could be treated in their own unions, and I think that the increased experience and responsibility thus thrown on the medical officers would produce an increased efficiency, and I believe that increased efficiency and consequently more expeditious treatment would result in economy.

June 25, 1909.

Sir William
Thomson
Stoke.

625. Dr. BROWN.—Would you make any suggestion why that increased efficiency might be anticipated?—At present a large number of cases are sent to towns which could, under conditions of ordinary advantages, such as they then would have in improved hospitals, be treated in the country; of course there would still be a certain, but small, class of obscure and difficult cases requiring metropolitan treatment.

626. You mentioned about increased efficiency; would you make any suggestion how the increased efficiency could be obtained?—Improvements in the nursing is one thing, the doctor would then be a man placed in charge of a number of difficult cases, which are now sent away; his knowledge of the work would increase, and consequently the confidence of the people of the district in him would increase. At present there are a large number of men in obscure places who have no opportunity of dealing with difficult and obscure cases; they are all sent to Dublin, Cork, or Belfast, and the doctor loses the advantage of study and cannot study them at home, because he has no proper appliances for treating them, which I hold he would have if the hospital were a separate thing in the way I speak of.

631. CHAIRMAN.—General efficiency all round?—Yes, in nursing, and probably in feeding as well. Then I think the nursing arrangements, although they are very much improved of late years are capable of a great deal of further improvement. I think the different classes of nurses as regards accomplishments require to be defined more clearly. I think the terms "qualified" and "trained" which are used at present in both Ireland and England by the Poor Law authorities are not desirable ones. To call one class trained is to imply that the lower grade are not trained; and to call a person who is not fully trained, qualified, is, I think, a mistake. I think every nurse should be both qualified and trained, although a different degree of training, of course, might be necessary for the higher position in the nursing ward.

632. Dr. BROWN.—How would you differentiate between the nurses?—The half-trained nurse might be called an assistant nurse.

633. I must say the nurses are very well trained?—In the experience of people engaged in nursing schools in metropolitan cities they are not trained.

634. I have got the same opinion expressed by county medical officers regarding Dublin-trained nurses?—Here in the Waterford scheme of nursing, which I understand has been sanctioned by the Local Government Board, and in paragraph 10 it says: "Training in a fever hospital, though very desirable as an additional qualification, is not regarded as essential for obtaining a certificate as a trained nurse." Now everyone engaged in teaching the better class of nurses will include such an idea as that.

635. That is not meant, Sir Thomson, as a general statement?—It is a very particular one.

636. It is meant as regards Waterford; they are doing their best to train nurses there; they have only the small local fever hospital; the nurses will have that advantage, but the Local Government Board and the Guardians did not propose to give a certificate for fever nursing?—Here is the fact; the rule has been sanctioned by the Local Government Board.

637. I was explaining the extent of the sanction, and those nurses who are so certified as Waterford are not certified for fever cases, but for medical and surgical cases only, and their training is given in the society infirmary, the old Leper Hospital, and the union infirmary; they do not get fever training, but I think the arrangements are being made as far as they can?—We hold that a qualified or trained nurse should be trained in all the branches of her profession, and should be competent to go from one case to another as ordered.

638. What the Waterford people and other unions do is, where they have a nurse who has not the fever qualification, they telegraph to Corkinchester or Belfast or the fever hospital in Cork, and they get their nurse, and there is no difficulty in getting a sufficient number of qualified nurses. It would not pay in a union to keep on a full staff of trained fever nurses?—Every nurse trained in a metropolitan city in a clinical hospital gets a training in fever, and we hold a nurse is not fit to undertake general duty unless she has a fever training, and I go further any fever training in an Irish country hospital is the most important branch of learning they have to follow.

639. CHAIRMAN.—Even when she has no fever cases?—She is always liable to get them.

640. No, never; the two institutions are separate; you have the union infirmary, in which no fever cases are admitted, and the fever hospital nursed by a special

nurse?—I don't believe any nurse is fit to nurse unless she is qualified for everything. You might as well have a doctor to deal with throat diseases who knows nothing about the stomach.

641. Dr. BROWN.—St. Thomas' in London gives no fever training, and the London Hospital, one of the largest institutions in the Three Kingdoms, has no fever training?—I am not prepared to answer that.

642. I tell you that is so; an ordinary case of typhoid may be treated by them with ordinary precautions, but not treated as a fever case?—I am only speaking about Ireland.

643. About Dublin, you mean?—Take my opinion for what it is worth. I think the terms "qualified" and "trained" very unfortunate ones, for it implies the qualified nurse is not trained.

644. CHAIRMAN.—It was the result of the word "trained" being used in the Act of Parliament with regard to one purpose only, that is the recruitment, and power was given to the Local Government Board to pay back half the salary of the trained nurse, and it further went on to say that the Local Government Board should prescribe the meaning of the word "trained." The Local Government Board were therefore obliged to use the word "trained" for the class of nurses whose salary would be recruited; and they had to find out some other word to use for the nurses whose salary would not be recruited?—I am aware that the Irish Local Government Board has carefully avoided defining exactly what a qualified nurse is; I am also aware that the English Board has tried to define it, and I think most unfortunately.

645. That shows the wisdom of not doing it?—That is a very worldly sort of wisdom. I think all superintendent nurses—I mean nurses who have attendants and probationers under them—

646. They won't have probationers under them in a workhouse hospital; they would only have them in half a dozen hospitals?—I don't see why every union hospital should not have probationers in them; they ought to. Then I think that all superintendents or fully-trained nurses should have had a term in a clinical hospital as part of their training. By a clinical hospital we mean in my profession one where teaching is done to medical students, and I think that nurses should always have a term there—perhaps a year; they never can get the same class of training anywhere else. The nurses stand with the students in the ward and hear the instructions given, and in that way they get a systematic teaching and a height of teaching that never could be given in classes held purely for nurses. In the ordinary Dublin hospital the clinical instruction is going on for three hours every day in the week except Sunday, and the nurses have the advantage of that.

647. That is what our trained nurses really get; we require two years in a clinical hospital for a trained nurse?—I have a suggestion to make about that. My point is that your "qualified" nurse need not have that, and I think no nurse is qualified that has not had it. I think if a nurse is to get training in a clinical hospital, which means in a large town or city, it should be in the first year of her training, because if she is trained in the infirmary school she comes up to Dublin or Belfast with all the bad habits that she ought not to have had, and which arise from defective training, and the first duty of the matron of a Dublin hospital is to try to unteach all the girl has been taught before. I am not speaking of that as a theory, but as a matter of which I have had practical knowledge and experience. The matrons in Dublin have a great objection, as a rule, to take girls who have been in union hospitals, because they find often their faults as nurses are insensible. I notice that in this scheme—the Waterford scheme—it is laid down that a nurse should be taken for a month on trial before it is finally decided to accept her as a probationer. I don't think a month is nearly enough; it requires at least three months for a matron or superintendent to form an opinion about the fitness of a girl for nursing; she may scrape through for thirty days without any of her faults being known, without her health being examined as well as her head. I think there ought to be a trial period, and there is in all the hospitals here, of at least three months. The next proposal I would venture to put forward is this, that if there is to be an equal system of nursing in the unions and county hospitals all through Ireland there ought to be some standard criterion to them all. The Local Government Board, of course, have to approve of the appointment of nurses, but I think it would be very useful if there was an Advisory Board associated with the Local Government

Board here in Dublin, whose duty it would be to consider the qualification and fitness of nurses for appointment. For example, there might be two matrons or superintendents from Dublin hospitals that have training schools, one from Cork, one from Galway, and one from Belfast, and the effect of these matrons being called in to consultation with the members of the Local Government Board would be to secure good advice as to the class of training the candidates had.

648. Don't you think there is room for a very much larger scheme than that; a large scheme for the United Kingdom, for making some general regulations as regards the qualification of nurses?—Well, perhaps so; I doubt if it would work. What has happened about the Midwifery Bill would apply there. If you once raise so big a question as that you raise the question as to whether these ladies would not be a sort of initiation doctors; that has been said in connection with the qualification of midwives, and there has been a most angry battle going on, both in Parliament and out of it, on that question for years. I think a local scheme for England and Ireland should be tried first.

649. I mean as regards the qualification?—As regards the Advisory Board.

650. No, for fixing a uniform standard of qualification?—I suggest that could be done with a number of matrons associated with the Local Government Board.

651. That would be merely for union hospitals?—It might be extended to all hospitals under the Local Government Board; this has been done lately in connection with the Army Board, a number of matrons have been appointed to consult with the Advisory Board of the Army Medical Service.

652. Dr. BAKER.—Are they the Nursing Sisters in the Army?—There is one of those, the head of the Nursing Department in one, and either two or three matrons from English hospitals. I forget the exact number, but you may take it the thing does exist and is working. I think, of course, that the nurses should be removed from workhouses and placed in asylums. I need not enlarge on that matter—placed in district asylums.

653. CHAIRMAN.—That is in the existing lunatic asylums?—Yes.

654. No auxiliary lunatic asylums—closed workhouses?—I don't see the necessity for multiplying unnecessarily the number of asylums. I think the fewer asylums you can get to take the insane people of the country the better; I don't think they ought to become overgrown; I don't like the idea of an asylum with two or three thousand patients; I quite admit that there ought to be a limit to the number a district asylum would take, but I am not competent to give an exact opinion as to how big a district asylum might be allowed to become; you must consult men who make a special study of lunacy on that point. My next point is that separate provision should be made for the epileptics and idiots, preferably by settlements such as already exist in certain places where epileptics can be made to fill a useful occupation and be much happier than they are in lunatic asylums or left in workhouses. Then there are a certain number of epileptics who are insane, and it is right to say that insane epileptics are

the worst and most dangerous of all classes of insane people; so I think that if a settlement for epileptics were forced—one or two for the whole of Ireland—in the shape of a village, there should be a small auxiliary asylum into which these epileptics could be placed when their attacks came on. Of course there are epileptics who are permanently insane, those I would send to the district asylums, but epileptics who are either sane or who have only intermittent mania are persons whom I think it is very cruel to leave in workhouses or confined in asylums, and I think an intelligent and liberal provision, such as has been attempted elsewhere, should be made for them. Then I think that all healthy children of over—I am not prepared to define the age exactly, I am not competent—but say from two to three years of age, should be boarded out; I don't think a healthy child of over two or three should ever be kept in the workhouse. I have been a good deal about country workhouses in Ireland, and there is no more terrible or lamentable sight than the children who are degenerating into beggars, prostitutes, and thieves by being left in those places, untreated to a great extent, and brutalised, and who, when they become old enough to go out about the world, become criminals, who are constantly coming back to the workhouse, and never do any good in life.

655. Do you mean sent to other institutions or boarded out in families?—I mean boarded out in families. Of course where a suitable institution offers I accept that as a partial solution of the difficulty, but they cannot all be sent to institutions. I think this would involve a very much larger number of women inspectors than at present, and perhaps one male inspector, because if the system of boarding out children became very large and extensive questions might arise from time to time where it would be advisable to have at least one male inspector. The next question—as to dispensary doctors—I propose to say something about it, I understand, one that you have a difficulty in letting me speak about. May I explain to you why I think it is permissible. I propose only to touch on it very briefly.

656. No, 6, dealing with administration and financial changes to secure more economy?—Any changes I propose would be directed to economy.

657. I think that would be rather far-fetched?—I will tell you just what I wanted.

658. We have it here, I think, perhaps, if you would be satisfied with that?—I would like to say that I want to speak of the holidays for doctors, pensions for them, and cases of rearrangements of salaries.

659. Those are under the Medical Charities Act, and these are entirely clear of this Inquiry?—I must accept your ruling.

660. It has been defined very clearly that we are not to go into the question?—Generally to inquire and report whether any, and what, financial changes are desirable in order to secure a more economic system for the relief of the sick and destitute poor.

661. Under the Poor Law Act?—I would just say this, if the scope of the Inquiry should, at any future time, enable me to give evidence on this point, I will ask you to allow me to come before you again.

CHAIRMAN.—Certainly.

Mr. JOHN KENNY (blind), examined.

662. CHAIRMAN.—What evidence do you wish to give to the Commission?—Well, gentlemen, I represent the National League of the Blind of Great Britain and Ireland. I wish to give evidence on the present condition of the blind, and in the beginning I would wish to point out that in 1895 there was a Royal Commission issued to investigate into the state of the deaf, dumb, and blind, and imbeciles in these countries, and their labours extended over four years, in which they examined the various systems throughout Europe, and they unanimously recommended that the case of the blind required immediate legislation. Since that time no effort has been made by the Government to take the matter in hand though we have often endeavoured to bring it under their consideration. If you would kindly examine this paper you will find a memorial to the Chief Secretary from the blind, upon which you might ask me various questions, because it contains all that we require. Of course we came before you merely that you may, in your recommendations, strengthen our case, because we don't actually want to continue under the Poor Law system. We think, as a gentleman here has mentioned some time ago with regard to the epileptics, that they are a class for which the

State should provide. We think, also, that we are a class for which the State should provide, and not leave us under the precarious system of Poor Law treatment and voluntary assistance to which we are subject from the charitable public. They are called on from time to time to help the Poor Law system, to keep the blind in institutions, and, of course, to this we have a great objection. We don't wish to be locked up in institutions any longer than to enable us to learn a business, and we wish these institutions, of course, to find us employment afterwards.

663. Are you speaking of Poor Law institutions?—Institutions aided by the Poor Law?—The institutions aided by the Poor Law system provide no employment for the people after they are trained there; we wish a system to be adopted similar to that in England, although it is not perfect in England either, and that is that the children should only be brought to these institutions and there taught a proper education up to sixteen years of age, after which they would be transferred to a workshop in connection with the institution, which they should be compelled to have, and that the children thus transferred to the workshop

June 26, 1905

Sir William
Forster
Stoker.

Mr. John
Kenny.

June 24, 1933,
Mr. John
Kenny.

would become more efficient because they would be stimulated by the efforts which other people were making to earn a living. They are trained up, at present, in the institutions to industries, some of which are no practical use to them—only of use to the institution—because they get no employment afterwards at these industries.

664. What institutions are you referring to?—I am referring specially to the great national institution of Ireland at Drumcondra.

665. We have nothing whatever to say to Drumcondra?—But this institution is aided by the Poor Law.

666. I think not—certain people are sent there and boarded out there?—Yes, they are paid for by the Board of Guardians. Have the Board of Guardians no control over them?—

667. They have not any control—and are they compelled to send them?

668. No. Well, then, in that case—

669. But the Commission, when they are going round the Irish workhouses, will, having regard to the statement you have made, take extra care in inquiring into the condition of the blind who are in the workhouses, and into the condition of the blind who are boarded out of the workhouses?—Yes, sir; but apart from that, could you not, in your recommendations, strengthen our case as far as your recommendations would go, that our case requires exceptional legislation from the State.

670. We will have to deal with the question of course of the blind in Poor Law institutions or maintained by the poor rates, whether the present provision is adequate, and if you could send in any documents on the subjects we will look over them carefully when making our investigations in various parts

of the country?—Would it be any information to you to have the report of the late Royal Commission?

671. Yes, we will get that?—It would help you materially.

672. But if you had a report of your own association, an association of which, I see, Mr. John McDermott is chairman, if you had any suggestions in a short compass from that it would be still more practical and valuable?—We have a pamphlet on the subject—on the condition of the Irish blind—which, of course, we could forward to you, and it may help you in the matter.

673. In understanding your views, I am sure it would?—We earnestly hope that in your examinations, when you visit Belfast, for instance, you will find there a workshop established on the lines which we indicate. In this way, that there is no indoor institution, the blind are sent to this workshop as apprentices, many of them are aided in a similar way by the Poor Law system while they are learning their trades. This institution teaches various trades, which the blind follow, whereas in Dublin, unfortunately, there are only two trades, you may say, taught to the blind, one of them is no practical use, and the other is basket-making, at which about thirty or thirty-five people are only earning a living in Dublin. In Belfast it will be worth your while to make particular inquiries into the workshop system carried out in that city, and in your recommendations, if you could recommend that this system should be carried out through Ireland, you would do a great service to the blind.

CHAIRMAN.—We will do as you ask in making a close inspection of Belfast, and, as far as we can, we will do what you ask; we cannot say anything more definite now.

MR. JOHN McDERMOTT (blind) examined.

674. In connection with this case of the blind, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have somewhere of about forty-five or forty-six years' experience. In the year 1859 the institution at Drumcondra was then established in Glasnevin, and I became an inmate of that institution in 1861. I left it in 1863, and when I left the institution I had a little knowledge of the trade I learned in it in a way that I could earn no living by it. I had to go and learn my trade over again. This is a vast institution, all the blind in Ireland are collected in it through the Poor Law—there is no blind man there that is not paid for. I heard you say that the Local Government Board or the Board of Guardians has no control over it. I was more than astonished to hear that, for I think where the ratepayers' money goes that there should be some supervision of this money; there should be some one go there to see what are they doing. They should see what becomes of the inmates when they leave the institution after training. My experience of it is they come out, and out of every twenty there is not more than one able to get a living, the other nineteen go adrift—they go back into the unions again. I have known so much as £340 to be paid for one man to learn a trade. Seeing all these things from time to time I was more than astonished—the idea of leaving a man as a machine for making money and being paid for all this time. I think it is highly wrong to the ratepayers at least, and it is also wrong to him, because you have the brand of pauperism on him. What we want the Government to do is to act on the report of the Royal Commission of 1889, which unanimously came to the conclusion that the Irish blind, deaf, and dumb were in a bad state, the Government as well as the Local institution. The Government has every right and title to legislate themselves, and take the blind, deaf, and dumb under their special care.

675. CHAIRMAN.—You see, Mr. McDermott, this is a special and a very large subject on which a Royal Commission was appointed; this is a Commission for an entirely different purpose, but so far as there are blind in workhouses, we will look into their case, but as to making any inspection or report on the general treatment of the blind in Ireland, it is not our function

as all?—I beg your pardon, oh yes, it is. I wrote to a member of Parliament—I have written to many members of Parliament, and got them to put various questions to the Government from time to time, among the rest here is the latest (produced), and you will see you have every privilege to meddle with this question according to Mr. Wymondham. This is only this week before. It was through me it was put.

676. Exactly. I have seen this question and answer before?—It was through me it was put.

677. And it was through me it was answered?—I wrote to Mr. Neenan asking him to put such a question.

678. We will do what is said here and will look into the question?—The ratepayer is at an enormous expense. Imagine £1,019 per annum from the North Dublin Union only; if this be so from the North Dublin area—it is small compared with the South Dublin Union—the South Dublin Union must be £2,000, and only imagine this drain of money from the ratepayer, where we are already burdened with rates to the amount of 11s. 3d. on the pound. And the Government—I need not say I am not going to bring in any vested question, but it is said our already over-taxed local resources is not able to bear it—and the Government have every right to step in; in fact, men of intelligence and intellect say, they have every right to step in. If you just see Sir Patrick Keenan's report—

679. You are going outside the lines altogether, you must be satisfied with what I have told you, and not labour the thing further from that point of view. We will look into the question of the blind who are in workhouses and are maintained by the poor rates. The last witness very kindly promised to let us have some pamphlets and statements on the subject, and we will look into them most carefully, but to take up the question of the blind all over Ireland is not our duty. The biggest part of the blind have passed through the Poor Law institutions.

CHAIRMAN.—You have our decision now.

(Witness).—Well, we are very thankful to you for receiving us as you have done.

Mr. John
McDermott.

Miss A. M. ROYAN examined.

June 26, 1920

Miss A. M.
Royan.

592. CHAIRMAN:—You have kindly supplied the Commission with an abstract of your evidence, will you read it?—I. Under present facilities of intercommunication amalgamation seems advisable. Each rural county being the division, classification to different workhouses would be simple; this would be more comfortable for the poor, and greatly reduce staff and expense of up-keep. A better arrangement of outdoor relief, within a minimum and maximum, could be given to some of those now housed, at a lesser cost to ratepayers. (a.) An aged couple in the house are separated and cost 5s. per week. Five shillings outdoor would in most cases keep them happy and comfortable in their homes. I am talking now not of cities, but of the rural districts, of which I have fair knowledge.

593. If you pay them outside at the 5s. rate you might have a great many more?—No, I think not. I think it could be arranged so that you should not. (b.) Southern Boards give from 1s. to 1s. 6d. as ordinary out-door relief. This is inadequate for support, induces to begging for sustenance, and frequently this is spent on drink. I know that in two or three unions, with which I am fairly well acquainted, the average is from 1s. to 1s. 6d., and you cannot get more; when in illness more help is refused. (c.) Some Boards give popular allowances 4s. per week; these are special cases, and sometimes continue for a long time, and sometimes do not. (d.) A single man, out of work, living at home, 2s. 6d. from Board would keep him per fire. The head of a family of six, under some circumstances, could live on 12s., which is an average poor man's earning per week; they could not do so less without wearing clothes, begging, or borrowing. If this family of six were forced into the house it necessitates breaking up the home, and they could seldom emerge from the pauper wards where they would, for years, cost the union 18s. per week. I have known a family of six brought into the house who were most thoroughly respectable people; the man was out of work through misfortune, and it cost an enormous sum of money. I tried to get the Guardians to give that man out-door relief which would keep him in the respectable status he formerly occupied until things recovered; he never got back his status.

(e.) When a wage-earner is in a union hospital it is usual to give the family 3s. or 5s. out-door relief. When the man is discharged from hospital—well made for work and needing nourishment and rest—he goes home—that is because he won't go into the body of the house—and immediately this wretched hole is withdrawn. This is a serious evil. It entails much suffering. The man goes to work too soon (if he can get it), and probably has shortly to return to hospital, accompanied by another member of his starving family. Some plan of home help should be arranged for convalescents. Also for bona fide labourers out of work through no fault of their own. I think both Dr. Smyth and Dr. McInnes suggested for this a convalescent home, which would be a better idea still, but I was speaking merely of what could be done under existing conditions. If there could be a considerable reduction in the number of workhouses; there are 150 of these houses in Ireland, with 40,000 inmates. When unions were arranged, and workhouses built in Ireland in 1840-43, the population was double what it is now, and paupers were eight times more numerous than they are to-day. At present twenty-four only of these unions have over 500 inmates. In half of them, certainly two in Co. Kerry, there are rarely 100 inmates. The average cost, per pauper inmate, of 1840-43, is 4s. 10s. per annum, the cost of up-keep of the establishment 25 10s. per annum, while the actual sum per head for food and clothes is 410s. per annum, making an average of 290s. per head for each workhouse inmate, a sum which few of our ratepayers can afford to expend on each of their own children.

594. Is this in Kerry or all round it?—It is in Kerry, I take it from the statistics three or four years ago. I had not a report of later years; it was 1868. (a.) Vacated workhouses could be handed over to county councils for other uses, and to avoid medical expenditure on stone and mortar. It would be a great advantage to have in each county an auxiliary lunatic asylum for harmless imbeciles. I must speak very strongly on that subject. There is an imbecile I am very much interested in—a young man who unfortunately lost his reason through influenza when

twenty-two years of age. He was a very respectable clerk in an office. He has no father—an orphan—he has been obliged, several times, to be sent to an asylum, from there he is sent into the workhouse wards for imbeciles, which are not fit to receive any human being; the boy won't stay there, it is impossible to keep him in it, he walks home to his mother, and actually starves. He gets no out-door relief, so presently he goes back to the asylum, having got bad again. He has been three times in the asylum, when he gets better they draft him into the workhouse; he won't stay there and he goes home, where he has not proper care.

595. Out-door relief would be your remedy for that?—For that, because he has a respectable parent, an old woman, who has no help whatever. She is hardly able to support herself, she cannot feed this young man, who comes out of the asylum with a very large appetite, she has no means to feed him. Also I think provision might be made for aged couples, past labour, by giving them apartments and a small pension. Most of the doctors seemed to agree with me, and Dr. Foy suggested a cottage home for them, which is a very good idea. I know one place in England where it is carried out. I don't know the expense of it, but it seems to be a very happy arrangement—of course it costs more, which must be considered. III. Boarding out, or pensioning them in their own homes, would be another, more economical, and more comfortable way of providing for aged and deserving persons. Possibly in some districts boarding out would be more suitable than the apartments previously suggested. The privilege ward, which was alluded to to-day and yesterday, that might be a good arrangement. In one union I know they had married quarters for old people, and during five years only one applicant; old folk don't like it; they prefer a general mixing with the people.

596. A sort of sensible life?—Yes; as I don't think it would be worth while going to any expense. (A.) In connection with expense, it is well to state that there are societies which board out persons, notably Protestant Orphan Societies; these children are not brought up as paupers. Few of these have ever graduated to "the union" or the "gaol"; on an average the up-keep of these children until they become self-sustaining is 210s. per annum. Yet, I noted quite recently that the Clerk of the North Dublin Union told the Board the cost per head of the Protestant children at Calra was £12 10s. 4d. A large sum is expended for creating paupers. In most counties Protestant orphans are kept mostly boarded out by a private society.

597. That is what you think the result, not the object of course?—It is the result; it seems to be the object, so long as you insist on children in poorhouses. There was some difficulty made yesterday by Miss Bradshaw. She said it would be difficult to board out children when they came to 32s. I don't know any union where there are so many to be provided for, but there is a difficulty over where there is a smaller number. In the South of Ireland we find very few respectable houses will take these children—they say once they have been in the house they are perfectly incorrigible. I once got a very nice little girl, about twelve years of age, into a very respectable married family; the head of it was a carpenter, he had three little children, averaging from seven down, who were going to school, they lived some distance from the school, the children were too young to go through the town, and the mother asked me if I could get her an older girl who would take her and let her go to school with the children, so she took this little girl, a very interesting child. I went up to see how the child was going on and I found the mistress of the house in a perfect rage—she said the child was quite useless, and a fool. "What has she done?" "This morning I was rather late getting my children ready for school, and I told her to get ready the breakfast table. When I came down I found the loaf in the middle of the table, no knife, no spoons, no forks, or anything else. I asked why she had not got the breakfast ready. She said she had." The child had never seen a cup or saucer in the workhouse; she had never seen a knife or a tablecloth; she brought a put on the black table for them in junks; she thought the loaf of bread was the breakfast. You cannot expect people who are bred to teach children so entirely ignorant.

June 26, 1903.

Miss A. M.
Kerry.

685. Would families be more likely to take them at three years old?—No, because that is additional labour on them; you would have to pay very highly for that in the country.

687. At all events they would have the training of them?—Somebody here said they wanted to put out the infants to nurse with respectable farmers; I do not, from my knowledge of farmers, at least in the South of Ireland, think you would get any respectable farmer's wife to take an infant from the workhouse unless you paid her something quite beyond the ordinary amount.

688. Made the child a paying guest?—Yes, because they have more to do for them, and you must remember a great many of these farm-houses are more or less limited in room and accommodation, they have their own families. (c.) I would, however, urge that all children be boarded out. If this is impossible a school in each county should be provided for workhouse children, to which all children, even those who have parents in the workhouse, should be sent. It is ruinous to the children, the way, in slack times, families come to the house, and go out, to return again in a month's time; this brings up the child to vagrant life. (d.) Workhouse schools are costly, and workhouse education a decided disadvantage to children. By the report of the School Inspector for 1900, the last one I have had the opportunity of examining, I find the following figures given. Number:—

37 Ulster, ...	812 pupils, ...	Attendance 567
19 Munster, ...	1,592 „ ...	1,340
36 Leinster, ...	1,464 „ ...	1,262
23 Connaught, ...	524 „ ...	443
120 Schools	4,422 pupils, ...	Attendance 3,737.

For these schools there are 218 lay teachers; some of these are uneducated.

689. How many?—I don't know. It was not given in the report.

690. I would suggest two as the answer!—There are some antiquated specimens in some unions. The average pay is £20 a head, £4,250 per annum. They are housed and have salaries, or a higher salary in lieu thereof, at least £2,000 per annum more. That is a charge on the country of £5,250 for teaching 3,737 pauper children in a way that hampers these children for all their lives. That amount of money would provide them with much better teaching outside.

691. You have only 194 children in workhouses in Kerry; there ought not to be much difficulty in boarding out 194 children in such a large county?—No, there is not in the rural districts.

692. Do you think you would find much difficulty in boarding these children out?—No. I don't think I would. (c.) And this is not all the cost, as, in twenty other workhouses there are nuns teaching who, of course, are paid, I suppose, at a similar rate.

693. It is a much lower rate?—This would be, at least, another £300, a total of £7,550 mis-spent money on a very injurious form of education—that is to say for pauperising the growing generation. If there is no other arrangement made, all workhouse children should be sent to the nearest national school, and so reduce this expense. There would be no difficulty about this. Take Kerry, the highest number of children is in Tralee Union; they are thirty-seven. Cahersiveen has only three.

694. There are fifty in Killybeg and fifty-five in Tralee at present?—I took this from the report of a year or two ago.

In the whole six unions in Kerry children are given as 123. For these there must be at least nine or ten teachers, as I know there is in Tralee Union a master, mistress, and an assistant, at a cost of £45, £35, and £25, which includes retentions.

IV.—There is an alternative to poorhouses—that is a re-arrangement of "out-door" relief, which would be practicable, but on this point there is an alarming example. This system was practised in England before 1840. It became a great abuse. Whole villages lived, married, and reared families as paupers, refusing to work, while they drew from one to two pounds per week as paupers, and could only obtain one pound a week for labour. I could have given you if I had time a very notable instance of that.

695. We know these cases; they are a little bit of

ancient history?—I have known the Poor Law system from the very first. I was at the opening of our own union in Kerry in 1843, and I have been interested in it ever since, so I have some knowledge of it.

696. And now you want to be in at the death?—I want to see the end of it. (c.) Many persons think divisional chargeability checks extravagance in relief. Personally, I believe the union, but under the new scheme here shadowed the remedy should be changed. We all know the largest number of paupers are in big towns. When labour is scarce in the country, men flock to town. It is often impossible to locate some paupers to a division. Sometimes they do not know themselves where they belong to. I heard an applicant for admission to the house, who returned on four occasions within a few months, giving each time a different division as his birth-place, the Guardian for the division named always repudiating him; the man finally insisted that he was born in the last place where he had worked.

V. Hospital accommodation is a very important matter. The number of existing union hospitals might be increased, and certainly existing accommodation should be amplified, and arrangements made for a paying ward in each district. I strongly object to sending a man to pay because he is not a pauper when he is placed in a bed side by side with a pauper; the treatment, of course, must be the same, but it perpetuates a man when he comes out of hospital to have it said of him that he lay in the same ward with so-and-so, who is a pauper.

697. Do you really think that people who go into the sick wards of the workhouse are classed as paupers when they come out?—They are. I have known people when urged to go in say: "I won't go; I would be a pauper ever afterwards." They won't go in. "I will be honest outside." It is hardly fair to charge persons who are able to pay a little—noisy policemen—when they are placed side by side with the pauper who is treated free. They charge policemen more than what I call the actual charge. I think it was life, that is above the actual hospital charge; the police rebuked; they said they were always willing to pay the actual cost, but unless they had a ward separated from the paupers, they objected to pay above the actual cost, and they were perfectly right. Many more poor persons would avail themselves of these hospitals and gladly pay from 6s. to 10s., if there were a special paying ward. The actual cost per head is from 4s. to 6s. in hospital, so that recipients would gain by such an alteration. (a.) Fewer hospitals must, for sanitary reasons, be separate institutions. I do not know that they need to be increased. (b.) I believe, however, that an isolation hospital, which need not be a large or expensive place, would be very useful in large towns and seaports; in fact, it is essential in seaports. (c.) County infirmaries are most useful. They are in large towns, where many doctors are available for consultation in critical cases. Infectious cases are not admitted; accidents and exceptional ailments are here kept under observation. Here paying patients can have separate accommodation. I judge from my own infirmary. Most infirmaries receive their support from old donations, that is, donations they got years and years ago—subscriptions and rates—therefore, there may be a difficulty in putting them on a similar footing to district hospitals.

698. Do you happen to know how the subscriptions are at present for your county infirmary?—Very small. I don't think of late years that there have been very large subscriptions to it.

699. Since the Government lost the privilege of attending under the Act of 1861?—Yes, and before they ceased subscribing very much. And another thing, we have too many committees, I think, at present. There is an infirmary committee under the County Council; also the poorhouse, and the dispensary under the Board of Guardians.

700. There is no dispensary committee now?—No; the Board is the dispensary committee, and there is the fever hospital committee. I don't see why they should not all be under the same committee; it would save a great deal of confusion.

701. Have all hospitals under the one managing body?—Under the one body; it would make a very great saving of economy and friction, but I believe there are these numbers of Boards because the County Council thought they would please a number of persons by putting them on.

702. Under the law there had to be this number—I was not aware of that, but I think they ought to be amalgamated. There has been some idea in some places of closing up infirmaries. I don't think they should be closed up, for persons from all parts of the county are admitted as patients. (d.) With regard to Poor Relief generally, doctors should be better paid. In country places it is impossible that doctors give full time and thought to the poor for the miserable salary they receive. I recently noted an advertisement for a dispensary doctor at £50 per annum. It was a wild, country district, which would require two horses, and all a man's time, if properly worked. A doctor is expected to work at all hours of the day or night, as required. No tradesman would give eight hours a day for the £50 offered to this professional gentleman, who expended somewhere about £1,000 to qualify for the position offered.

703. Did he take it at the £50?—I don't know. There is rather a funny story about that that might amuse you. It was advertised, but not taken up, in the country, but taken by a Dublin gentleman, who accepted it, but I believe he never was able to act in his scientific papers, and there is no appointment made yet. Outdoor sick relief should be more generously given than it is. District nurses should be appointed, and a lady inspector, for all places where women and children are under public bodies. Sick out-door relief is most abominable. I could give you a case where there is a wretched widowed mother with four children; each child full of disease of constitutional description, and unless that woman goes into the workhouse, they won't take her children. She gets no help from outdoor relief, and how they live I don't know. She was with me last week. I have been helping her from various private charities. I said: "I see nothing but the workhouse for you," so I suppose she has gone—the woman and her four children. Tramps and such like cannot be refused shelter. Tramps generally frequent certain localities. They should be housed separately from other classes, and would require small accommodation. The old-fashioned belief that treatment would suffice for these. I am very sorry to say in our town they have done away with the bridewell; it would be a splendid place for putting tramps at night.

704. You have not many tramps in Kerry?—No, I think the suggestion that the police should look after them is very feasible. There are no doubt difficulties in such a reformation of our Poor Law system. Year by year, for sixty years, alterations and improvements have been introduced. Repudiation has been incessantly increased without securing sufficient advantage. We have been patching the old garment, trying to make it do; for the public good, it is high time we did away with the old system and remodelled our poor relief, fashioning it in accordance with modern ideas and requirements. If I may tell a little story:—It is about 100 years ago, not much more, since the first poor laws in Ireland were established from the Poor Office in Dublin to the country. They went then by a man and a horse. He had to be loaded with letters, and he was only allowed to ride at the rate of three miles an hour, on pain of death for fear of killing the horse.

This is in the Irish statistics. Postboys rode laden with letters, which were charged 1s. a piece. Well, we send millions of letters now where one went then, and we send them at one penny, but I doubt whether we could have sent them if we had loaded them on a man and horse, and only let him go three miles an hour.

705. No, they readjusted the system?—Why should we not readjust the Poor Law? No doubt, at the first, Guardians will be adverse to the proposed changes. It will interfere with their patronage; they will no longer have the power of putting Tom, Dick, and Harry into a post at the ratepayers' expense. Now, curious to say, the public generally, and some Guardians, cherish the fond belief that public posts are not a burden on themselves. They vaguely fancy salaries paid to officials, and "Government money," especially, comes as manna from heaven. Few realise that all public funds, no matter how they are dissipated, come, in the first instance, from the pockets of the people. Therefore, all public economies save their own money; money so saved can be individually expended in a more remunerative manner, gradually increasing individual welfare and the country's prosperity. As for the children in the large centres, where there are 700, as Miss Buchanan said, they must go to schools; you could not boot them out. Wherever possible, existing industrial schools should be turned into day schools and made available for all classes of rural children. I think technical schools and workhouse schools should be worked under the one control. The obligations exacted from workhouses at their commencement, included training and apprenticeship to trades, but trades unions interfered with these.

706. Are you quite sure you are right about any obligation under the existing Poor Law to apprentice?—I think we had.

707. Only to send boys to sea?—No; perhaps not to apprentice, but you train them; they were supposed to be trained. If you look at the old Poor Law you will see it.

708. I saw that in your paper, and I looked it up—it is confined to the sea?—That is a mistake of mine; one cannot be always right. In recent years we have discussions about trade, and the trades unions all stopped, and that makes a very great difficulty, which people don't realise, in workhouse training, and I think we will find a little by-and-by in the technical training for the same reason. They are teaching a great deal of carpentry, the carpenters are getting their backs up, and they will not let outside boys into the trade. I was rather amused to hear—that is Dr. Latham who said it—he did not approve of girls except they were trained in mud ovens, because they made the best wives. I cannot say I agree with that. I think the better you bring up your girls, the higher education and the higher ideas you give them, the better wives they make, even for the poor man. But there is a great difficulty in training our girls under the present conditions in Ireland, now that the gentry have to reduce their establishments. At one time we kept thirteen servants; we keep one now. We cannot train girls; we cannot afford the time. Housekeepers want too much done now, and must have regularity, so no respectable house will take a girl to train.

Rev. E. T. Crockett examined.

Rev. E. T. Crockett.

709. I have very little to say, but as I am in connection with Mountjoy Prison I have a number of individual cases that I thought I would like to mention. A woman I visited in prison had been convicted sixty times of all kinds of crimes, and was a very bad worker in every way. I went one day to visit a decent woman in the workhouse, and found her and the woman mentioned in back side by side. I have had complaints from the respectable poor of the dreadful language and frightful conversation they hear in the union hospitals. I would advocate some method of classification by character. And I would keep in one class any woman who lived as a prostitute; they are all known to the police, and it would be very easy to discover that, and any who had been convicted and imprisoned. The prostitute class being confined to a certain district well recognised and well known, by a very short inquiry it could be found out whether they belonged to that class or not, and also anybody who had been convicted and in prison. I could give names in the case I have

already mentioned, and in other similar cases. There is another woman convicted 300 times; she has been in the workhouse hospital in Dublin mixed up with the respectable poor. The contamination is terrible when these women are put next young girls, which cannot be avoided, when women of all classes are herded together in the same hospital.

710. Chairman.—It seems exceedingly bad management—I can tell an actual case of one of these women; I saw it myself.

711. Any compassionate person ought to be able to keep a woman of that class away?—They don't always recognise them at first. I do say it was not known in the case I first referred to what this woman's character was, and under present arrangements such persons are only known by their conversation. This woman had come from a better social position, and appeared to be all right, and in the hospital was not known. Another case I have known was that of a woman convicted about thirty times—I found her a wardmaid in the

June 26, 1902.
Rev. E. T.
Crosier.

hospital, attending and bringing food to, and giving a considerable amount of medicine over, the patients in the ward. The next class of which I should like to speak are the respectable aged poor. One case in point—I went to see a poor old woman. There was no chair at that time in the ward; she could hardly stand; she was sitting on the iron bed, the mistress of which was turned back. She had fallen and blackened her eye; there was nothing for her to do all day; she was hardly able to mind herself. I made a row about it, and got her sent into the infirm ward. I managed to get an inquiry made into the circumstances of the case, but people very little better than she are often kept in these wards in great discomfort, who have been decent and respectable all their days. I have had the case of epileptics brought very strongly before me. I went to visit the ward. It is in a most awful condition; they have nothing but a narrow yard to exercise in, with high walls. I know the case of an epileptic who is sensible at times, and the mother is utterly unable to support him, and in dreadful poverty. He is very violent at times, but she cannot bear to send him there, it is such a dreadful place, and the whole family are suffering. I think the institutions of the other children are becoming affected by association with this epileptic. Then another class that comes largely under my observation are the vagrant class, and in Dublin a large number of these are not admitted into the union if they are known; this master refuses them admission.

711. They go to the shelter?—They are not admitted to the shelter—the habitual class—and they get into an absolute state of despair; they cannot get into the union, and if they are in the streets after 12 o'clock, they are arrested as vagrants, or for loitering. I know men in prison whom I am trying to lift up; they go out and don't get the money for their bed some night, and then they are arrested and put in prison again for months without any crime at all, but simply found

wandering. I don't suggest that all these cases should be admitted to the union, but some arrangement should be made to make the place for vagrants of such a nature as will deter the wandering, but still will admit those who really want shelter.

712. Can they not go into the night asylums?—The free night asylums, as far as I know, will only keep persons for a time, and they are refused admission.

713. They are not very strict?—I know it is the case that they are sent away from the night asylums after a certain time. They have been trying to get work and have not succeeded. They come on a certain night; they are refused everywhere, and then if left in the streets they are arrested. I think a system could be found to relieve this vagrant class which would make it unpleasant for them, but still that none should be excluded. One suggestion is that before getting food they should break a certain number of stones and throw them out of a window with a grating work takes of the size to which the stones should be broken. The other class I would refer to is those men who are sent to prison for cruelty to a wife or children; the man is given six months' imprisonment; what is to happen to the wife? There is a man at present—he is not a bad sort of man—he was drunk and ill-treated his wife and children. He was arrested, and given six months' imprisonment. The wife was a most respectable woman, and the children very nicely brought up. They cannot get outdoor relief, and the whole family will be broken up, and she and her children have to go into the union. It will stamp them for life; so sending the man to prison is the ruin of the wife and family. I think that is a distinct case where outdoor relief should be given. Is it not a case that ought to have some consideration, especially where the woman has been cruelly treated by the man, and then she is more cruelly treated, because she has nothing in the world to do but go into the union?

Mrs. HASLAN continued.

Mrs. Haslan.

714. CHAIRMAN.—It is a long time since you have taken up Poor Law administration?—Yes, for nearly thirty years I have been interested in Poor Law administration, what I visited very frequently both the North and South Dublin Unions as an outsider, and I have seen the most wonderful improvement in these two workhouses in the thirty years. I know the late mistress of the South Dublin Union intimately; and I have taken many a party through the South Dublin Union; and from the first time I went there, before Miss Amner's time, I knew what it was, and I also know what the North Dublin Union was before the changes there. Since 1896 I have visited over twenty workhouses in England and Ireland, including some of the largest in London, Birmingham, Manchester, &c. It was a perfect revelation to me when I crossed the Channel and visited the Holyhead workhouse, to see the children going to school without any caretaker, not dressed as our children are; and the swings and the merry-go-rounds for the children took my heart; and I did it very best, with Lady Thompson and one or two other ladies, to get something of the kind into the South Dublin Union. I don't know whether they have them in the North Dublin Union. I thought it was a pity to see the children turned out into the playground, where they had nothing to play with, and I was the means of getting skipping ropes and other things for them. I have visited several large workhouses in London. I have been in six or eight. The last time I went over I was commissioned by Miss Welgely to look into the question of the bread, as she felt there was a great waste in the South Dublin Union. I was in Kettering and different workhouses, looking into the question of the bread, and I found they did not give out all the bread at once; they gave out 4 oz. in the first instance. I asked the master to weigh 4 oz. for me, and he did so. I found in the Marylebone Workhouse that they made bread of the 4 oz. and hand them round, and when the 4 oz. was nearly finished, the master said: "Anyone who wants more bread, kindly stand up." And he sent down 2 oz. more. I don't remember the saying that the master of the Marylebone Workhouse told me there was in the bread from the adoption of that, and also, of course, with the sick people; and it was served in a nicer way than the crumbs that are handed out here. I consider that the lady Guardians are absolutely necessary in the dietary, cooking, clothing, nursing, and children's de-

partments. Ladies committees are not sufficient in themselves; they have not jurisdiction; they are very useful in their proper place.

715. Is that for boarded-out children?—Yes, in every way that committees are allowed. I know that some hold it is very well to have these committees in places where there are no women Guardians. I suppose it is better than nothing, but when possible they should be under the lady Guardians. I want them very much to visit the recipients of outdoor relief. That was brought before me in Holyhead. The lady Guardian who took me round said that when she was first appointed, after she got to know the workhouse, she visited every recipient of out-door relief on her ward, and was the means of effecting a great many improvements. Some were not getting enough; others too much; and others should not be getting it at all; and the gentleman Guardians said:—"Oh, Mrs. —, won't you visit for us?" She answered: "You should do it yourselves"; and after a while she got all the Guardians to visit the recipients of outdoor relief. There is a lady that I was interested in getting in here in Dublin, and she said to me: "What do you want me to do?" One of the things I want you to do first," I said, "is to visit every recipient of outdoor relief in your ward." She has done some of it, but not all. But I do consider we want a great many more women Guardians, and they ought to take up this question of outdoor relief; there would be a great saving, and certainly more kindness to the poor. Imagine the case I knew of an old woman; three leaves of bread and a quart of milk were given her one day in the week. Of course she sold two of the leaves of bread. No woman would have sanctioned such a thing as that. Lady Guardians are required in every one of our 189 unions in Ireland; and my proposal is that where no women are elected, the Guardians might be empowered to co-opt a certain number. I know some hold very strongly that there ought to be as many women Guardians as men. I don't think I would go quite as far as that. I think if we had perhaps one-third women. The men are absolutely necessary, and I hope in time that the women will be able to educate the men to look after things a little better than they have been doing.

716. I think they are getting better?—They could not but be better under the ladies. As regards the children, I would have them out of the workhouse altogether,

and they should attend the National school. What delighted me in Helyhead, the matron was so pleased to show me the Sunday hats and coats the children wore. The matron was very much astonished when I said: "Of course you take these children to school." She was quite insulted. "They are very well able to take care of themselves." In Carnarvon I put the same question. "Of course you see the children safe to school." "I should not think of such a thing; we would not insult our children by going after them in that way; we trust them." Boarding out where possible. I would have a special cottage home for the mixed-outs children near the workhouse. I visited Kettering, Croydon, Birmingham, and Manchester cottage homes. I mentioned before what I consider the ideal cottage home that I visited three or four times, three miles out of Kettering, where all the children, about thirty, are under the care of a foster father and mother. They have an old farmhouse and garden and a little bit of ground; the coach-house is given to the children to play in, and they are allowed to have pigeons-pigeons, guinea-pigs, or anything they wish. They have fowl. The children work in the garden, and, above all, they have pigs; and the children are delighted to look after the pigs, the fowl, and the garden. There is no one to help but the foster father and mother, and one woman under the mother, for these thirty children. The children do up the rooms in the morning, help a bit in the cooking, and help the foster mother to make their own clothes. I think they buy most of the things in the village, and some things may be sent from the workhouse at Kettering, but they have no children in the workhouse at Kettering over two years of age. They are all out; it is a little more expensive. They go to the Board school; and the foster-father was very proud each time to take me to the Board school and see them all, and try and get me to guess "Which are my children." I could not tell, except a couple of them, and when he asked the schoolmaster: "Would you kindly allow my children to stand up for this lady to see," they did, and with a couple of exceptions, I would not have known them from the other children. I think we could very well have the "ins-and-outs" taken care of. I asked that question in Croydon. I was so pleased with the homes I visited there; they have several more cottage homes than they had. I asked what was the cost per head. They said 10s., including matron and principal of the money.

717. Do you know anything about the after-care of these children in the cottage homes?—Well, I found that the farmers are very glad to get the boys and girls as servants. They are kept there with the foster-parents until they are fourteen or fifteen. They have to make the beds and wash the floors and the clothes. But they never have any difficulty in getting situations. Kettering is a great manufacturing place for shoes. It is very hard to get servants, and they are very glad to get these girls.

718. All these children are absorbed into the population, and don't come back as paupers?—No; at Birmingham they have fourteen cottage homes. I went out with Miss Cadbury. One is a hospital, another is a school. I think it is a pity they don't mix with the outside children, but they don't. They are in homes of about twenty-five. When I was there they were about trying to start another home, where girls could be trained for a more high-class service if possible. I don't know how they were going to do it. They

had it in their minds to do it. They thought perhaps they could get better situations for them if they kept them a year longer and trained them for servants. I said again in Croydon, where do the children, the "ins-and-outs," go when they first come in. They are sent from the home to the homes as soon as possible. "How often do they see their parents?" "Monthly."

719. Are they brought to see their parents, or do the parents go to see them?—I did not ask that question. "What is about the average time that these 'ins-and-outs' remain in the homes?" "From one or two days to some months." I saw the place which they have for the old married couples, and I took a great fancy to it. A nice room and a table with basin on it, a parcel for themselves, and magazines and books on the table. They all had their rooms where they slept, a kitchen in which to wet their tea; but they got tired of it, and now there are no married couples in it.

720. Were there any at any time?—Yes, I saw them. "Do they make their own tea, and eat their own bread and butter?" "Yes, when they have any." "Are their dinners sent from the house?" "Yes." "Do they appreciate these comforts?" "No." I certainly should like to see better classification, and the privilege wards that Miss Buckman alluded to, and greater comforts for the aged and infirm, and for the married couples, in spite of the evidence I saw after giving. In some of the London workhouses I found several married couples, and one of the lady Guardians told me that an old man and woman that had been in the workhouse for years went out and got married and came back in order to get into the married quarters. I have nearly finished now; but I want to state emphatically the necessity for women inspectors, an adequate number of women inspectors for workhouses, and women nurse inspectors of the hospitals, and of the home for nurses, which I should hope may be established in connection with one of the workhouses here; and then we should have some women doctors, wherever a second doctor for I put the men first—wherever a second doctor is required, it should be a woman evident. In the South Dublin Union there ought to be a resident women doctor, and in the North Dublin Union, and in all large unions where two are required; and I should like to say that the matron ought to be brought more forward at the Boards, and more recognized to be on an equality with the master. I know there is a lady Guardian present who feels on that point very strongly, and mentioned it to me some time since. As regards women Guardians, when Mr. Johnston got the Act through, we had two in 1896; we had twelve in 1897; we had twenty-one in 1898; in 1899 we had eighty elected and twenty co-opted; and in 1902, we had about eighty elected and ten co-opted, or perhaps rather more. I am very glad that there has been a lady co-opted in the South Dublin Union; only by a majority of one, but still it is well to get that, on last Wednesday. She was a lady who had been a Guardian, but was not re-elected. I think unless you have any questions to ask me, that these are pretty much the points I wanted to bring out.

721. You know that there are a couple of lady doctors in workhouses?—Oh, yes, there is one in Lurgan.

722. And in Edinburg?—We tried very hard to get one in the South Dublin Union.

723. You had a candidate?—We had; she had been for five years at Mullingar, at the district asylum, and was most efficient.

Mrs. WYSE-POWER, P.L.C., examined.

Mrs. Wyse-Power.

724. CHAIRMAN.—As regards the amalgamation of unions, you think a good many might be amalgamated, but you would keep on the hospitals?—I would keep on the hospitals for the sick part of such a character as would meet the requirements of infectious disease.

725. Only infectious?—Yes; I would strongly urge that all surgical cases be brought to the infirmaries of the county towns, and if they have properly-constructed sanitariums attached to these district hospitals, that could be very easily carried out.

726. In some counties that would be very difficult, where the distances are long?—Are there not railways?

727. You cannot send surgical cases by railway; you could not send a broken leg by railway?—In any place where it was feasible, because I think in the surgical hospitals there have more advantages than they would

get in any union hospitals. Certainly, in the case of towns and cities, all these cases should go to surgical hospitals. I believe the charge in the Richmond Hospital is 14s. a week for surgical cases. Of course, that is in excess of the cost of patients in any union, but then the immense advantage the patient gets, and how very much sooner he may be able to get about, perhaps it would not be so much; it might be economy in the end.

728. There is nothing more you think of saying in that respect. You would keep the existing hospital accommodation, or you would have hospital accommodation; where you break up a workhouse you would not diminish the number of hospitals?—I would not diminish the number of hospitals, but I would have them of such a nature that perhaps the cost of maintenance would not be very great.

June 16, 1903.
Mrs. Wyse-
Power.

729. And you would have pay wards, I understand?
—Yes, I would have pay wards, and wherever it was possible to send patients to other hospitals, I would urge that to be done.

730. You have mentioned something about hospital accommodation at the North Dublin Union being insufficient?—Before I come to that I would like to say something arising out of the evidence I heard here to-day about pauper nursing in the North Dublin Union.

731. As far as we can, we would like the evidence to be general?—I think this evidence would be general. I think it is a general thing I am going to say. Where there are trained nurses there are no paid wardmaids, at all events, in the North Dublin Union, and there are 551 sick people there at present. There are no paid wardmaids in the wards where there are trained nurses and nuns; they are pauper wardmaids and assist in the distribution of the food.

732. Dr. Brogan.—It does not apply to a good many workhouses in the country?—It applies to 601 sick people I know, and they certainly carry food from the nurses to the beds. I saw them yesterday. There is a traffic in food—we know that—and cups of tea at one penny a head, and it is a terrible scandal. I think in connection with that a lady inspector would do very good work. I think she would be able to find out perhaps a little more than a man.

733. It is the remedy we want to get at?—The impression prevailed, after the evidence of Dr. Maguire, that nothing like this occurred with the pauper nurses, that they only scrubbed the floors. I know it is the contrary, in our union, at all events.

734. CHAIRMAN.—The fact is that in very few unions indeed do the inmates discharge any duties that could be called nursing duties?—I am very glad to know that. I wish it was general. I wish there was a general order.

735. There is an order made?—I am very glad to know that, too.

736. It was an order made in 1897?—Well, it is not carried out in the North Dublin Union.

737. Now, as regards the convalescents of the sick poor?—You are not allowing me to touch the hospital accommodation in North Dublin Union.

738. It is more a local matter; later on you will have an opportunity, because there will be a definite inquiry into the Dublin hospitals?—The convalescence of the sick poor is the principal thing that struck me since I became a Guardian. Attending the Admission Board on Monday morning, I found there a very large proportion of people discharged from the hospital—straight out of the hospital—on the previous Saturday evening. All that time their diet was that of the able-bodied—dry bread for breakfast, etc.—and their sleeping accommodation for two nights the wooden sheds. That has gone on to such an extent that the Guardians have unanimously passed a resolution that we hope will correct this state of things. It is:—“That when a patient is discharged from hospital by the doctor the patient be immediately sent to the resident doctor with

a view to putting the convalescent on suitable diet and in a suitable portion of the house.”

739. Could not all that be done at present?—But think of the terrible wrong that has been going on until that resolution was passed, and it probably has been going on in every union in Ireland, and we had a great wrangle until that was passed. I think if we had some place to put the convalescents—

740. Or if you got the children and lunatics out of the workhouse?—I think if we got the convalescents into a convalescent home; some place where they could be sent when out of the doctor's hands, but where they could get nourishment and treatment suitable to their condition.

741. It is very difficult now in Dublin to get a patient into a convalescent home?—Most of the hospitals have it. I suppose they purchased their sites.

742. Hardly any of the workhouse patients go to a convalescent home. Do you know whether any of them do?—None go, because each hospital has its convalescent home.

743. There are some general?—There are some general, but then the Guardians would not send them there at all, but it is a very odd thing to find sick people put on dry bread and to sleep in the sheds.

744. As regards consumptive patients?—I think if there is an amalgamation it would be a very desirable thing that I heard suggested, a sanatorium, for although there is in each hospital one ward for consumptives it is not a ward suitable for their treatment.

745. A sufficient number of sanatoria?—Yes, a sufficient number would meet that; that, of course, too, would relieve congestion whenever it occurs.

746. There are a large number of consumptive patients?—A very large number. There is one thing I would like to say a word about, the boarded-out children. I heard Dr. Maguire and Lord Montagu give evidence in favour of keeping the children in the union until two years old. As a Guardian, a woman, and a mother, I pled that the children be sent out as soon as possible. I have lived in the country, and the death-rate in the country of infants is very low, but the death-rate in the unions is appalling, and I think if the children were put out with young women—young married women, who had successfully reared a child or two of their own—the children would be perfectly safe.

747. It seems reasonable?—It is really awful to keep them in the unions; it is said they die from breathing the one air; I don't know what they die from.

748. Would you put them out very young?—I would get them out as soon as I could get a nurse to take them. The difficulty is to find a nurse to take them.

749. Would you keep them until the bottle stage?—I would not; they are fed in the unions on the most scientific principles, and they die.

750. Dr. Brogan.—Did you inquire into the cases you send out?—I have been fifteen months in the union, and there was only one death of a baby boarded out in that time. I would not like to tell you the number that died in the union during the corresponding period.

MISS ROWAN further examined.

Miss Rowan.

I had not said anything about the dietary in the workhouse, which is very extravagant in this way. The very best materials are provided by the Guardians generally, but they are not used to the best advantage, because the cooks are entirely inefficient. For instance, I have known tea made in a cauldron in the morning and ladled out to the poor; then the dinner put in. Soup—any cook knows it requires twenty-four hours to make decent soup—that soup is ladled out at 1 o'clock. The poor get hot water and the pigs get the food. The cooking is not what it ought to be, and therefore good materials are wasted. Bread is also wasted. But it is easy to arrange that where you have the bread baked, as it now very often is, in the house; you can get your proportions made small and replenish them, as Mrs. Haslam described they do in England, and it has been done in one or two places.

751. In Limerick?—In Tralee, when I was a Guardian, with very great persuasion, I got them to build a bakery, and in the year they built it they saved close on £100 in bread alone, because the waste was not so great. What attracted me to it was seeing the bread put on the table; they have no knives; they tear off what they want and throw the remnants on the floor. I suggested it should be divided, and the remnants

of bread not used should be used next day for various dishes, puddings, &c. The Local Government Board told us to arrange a dietary, which we did, but it was impossible to put it in force unless we got a new cook. The cook could not do it, but at that very time the cook required an assistant. It was advertised, and the cooks that came up were five men, aged between sixty and seventy, but nobody asked them if they had ever cooked, and a gentleman was finally appointed—a very nice looking old man. I asked the chairman: “Would you allow me to congratulate him, and ask him some questions?” The Chairman said, “Certainly.” “Will you tell me, sir, how have you employed yourself during your life?” “When I was young I was a stone-mason, but I am past my work many a year, and I thought this would be a nice easy job.” “Did you ever cook for yourself?” “No, I lived with my neighbours.” “Do you know how to boil potatoes?” “No.” “Did you ever make mince-ahoy?” “No.” And that is the cook who got the appointment. I advised that they should get a trained cook to teach in the house; it would have cost something for six months' training, but then they would have had their cooking corrected. Until we get a cook we cannot save ration, and I am perfectly certain, from

my knowledge of house-keeping, that if the food was properly cooked, we would save one-half of the food of the people, and get them better fed.

752. How is the old man getting on now?—I don't know, for I have not been there lately, but I know if

the same old gentleman and assistant cook are still cooking, the soup is made in the same fashion; but how are they to make it better without better appliances; there are only three children; they must put the breakfast in, and then the dinner in, and then the tea, which is very grossly and undrinkable. June 24, 1923
Miss Rowan.

Miss WATKIN examined.

Would it be possible to make the elections of officers or officials connected with the workhouse independent of the Boards of Guardians, because if it were that would go to the root of the matter?

753. CHAIRMAN.—My colleague, Mr. Murnaghan, who is chairman of a Board of Guardians, is rather taken aback by that question.—Your poster's experience of mine is that there is a total disregard of the fitness of a person for any position; it is a mere question of interest. Even with regard to the cooking, we had an assistant cook appointed some months ago at a certain union, and I understood that he was in a large establishment not very far from Dublin, where he was principally in attendance upon men, and could blacken their shoes and clean knives, and because a great deal of food was supposed to be cooked in the establishment, the mere looking at it was to qualify him as a cook, and he was appointed. He had been valet in one house and butler in another, but as for knowledge of cookery, he did not even present any credentials.

754. Was there an objection made to his appointment?—It was put to the vote, but he had made a successful canvass, and he was elected. In another department the female cook had been employed in a drapery establishment, but not as cook. It would be the greatest matter and it would have one effect, the wording out of a number of Guardians whose chief interest seems to be to come and champion certain candidates for posts.

755. Was there a well-qualified candidate on these occasions?—Yes, far better qualified. In other departments, in the same way; with regard to an agricultural instructor, or a steward, even those with very good testimonials were set aside, and persons who had been publicans, clerks, or grocers' assistants were in the running, and were very largely patronised and voted for.

CHAIRMAN.—Our next sitting will be in Derry, sometime early in August. We won't be back in Dublin for some time.

The sitting terminated.

Aug. 11, 1903

THIRD PUBLIC SITTING—TUESDAY, AUGUST 11TH, 1903.

At the Courthouse, Londonderry.

Present:—Mr. MICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. COEY RIDGER.

CHAIRMAN.—Gentlemen, the main object of this Commission is to inquire and report whether any, and what, administrative and financial changes are desirable, in order to secure a more economical system under the Poor Laws for the relief of the sick, the insane, and all classes of destitute poor in Ireland, without impairing efficiency of administration. Various questions are involved in such an inquiry—for instance, the classification of Poor Law unions; alteration in the boundaries of various areas; the provision of auxiliary sanatoriums; the better classification of the destitute, infirm, and sick; the boarding-out of children; the methods for dealing with casuals or tramps; the erection of additional hospitals in some localities remote from existing hospitals; the best methods of obtaining payment or contributions from such patients as may be considered able to defray the cost of their treatment either wholly or in part; together with various other questions of interest or importance. Such an inquiry obviously goes to the root of Poor Law administration in this country, and my colleagues and I desire, before we begin to receive evidence, to express a hope that no single question of particular local interest, such as proposed changes of boundaries, will be allowed by the various local bodies and witnesses to obscure, if not shut out, from consideration, the other most important questions to be inquired into. It may perhaps be convenient for some who are now present to know that we do not intend to take evidence bearing directly upon the question of the various union boundaries in Derry, Donegal, and Tyrone until the other branches of the inquiry are finished. We think it best to begin with the official witnesses, and to obtain statistical and other information that will facilitate the subsequent proceedings at this inquiry.

Mr. McCay.—I appear for the Corporation in reference to the boundaries question, and all the parties here are represented by counsel. I would ask you to fix a day for taking that question, if possible, because counsel are brought down here at heavy expense by all parties, and if you could fix a day it would facilitate us.

Mr. William Wilson.—I appear for the County Council of Donegal, and I have counsel also. The counsel would be ready to-morrow morning, if you could see your way to take it up to-morrow, and let them away. There are a number of counsel; there are other interests involved also, in which counsel are coming here.

CHAIRMAN.—We might not be able to say that the other branches of the inquiry would be finished.

Mr. Wilson.—If you would say it would be possible to take it up to-morrow.

CHAIRMAN.—Would it be more convenient to say Thursday?

Mr. Wilson.—We cannot stop them now, they are on their way.

Mr. Ross.—I appear for the Derry Guardians; and the cause of the delay is that counsel amongst themselves arranged they would not go into the matter until to-morrow morning, if it so suited the Court, but they

are on their way, and will be here this afternoon. There are a considerable number of counsel engaged in it, and if they are not taken on to-morrow it would be a considerable loss.

Mr. E. McFadden, M.P.—I appear for the Lifford Board of Guardians, and would support the application made by Mr. Wilson, to take it on to-morrow. Counsel are all coming down from Dublin to-day, and it would be very convenient.

Mr. Boyle.—I appear on behalf of the Stranorlar Guardians, and as a matter of fact, I have counsel briefed, and he will be here to-morrow morning; and also the witnesses whom we will have in attendance will be here to-morrow as well, and it would be a great saving of expense if you could see your way to have the case taken to-morrow.

Mr. T. Elliott.—I appear for the Stranorlar Guardians. I have a letter from Mr. Denis Henry saying he arranged with other counsel that it would not be taken up before to-morrow morning; and Mr. Hady and Mr. Clancy would be ready to go on to-morrow morning. I would ask you to take up the case to-morrow also.

CHAIRMAN.—Would it be quite the same to you if we were to tell you after the luncheon interval?

Mr. Wilson.—That will do very well.

Mr. Ross.—Major Scott, chairman of the Derry Board of Guardians, is here, and he would be very anxious to get away, if you think he would not be called to-day; it would be very convenient if you could tell him whether his evidence would be taken to-day.

CHAIRMAN.—Our idea was to take the chairman of the Londonderry Council first, and formal evidence to prove a few things, then take the two specially nominated witnesses, Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Morrison; then to go into the Derry Union evidence. That would mean that after getting the statistical information from the clerk and master, we would reach Major Scott, I should fancy, before luncheon.

Mr. Ross.—I think you would.

Mr. McFadden.—Would you allow me to draw your attention to a matter which, I think, concerns this Commission and the matters you are called upon to investigate. I don't know whether you read the Derry Sentinel or not.

CHAIRMAN.—I never miss it.

Mr. McFadden.—I am also a very careful student of its columns, and coming along in the train this morning I read an article which simply shocked me.

CHAIRMAN.—I think it is unnecessary; I have seen it.

Mr. McFadden.—This is not a court of justice; but if it were I should certainly ask you to bring before you the editor and publisher; they say it is a jerry-mandering scheme, promoted in the interests of one party.

CHAIRMAN.—I saw it.

Mr. McFadden.—I think some expression of opinion should go from the members of the Commission.

CHAIRMAN.—Well, I am not prepared to express an opinion upon that until after luncheon, at all events.

Mr. THOMPSON B. ADAMS examined.

Mr. Thompson B. Adams.

756. CHAIRMAN.—You are the Secretary of the Derry County Council?—Yes, sir. This (pencil) is the report adopted by the meeting. These were the answers arrived at by the County Council at a special meeting.

757. Was it largely attended?—We had only ten members of the County Council present.

758. What is the total number?—Twenty-five.

759. In the first query?—Whether, having regard to the extent, population, necessities of the sick and

destitute poor, the Council were asked whether they thought it would be well to dissolve any of the unions; and their answer to the first question is—"In the opinion of the Council, having regard to all the matters referred to in the question, three workhouses are sufficient for the County of Londonderry, and one union should be accordingly dissolved." They did not think it necessary to mention what union that should be.—They thought it better to leave that to the Commission.

768. They did not mean the Derry Union?—They did not.

769. "Whether, in the event of any union or unions being dissolved, and of the workhouse or workhouses thereof being no longer required for Poor Law purposes, such workhouse or workhouses could with advantage be taken over by the County Council for an auxiliary lunatic asylum." And they answer—"In the event of a union being dissolved the Council is of opinion that the workhouse thereof should be used as an auxiliary asylum or a building for accommodating epileptic or mentally deficient patients." If Magherafelt or Limerick was dissolved the opinion of the Council is that that union should be used for harmless imbeciles or epileptics?—Yes; the Council did not contemplate that Magherafelt or Derry Union should be dissolved.

770. Does that would accrue it to Coleraine or Limerick?—I don't like to go into that very closely.

771. Is coming to that conclusion in favour of having a workhouse used as an auxiliary asylum, had the County Council before them any statistical information as to the cost of inmates in lunatic asylums as compared with the estimated cost in the auxiliary asylum?—The chairman of the County Council had evidently gone into the matter very carefully, and gave a lot of statistics to the Council as to the cost. It was from the County Clerk he got his information.

772. Yeaghall?—Yes.

773. And he was comparing that with the cost?—With the cost in the asylum.

774. Had he the figures for the cost in the asylum?—I believe it is something like 9s. a head.

775. Have you the figures, or do you intend to produce any evidence on that?—No; the chairman was not able to come. I don't think any other members of the Council had the same information. He seemed to have gone into it very carefully, and told the Council all he knew about it.

776. The next question was, whether by boarding out workhouse inmates better provision might be made for the classification and treatment of inmates, and "The Council is of opinion that the system of boarding out workhouse children should be continued." Did that mean extended also? Do you know, at present only orphan or deserted children can be boarded out?—What the Council meant was that children should not be kept in the workhouse at all.

777. That is an extension to the fullest extent; and the fourth query was: "Whether, in the event of an amalgamation or combination of unions being carried out, or any other arrangements being made for the relief of the destitute poor, any changes in the law and procedure as to administration and in the shareability of relief, would be desirable?" And the answer was—"In the opinion of the Council it would be desirable to limit the area of shareability of relief to electoral divisions." Do you happen to remember whether that question of shareability of relief referred to all kinds of relief, or only to outdoor relief?—Principally to outdoor relief.

778. They were not so anxious that indoor relief should be an electoral charge?—No; I think it was agreed at early on a consideration of outdoor relief; it was pointed out that in former times, when there was district rating, there was much less outdoor relief given than there is now.

779. I suppose you have not the figures for the outdoor relief of the various unions?—I have not.

780. And the fifth query was—"Whether, having regard to the number, capacity, and situation of the workhouse hospitals, county infirmaries, county fever hospitals, and other hospitals existing in the county, additional accommodation is required for the proper treatment of the sick poor in any union, district, or locality in the county, and if other accommodation seems desirable, how it may be best provided without entailing undue hardship upon the destitute or on the sick poor of the union?" And the answer is—"In the opinion of the Council no additional accommodation of the nature indicated in the query is required in the county; but in the event of the dissolution of any union the infirmary of the workhouse thereof should be utilised as a district hospital." What hospitals have you got in the county altogether, including the Derry Workhouse. You first have a lunatic asylum for the mentally diseased, then the county infirmary?—The county borough infirmary.

781. Then you have a fever hospital?—That belongs to the county borough exclusively.

782. That is Foyle Hill; it is situated in the county?—Yes.

783. Then you have the Union General Infirmary and the Union Fever Hospital. Is there any other hospital in Derry?—There is a hospital in Coleraine.

784. But I mean in the city?—No, I don't think there is.

785. Then in Coleraine you have the union infirmary and the union fever hospital, and which other hospital?—There is a cottage hospital at the Courthouse.

786. How is that maintained—is it a voluntary hospital?—I believe it is.

787. You have in Magherafelt a workhouse infirmary and a fever hospital, and you have in Limerick?—A workhouse hospital.

788. Then there is no hospital in Magilligan?—No.

789. There is no other hospital in the county or county borough?—Not that I am aware of.

790. Can you tell me what populous part of the union is most remote from any hospital accommodation of any part of the county?—Well, I should say some parts of the Magherafelt Union.

791. What part of the Derry Union would be most remote?—There is no place more than ten or twelve miles; I think seven or eight miles would be about as far as there is. I deny in Magherafelt Union it might be thirteen or fifteen miles.

792. Query 6 reads—"Whether any administrative and financial changes are desirable in order to secure a more economical system for the relief generally of the sick, the insane, and all other classes of the poor or destitute, without impairing efficiency of administration?" No answer given to that?—None by the local bodies.

793. Paying wards in hospital is No. 7, and the answer is—"In the opinion of the Council it would be desirable to attach paying wards to hospitals, &c., and persons not destitute and treated in such wards should be required to contribute towards the cost of treatment." Do they mean that additional wards should be built?—I think not; but that certain wards in existing hospitals should be set apart for paying patients.

794. I am afraid that would not be practicable?—I don't think they contemplated that any new wards should be built.

795. In most of the Poor Law hospitals space is not sufficient to put aside pay wards; it would mean an expenditure of money in building; but that is what they meant?—That is what they meant; they did not contemplate any building of new wards.

796. No. 8 reads: "What change, if any, seems to be possible and desirable as regards the treatment of the vagrant poor, generally known as 'tramps' or 'casuals'?" and the answer was, that "In the opinion of the Council the provisions of The Casual Poor Act, 1882, should be extended to Ireland." That is, to permit the people who come in frequently by not allowing them to take their discharge for a certain number of days, in accordance with the number of times they have been in the workhouse?—Yes; the first time for two days, and the next time a week.

797. What is the valuation of the entire county?—£338,584 18s.

798. Does that include the county borough?—It does not.

799. I mean including the county borough?—I have not the valuation of that.

800. Have you got that according to unions or rural districts?—I have it in rural districts and unions:—Coleraine—Rural District, £81,357 5s.; Urban, £20,351 9s.

801. Next?—Limerick—Rural, £25,615 10s.; Urban, £5,506 15s.; Londonderry, No. 1, £32,783 3s.; that is the rural district only—the Derry portion of the Derry Union.

802. Have you got the county borough?—No.

803. Do you happen to be aware of what the valuation is?—No. Magherafelt, £25,450.

804. Have you got the particulars of expenditure on various asylums and hospitals made by the County Council during the last year?—I can get the figures for you in a few minutes. I don't know that the accounts have been audited for the last half-year; I can give you the last two audited accounts.

805. I suppose we shall have some evidence from the infirmary?—I am sure you will from Mr. Stewart.

806. And any evidence from the asylum as regards the comparative cost?—Dr. Hetherington, I dare say, will give you information on that.

Aug. 11, 1905.
Mr. Thompson
B. Adams.

Aug. 11, 1902.
Mr. Thompson
B. Adams.

799. I don't know whether the County Council wish to put forward, in the absence of Colonel Clark, some statement of the figures which made him arrive at the conclusion that an auxiliary lunatic asylum would be more economical and better than an extension of the present asylum. I think some evidence on that point would be desirable.—They have an idea that if they

had an auxiliary asylum they would be saved building a block.

800. I suppose you have some evidence to-morrow on that point?—I will communicate with Dr. Hetherington. Here (produced) is the resolution of the County Council as to the union boundaries of Londonderry. I put it in.

Mr. Alexander
Hamilton.

Mr. ALEXANDER HAMILTON examined.

801. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the County Council?—Yes.

802. Did the Council go closely into these various matters in the quinquennial?—Yes, they did; it was discussed fully.

803. And the result was you thought that out of the four unions in the county one ought to go?—Yes, that is what I think.

804. The resolution does not say which one ought to go?—No; they left that to be decided again.

805. I suppose the question was discussed as to whether one union or another ought to be mentioned?—Not very much; there was some reference made to Limerick. The question was, whether there should be three or four unions in the county—principally confined to that.

806. But have you yourself formed any opinion as to which ought to go?—No, I cannot say; I am living pretty near Derry here, at one end.

807. Having regard to the geography of the county do you think one ought to go?—From what I hear of the number of lunatics we thought three should accommodate the county.

808. Not distances; all these considerations?—Distances would be the greatest objection, I believe. There would be an objection in the distances.

809. Would there be more objection in the case of one union than another? Which union, having regard to distances, might best go?—I think it was generally considered among the County Council that Limerick would be the likely one to go—it was the smallest one. But that question was left rather open.

810. The idea of the Council was, that if Limerick, or any other workhouse, were closed for Poor Law purposes, it should be used as an auxiliary lunatic asylum?—Yes.

811. Colonel Clark, the Secretary tells us, gave a great many arguments explaining his view that an auxiliary asylum would be better than an extension of the existing asylum?—Yes, not better; he did not say better, but it would relieve the present congestion that exists in the asylum.

812. Was the question considered whether it would be better to extend the present asylum or to have an auxiliary asylum?—No; that question, the one as against the other, was not considered; at the present time it was considered it would relieve the congestion, until the buildings at Grange could be further proceeded with.

813. As a temporary measure?—Not exactly. Col. Clark, from the figures he brought in, said even when Grange was finished, and the lunatics could be maintained at a lower rate at a place such as he described an auxiliary asylum to be. He suggested that even when the asylum was completed this thing would still be useful.

814. Are works being carried on at present for additions at Grange?—Oh, yes.

815. How far is that from the present lunatic asylum?—There is a block or two there in existence already, and there is a contract for an additional block.

816. How far is that from the present building?—I dare say it would be nearly two miles from the city.

817. Is there an additional resident doctor there?—I am not sure that there is. I don't think it.

818. Those are facts that we will find it necessary, I am afraid, to have in evidence?—I am not on the asylum committee.

819. Is Mr. Morrison on the asylum committee?—I think not.

820. If you could, as members of the County Council, arrange that by to-morrow we should have some evidence on these things it would be useful.—You would require members of the asylum committee to go into the question.

821. Some member or official who could give this evidence?—Well, I will see.

822. Then the next question was about the boarding out of children. And you thought the system of boarding out workhouse children should be continued?—Yes.

823. And Mr. Adams said he thought the view of the Council was that it should be extended so that all workhouse children should be boarded out?—Yes, that is about the idea. It was thought they would be brought up more respectably outside the workhouse.

824. That would require legislation to enable parents and children to be separated. You think that would be wise?—So it was thought.

825. The next thing is whether any changes, financial or administrative, might be made with advantage, as regards chargeability of relief, and the opinion of the Council was that it would be desirable to limit the area of chargeability of relief to electoral divisions, to go back to the old electoral division rating?—That is the idea; it was thought taxation and representation would go better together, having the area of charge limited to electoral divisions.

826. An individual Guardian would have more responsibility, and would be slower to spend money, if it was charged on his own division?—Yes; and besides, if a Council had power to vote away an amount of the rates it might not work out so well: a man from a lower rated division would have the same voting power as a man from a division with a large taxation.

827. You would limit that man's power to his own district?—Yes.

828. Of course, the theory always was that relief should be given by the Board of Guardians as a whole, not by individual Guardians for any particular electoral division?—We wish to save men from being extravagant who do not very much contribute to the rates.

829. To go back to the old divisional chargeability, was that intended for all relief, indoor as well as outdoor?—Yes, I think so. That was my idea.

830. Do you think it would be as necessary in the case of indoor as of outdoor. One person is willing to accept the extreme test of workhouse life as a test of their poverty. Do you think it would be as necessary to make that a local charge as in the case of outdoor relief, where no such test is imposed?—I think it was the idea of the Council to make it for all, as far as I remember.

831. You are not at present, are you, connected with any union?—No.

832. Then the opinion of the Council was that no additional accommodation was necessary for the sick—no further hospitals in the county?—No, I think not.

833. And the question whether any changes, administrative or financial, were desirable—that is rather left by the Council to be answered by the local Boards and Commissions concerned?—Yes.

834. As regards paying wards in hospitals, the Secretary thought the idea was that separate rooms in the existing hospitals should be set apart as pay wards?—Yes, that was the idea.

835. If that were not possible, that the present hospitals are not sufficiently spacious, and having regard to the necessary classification into male and female wards, if it were found paying wards could not be set aside, would the Council be in favour of building additional wards as paying wards?—That question did not come up; it was thought the present accommodation was sufficient.

836. The present accommodation for numbers is sufficient, but if they adopt the plan of pay wards I think, from what I know of the existing hospitals, you would find it very difficult to get room?—I think that is quite possible; but the question did not come up in that shape. I have not much experience of the workhouse system.

837. As regards tramps, you think that they ought to be obliged to give longer notice, and you would give power to the Guardians to keep them in?—Yes.

836. You would not go any farther; you did not think it necessary to go further?—No, we thought that was sufficient. Just adopt the English system.

837. Was the question discussed whether the existing accommodation for tramps ought to be abolished altogether, for instance?—It was discussed. We thought it should not be abolished, but that some system of penalising them should be adopted; it was thought it would not be very wise to turn them out loose in the country—they might do harm.

838. If they had not shelter they might go into out-

buildings and places where they would be mischievous?—Yes, that was the idea.

839. Did they consider at the County Council whether any provision might be made for the treatment of consumptive patients?—No, I don't think that question came up.

840. A special hospital or special sanatorium?—No.

841. Thank you. I think that is sufficient, but if you could arrange for evidence with regard to the infirmary and asylum to-morrow it would be a great convenience to us?—I shall see Mr. Stewart about it.

Aug. 11, 1903.

Mr. Alexander Hamilton.

Mr. JOHN MORRISON examined.

842. CHAIRMAN.—Now, I think, Mr. Morrison?—Mr. Adams and Mr. Hamilton have given you the mind of the Council pretty fully, and for other facts or figures connected with my district, I think you would connect better with Mr. Long, who is chairman of the Lonsdale District Council, and also a member of the asylum committee.

843. You have heard the evidence that has been given by Mr. Hamilton; does it occur to you that you

have anything material to add to it?—No, I don't think I could add very much.

844. You answered in what he said?—Yes, I think he and Mr. Adams have given you the mind of the Council, and we are obliged to express their mind rather than our own.

845. There was nothing said about consumption hospitals so far as you remember?—Nothing said about consumption hospitals.

Mr. John Morrison.

Mr. W. L. PERRY, Clerk, Lonsdale Union, examined.

846. CHAIRMAN.—What is the valuation of the Union of Lonsdale?—£189,866.

847. What have the rates been for some past years; I think you might go back to 1894?—I have them from 1890.

848. Take a few years before the passing of the Local Government Act. In 1894, how much were raised, and on what percentage rate?—£4,593, or equal to 6d. in the £.

849. 1895?—£4,798, or equal to 6½d. in the £.

850. 1896?—£5,410, or equal to about 7½d. in the £.

851. 1897?—£4,486, equal to a rate of 6d. in the £.

852. The half year in the transition period?—I don't think I have that.

853. I have taken it down myself as £2,608, which came to 3½d. in the half-year?—I can get you that.

854. The average for these four years before the passing of the Act would be?—5½d. in the £.

855. Then come to 1900?—£7,042 12s. 6d., equivalent to 8½d.

856. For 1901?—£6,050 12s., equal to about 8d.

857. 1902?—£5,700 12s., equal to 7½d.

858. 1903?—£6,241, equal to about 8s.

859. 1904?—We have not that.

860. You have a current rate?—I have not it here; it is 2d. less than that. Of course these last four are the gross estimates.

861. These amounts were struck after considering the Parliamentary grant?—Not the last; the last is the gross demand on the County Council.

862. Then they would be recouped?—It goes back direct to the County Council now, the Parliamentary grant which we formerly received.

863. You make a demand on the County Council for the gross amount?—Yes, less some trifling matters. The previous year it was a net amount after giving credit for the estimated Parliamentary grant.

864. What is the annual amount of the Parliamentary grant?—When we get it it averaged from £200 to £1,100 a year for all purposes.

865. What is it now?—I could not tell, because it is allotted direct to the County Council; it would be about the same; it might be £1,100.

866. One penny in the £ on this union produces £760 about?—Yes.

867. These sums that were raised year after year, for what purpose were they raised. Since the passing of the Local Government Act?—I don't mean the years before—for what service did the Poor Law Guardians raise these amounts?—For Poor Law purposes and medical charities.

868. Medical charities includes dispensary medical officers' salaries?—Midwives, apothecaries, rents, and all that, and also any superannuation allowances we are liable for.

869. You don't include these in establishment charges?—They are paid out of that rate that I demand from the County Council.

870. They were always, that is nothing new?—No.

871. We have no power here to look into expenditure under the Medical Charities Act, so that it is neces-

sary now to subdivide these gross amounts and find out how much was expended for Poor Law purposes proper, that is indoor and outdoor relief, and the salaries of officers, and some other very small expenses. Could you tell me for each year, say from 1898, how much was expended for Poor Law purposes?—I can: in 1898, £3,274; in 1899, £3,147; that is equal to 6d. in the £. In 1900 it was 4½d.

872. 1899?—4s.

873. 1900?—The amount was £3,550; that would be equal to 4½d.

874. 1901?—£4,502, equal to 5½d.

875. 1902?—£4,916, equal to about 5½d.

876. Can you tell me the reasons of the increase for 1901 and 1902; where the rates got out of the 4½, came into the 5d. and 5½?—Between 1901 and 1902 there was an increase of £400; the excess in maintenance in the house for the year was £345.

877. Was that owing to there being more patients or an improved dietary?—I would consider the most of it owing to the liberal dietary in the infirmary and the number of patients in the infirmary.

878. There was some increase in the number of patients?—There was, the infirmary was pretty full, and we appointed an extra nurse; that is the only reason I can give for it.

879. Subdividing that amount, say for the year 1898, how much did you spend on in-maintenance in that year?—£1,687 12s. 6d.

880. On outdoor relief?—£181 17s. 10d.

881. What does the expenditure on outdoor relief consist of: have you taken in boarded-out children?—I have, that is nearly all boarded-out children.

882. How much of that is for boarded-out children and how much for outdoor relief proper?—I would say about £150 for boarded-out children, or £140.

883. Do you think it is as much for boarded-out children as £140?—I do; there are twenty children; each of them gets two suits of clothes. Well, about £100 would be nearest.

884. Establishment charges for 1898?—£1,437 6s. 11d.

885. Burials?—£77 10s.; that includes ins and outs.

886. Superannuation?—£38.

887. Now for 1899—in maintenance?—£1,548 1s. 7d.; outdoor relief, £195 15s. 5d.; establishment, £1,415 8s. 6d.; burials, £28 1s.; superannuation, £38.

888. For 1900?—In maintenance, £2,039 1s. 2d.; outdoor relief, £158 19s. 3d.; establishment charges, £1,465 12s. 6d.; burials, £27 4s. 8d.; superannuation, £38.

889. 1901?—In maintenance, £2,456 13s. 3d.; outdoor relief, £266 10s. 4d.; establishment, £1,910 12s. 8d.; burials, £24 1s. 6d.; superannuation, £37.

890. 1902?—In maintenance, £2,801 16s.; outdoor relief, £170 15s. 6d.; establishment, £2,044 17s. 3d.; burials, £27 2s.; superannuation, £35.

891. I suppose there was a death?—There was a death.

892. And 887 was for a broken period; death must have been during that half-year?—Yes.

Mr. W. L. Perry.

Aug 11, 1902. 895. Now during those last few years, was there any capital expenditure as distinguished from ordinary expenditure or maintenance?—Within the last few years there was \$400 or \$500 spent out of rates.

896. Was there any larger sum spent on buildings?—There was. There were loans got to the extent of £5,000 from the Board of Works for the extension of the infirmary.

897. What is the repayment instalment annually?—Some part of it forty years and some part thirty years; it is about £210.

898. Then in this increase of expenditure in those years that I was asking you, about £210 out of the £1,000 would be for the interest on capital expenditure; that would leave about £790. What percentage has been necessary for Poor Law purposes annually since the passing of the Local Government Act; begin with 1890. This would mean what percentage is necessary for the expenditure which we are reviewing here?—I have given you that.

899. Yes, 4½, 5½, 6½, and 6½?—That is since the passing of the Act.

900. I have it here—4½, 5½, 5½, and 6½. I should like to have details of last year's expenditure. In maintenance, £2,601?—That was for 1902; that is the last I made up.

901. How much does the poundage come to, I make it about one-twelfth of a penny in the £ for outdoor relief proper?—About that, leaving out the boarded-out children.

902. Is there any special test for the granting of outdoor relief in the union; is it necessary to get some evidence that the person applying cannot be removed into the workhouse hospital, or is it a question of general discretion?—The Guardians have bound themselves in past years by a rule not to give outdoor relief to any person of whom the doctor gives a certificate that that person can be removed with safety to the workhouse hospital.

903. That is not operative now?—It is, but on one or two special occasions they overruled it.

904. As far as you are aware—you need not answer this unless you like—is there any head of expenditure

under which any substantial reduction could be made?—I don't think there is any.

905. Or any heavy expenditure for Poor Law purposes?—I don't think it could be worked more economically.

906. Mr. MURPHY.—As regards outdoor relief: outdoor relief as ordinarily understood does not exist in this union; it is not permissible; it is only where a doctor certifies that a patient is unable to be moved that outdoor relief is given at all?—Yes, you may take it that way. Of course the relieving officer goes in all cases to the party for whom the outdoor relief is asked. If he finds they cannot be removed he gives provisional outdoor relief, and reports to the Guardians, but that is not in every case. In other cases he gives them the option, by sending the man, to go to the workhouse, and if they refuse to go, that ends the matter.

907. Then they get no assistance at all?—Not from the Board of Guardians.

908. They are not looked after any more?—No.

909. CHAIRMAN.—But it would be the duty of the relieving officer to keep an eye on those people if relief were refused?—I don't know that. If the relieving officer does not consider that they are destitute in the first place, or entitled even to provisional relief, he reports that to the Board.

910. Is provisional relief given?—It is.

911. If in a case where provisional relief has been given the Guardians refuse to give outdoor relief, and if there is no certificate that the person cannot be removed, what happens then?—That would not happen. If the relieving officer gives provisional relief the Guardians know it is a case for continuing, and, as a rule, it is continued.

912. Then it would be a case for giving outdoor relief even if the person refuses to go to the workhouse?—The relieving officer would not give it unless the person was unfit to be removed.

913. He would not give even provisional relief?—No, except in the case, perhaps, of a woman that was confined, or where a medical certificate was produced as to sickness for removal.

Major W. E. Scott examined.

Major W. E. Scott. 914. CHAIRMAN.—You have considered the queries that have been issued?—Yes, the queries were before our Board.

915. You are the Chairman of the Derry Board?—I am the Chairman.

916. The first question was whether, having regard to the extent of the population, amalgamation was desirable?—The great majority of the board were of opinion that amalgamation was not desirable; there was a minority, some one or two, not of that opinion.

917. Did they go beyond their own union?—Only what they knew.

918. They did not consider the question of other unions, such as Lonsdale?—They did not express as strong an opinion about Lonsdale, but only as far as they were concerned, joining any part of Lonsdale to us.

919. Did they take into serious consideration the question of an auxiliary lunatic asylum, under the second query?—No, not very much I think, except in as far as the two questions; whether any union could be dissolved, that is the first question. Their opinion was negative on that. Then you ask if any workhouse that was dissolved could be used as an auxiliary asylum. The opinion was negative on that, too. Their opinion was very strongly expressed that for certain reasons Lonsdale would not be good as an auxiliary. Maybe one ought to state the reasons. They thought that for the administration of the Poor Law the districts, if any, are rather too large, that the administration of the Poor Law does not apply only to workhouses, but is very largely concerned with the industrious, hard-working poor outside the workhouses, and their interests are partly overlooked at present and would be much more overlooked if the unions were made larger.

920. In what way does the Poor Law touch that class at present?—By the Medical Poor Law Relief, that is the dispensary. If the Boards of Guardians were broken up it would mean that the dispensary district would be dealt with by a still more remote body. And that is the part where the Poor Law would support and assistance.

921. You would be rather disposed to have more bodies if it could be done without expense?—Not more bodies, but more flexibility given by committees. I think it is a pity dispensary committees were done away with. I would not advocate restoring them, but giving power to the Boards of Guardians to appoint local committees out of their own bodies to look after the dispensaries.

922. Not necessarily composed altogether of members of the Board?—They might be taken in. I would like to see it done by the elected Guardians of each district, that they should form a committee for that dispensary, and the special reason is we have lost all touch with the dispensaries. I was so long connected with it under the old system, and I remember when we had in dispensary committees, we had very great assistance from the dispensary doctor; he was always present, and we feared his opinion and advice most useful. Now we never see him at all.

923. He sends in his book?—We don't even see the books; it is merely a form of signing the books. The opinion is expressed by our Board strongly that there ought to be greater supervision of these districts than there is; that is a very strong feeling. For these reasons you will see that we don't think you could enlarge the unions, unless you take up a system of local management by committees—I mean a committee which will report to the Guardians.

924. Not an executive committee?—Not an executive committee; it would be a very useful committee to report to us on outdoor relief. But about outdoor relief, I am expressing my own opinion; that was not discussed.

925. Mr. MURPHY.—You think the abolition of the old dispensary committee was a loss as far as the administration of relief?—It was in this way, that nothing was put in its place.

926. There is not that close supervision and careful examination that used to take place under the old bodies?—No, I think we have not the information. I sat on these committees very often, and coming to do the work of the Guardians, I got great assistance from being at the dispensaries.

937. CHAIRMAN—Merely a reporting committee?—Principally a reporting committee; we cannot do without it.

938. You think the Guardians would take sufficient interest to go so far to make a report?—I think they would, for their report would have great weight when it came; they might be given a little executive power, I think the Board of Guardians would be only too glad to give it to them. Whenever anything is reported out of order we have to send some Guardians to inquire into it. The present elected Guardians are always most anxious to do their work.

939. The third query?—Well, that is a very difficult thing; we could not come to any universal opinion on that. We are very strong on the boarding-out of children.

940. It really works in with No. 1, if you thought it desirable to break up any union?—Yes, there it would come in. But if Linsavady was closed as a workhouse, they might board their inmates with us, but that would not work very well; it would remove the sick and infirm very far from their relatives.

941. The point was whether if a workhouse was closed as such, it might not be reopened for a particular class—say, that the workhouse in Linsavady should not receive any but aged and infirm from the county, and that the sick of the Linsavady Union should go to the County Infirmary if it were large enough, and another class of inmates might go to Linsavady, and so on, to make such institutions, as far as means of communication would permit, into a place for one class; that was rather the idea?—It might be possible, but it would be great churning.

942. As soon as you come to Magherafelt you would find a difficulty owing to want of communication?—Yes, in some cases it would be possible, in other cases impossible; it would be a very difficult thing to work out.

943. Magherafelt is not directly in connection with Derry?—No, you would have to go round by Coleraine. We also thought it would be very expensive to turn a workhouse into an auxiliary asylum.

944. Have you any statistics on the matter?—No, not statistics, but we went into the general question. It was mentioned that Linsavady would not be at all suitable, for there is very little ground there. It would be cheaper if they were all sent to a large asylum; that was the expression of opinion, but no vote was taken on it. In Glenties there are between 200 and 300 acres; that gives ample room for the outdoor life of the inmates.

945. Then your opinion is, as regards making workhouse institutions for particular classes, that in the County Derry it would hardly be suitable, owing to the want of communication with the most distant union, Magherafelt?—Yes, I don't think it would work at all, the communications are so broken, you have to go up to Coleraine and then down again.

946. It would cost two or three weeks' maintenance to bring a pauper from Magherafelt to Derry?—Yes, and it would be very unfair to the poor.

947. And they would not have their friends to see them?—They would not.

948. Would their friends be likely to come?—No, I am afraid they are very often forgotten, but still they don't like the feeling of being banished.

949. Do you think even in your own union that people from remote parts of the union are slow to come in, or is your union sufficiently compact?—I think they are coming in much better now that we have improved the treatment for the sick and the poor, and they are coming in more willingly, but still they have a prejudice about it.

950. Would it be owing to the word "workhouse," and the associations of a workhouse, or would it be to the disadvantages of being cut off from their friends?—I think it is the name of workhouse. When you first remove them they have great reluctance to be away from their own home, but after a time they have not.

951. I remember when the Gortin Workhouse was closed, I happened to be there, and the people lamented as much as if their own home was being broken up; the idea of going to Omagh was a horrible idea?—At first it is.

952. Query No. 4, what do you say about that?—We are against consanguinity.

953. Do you think any further accommodation is necessary for the sick in the union?—Not at present; ours is a very good workhouse.

954. I meant as regards any other part of the union, a hospital accommodation so remote as to make it impossible for the sick to come in?—No, I don't think it is now; they are always within reach.

955. What is your most distant part of the union?—Fourteen or fifteen miles. We can quite easily send the fever van to part of Bangor, and part of Park. I think I have said too far, fifteen miles.

956. Is that a populous part of the union?—There is a good number up in the mountains.

957. Do they come in an considerable numbers?—I have known cases sent in. Of course there are great objections to coming so far.

958. Do you think it would be necessary to have any separate cottage hospitals?—No, I think we can deal with all the sick poor.

959. No sick poor remain untreated in their own homes, as far as you are aware?—That is the reason why I want dispensary committees. I don't think the treatment of the sick poor in their own homes is what is ought to be. I think we have excellent doctors, and we have good medicines, but that is no use unless the doctor's advice is followed and the medicines are taken; but the nursing is the great deficiency in our union. We have taken a step—I don't know whether you are aware of it—in the direction of getting, as far as possible, district nurses to attend to these cases. We have only had one or two cases of that, and they have been of the greatest benefit to the sick poor. Independent men, fathers of families, who have to go out to work, when their wives get sick they have no one to look after them or the children, and in one or two cases it has acted splendidly and given relief. If we could have the system that they have in some towns, of Jubilee nurses, and have also the power to give them a little extra food during sickness; that might be done by dispensary committees. That is my idea, but that was not before the Board. That is a want in Poor Law relief. I can give the case of a hard-working father, with a large family, and his wife was dying of consumption.

960. Would not this be a good time to consider some provision by a county, or groups of counties, for the treatment of and the stamping out of phthisis?—The question is whether a workhouse is the proper place for consumptives or not.

961. Has that been considered?—No.

962. If a workhouse were broken up, might it not be used, with structural alterations, as a sanatorium for consumptive cases?—I would be slow to give an opinion whether the workhouse would not have to be so completely altered; that would be more a medical opinion.

963. At all events, it would be better than their own homes?—It would be far better, but then they must be suitable places; they must have fresh air, at least, I know from reading and some private experience, a closed workhouse might not be the place for them. It is a great need to have some place in the county for consumptive patients.

964. Nothing of the kind has been publicly broached in Derry?—No.

965. I mean within the last few years?—Not beyond the workhouse providing separate wards.

966. Some Boards of Guardians have?—Yes, but it was not before us.

967. Have you any personal opinion about consumptives?—I think if it were possible they should be separated, but that ought to be for a large district; there are not so many cases, I am glad to say.

968. For a county or group of counties?—A group of counties. The Guardians might have power to send special cases to that.

969. As they do now to extern hospitals?—Yes.

970. They have power to do so, the only thing is they want the institution?—I think, from what I know, the Guardians in proper cases would always avail themselves of them; they constantly send children out for special treatment, and if there was such an institution, I think they would avail themselves of it. With regard to the sick poor, we think we have erected a very good hospital for them.

971. The question is largely whether the good hospital accommodation there is in different places is sufficient for a large area. In some cases the union would be forty miles long with only one hospital; it is obvious in such a case that something might be done?—I can only speak for my own union. I think with the county infirmary we have ample.

Aug. 16, 1900.

Maye
W. E. Booth.

Aug. 11, 1903.

Major
W. E. Sack.

952. How do you think it would work if Derry Union were closed to the sick?—That is a point on which I would not like to speak. We have spent a great deal of money in putting up a good hospital, and we have a good staff of nurses and doctors. My own opinion is that hospital cases would be better treated in a hospital, but that is only a private opinion.

953. Query 6, I think virtually we have discussed that already.—Yes.

954. As regards No. 7, the question of patients' contributions, do you collect much in your union owing to the granting of relief by way of loan?—I don't think there is very much.

955. In fever hospitals you very often get recommendations from people in good positions who go there?—We do, but not so much since there has been a City Infectious Hospital in Derry.

956. Do you think it would be desirable, if a change in the law were made, that payments should be required, say payments in full or contributions?—I think it would; we have that in lunatic asylums, but we very seldom get any payments. I think it would be a great improvement, and especially for fever.

957. Now, as to the question of a "District Hospital," as distinguished from a Workhouse Infirmary. If you leave the various healthy or infirm classes in a workhouse, do you think that the sick would in a workhouse be regarded by the public as a District Hospital, or as an institution unconnected with the idea of pauper relief?—No.

958. In every workhouse you have the sick, fever, and ordinary medical and surgical cases, the aged and infirm, mothers with infants; you have children under fifteen; you have lunatics, and you have casuals and tramps; and you have other classes who are nominally able-bodied; do you think if the sick and the aged and infirm remain in the workhouse, and no other class were to be admitted, you would then have really a hospital?—You would have.

959. Then if we come to consider where and how the other classes are to be dealt with; now mothers with infants, these are very largely girls and married women who come in there, does it occur to you that any means could be adopted for taking that class away from the workhouse?—It would be very desirable if it could be done.

960. There are in Ireland a number of penitentiaries?—They would have to be enlarged very much to meet the evil.

961. They would have to have a large yard?—I doubt whether you could force them in.

962. If the workhouses were no longer available for that class, if unmarried women could not get admission into a workhouse, but if the Guardians had power to board out or pay for them in what might be called an external hospital—a penitentiary—what would you think of such an arrangement?—In theory it would be very well, but practically working with that class would be very hard.

963. Coming in after the first lapse, would they not rather prefer to go, according to their own religious opinions, to a penitentiary conducted on religious lines, with a view to redemption—would they not rather go to an institution of that kind?—The first ones possibly would.

964. I am speaking of the first; then there is a less possibility with the second?—That is so; but when you come practically to work it out there are enormous difficulties.

965. Now what difficulties do you perceive?—You are absolutely encouraging vice and letting off the really guilty person, that is the father.

966. It has been suggested that the law might be changed to the English system?—It is a most difficult subject, we think.

967. But at present you have those women going into the workhouse, and having in many cases numbers of illegitimate children?—It is an immense evil.

968. Do you think it would be a good plan to try and reclaim them after the first lapse?—If you could manage it, I think I would rather leave that to some of the other Guardians who know better. We did try it; the lady Guardians tried to look after that class and failed.

969. You want classification?—We know as a Board that it is very hard to make a decision in such cases, but if we had a good many more of these penitentiaries, and power to send them there, and the legal power to keep them there; they must not go in there and go out whenever they are found fault with.

970. As soon as a woman after her first lapse went into one of these places, the natural object would be to

get her into a penitent state of mind, and provide for her by getting her a situation?—Certainly, if it could be done. They are very penitent at first, and as soon as that passes off and any fault is found with them, they will demand their discharge.

971. Yes, so I should expect?—You would have to keep them some little time.

972. Say while they are nursing the child?—Oh, yes; it is a very difficult question you are alluding to.

973. It is a difficult question?—I know many ladies and others have taken it up very strongly to see what they can do as to it, but that is a blot on the workhouse system.

974. Then those mothers with infants, if they could not be got out of a workhouse, it could hardly ever be looked upon as a district hospital?—No.

975. The next class would be children under fifteen; these are largely composed of illegitimate children. Where their parents have deserted them, or they are orphans, they can be dealt with—they can be boarded out, but at present you have in the Derry Union forty-five children under fifteen who cannot be boarded out, their parents or parent being alive; would you be in favour of any legislation towards boarding-out, taking these children away from the control of their parents?—I certainly would. I think the Act requires strengthening. We tried and failed in one important case. Those children are simply brought up as beggars or criminals; they are brought up to a vicious life, and the sooner we can get them away from their parents the better.

976. Then you would be in favour of legislation for taking illegitimate children from the control of their parents and boarding them out?—Or the children of criminals.

977. Now, as to lunatics. You have only fourteen lunatics in the Derry Workhouse: do you think they ought to be there or sent to an asylum?—They ought to be sent to an asylum.

978. Surely there is room for fourteen lunatics in the Derry Asylum?—Not now, but they are building an addition.

979. Then they will have room, and do you think they ought to go there?—I think it would be far better that they should be treated separately.

980. Then the next class are the casuals or tramps; they are a comparatively small class in numbers?—They are in numbers, but they are doing a tremendous amount of mischief in the country; the workhouse makes the life of the tramp possible.

981. How far would you go in proposing a remedy?—I would go pretty far. We all agree that they should not be allowed to demand their discharge at any moment. I would certainly say that they could not demand their discharge in less than a week; that would give them an opportunity of being brought before the Board.

982. You would not allow them to be discharged without a Board's order?—I would not allow them to demand their discharge, but they might come before the Board, and the Board might dismiss them, and, in certain cases, give authority to the master, but the tramp himself or his family would not have a right to demand it.

983. You would practically imprison them for a certain time for demanding admission?—Yes. We have very bad cases sometimes in Derry Workhouse; they go out and live on the very poor; the workhouse makes that class possible, where it would be impossible.

984. Would it be impossible?—It would; because when they come to towns the townspeople—the busy people—are more hard-hearted, then they go into the workhouse, and out of it they go when it is fine.

985. You class among the casuals or tramps in your workhouse people resident in the city who come in for a couple of days and go out again?—Yes.

986. They are not really tramps?—No; we call them casuals.

987. What do you think about that class?—There are cases where they absolutely come in two or three times a week and go out again, and we can do nothing; there is nothing very wrong about the person. There is one woman who takes her children in and out, and we can do nothing with them; they cannot go to school. Sometimes she comes in twice a week. Our lady Guardian, Mrs. Morris, has taken great interest in them, but can do nothing. If we had power to keep them in, first for a week and then for three weeks or a month, we would be able to do something.

988. You would apply to these people the same rule as to tramps, keeping them in with a view to keeping them out?—Yes; the Belgian system is very good:

when they come two or three times they send them to an industrial village.

999. Are some of these people really chronic idle people, who don't work?—Have never from their birth seen a day's work, and don't intend to do it.

1000. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—What would you do with the children of these people?—Teach them; give them instruction.

1001. Take the children off them?—Oh, no, I would not; I would not take them from them unless they were vicious.

1002. CHAIRMAN.—If they were leading really idle wandering lives?—I would prevent them by my system, keeping them in.

1003. But only for a short time?—Yes; but if they came in often I would keep them longer—up to six months. That would require great alteration in the law.

1004. Then there are the other, or so-called "able-bodied," class that it is difficult to know what to do with. In your workhouse you have twenty-one men and twenty-five women who are considered able-bodied. Judging from what I remember of the workhouse here and what I know of workhouses elsewhere, these people, although they are in the workhouse books as able-bodied, yet they are not men that anyone would select for a day's work?—No; but many of them would get a day's work.

1005. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Have you any suggestion to make about that class?—As much employment should be provided as possible for them at farming and general work in the workhouse.

1006. CHAIRMAN.—What would you think of a general institution for that class of people, who are well able to travel, to send them to one institution, say, for half Ulster?—That would be an important change.

1007. Keep them in one institution; nobody there but themselves?—That would be such an immense change in the law it would be really imprisoning them.

1008. It would. They could take their discharge, of course?—They would take their discharge at once and go out again.

1009. Then they would be under certain penalties. They would have to go back to the same institution if they took their discharge; and if they were to take their discharge too often, and put the rates to expense in railway fares you could have a rule something like what you suggest for animals and tramps?—I think by beginning with small periods, a week or a month, would check that.

1010. The object of analysing these classes is to find out how we could reduce them and bring the workhouse to be a district hospital for the sick and weak sick. We have considered all the classes. The mothers of legitimate children, I think, could be dealt with without any difficulty by having a lying-in ward attached to the infirmary. The children under fifteen, juveniles, orphans and tramps we have dealt with. Now we are at the able-bodied. What I wanted to know was whether, in your opinion, it would not be possible to have an institution at some central point—some convenient centre, say Derry or Omagh, for the able-bodied of North-West Ireland?—I am afraid that would hardly do; it would be a jail. I would rather take the sick and the old and infirm and separate them.

1011. The sick you must have near their own homes. This class of forty-six able-bodied people you have, I fancy a good many of them are all-the-year-round residents?—They are, I think so.

1012. So that there would not be a very great hardship in removing them?—It could be done.

1013. With the object of getting workhouses to become in every place really hospitals at refuges for the infirm?—I am afraid you could hardly do it. I would rather, in the workhouses, put a greater separation between the old and infirm and the able-bodied.

1014. How would you do that?—Separate wards.

1015. You would accept the phrase "deserving poor." You would classify them into deserving and non-deserving poor?—I think that is more possible—we have wards in which those who behave well could be put, and get a little better treatment, and if they misbehaved they could be sent into the body of the house.

1016. I think that is feasible as regards the aged and infirm; but when you come to the able-bodied, would you classify them?—No; I would keep them all together, and give them as much work as they could possibly do. If you put them into a central institution for a large area, where there will be work in a thorough way, you could do that. In theory that is the best;

and that, I think, is done in Holland and Belgium. They call them labour villages. I saw something of that in East Germany. They are kept there, and not allowed to go out for some time. That might be a step too far; but leaving them the power of taking their discharge, with the consequent penalty of being kept in next time if they go out too soon, possibly that might do. I have very little faith in these, I have seen them so often coming before us.

1017. That is where there are so many classes to be dealt with. It is difficult to apply the same rule all round to different classes; but if you have an institution with only one class you might have a hard and fast rule. What are you to do with the able-bodied man who comes in with a large family?—That is why I think we cannot get rid of the present system; I am just thinking of a case before me, when a man comes in with a whole tribe of children after him.

1018. What class of man would that be?—A very common class; a lazy, indolent man, who does not want to do a day's work.

1019. From whom you would be willing to take the children?—There are cases in which they are hardly so bad as to make them orphans. That is the difficulty, separating them from their families.

1020. Of course, they are separated, now, to a certain extent; they are in a different part of the house, and don't see very much of each other?—They ought not to.

1021. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Do you not think that where a parent does not fulfil his responsibility to his children the State should interfere?—As much as possible.

1022. And provide that these children should make good citizens in future, instead of growing up in a vagrant life. Do you not think there should be some power given to local bodies, some control of that description, to separate parents and children in cases where the parent proved utterly worthless?—You mean visitors?

1023. CHAIRMAN.—Hardly, perhaps, as much visitors as unworthy?—I am quite for that; but a man ought to have a fair chance. It is a serious thing to deprive a man of his children. And again, many parents would be simply getting rid of the responsibility of their children. There is very great danger of people coming in and neglecting them for a time, in order to get rid of the responsibility.

1024. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—You say that frequently a parent comes into the house with children, remains there a considerable time, goes out, and perhaps comes in again. If that is done repeatedly do you think the State ought not to take some action to see that these children are provided for?—I agree with you in that; but you must follow it up by severe punishment to the parent—that the parent should be sent to jail.

1025. CHAIRMAN.—He should not go at large?—Certainly not. If you do that you will have a number of children left on your hands. The man must be, formally sentenced to some term of imprisonment, and then take the children.

1026. Have you carried out the boarding-out principle for children as far as possible in the union, with children eligible for boarding out?—I think so, as the master will be able to tell you. We started a very long time ago in Derry; we were nearly the first.

1027. Do you know, have any of the children come back into the workhouse?—No; there is a great improvement. We have really got a better class of nurses, who are anxious to adopt, and a great number of children have been adopted; and there is the greatest affection shown between the foster parents and the children—I think hardly ever any of them come back to us. But when they are brought up in the workhouse they are incessantly coming back.

1028. As regards the children who are in the house, I think you would, as far as possible, with a view to safeguard against encouraging vice—you would like to take them away and board them out?—Certainly; and we do as soon as we can. The children go to the National schools outside, to try and take them away from the associations.

1029. Dr. BARNES.—Did you ever consider whether your infirmary could be separated from the workhouse, and make it a district hospital?—I think that, originally, would have been the better plan.

1030. Even as it is with your infirmary as it exists and where it exists, have you thought of it at all, or is it possible to separate it from the rest of the workhouse and administer it separately, with a separate entrance,

44p 11, 1904.
Mayor—
W. E. South.

Aug. 11, 1902.

Major
W. R. Scott.

as a district hospital?—The position would not permit of that now; but it would be much better that the sick poor had not the name of coming into a workhouse. There is no stigma in coming to the fever hospital; and indeed, I must say that now a great number have no objection to coming into the infirmary. It is the name of it.

1031. You don't have many patients who pay on coming in, on account of the county infirmary being in the same district?—There are no paying patients in our hospital; it is too small.

Mr. SAMUEL MCCORDY examined.

Mr. Samuel
McCordy.

1033. CHAIRMAN.—You have been the Workhouse Master here for a long time?—I have.

1034. And you have had previous experience in another union?—Yes.

1035. So your knowledge of the management of a workhouse is extensive?—It is pretty large.

1036. I asked you to get for me the numbers that were in the workhouse on the first Saturday of January in the present year?—I made out a list as far as possible, of the separate divisions in connection with the union.

1037. What I want is rather the classes of inmates—sick, aged, and infirm, &c., on the 3rd of January in the present year?—I have not it in that form.

1038. I have it here; and I think you may take it I took it from your own returns. Your own return was that on the 2nd of January, the first Saturday of the present year, there were 89 inmates in the infirmary and 8 in the fever hospital; aged and infirm, 68 males and 36 females—total 104. Can you tell me why there should be so many more men than women?—Yes; in thinking over the cause I considered that there was more employment for old women, in the way of nursing and taking care of the house when the bread-winners are away at work. There are always inquiries for this class of servants. These women over sixty or seventy are able to do a little nursing, and do a little cooking when the breadwinners are at work.

1039. Respectable families?—Yes. There are shirt factories here, and the wife and daughters are generally at work; there is generally employment for the husband; they have no person to keep the house, and they come to us to try and get a suitable person that will be able to do a little cooking and look after children. Their wages are very little, and it is merely for their food. And there are more inquiries for that class of help, and no inquiries for the men at that age.

1040. So that the men are more numerous because there is employment for the women?—Yes; and another thing is, there are more women in the infirmary. When a woman comes to over sixty or seventy she is more infirm, and she is generally ailing, and she is removed to the infirmary.

1041. Because a proper case for the infirmary occurs that a man—a man at that age is generally able to knock about the yard. That is my explanation for that class, and the reason the women are so numerous in the sick ward.

1042. Then you have mothers with infants?—I think there was another query—could I find out any infirm deserving cases? With the matron, we went over that, and we considered that we had in the infirm class about twenty women and twenty-nine men, and as far as we knew, and had known, of their character, they were over the ordinary class of poor—a little better than the ordinary class. Some of them had been brought to the house by old age and infirmity. Of course, I speak of these people a good deal by their character in the house.

1043. Not from previous experience?—That connected with it, as far as we could learn. We studied each person in the whole house.

1044. And out of those ninety-four, did you find many that you would put down, if you were asked to do it on your own responsibility—that you would classify as aged and deserving?—That is what I say—twenty women and twenty-nine men; but I would not say that these people would require separate treatment.

1045. They are not sufficiently good?—Not sufficiently deserving.

1046. You still think they might be kept all together?—I do, certainly.

1047. Do all these people get along fairly comfortably together in the same ward?—They do; we may have had one or two men or women that always create

1038. Mr. MURPHY.—Do you not find that the strong objection that formerly used to exist against going into the workhouse is declining?—I mean to say that the people have not the strong objection to-day that they used to have?—I don't think they have quite so strong an objection as formerly; the treatment is a great deal better; they are very carefully looked after, I must say, in our workhouse, and there is a great deal more attention paid to them; in fact, some people say we are attracting in too many.

a rumour or trouble in the ward, and are never satisfied; but on the whole they all live peacefully and I should say, contentedly together.

1048. Not throwing responsibility or want of respectability in each other's faces?—No; I would say they are contented. That occurs a lot.

1049. Passing on to mothers with infants?—You wanted to know, then, how many were born in the house. That was 18, during the year 1902; 13th illegitimate, 11; legitimate, 4. I made out a list of the women that told us it was their first.

1050. How many of these eleven were the first child, as far as you know?—I would say about six.

1051. And the mothers of the other five, had they been confined in the workhouse on previous occasions?—Yes; one of them had been confined in the workhouse. One woman had two children.

1052. What was the largest family of illegitimate children that these people would have. Have you, in your own experience, knowledge of women having a considerable number?—Yes; there are women in the house who have had more illegitimate children. I don't think there is any woman with more than three.

1053. It is not unusual to have that class coming in having two?—It is usual.

1054. When a woman comes in with an illegitimate child, about how long does she remain in the workhouse?—You don't mean those ones born during that year?

1055. No, but generally?—I think there is a woman in at present; I am sure she is fully two years in the house.

1056. You had eleven births of that class in 1902; on the first Saturday in 1903 you had nine?—Mothers with children.

1057. I was wondering how many of those would be illegitimate and how many of them would be included in the eleven. What I want to come at is, how long would a girl remain in the workhouse when she comes in—she comes in a short time before her confinement?—That class of people have changed. There was a class long ago that used to come in and had their child, and they would stay a good while in the house—I am sure some of them over a year. Now there is so much work for that class outside—

1058. Farm work?—No, factory work; and the wages are good; and, in fact, no sooner have some of them had their child, and stayed, may be, a fortnight or three weeks in the maternity ward, than they take their discharge, and the reason is that they are able to put the child out to nurse, and pay from 2s. 6d. to 3s. a week out of their wages to keep these children outside.

1059. Then you have not many women in this union, as they have in other unions, where, when the mother comes in to have a child, they stay a long time?—We have not; and, in fact, it is only cases of indigent characters that would remain—what the matron and I call tedious ones.

1060. Never have we had?—Little; in fact, the matron says they are not able to score a foot.

1061. But those who can work can get five wages here?—They can. I find a great change in the house.

1062. Where would they get the child supported? Have you followed any of those children?—I have not, except asking the women.

1063. I mean would they be in proper custody—they would not be farmed out?—I have heard that sometimes the inspectors of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children have taken these fatherless children up for not treating the children well, although the woman had given these people good money to keep them—quite enough; in fact, more than what the Guardians give for boarding out. They give some of them 3s., 3s. 6d.; and 3s. would be 67 lbs. a year.

1054. If the Guardians were boarding out, what is the age they begin at—what is the earliest case of boarding out you know of a deserted child?—I brought children under the notice of the Guardians, I may say a few weeks old, because children have been brought in to me who have been found on the roadside, and the Board have directed, at once, the relieving officer to make inquiries to get a proper nurse; in fact, the Guardians endeavour to the best of their means to send them out, and keep none of the children of that class in the house at all. They even board them out to twelve years of age.

1055. But they do board out, even under a year?—They do, certainly.

1056. Dr. BARNES.—Do you know anything about the mortality amongst the boarded-out?—It is only by being in attendance at the Board room and listening to anything—I can say I have not heard of any death; the death rate is very low.

1057. Can you remember how many children have been boarded out young?—I can; a lot.

1058. You don't remember any deaths amongst them?—I do not. I have no books to prove it.

1059. CHAIRMAN.—You know the young children are still living?—Still living; I see them twice a year when they come up to be inspected, and I never heard of any of them saying there was a death.

1060. Passing on to the children under fifteen, there were forty-five in the workhouse: how many of those were illegitimate?—Twenty-one and twenty-four legitimate.

1061. Of those twenty-four were some the children of vicious and unsatisfactory parents?—There are some of them of parents who lead an unsatisfactory life.

1062. Did the twenty-four go in and out much?—We have two or three families that do go in and out.

1063. Are they large families?—One has a family of four or five, another has a family of two, and among those legitimate ones there is one with a family of at least four, but they don't go in and out.

1064. They are chronic?—Yes.

1065. Do the parents of these children when they pass out of the nursery and go into the children's school wards, do the parents see much of them?—They do at prayer time, morning and night.

1066. Have they much opportunity for speaking to them?—Not any other time.

1067. They are not allowed to speak at prayers, are they, just passing to and fro?—Yes, and in the supper room too; it is not always quiet.

1068. The next class—you have only fourteen lads?—Yes.

1069. Are there any troublesome people among those?—No, none, because when anyone gets troublesome we have them removed to the asylum.

1070. There is no difficulty made in this asylum?—Not lately. I get a form, the doctor fills it up, and I fill up the remainder, to the best of my knowledge, and get a magistrate to sign it, and send it to the asylum with a letter, asking that the person shall be received; then I get word, and it is generally that day or at the latest next day.

1071. Therefore all the fourteen lads are really quiet and harmless?—They are.

1072. How many inmates could the wards hold?—I am sure they could hold at least thirty.

1073. But would you have more than thirty inmates when I was here as an inspector you had a number boarded out with you by the Asylum Authorities?—We have only two, but that is to give them all plenty of room.

1074. Cossels and tramps, have you many tramps, as distinguished from casuals?—I would consider in that class people belonging to the city and neighbourhood; there are more than half of them during the year. Not tramps from other unions, considering the size of the place and the opportunity of getting labour, are aston-

ishingly few. A large place like this, with a population having so much work, naturally brings people from other districts. I know when I make inquiries as to the reason for bringing them here, that is the cause.

1075. They are people really looking for work?—Yes, but of course there are among them tramps that we recognise as generally on the run from the North of Ireland to the South; it is the "in-and-outs" are the difficult class.

1076. What would you do with them?—I would have the police to act as relieving officers, and give lines to these people living outside the union.

1077. These are the tramp class?—The tramp class, and make the tramp class prove that they have been in work; not leave the case on the police; and for the "in-and-outs" I would leave a great deal in the discretionary power of the relieving officer. My idea is they should not get a line until they came before the Board on Saturday.

1078. Would they be people who actually have a house or room of their own?—Yes.

1079. When they come into the workhouse, would they leave a home behind them to which they could go back?—Yes, I find, on inquiries from them, that a number of them have quarrelled with their wives or children, and leave on a Saturday night, and go back to the same place next day again.

1080. Mr. MURPHY.—Would it be your view that the tramps would have to go to the police officer to get admission to the workhouse?—That is an idea of my own from what I have read and seen in other places, and to make the tramps prove, leaving the case on the tramp, that they had been at work, and, if possible, they should have a character from their last employer.

1081. CHAIRMAN.—They would not be able to do that, because they had never been at work?—Then let the police take them as vagrants.

1082. Mr. MURPHY.—You think the fact that they would have to present themselves to the police would deter them from coming?—I believe so.

1083. CHAIRMAN.—The next class is what are called the able-bodied—any people that don't belong to any of the classes that we have gone through—they amount to twenty-one males and twenty-five females: would you tell us what kind of people these are—are they hard-working deserving poor?—They are not deserving poor as long as they are an able-bodied class, I consider, but there are a number of that class of men that are under sixty, they are able to do a little work, they are not able to do what you call a thorough day's work; in fact outside they would not be worth their meat; no farmer would keep them about him, and there are a number of women, even though they are young, up to thirty, their rearing or their life before it has made them useless and debilitated from the want of proper feeding.

1084. Then they are not able-bodied; they are only classed as able-bodied?—I would not call them able-bodied or expect them to do a day's work.

1085. If you were an employer of labour you would not take many of these people?—I would not; I would not have them about me at all.

1086. Would you take any of them?—Not many of that class. There is another question about the sick in the infirmary: on going through the infirmary, have I ever had any complaint of their distance from home that they cannot see their friends, my answer to this is, going through the infirmary and talking to the people as they come in, unquestionably I have never heard any objection to the distance they had to come, and another thing is, though they have two days for visiting friends—two hours each day—any friends of the sick people we never hinder; they can come in seven days of the week.

1087. You think there is no inconvenience or hardship to the sick?—I never heard of any.

Aug 11, 1908.
Mr Samuel
McCoady.

Mrs. MORRIS examined.

1088. CHAIRMAN.—I have some notes of the evidence which you were good enough to offer to give—first, as regards the unions in the County Derry, you are in favour of abolishing one union?—Yes, Lincavady. I heard from the Chairman there were only sixty inmates in the union, but a lady Guardian told me there were 250; but even 100 it is too much to have officials for that number. I think they could be divided between Derry and Coleraine.

1089. Then as regards what use you would put Lincavady Workhouse in?—I would leave that to the County Council. I am sure they could deal with that, and it would come in useful for something; at present I would be in favour of converting the workhouses. I think it is a misnomer to call these workhouses; many of the inmates have done no harm. I would convert them into district hospitals for the sick and infirm. At present the really deserving poor have a great ob-

Mrs Morris.

Aug. 11, 1903.
Mrs. Harris.

sion to go into the workhouse; they prefer to get relief outside, and in the part of the union which I represent they are entirely opposed to going into the workhouse.

1100. Which is your electoral division?—The West Ward. I asked outdoor relief for one in that ward last Saturday week, and the Board directed the relieving officer to go and see the person whose address I gave, and he reported she was destitute, but the majority would not give her even 3s. outdoor relief, and she refused to go into the workhouse. She is a very decent woman, one of eleven in family, an old Derry woman, very respectable, and as the workhouse is at present that class of people will not come in. She is not married; she is the last of the family, and she is destitute.

1101. Does she live on charity?—Yes; a woman who knew her gave her shelter, and she goes out to a few friends, who help her in town.

1102. Would you be in favour of boarding out the inmates in dissolved unions?—Yes, I would.

1103. You would board them out with people who would take them in the country or towns?—I believe what they call able-bodied; I know the people in the Derry Union intimately, and there are those in the infirmary who would be very anxious to go out and improve if they got their children taken from them. One of them asked me to get her two children into the Starvelin Home, and she cried and said she would be very glad to go to a place which would keep her. There is a penitentiary in Derry.

1104. I was not expressing any opinion, I was merely making a suggestion. You would be in favour of boarding out the inmates of dissolved unions, all classes, except of course the sick: would you board out the infirm?—There is one class, the tramp class. As to the infirm, if they would prefer being boarded out in preference to living in the workhouse, that is in the infirm wards of the workhouse, I know there are some who would prefer living out, being out in farmers' houses or some families who would take them and give them their food and shelter at so much.

1105. About what it would cost in the workhouse?—Yes, or cost even less.

1106. Then you make the statement that you think outdoor relief is not given with sufficient liberality at present?—It just depends; if the relieving officer is disposed to give outdoor relief to the Guardian who asks it, it may be given, but if the Guardian makes his office a little troublesome for him, sometimes he is not very favourable in listening to the request. The existing rule, you see, is to send the relieving officer to investigate the case, and until he returns the person or persons destitute, out-door relief is invariably refused. There is very little outdoor relief given in Derry.

1107. Yes, when you take what is given to board out children there is very little, a few pounds. You would be in favour of closing the Derry Workhouse fever hospital?—Yes.

1108. And sending the inmates as paying patients to the Foye Hill Hospital?—Yes.

1109. And then converting the workhouse fever hospital into wards for consumptives?—Sometimes we have very few patients in the fever hospital.

1110. You never have many?—One time when I was Guardian it was closed for three months, and it was closed lately, and sometimes we have no fever patients. We have children sent over with diphtheria; they have a reluctance often to come to our hospital; it is still the workhouse fever hospital; they prefer going, and indeed some of our doctors kindly send them, over to Foye Hill, and I would be in favour of converting the present fever hospital at the Waterside into a hospital for consumptives, for they are a most pitiable class. I think it has been recommended that the present children's wards should be converted into a hospital for consumptives, but really the short time they have to live they would not live two days in it; there is no means of ventilation and no possible means of getting in sun unless you knocked down the whole building; I mean the children's ward. It is not habitable, in my opinion, and in the opinion of every one I brought to see it. A very eminent doctor in town said it was an eyre, and I would like to get rid of all these eyres.

1111. Outdoor relief you would give to the sick poor and destitute, and send the inmates to the asylum, so as to reduce the workhouse to the most slender proportions?—I would have no person in the workhouse except the infirm and sick poor. As long as you have a

gate for the tramps and all classes of people coming in through the same gate, you would still have an objectionable place for the deserving poor.

1112. You would have pay wards?—Yes.

1113. That would be possible if you had a number of wards vacated, but at present it is not possible?—It would be possible if my recommendation had any weight. I would send the lunatics and imbeciles to Grange; they are not getting proper treatment in the workhouse; they have the doctor looking after them, and medicine and nurses; but really I have visited there several times and have found them lying on the floor without one to give them the least assistance very often, or drink, but after that I believe the doctor visited them next day, but it would take a Guardian to keep a regular watch over them.

1114. You would like these pay wards, and that a fee should be charged in accordance with the ability?—You should leave that to the discretion of the Guardians?—Yes; I know there are patients who would go in if it was raised from the standard of the workhouse.

1115. You are in favour of admitting casuals to the workhouse?—Certainly not. I would instruct the relieving officer not to give tickets to tramps or casuals, because they have plenty of money in their pocket to use badly. They get a bottle early in the evening, and later on they tramp over to the workhouse and are admitted, and they are drunk, and the next morning, or perhaps on a Sunday, they get out after three hours' notice. I am not quite certain do they get out on Sunday, but I have met them several times between Campsey and Derry—five or six of them—basking in the sun on a hot summer day going on to Coleraine. I am not sure are they discharged on Sunday, but they are on Monday evening certainly. I think they should not be allowed into the workhouse at all.

1116. You would like to put an end to pauper students in the infirmary?—Yes, it is most objectionable.

1117. Of course it is most irregular that they should do anything except very manual duties?—I would not have them there at all, because as long as they are there they will be used practically as nurses; they cook the food of the patients, dispense the food, and carry it to the wards.

1118. You consider re-classification of the inmates necessary: what kind of classification do you refer to?—I would classify even the patients in the infirmary. It is a common saying that sickness levels everything, but I have a decided objection to one who has led a very—

1119. I did not think it was sickness that levels ranks?—I don't mean hovelling ranks. I mean that when sickness comes people have very great sympathy for one another, even with those who do lead a very bad life. You must have people there from their childhood up to sixteen or seventeen, and you have girls who have led a bad life side by side with the respectable poor. I would have a ward for the respectable poor separate.

1120. You are opposed to the existing practice of bringing boarded-out children to the workhouse twice a year for inspection?—Yes, there is a committee of women Guardians appointed to look after them also.

1121. I think it is not the usual practice in bringing them to the workhouse?—It has been since I became a Guardian of this union.

1122. It is not a usual thing in other unions?—If you allow me to tell you, when I became a Guardian I asked the Guardians to inspect these children at the dispensary in William-street, to appoint a committee to inspect them, which they did, and we were very grateful, and afterwards, for some little petty motive, they brought them back to the workhouse for inspection, and they have been back there three times since that.

1123. That, of course, is a matter for the Guardians?—They are a very strong body, and everything is carried by the vast majority of the Board, but notwithstanding the fact, you heard from our chairman that a great many improvements have been made.

1124. Is there anything else that occurs to you?—There is very little given in outdoor relief. Well, I think the majority of the Guardians will in future decide on having the children kept away from the evil associations of the workhouse.

1125. You think you have persuaded them to that?—If I can get round them, I will.

After the adjournment for luncheon.

Aug. 11, 1902.

CHAIRMAN.—I don't know, gentlemen, whether you have heard anything from counsel.

Mr. McOg.—Our counsel are here.

CHAIRMAN.—Have you heard anything from any of the other counsel?

Mr. Elliott.—Mr. Henry is here and ready to go on in the morning.

Mr. Wilson.—And Mr. Drummond will be here and ready to go on in the morning, and Mr. Cooke.

CHAIRMAN.—I think we will hardly finish the general part of the inquiry to-night. I don't see any chance of doing that, and I suppose we will want a day for the boundaries.

Mr. McOg.—I am sure we will.

CHAIRMAN.—And some of the counsel have written asking for a postponement until Thursday.

Mr. Wilson.—That would be very inconvenient.

Mr. Elliott.—On the ground of expense it would be an inconvenience to those who are ready to go on.

Mr. Wilson.—I think, Mr. Micks, if you allowed the County Council of Donegal, for whom I appear, to go on to-morrow, whatever time you have done with this other inquiry, say after lunch, perhaps Mr. Drummond, who appears for us, could open the case and go on with his evidence; the other counsel could come in later.

CHAIRMAN.—Once you open the subject everybody would like to be here.

Mr. Wilson.—Most of the counsel will be here to-morrow.

CHAIRMAN.—We have been looking through the list of witnesses, and it would appear that on the general questions we have enough witnesses to last us over to-morrow.

Mr. Wilson.—I think with counsel's statement and the witnesses we have, we could keep you from lunch time.

CHAIRMAN.—I mean there are witnesses on the general question to last over to-morrow on the same lines as to-day. I expect it will really be more convenient in the end to say Thursday.

Mr. Wilson.—Do you intend to-morrow to go into the Donegal part of the Poor Law inquiry?

CHAIRMAN.—No, we will have an inquiry at Letterkenny for that.

Mr. Wilson.—Of course, I know Mr. Henry is here,

and Mr. Drummond is coming to-night, Mr. Osborne and Mr. Cooke are here. I would suggest, if you could see your way, to take up the boundaries question to-morrow and let Mr. Drummond open it. I think we could keep you going to-morrow; then Mr. Hinkley and Mr. Glancy would be here next morning.

CHAIRMAN.—I don't think the general evidence on this inquiry will have finished in time for that.

Mr. Wilson.—I don't know, of course.

CHAIRMAN.—I suppose you would want to know some definite time to begin. I think it would be much safer to say Thursday morning.

Mr. Wilson.—That leaves counsel here kicking their heels all day to-morrow. If you could possibly say you would let us begin after lunch to-morrow.

CHAIRMAN.—We may finish the general evidence; but it does not seem at all likely, from the long list of witnesses. It would not do to take one part, without going into the whole thing. Shall we say Thursday? Well then, gentlemen, Thursday morning, first thing. There is one doctor to be taken on Thursday, but he won't be long.

Mr. Elliott.—Would you indicate in what order you would take the case—would the County Donegal open first?

CHAIRMAN.—I have not thought over that.

Mr. Doyle.—I think that is what the advocates would prefer.

CHAIRMAN.—If you agree among yourselves.

Mr. McFadden.—The County Council have applied for this inquiry, and they are the parties to open it.

Mr. Doyle.—The County Council have initiated the whole thing. They were promised an inquiry by the Local Government Board, and this is the first opportunity.

Mr. Elliott.—I think it would lay on the County Council to show why the existing state of things should be altered.

CHAIRMAN.—Then you are prepared to do that on Thursday morning?

Mr. Wilson.—Certainly.

CHAIRMAN.—That is settled now.

Mr. McFadden.—But there is another matter you ought to settle, and that is, this contempt of the Sanitary.

Dr. WARNOCK examined.

Dr. Warnock.

1125. CHAIRMAN.—You wish to give some general evidence as to the improvement of workhouse hospitals and the provision of hospitals in remote parts of the county?—Exactly.

1127. Kindly explain your views on these matters?—I think by raising the standard of the workhouse hospitals that their efficiency would be very much improved; and what I would suggest with regard to it is that the building should be cut entirely off from the workhouse proper; where the workhouse is still retained, that they form a block by themselves.

1128. With separate entrances?—With a separate entrance; that the fever hospital and the workhouse hospital should form a block by themselves and the name be changed to that of district hospital; that wards should be provided in those hospitals for a class of patients who can pay—separate accommodation provided for them; and I think that this would work for economy, because in cases where a man could pay, say, £3 or 10s. a week, the surplus should go towards the alleviation of the rates and the support of the union patients in the hospital.

1129. Under what management would that hospital be?—I would suggest that it should be placed under the same management or board of control as at present controls the county infirmary.

1130. A joint committee?—A joint committee of the County Council and a certain elected member, with a certain number elected locally to control each district hospital, in addition to the number of County Commissioners for the union.

1131. And that they would exercise all the functions of a Board of Guardians?—All the functions that a Board of Guardians at present exercise; but I would suggest that all the hospitals in the county be under the immediate control of the infirmary committee; and for this reason, at present in the fever hospitals very frequently there are not patients for nine or ten months of the year; so in one particular hospital the staff of that hospital—that is the nursing staff—is, of course, idle. During that time an outbreak of fever may occur

in another part, and during the term of that outbreak the nurses could be transferred from hospitals where they are not required to assist in nursing where it is required. Take, for instance—I see by the papers, and have heard from other sources, that there is an outbreak of fever in Araraun, in Glenties Union. At present we have no fever in Donegal Union; an increased number of nurses will be required in some part of the Glenties Union. If the nurses were all under the control of the central board the nursing staff could be sent from Donegal, and perhaps Dunfermaw, Letterkenny, and other places, to assist to tide over that epidemic.

1132. The nurses would be servants of the County Council, not of the particular union?—Not of the particular union.

1133. They would go back to the central infirmary after nursing a case in Glenties, and be sent off wherever they were required?—Yes. To show the importance of that, some time ago in the Donegal fever hospital we had a case of fever and a case of diphtheria; there were only two patients in the place. I could not permit one nurse to attend to the two cases, and we had to get a special nurse.

1134. Dr. BOGUE.—Where did she come from?—From Belfast. An excellent nurse she was. We had a very good nurse there; but she could not be permitted to attend a case of diphtheria when she was attending a case of fever. If the idea I suggest were carried out all that would be necessary would be to wire or write to the secretary of the infirmary board and get a nurse from there, without the trouble of getting a nurse from Belfast and paying her.

1135. CHAIRMAN.—They would be salaried, instead of having a high weekly payment and their travelling expenses?—Yes. With regard to the question of providing better hospital accommodation in outlying parts, I think it is excessively important. To take the part of Donegal with which I am best acquainted. I would say an hospital is urgently required at Dungloe or Burton Port; an hospital is also required at Carrick.

Aug. 11, 1908.
Dr. Wernack.

These hospitals may be very small, and as far as the question of economy is concerned they need only be offered when necessary.

1136. By the staff nurses?—By the staff nurses.

1137. What medical attendance?—That raises a large question. For the present, I would suggest that they be attended by the medical officer of the district in which the hospital is situated, with the assistance, perhaps, of an adjoining medical officer if necessary. My idea is that the present Poor Law medical service should be converted into a State service. When you consider the small amount at present levied of the rates towards the salaries of the medical officers, the nursing staff, and medical appliances, I think the Government would act wisely in taking over the whole thing and appointing officers to it by competitive examination, and establish a system of prosecution. I don't think I have anything further to say.

1138. Dr. Brogan.—Would you suggest anything about the county infirmaries—how they could be improved?—Except by the establishment of pay wards in them.

1139. Would you suggest that for the county they might possibly get the major operations performed in the county infirmaries?—Yes; I think that in case of major operations they might with advantage be transferred to the county infirmaries, the doctor of the hospital from which they were transferred assisting at the operation; that is, where the nursing staff of the district hospital was not sufficient.

1140. CHAIRMAN.—Or the appliances?—Or the appliances. Of course, some of these operations require very costly appliances; to provide a hospital with the necessary appliances to perform the work required in modern surgery means an expenditure of at least £500 or £600. An operation theatre is a very expensive item, and the appliances connected with it. To have these in every small hospital in the county would mean a very large initial expense.

1141. It would be hardly possible for a local doctor to accompany a patient to the hospital for an operation?—That would be a matter of arrangement.

1142. He could not leave Denegal, for instance, and go off to Lifford?—That would be a matter of arrangement between the surgeon to the county infirmaries and the medical officer of the district hospital, with the approval and consent of the infirmaries board.

1143. It is not an essential part of the scheme?—No.

1144. Dr. Brogan.—With regard to the treatment of consumptives, what is your idea—what arrangement would you suggest in case of that kind?—I think that a number of counties should combine and provide accommodation for consumptives. It is impossible to provide sanatorium treatment in the workhouses as at present constituted; it would mean very great expense to provide the accommodation and a special nursing staff; it would be much more economical, in the end, to have a large sanatorium to which patients might be sent from two or three or four counties, as the case might be, according to the numbers, the cost, of course, to be contributed in proportion by the counties. The numbers at present are small; we hope they will become very much smaller; they are so small that it would be extremely expensive to provide a nursing staff in each district hospital, or even for one county. I think several counties should combine. It is an extremely important matter, not so much for the immediate treatment of the patients themselves as for the alarming influence it will have upon the patients and the patients' friends; a patient sent to one of those

sanatoria or consumptive homes, even for a period of two or three months, will be so educated that, first of all, he will learn the routine of the treatment and how to protect others from his disease, and how to lead a sanitary life himself; he will get rid of the dread of life in the open air; he will get rid of the dread of draughts, and learn the importance of attending to a particular line of diet. These are things that can only be taught practically by residence in a home; no amount of theoretical teaching will have the same effect as a residence in a home will have.

1145. Even a temporary residence?—Even a temporary residence will have a good effect; even a month's residence. There is no reason why a patient treated in one of these homes for a short period should not return to his own home without being a risk to others, and why he should not lead an open-air life and be benefited himself and cured, as far as these cases can be cured. That is one of the things that will impress on people the fact that consumption is as dangerous a disease as fever; that it can be communicated as fever can.

1146. By separating the infirmaries from the rest of the workhouse what advantages would be gained?—The first advantage would be that people of a class would come into the hospital for treatment who do not now come in. That is the chief advantage it would have.

1147. Would a larger number avail themselves of the hospital of the district, and pay for their treatment there?—Undoubtedly; as it is at present numbers have come in, and pay the average cost of the hospital, or whatever sum the Guardians may fix. But a greater number would come, I have not the smallest doubt, with great advantage to themselves and the community at large, if the hospitals were separated entirely from the workhouse.

1148. CHAIRMAN.—You would leave the scale of fees to the managing body, with the advice of the doctor?—Certainly.

1149. If a man or woman comes in—the head of a family comes in—the earning member of a family comes in—nothing could be paid, practically, by him?—Nothing would be asked, I am sure, by the Board.

1150. But if a child came in whose father was earning—one might earn 10s., another 15s., another might be a farmer with a considerable valuation?—I would leave that entirely to the discretion of the local body.

1151. Dr. Brogan.—Not to have any fixed charge, but a different charge?—Not to have a fixed charge, but to have charges apportioned to the means of the patient, according to the discretion of the governing body.

1152. It would tend to save life?—It would tend to increase the reality of these district hospitals, and save the life of people living in the district.

1153. CHAIRMAN.—And reduce the rates?—I have no doubt that it would reduce the rates.

1154. Have you really incense in your charge in the Denegal workhouse?—Not at present.

1155. They have all been taken to Letterkenny?—Yes. We have one or two simple cases; you would not call them incense; one might come under the head of incense.

1156. Would you consider it desirable to draft even these away from the workhouse?—I cannot say there are any at present in Denegal workhouses whom it would be necessary to draft away.

1157. Would you keep any mentally incense?—I would not keep any mentally incense cases in workhouses at all, or in workhouse hospitals.

Mr. JOHN A. LEON examined.

Mr. John A. Leon.

1158. CHAIRMAN.—You are a County Councillor and a member of the Infirmaries Committee and of the Lunatic Asylums Committee?—Yes.

1159. I think you were present to-day when some questions were asked?—I was, sir; if I can answer any of them I will be very pleased to do so. Dr. Hetherington is away from home.

1160. The question was considered by the County Council whether it would be judicious to have auxiliary lunatic asylums, and they apparently thought that a lunatic asylum might be started at Limerick. Is that correct?—I was not present at that meeting; but you have had that evidence from Mr. Adams.

1161. You don't know what statistics were considered. Can you tell anything of the cost of patients

in district asylums?—Without making any deduction for paying patients or other miscellaneous expenses, the cost is £25 13s. 1d. per head per year, the net cost is £24 4s. 2d.

1162. Were any figures gone into about what the probable cost would be if an auxiliary asylum was started?—I was not present at the meeting.

1163. You have not heard anything?—No, sir. The County Council are building a block at Granah, at a cost of £22,190, to accommodate 100 male patients. The number at present in Londonderry Lunatic Asylum is 500, and there are 60 of those at Granah; the committee are building a new block to accommodate 100 patients more at Granah, which would be 160 altogether.

1164. Are both sexes at Gransha or only one?—The males are at Gransha.

1165. Dr. BROWN.—Your present asylum is overcrowded?—Yes; 366 the asylum is built to accommodate at present; the actual number, I should say, in the asylum at present is 448.

1166. CHAIRMAN.—That is including Gransha?—Yes; but the daily average number resident in the asylum for 1903 was 699; of course that varies greatly from month to month, as after our Board meets, which is every month, there are a lot of discharges, and it would not be fair to take the numbers on any one particular day, but the average for the year is 500.

1167. In considering the accommodation you have to look to the greatest number?—Yes.

1168. The variation is not very great from 430 to 500?—No.

1169. Dr. BROWN.—Did I understand you to say that it cost £24 per year to keep each person in the asylum?—£24 3s. 6d. is the net cost, after making deductions for paying patients. They receive £365 a year from paying patients; it is £25 12s. 6d. without that.

1170. That is less than 10s. a week?—Yes.

1171. Is that £25 do you include establishment charges, that is, interest on loans, if there are any?—No; the annual average charge, without any deduction for expenditure, is £29 8s. 5d.

1172. What does that include—that includes everything?—Yes; superannuation, repayment of loans, ground rent.

1173. Is there a certain rent for Gransha in that?—We require, now, to charge a rent for it.

1174. And that is included in the £29?—Yes.

1175. Although you are not using it to any extent?—Oh, yes, we made a considerable profit this year.

1176. Not a profit equal to the rent?—Oh, yes, considerably more than it.

1177. Is that counting the labour you get from the asylum?—No, it is not putting any estimate on the labour.

1178. But you are feeding these people, and still charging nothing opposite it?—No.

1179. In the workhouse have you any idea how much it costs for a lunatic to be kept there?—Yes; I should think they don't cost more in the workhouse than the other place; 3s. 6d. in the infirmary and 2s. 3d. in the home.

1180. Do you think 3s. 6d. pays for the upkeep of a patient in any workhouse?—I do.

1181. Do you know how that 3s. 6d. is made up?—That is the actual cost of the food.

1182. Only food, not clothing?—No.

1183. No establishment charges, nothing for the doctors, nurses, master, or clerk?—I should say it would cost 6s.

1184. Do you really think 6s. would cover it?—The only thing I have to guide me in making that statement is occasionally, when a person comes in for treatment in the fever hospital, and wants to pay, I have heard the master asked what, in his opinion, would cover the cost of the treatment that the patient receives, and he usually says about 6s.

1185. That is not allowing one penny for the salary of the nurse or doctor. In the £29, which is the cost of an inmate in the asylum, you include everything, whereas in the workhouse you are comparing the 3s. 6d., which is merely a matter of food?—I was not comparing these.

1186. If you added on all those things you think 6s. would cover it?—I have stated to you the only reason I have for mentioning 6s. is, that the master said, in his opinion, 6s. would be the reasonable thing.

1187. I don't think many Guardians have ever looked at this in that way; they generally take the 3s. 6d. or 2s. 3d. as the cost of the patient, and they never reason beyond that. If you take the capitation grant, 4s., and add it on to the expense of a lunatic in the workhouse, there is no saving in keeping a lunatic in the workhouse?—Is it drawn by the asylum authorities for patients in the workhouse?

1188. Oh, no, it is drawn for patients in the asylum?—I could get you those figures, if you wish.

1189. You are a member of the infirmary committee also?—Dr. Cooke is here, and he can give evidence on that; he is the doctor.

1190. CHAIRMAN.—The Limavady Board of Guardians have considered the queries that have been issued, and they have decided against amalgamation for their own union?—They have; they think it would not be

an advantage to the ratepayers or the sick poor, and it would leave them practically no representative; they would be virtually without representation if they had to go to Coleraine or Derry. Those are the main grounds on which we object to amalgamation.

1191. Has Limavady always had a workhouse?—Well, since 1843. I have some statistics here. It was built to accommodate 660 persons, and the fever hospital 32; there has been expended on repairs and improvements since 1867, £215, varying from £203 to £200 each year. The salaries to the officers for the year 1903 amount to £548.

1192. Does that include the value of their food?—A goodly number of them are not fed; it includes the three chaplains, and the clerk and assistant clerk.

1193. Does it include salaries for the resident officers, master, nurses, and matron?—Yes, the cost of the inmates in the workhouse was £1,537 for 1903.

1194. Dr. BROWN.—How many is the average number?—317 for 1903.

1195. Do you mean to say a daily average?—317; the total expenditure for the year was £1,540.

1196. CHAIRMAN.—Does that include dispensary doctors?—No, none of the medical. As compared with Coleraine, Derry, and Magherafelt, the number of persons in Limavady relieved was 1,432, and out of two. The total amount expended in relief was £2,322. As compared with the other unions our poor rate expenditure was 7d. for poor relief alone, and 10d. the total expenditure, compared with 9d. and 1s. 0d. in Magherafelt, 6d. and 10d. in Derry, and 9d. and 1s. 0d. in Coleraine. In Coleraine the average yearly cost of each person was £22 8s., compared with £17 3s. 8d. in Limavady, £22 8s. 4d. in Magherafelt, and £20 0s. 7d. in Derry, showing a very considerable saving in the case of Limavady.

1197. What was your average rate in Limavady?—I don't know from memory.

1198. Are there any other figures you wish to mention?—No, nothing that I wish to mention. I should say that the cost of nursing increased by £140 in six years, including salaries.

1199. Dr. BROWN.—How much was the increase yearly?

CHAIRMAN.—How much did you pay six years ago?—In the infirmary it was £20 six years ago, now it is £35; in the fever hospital it was £15, now it is £30; workhouses £31 now, none in 1897.

1200. Dr. BROWN.—How many workhouse did you keep in 1897?—None apparently; none paid.

1201. You had inmates?—Yes.

1202. Probably three or four?—I cannot tell you; we probably have to keep three yet.

1203. CHAIRMAN.—You are not mentioning that except to show what an improvement has been made?—That is all, and to account for the increased expenditure. There was a very strong feeling among a number of Guardians that they considered the amount of that expenditure was not called for at all, but the Local Government Board insisted on it. With regard to the tramps, I have been inquiring from the master, and it is not considered a very important question in Limavady; they are so few and they are required to do 24 hours' work before breakfast in the morning, and the breakfast only costs one-third of a penny.

1204. What are the commitments of that meal?—I don't know, but the master has told me that you might reasonably conclude the 24 hours' work was worth their breakfast. The Limavady Board of Guardians, however, have decided that it would be better to erect tramp shelters, and not to allow them into the workhouse at all.

1205. Under the control of the Guardians or under the police?—Under police control, using the old beds for that purpose.

1206. Is there a disused hibernian in Limavady?—Yes.

1207. As regards getting contributions from patients, the Guardians are in favour of getting such contributions?—They are.

1208. How do they think payments ought to be charged?—That should be left to the discretion of the Guardians, according to the individual means of each patient.

1209. Would you have any insane people kept in the workhouse?—No, I think the insane should be maintained by Government funds.

1210. And altogether in an asylum?—Yes, if asylums were sufficient to contain them; at present the inmates of the Limavady workhouse are very useful, doing

Aug 11, 1905

Mr. John A. Long

all the work of the farm, which yields a considerable profit each year. There are twenty-nine inmates, and they are very useful.

1211. You used to have a number of patients boarded out in the Limerick Workhouse from the asylum; does that go on still?—There are only three of the original patients left; there were eight originally sent down.

1212. But you have some boarded out there still?—Yes, three.

1213. They are not sent any more to you from time to time?—Oh, no.

1214. Did you try to get your lunatics taken by the asylum?—No, we did not make any effort.

Mr. James Gannon, A.S., examined.

Mr. John Gagg.

1220. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the Derry Board of Guardians?—Yes.

1221. You were kind enough to furnish me with a short abstract of the evidence you intend to give. As regards union rating, what opinion have you formed?—I have formed a very strong opinion that union rating should be done away with, and each electoral division should be called upon to pay for its own poor.

1222. That is going back absolutely to the old principle?—Exactly. I consider that if this arrangement was made, the representatives would take much more interest in union affairs, and there would be a chance of giving outdoor relief without the risk of having it abused, as, in the case of union rating, everybody is prepared to recommend outdoor relief coming off such a broad back.

1223. You are not speaking of the Derry Board of Guardians in that statement?—I say everyone is more willing to give it when the relief comes off a large valuation.

1224. Not in Derry?—I should say it applies to every place.

1225. 260 a year is not very liberal?—We don't go in for it in the Derry Union; we are very much against it.

1226. You would like to adopt divisional rating to reduce the 260?—No, to add to it if possible. The only chance of giving outdoor relief in a manner that I would call fair to the ratepayers would be by divisional rating. Then the Guardians would have the responsibility if their recommendations were followed; you would fire the responsibility down to a small spot that you could lay your finger on.

1227. Mr. MURPHY.—You think the present practice of the Derry Guardians sometimes acts harshly in deserving cases?—It must be admitted that it would have that effect in deserving cases, but there is hardly a Guardian of the sixty who has not in his mind twenty as deserving cases in his own neighbourhood; yet he would not recommend them, the amount would be so much it would swamp the union, and do away with private philanthropy.

1228. Yet there must be several cases in such a union where the people are really in want of sustenance and cannot get it: is that a fact?—I don't know that it is. I think that would hardly apply to our union. I would be sorry to say that anybody in our union would starve if we did not give outdoor relief.

1229. But the practice is not to give it unless the doctor gives a certificate that they are not able to be removed?—That is the general practice; we are against making outdoor relief general.

1230. CHAIRMAN.—You would suggest that an alteration should be made in the question of rating, so that this outdoor relief might be extended in deserving cases?—I would say that there would be a chance of extending it in deserving cases without inflicting charges on people where they were not interested. For instance, a very small rated division, say one-fifth of the valuation of a large rated division; they send two representatives, and they have two votes, or say ten votes, against two to tax a large division with a lot of cases which they may call deserving, but still when they are run down to a fine thing they may not really be destitute. It is very hard to say where the fair play comes in.

1231. That is the distinction between poverty and destitution?—There is many a man deserving that is not destitute, and still if you give every deserving one, where would you stop?

1232. It is only to be given to the destitute under the law?—That is all. A person that has some little

1233. You don't object to it, because at present they are doing so much useful work?—Yes.

1234. What is the number of children in Limerick?—I think it is six, who are fit for being boarded out; six who are orphans and deserted.

1235. What about the numbers of other children?—I don't know exactly the number, but they are very few—about five.

1236. Dr. BROOKS.—How many children altogether have you?—About five, I think, speaking from memory, but they are very few.

1237. Five, and six who might be boarded out?—Six are boarded out.

thing could not be called destitute under the law, and still we are often called upon when a person has a trifle to supplement that trifle. But I do consider if we went back to divisional rating, and the representative of the division had a say in the matter, and was responsible to the division, they would be very careful about a recommendation.

1238. Of course the recommendation of a Guardian or of two Guardians is not binding on the Board of Guardians?—Decidedly not; but if the Board of Guardians see two Guardians of that division making out a very good case, and know divisional rating would have to pay, I don't suppose the Guardians for the moment would stop them giving relief.

1239. But they might fear it would spread?—I don't think so, as it would not come out of their pockets.

1240. Mr. MURPHY.—You think the practice would be to leave to every division the management of its own relief?—I would say, in a case of this sort, some statement should be made from a representative of the division, and my experience of public boards is that the representation from a division has always full weight. I hardly ever saw it otherwise.

1241. CHAIRMAN.—Sometimes they are allowed even to decide the question?—Sometimes they are.

1242. But you say at the present time there are several people who are willing to vote outdoor relief, knowing it comes on a very broad back?—Knowing they would not do it if it came of their own division. I must say that the District Council I represent are entirely in favour of divisional rating.

1243. Mr. MURPHY.—As regards sanitary matters?—I only refer to the Poor Law at present; of course I need hardly tell you the District Councils are all Guardians. No. 2 in my evidence I think is very important. That power should be given to the Guardians of each union to send a pauper to the union in which he was born, except he is qualified for relief by, say, five years' residence. Only those who cannot be traced to any particular division should be a union charge.

1244. CHAIRMAN.—That is virtually bringing in the English and Scotch law?—Exactly; it is very hard they can ship paupers over here and we have to hold on to those we have got—cannot transfer them.

1245. Do you get any English or Scotch?—Occasionally we do.

1246. You are not referring so much to the Scotch or English as people who might come from 100 miles down the country?—Decidedly. I would even send them to Strabane or Armagh. I don't see why, if an old man came down here and got destitute, or went on a spree here, that we should have to keep them. I mean to stop it all over.

1247. It may be as broad as it is long; you may be getting back some gentlemen that you had hitherto got rid of?—That is exactly the idea. I want to go on the lines of common honesty. I go on the lines that the Guardians should have a very wide discretion in everything so long as it affected their own individual poor.

1248. If one of your people was in Tipperary they would have a discretion to send him back here?—They would, but if they wished to allow him to remain, I would say by all means let him remain; that would give them control of their own internal affairs.

1249. Dr. BROOKS.—But they might not be able to go themselves, they might have to have someone to go with them, which would be more expensive?—That is so, but those matters should be left to the Guardians to do as they wished.

Aug. 11, 1902.

Mr. John
Gregg.

1263. It would not be the Guardians who would be receiving them?—The Guardians who were shipping them off should provide for the transit. If they wished to send them away I say they should have power to do so.

1264. CHAIRMAN.—There has been a great deal said about this question of settlements for many years. You would like to have a law of settlement similar to that in England and Scotland?—Yes. No. 3 is another important matter—that the relieving officer's power of giving lines for admission to workhouses should be done away with, and that all admissions should be at the gate by the master. I think it is only a farce giving lines by the relieving officer; there is nothing in it, and, putting it in another way, it is almost an abuse. A person goes to the relieving officer and demands a line; then they go and do whatever they like until it suits them; then at any hour of the night they go to the workhouse and demand admission. I saw a case recently where a ticket was issued by the relieving officer at 6 o'clock in the evening to an able-bodied woman living in Fahan Street, and she arrived herself about 11.30 at night, then she rapped up the house, showed her ticket, and demanded admission. I think admission should be at the gate.

1267. What duties would you assign to the relieving officer?—I would take that duty off him. I don't say what I would assign to him. Giving lines for admission to the workhouse I would take off him altogether.

1268. In the case of a relieving officer who lived in the relief district in which the workhouse was situated; but would you take it away from a relieving officer living, say, at Clandy: would you not allow the relieving officer at Clandy to give a ticket for admission?—We have no relieving officer at Clandy; we have one for the entire union living in Derry; that a man coming in from Clandy should go to William-street to get a ticket for admission to the Workhouse is, I think, a laborious process. No. 4: Every person admitted should be compelled to put on the clothes provided, in order to have their own property searched. If any money or valuables are found, expenses of maintenance should be deducted. I have known a case within the last two years where one man in harvest time worked for a neighbouring farmer for close on a week, and came in each night and got relief in the workhouse, and on Saturday night when he was paid his wages, he came into the workhouse with it and was not properly searched. Casual admissions must be done away with altogether. Class 5 I consider a very important one. There is in every town of any size, and in country districts in a less degree, a class of loafers, some with a sort of trade, such as tin and locksmiths, strolling musicians, women of loose character, and men of easy drunken habits, in many cases accompanied by children. At present in a workhouse like Derry there are running in and out, in some cases as often as three or four times a week. The number of admissions varies from fifteen to twenty to, in exceptional times, say fifty per week. The Guardians have no power to refuse and no power to detain such people. Power should be given to Guardians to bring all such cases before the magistrates on, say, the third admission, the case to be proved by the workhouse master or porter. That is one of the greatest abuses we have of the relief in the Derry Union. You would hardly call this class tramps, but they make the workhouse a lodging; they very often come on Saturday night and spend Sunday with us, and leave on Monday morning.

1269. Mr. Scott gave evidence that the English law should be applied.—That is what I am coming on to. Vagrancy should be dealt with entirely through the Royal Irish Constabulary. The difficulties and expenses attached to proceedings in the way of summons, evidence, and arrest at present make Guardians allow many to go free who should be taken to jail. It is admitted that the Royal Irish Constabulary have perfect machinery for this purpose, but Boards of Guardians have none. I think the Royal Irish Constabulary could do a lot in the way of assisting us, and keep a lot of these vagrants from coming to the house. The Board of Guardians, on the 17th of March last, passed a resolution:—"Resolved, that the Clerk be instructed to write to Mr. Leathem, County Inspector, Royal Irish Constabulary, asking him to appoint one constable to call at the workhouse each morning to inspect the tramps, instead of a different man each day, as at present. Also asking him to allow his men to arrest and prosecute any vagrants found in the workhouse,

such as tramps coming into the workhouse more than once in the year, or deserting children, if any such case comes under their observation or is pointed out to them by any workhouse official who offers evidence sufficient to convict." Our object was to get the Constabulary to take up the prosecutions and save us the cost of going to a solicitor, which made the maintenance of the vagrant a small thing in proportion to the cost of prosecuting him. The Royal Irish Constabulary were in the habit of sending a different man every morning to inspect; we thought that if they sent one man constant he would get to know them. The County Inspector replied, stating he would have one man appointed to call at the workhouse, the other matter had been submitted for instructions. On the 7th of April, 1903, read letter of 2nd inst. from the County Inspector, Royal Irish Constabulary, in reference to the police arresting and prosecuting tramps coming into the workhouse more than once in the year, and stating that going to work in taking over the duties of the Guardians. The District Inspector, however, would be prepared to take up any cases in which he should present. I think the Royal Irish Constabulary could do very much more than they are doing without any trouble to themselves, because they are not a very over-weighted body of men, and they could do a good deal in stamping out vagrants. It is not what these men cost us in the workhouse, but the demoralising effect; they tramp the country for the greater part of their life and generally end in some workhouse.

1290. You would try and abolish these tramps by making the workhouse very unpleasant for them?—Exactly. I think there is no reason why in Ireland, where we have such a declining population and such a number of people wanting labourers in the country, there is no earthly reason why we should have a place for able-bodied inside, and if we commenced to set them to work inside they would see that they had better work outside. The present rule for discharge on giving three hours' notice should be abolished, and the time of discharge, with a maximum and minimum, stated or fixed, be left in the Guardians' hands—maximum, say, one week, or until a Board meeting decides; if such meeting be held within one week, a maximum might be fixed by arrangements of, say, two days to meet exceptional cases; no discharge to be given in any case in less than forty-eight hours. By this change work could be got out of such inmates which is impossible under present regulations as to discharge. A workmaster, who could instruct and organise in, say, at least two suitable trades, should be appointed to each workhouse of, say, about the size of Derry. This officer would be responsible for all labour and nothing else, and would in many cases where the children go out to school, save a schoolmaster being employed, and also take a lot of work off the master's hands. This man should be paid half by the Guardians and half by the Local Government Board, same as the nurse of the workhouse, for by paying half the Local Government Board could and would insist on a properly qualified man only being appointed. In our present workhouse we have a land steward, who acts as a wardman and looks after the advice in the house, and we have also a schoolmaster and a schoolmistress. If a workmaster was appointed, I hold he could do the work of both the land steward and of the schoolmaster; when we are sending the children out to school the schoolmistress could still be retained, who would both look after the children in her leisure hours and also give assistance to the master. It is my opinion that no limitation should be in the workhouse at all, neither do I consider that the county should be saddled with the expense of having another institution at Limerick, because we are getting on slowly with the building at Grangeha, where there is plenty of accommodation; and when it is completed I think it will be a perfect institution. I don't at all agree in multiplying the staff on different places here and there. If you allow Limerick to become a county auxiliary station the Local Government Board would insist on spending a few more thousands adding some more officials; you will have to superannuate the officials who are there at present, and then what will become of the sick at Limerick? I don't think that would be economy. The present system of workhouse hospitals, no matter what confinement is against it, would be hard to beat, taking Derry as an example, in treatment, comfort, and attendance. Cottage hospitals in rural districts would not work out economically owing to small and greatly scattered populations. Something might, however, be done by relief in kind to improve

Aug. 11, 1903,
Mr. John
Dugg.

the treatment of sick poor at home. Infectious disease should in every possible case be treated in a hospital, not only to benefit the patient, but to prevent its spreading. Something should be done to extend district nursing in rural districts.

1251. You say cottage hospitals would not work out economically. Have you only the Derry Union in mind?—That is all.

1252. You were not thinking of a case such as was mentioned here just now, where a union is forty miles long?—No; I am principally speaking from my own observation as a member of the Derry Board of Guardians.

1253. You don't think that any additional hospital accommodation is required in the union?—No, I do not. What I do think we should extend—I think you are aware that we tried to extend a system of district nursing to the rural districts. Of course, the unfortunate thing about it is that the most of the midwives are not exactly capable of taking up the work as a whole; but I believe it was one of the recommendations by a higher authority that it would work by having new appointments made with such qualifications that they could take up the duty. I also consider there should be relief in kind to the sick poor; the sick poor need more things than medicine when sickness comes amongst them; they can get medicine free, but find a difficulty in getting nourishing food and clothing free; but I do believe in having a depot at the dispensary under a committee that would look after the district nursing, and the same committee could look after the dispensary—a sort of dispensary and nursing committee who would have entire control. It is rather too much responsibility to leave in the doctor's hands; one doctor might be very sympathetic and do a lot, but they are human: where we might get one that would be perfect we might get another that would not trouble himself. I think a committee could manage the whole concern: control the district nursing, and keep a depot for little things, sheets or blankets. I know, in our dispensary some ladies provide sheets and blankets for our own dispensary nurses.

1254. You know the Guardians have such power at present?—Yes; but it is not recognised. I believe, if it was officially fostered by the Local Government Board, and they insisted on each midwife appointed having the qualifications of a nurse.

1255. That is not what I meant; I mean they have the power of giving relief in kind?—Yes; but it never would have the same effect as a control committee, or a committee who would manage the dispensary and look after the depot. We have been doing a lot since I became a member of the Board to improve the lot of the people inside, but, unfortunately, we can never get anything done to improve the lot of the people outside. It might be the means of keeping some of the people out of the house.

1256. I fancy the Guardians have power to do all that you recommend in those two paragraphs.—But we have not got the head; we want a committee with a nurse under them to manage the giving of this relief. Those things are never brought to me; we hardly ever know of a case of this sort. And another thing, the dispensaries have never been thoroughly looked after since they did away with the old dispensary committees.

1257. You could hardly expect relief in kind to be given when you have only one relieving officer for the whole union?—If there was a committee and nurse recognised as a district nurse, as well as a midwife and a doctor—a responsible individual—I have no hesitation in saying it could be given out by the committee without going to the relieving officer at all.

1258. Well, a committee to supervise these matters is the central idea of your recommendations?—Yes; a committee for each dispensary, to look after both the dispensaries and the doctor's lines and the medicines, and see that everything was going on right; although the dispensaries may not be neglected—I have every confidence the doctors are looking after them—but all the same, when the Guardians don't examine the books—

1259. If they had a qualified district nurse, and the necessary things were supplied to them, it would be an enormous advantage; that is your view?—Yes; to extend the system of district nursing there is in the towns to the rural districts is my idea.

1260. It is in a considerable number of rural districts?—Unfortunately it is not much in use.

1261. The next question was the workhouse classification?—I don't approve at all of having a different workhouse for a different class.

1262. You don't approve of having one class only in one building?—I do not. I heard it suggested to-day that there should be a sort of reformatory for able-bodied established for a large centre. If a man appears in a district, how would he be shipped to such a central institution—a really genuine case of an able-bodied man that wanted a couple of nights' lodging, how would he be sent to this central institution? Then you would have to centralise the infirm and the sick. A consequence look and forward, and the maintaining of these places on different lines, would never work out economically. I think if you establish more stringent laws with regard to the able-bodied, and give us power to detain them, and not make it so free and easy, in a short time you would stamp these able-bodied out; there are not so many of them coming in now.

1263. I don't know whether they are falling in proportion to the population?—You see the workhouses are so large that they could hold a great many more; in old times they used to pack them like herrings in barrels. If we tried, now, to do the things that were done twenty years ago we would receive a very severe reprimand from headquarters. There were times when we had fifty or sixty patients with one nurse, and that not a qualified one. I say the accommodation in Derry Workhouse is fairly well filled; if you had very much more you would make it rather uncomfortable. Classification should be improved, and a large discretion given to Guardians, who should be the best judges of the circumstances, which vary very much in different unions. I would do away with casuals or night lodgers by a change in the time of discharge; all would then go right into the house on admission. I would have Class 1, able-bodied, male and female, as at present; Class 2, aged and infirm, male and female, as at present. Class 3 I would have a superior aged and infirm class, with better accommodation and separation; but ratifies the same as now. This class is consist of decent people who are driven in by misfortune, and who come with a good character; the Board to select this superior class at admission, as for good conduct in the house. I think the number that would need to go into a class like this would not be more than 25 per cent. at the most, of the entire inmates. So far as the general routine of the house are concerned, I consider them good enough; the only trouble is separation. The ration are better than most people of the class are in the habit of having, and it would be an injustice to decent labourers outside if we attempted to give any class superior accommodation in the house to what any decent labourer can provide for his own family outside. If possible, I would set a good apart for decent old married couples, where they could live together, under special conditions. I think this could be met by sending the inmate to the asylum, and turning our present inmate wards, which are in good order, into wards of this class of superior accommodation. Of course, in giving this evidence my idea is altogether on the lines of economy. It is easy to get up and say establish hospitals here and there, but it all means cost; the people cannot afford to be taxed very much further than they are. The circumstances of each union vary so much that central regulations enforced on all would be an injustice; every labourer should be allowed under a vote of the Local Government Board. I do consider, where Boards of Guardians are instituted—as most of them are—to deal fairly and honestly with the people under their charge, they should be given very great latitude; and I must say, from my own experience of the Derry Guardians, if they sometimes do go out of the beaten track the Local Government Board has treated us very fairly in the matter.

1264. There is a special provision in the rules that any special division or classification you recommend the Local Government Board would very likely favourably consider your recommendations?—But I would like this to take the place of the idea that you would set up a separate institution. I don't think that would work out conveniently or economically; the getting to those separate institutions would be the whole trouble. We want to get one central place, where we can meet the needs of all within an easy distance. I think that is the great thing the Commissioners at starting the Poor Law did; they seem to have taken the map and a pair of compasses, and marked out a centre for each union that they considered a reasonable distance.

Aug. 12, 1903,
Mr. John
Gregg

1285. They were guided by taking a ten miles radius, as far as possible—I think they have done that pretty nearly. That is all I have to say.

1286. About the boarding out of children—I am entirely in favour of that; but I am not at all in favour of going so far as to very extensively take away the responsibility of parents for supporting their children.

1287. Suppose the parents are dissolute, unless people?—You would have to extend—

1288. Would you not, for the sake of the children, do something?—I could understand your sending the parents to jail and taking the children for the term; if you gave a man two years I could quite understand your taking the children for that time.

1289. What do you say about illegitimate children?—Where they become homeless we always board that child right away, no matter what age, or what the child is.

1290. You have a number of children in the workhouse in Derry, and their mothers are there, too; would you propose to keep them in the workhouse still?—If they are illegitimate it would be a very serious question; it has been often discussed at our Board. With an illegitimate child the responsibility rests on one party; it is very hard to father it on one, and it is very easy to settle it on the other.

1291. Where you have no knowledge of the father, and can only look to the mother, would you propose to take away that child from the mother?—If she intended to live with the child in the workhouse continually, I would say, "Certainly, yes." But if it was her intention to take the child out and provide for it herself I would say, "Certainly not." I think it would be hard to do so. And then taking children from parents that are dissolute, and you board them out, it would be impossible to keep these children from the parents interfering with them afterwards; they would annoy the people that had the children.

1292. I believe that many such do follow their children?—It is only natural. The only thing you could do with the children, if you take them from their parents, is to send them to an industrial school; but you could not attempt to board them out unless the parents were in jail.

1293. As regards payment by people in aid of their support in hospital, have you considered that question?—As applied to the city of Derry it is hardly necessary to consider it. We have the county infirmary and the Foye Hill hospital, and the question of offering payment to us, I think, has only cropped up about once.

1294. I mean patients who come into your hospital in the workhouse. Some of them could pay a little—I don't know that they could. I am rather inclined to think that any patients that come to us could not.

1295. Take the case of a man's child that comes in. A child consumes a certain amount of food in the week. Suppose it comes in with an illness of a month; the parents are saved some small sum by the Guardians keeping the child. Should they not, at all events, pay that?—That is a very great question whether they should or not. The people who send children are generally very poor people, and I would be inclined to give them every consideration.

1296. Even a little payment, if a child comes in with a broken leg?—To put payments to the full amount—

1297. Not to the full amount. They could not pay that, very likely; but supposing you took as a measure what the child really costs the father and mother?—On the labouring class I would not be inclined to put anything. I think, when they get a misfortune of that sort, by visiting the child now and again, and the worry and necessary expense put on them, for all we would get out of it I am sure would not be the wish of the Board.

1298. It would not be any expense to the parents?—Well, supposing they lived at Gladdy, and sent a child to the workhouse in Derry, the cost of coming to see it occasionally—

1299. But supposing they were people from the city; would you charge them nothing?—Not a person who was only caring a small amount in the city.

1300. It would take away the Poor Law appearance from the hospital?—Anyone that would mind the Poor Law appearance of the hospital, and was worth a little money, never would send a child near it. It is a case hardly necessary to consider.

1301. Then you don't think it would be possible to economise by payments?—I don't believe it would be

worth considering, so far as our hospital is concerned. If we get in any person who is able to pay, and know they are able to pay, we do ask them; but to make it compulsory, and try to recover the money, I don't think it would be worth it.

1302. Dr. Broome.—Do you know anything about the Foye Hill hospital?—Nothing, further than that it is there.

1303. You don't know how it is managed or supported?—No; all I know is the general opinion is that we have a much superior one at the Waterside.

1304. Do you think it a good thing that a town of the size of Derry should have two fever hospitals, both supported off the rates?—I dare say it is a sanitary protection for the city.

1305. But is not the city the larger proportion of the rateable value of the union?—It is rather more than half.

1306. And off the same ratepayers you are supporting the two institutions?—Well, we are; but country people are not treated in the Foye Hill Hospital.

1307. The city people are paying for the two hospitals?—I think they are entitled to pay a larger share, considering that 80 per cent. of the inmates of the fever hospital in the workhouse come from the city.

1308. The two cannot be as well managed. Would not one institution be better than the two?—It was the city authorities established Foye Hill hospital; for what purpose I don't know.

1309. Are any members of the County Borough Council here to give evidence?—I don't know; but if they did away with Foye Hill hospital and established a pay ward at the Waterside, it might be different.

1310. Or vice versa, one of the large hospitals might be made into a consumptive hospital, either one or the other; if the other took all the cases?—My idea is, if you are going to treat consumption right, a properly constituted central institution would be the only way to do it, and one of these hospitals might not be in a suitable place. I always do think that it is the Local Government Board should take the initiative and establish such a place, and charge us with the cost of maintenance.

1311. You would be quite willing to pay for the maintenance of the patients?—Yes; but the Local Government Board should erect it on a broad country at large location, because if you want to stamp out consumption it is for the benefit of the whole community.

1312. CHAIRMAN.—You don't mean that the Local Government Board should establish a hospital?—No; but help us to bear the cost, same as they help in dispensaries.

1313. What do you think should be done—that the Government should contribute a certain proportion?—To put up the establishment, and let, say, Ulster, or a large part of the country pay for the management.

1314. Who would manage it?—I suppose it would be managed by an infirmary committee.

1315. Appointed by the Derry County Council?—Yes; if you are going to stamp it out of the country it touches the whole community, and it is a very heavy tax. We, at the present time, are making efforts in Derry to isolate the cases of consumption, but we don't go any further than attempting to isolate.

1316. Dr. Broome.—Would not this idea of having a separate hospital be isolation in a much better sense than you are attempting?—We have only three patients.

1317. But you have a great many patients in the union, and you have not arrangements for them?—I question if they would come even if we had; so long as consumptive people's friends are able to keep them they would not send them into the workhouse.

1318. If they understood it was as infectious as it is, would they not?—Those are matters for the medical men to educate them up in.

1319. CHAIRMAN.—Dr. Bigger's idea is that if the union fever hospital building was recent it would do for an isolation hospital until something better came, without any cost?—We have consumption wards that I hold, will satisfy our own case for the present.

1320. They are not really cut off?—Oh, they are; perfect isolation.

1321. With stairs and grounds?—No grounds. We cannot go so far as that.

1322. You would if you took the fever hospital?—If you had the Foye Hill fever hospital.

1323. The idea in Dr. Bigger's mind seems to be that if any fever patients came the Guardians would let them go to Foye Hill, and let the union pay for

Aug. 11, 1903.

Mr. John
Grogg.

them there; and then you would have your own fever hospital without paying a penny for it, and you would be charged less, I suppose, for patients at Foyle Hill?—Do you suggest making ours a consumption hospital?

1304. Dr. BROWN.—Either way?—I consider that the city, when taking away the old hospital for plague at Maghlin, were well instructed or advised in holding Foyle Hill against an epidemic of smallpox.

1305. It still could take your case, for they have a separate hospital for smallpox at Foyle Hill.—It is really a subject I am not prepared to argue. I would

like to hear what proposal would be offered to us here. I would say, as a Guardian, whether we would be won in accepting it or not. We try to do the best we can; but we are all very much against adding anything to the rates.

1306. CHAIRMAN.—This is a suggestion to take something off the rates?—If you could show me that I would be very glad to fall in with it. A great many of these things look very nice upon paper, but when you come to work them out there are so many different things added that you can hardly express an opinion.

Mr. J. D.
Boyd.

1307. CHAIRMAN.—The abstract of the evidence you propose to offer is, first, as regards the amalgamation. You are a member of the Limerick Board of Guardians?—I have been a member for eleven years.

1308. It was suggested by somebody that Limerick was a union that might be abolished?—Yes, I heard it has been made; it has been made several times before the appointment of the Commission.

1309. What is your view of the matter?—The first thing I propose to mention is the great inconvenience. We have had this matter discussed on four or five occasions, and like a great many other unions, the Board of Guardians of Limerick approved at first of amalgamation in the abstract, but whenever it comes to be dealt with I find all over the country they immediately change their attitude. Within the past fortnight Letterkenny, Donegal, Magherafelt, and Coleraine, I find that they all disapprove of what will affect themselves. There is one thing I would like to refer to, and that is the action of the Antrim County Council. It was discussed there at great length, and a resolution was carried in favour of amalgamation. It is the only county in Ireland I know in which they approached the detailing of what unions should be amalgamated. It was proposed to amalgamate Ballycastle with Ballymoney, and Antrim with Larne and Ballymena, and although they appointed a day for the meeting of the committee of the County Council for the express purpose of the breaking up of the various unions, the result of the discussion when it was broached was that the committee appointed were so divided that when Mr. Agnew attended to carry out the arrangement, no one attended to meet him at all. I think that is very significant in itself as showing that they rush to the conclusion that amalgamation is desirable without considering the disadvantages and inconveniences. We are not a very large union, but the fact of the matter is that a great many members complain already of the great sacrifice of time and trouble in coming so far to attend the Board meetings.

1310. I suppose the ordinary meetings are attended only by the Guardians in the neighbourhood?—There is an average attendance for the Limerick Board out of forty-one members. Some of them have to come twelve miles, and of course it is a tax for a man not in a very good position in life. The distance from north to south is twenty-five miles, and from east to west fifteen miles. We think that for administrative purposes, if people are to have control of their own rates, the union is quite large enough without being thrown into any other. Of course the object of the Local Government Act was to give representation along with taxation, a thing that the country was calling out for as long as I can remember, and we considered that if we threw part of Limerick into Coleraine and another part into Derry, the ratepayers of the Limerick Union would be practically deprived of any control over the disbursement of their own rates; they could not attend so far. Then the inconvenience again with regard to the patients, even a healthy patient, someone would have to be sent with them at a cost; you could not start them on their way to walk to Coleraine or Derry.

1311. Have you made out a comparative statement of the distances?—Yes; twenty-five miles from north to south, and fifteen from east to west.

1312. That is not exactly what I mean. Take Feeny, that would go to Derry if it was amalgamated?—Feeny comes to us; it is one of our dispensary districts.

Mr. J. D. BORN, *x.p.*, examined.

1313. If Limerick were broken up, would Feeny naturally go to Derry?—Yes.

1314. How far is it from Derry?—About eight miles.

1315. And how far from Limerick?—Thirteen miles.

1316. It is nearer Derry than Limerick?—Oh, yes, it is.

1317. Glenties, that seems to be very mountainous?—It is inaccessible. The Glenties people hardly send any papers anywhere; they have a good system of paying for the upkeep of their own poor at home by private subscription.

1318. Omeagh?—The same.

1319. How far is Dangan from Limerick?—Five miles.

1320. And how far is it from Derry?—About seventeen miles. Then another feature, we considered sending papers out of their own district is not unusual; it makes exiles of them; their friends would never see them if sent from Limerick to Coleraine or Derry, and it is the one bright spot in their lives to have friends coming to see them.

1321. When people go to your place from Feeny, do their friends go to see them?—They come occasionally.

1322. That is thirteen miles?—They will come occasionally, but distance makes them less likely.

Mr. LONG.—It is ten English miles from Glenties to Derry, and it is four from Glenties to Feeny.

Witness.—In any case there would be a great increase in inconvenience in all the unions, I think, at a rate. When we take up this position in Limerick, we take up a general position, because I think as a rule, for administrative purposes and convenience, almost any union I know is quite large enough, if properly managed and controlled by the people who pay taxes.

1323. Is Limerick the market town for the south part in which you live?—It is.

1324. Or is Dangan the market town?—No, it is not a market town at all; it is a good town for fairs.

1325. Is Derry the ordinary market town for Feeny?—Oh, no, but from Feeny a good many people make it their market town. It would rob people who pay taxes largely of a voice in the disbursement of the taxes.

1326. Would the Guardians for Feeny rather belong to Derry or Limerick?—I would take it they would rather belong to Limerick Union, since the Dangan railway has come to Limerick; that makes it much more convenient. If the infirmary would be left at the hospital at Limerick, the matter still becomes more serious, because the whole staff at present existing would still have to be kept at Limerick, and the Limerick ratepayers would have to pay for the upkeep of their healthy paupers at Coleraine and Derry, and there would be no disbursement of the staff. We challenge them to lay their finger on a single officer that could be dispensed with, or that somebody under another name would not take his place if the hospital and infirmary was left at Limerick. The staff is nearly all kept for the convenience of the hospital and infirmary. I can see no advantage, in the first place, in the ratepayers by amalgamation, and in the second, as far as I have heard the matter discussed, I can see no advantage to the poor even by amalgamation. The standard rate for the Limerick Union was the third lowest in all Ireland, and it almost maintains the position still, 6d. 4; for rates we have nothing to complain of, it is economically managed. We are the

lowest per head of maintenance in the county, though they are all well managed. We are £17 per head, as against £22 the lowest of the other unions. I heard you ask Mr. Long the weekly rate of maintenance apart altogether from officials, that, averaging the infirmary with the healthy part of the house, is 7s. 2d., and the gross expenditure per head, including officers and everything else, is as near as possible 8s. 6d.

1327. Dr. Broom.—That is when a lunatic costs you 8s. 6d. a week?—Yes, to put them on an average.

1328. And in the asylum they cost a little over 10s. when you count the interest, but there is 4s. in capitation fees out of that; it only costs the ratepayers £18!—But we are very suspicious with regard to converting workhouses into auxiliary asylums, because we have our eye on that 4s. grant, which we lose by converting the workhouse into an auxiliary.

1329. No, but by sending your lunatics into the asylum proper you would be saving money?—We would much rather have it. I hold the opinion strongly that there should be no such thing as a lunatic of any class or imbeciles in the workhouse, and I am borne out in that by the correspondence I have had with some of the best known medical men. Dr. Graham, and Dr. Hetherington, seemed to none, and Dr. Nolan, they all speak strongly in favour of sending lunatics to the central lunatic asylums of Ireland, and they are the only institutions about which there has never been any complaint.

1330. About the management?—I would be strongly against keeping any class of imbeciles apart from the benefits of the central institution, where they have a first-rate trained staff and the means of attending to every case. I don't think there would be any objection about converting the workhouse into auxiliaries; the buildings are entirely unsuitable. In Limerick, where they tried it and asked tenders for converting an empty workhouse as against building fresh buildings, they found the saving was infinitesimal, and they adopted the plan of extending the asylum.

1331. Chairman.—What workhouse did they propose?—I don't know the workhouse.

1332. That was a great many years ago?—Yes.

1333. Was it Glenties workhouse?—Yes, but the argument was brought up at the discussion at the County Council of ANTRIM. If the infirmaries and hospitals are to be retained with all their staff, I see no great benefit. On the other hand, if these empty buildings were converted into auxiliaries, you are only getting rid of one staff to replace it with a more expensive staff still. The same applies to turning it into a district hospital.

1334. You don't approve of that?—I think the hospitals we have, with a very little more attention to their internal construction and a little more extension of the system of trained nurses as head nurses, which has effected a very marked improvement in all the infirmaries over the country, a little more extension would make them supply the wants of the rural districts very well. Take our own infirmary since we got a head nurse put in charge. A person who saw it two years ago would not know it, and there has been but a little increased cost.

1335. Dr. Broom.—It is well worth the money?—Yes, it did not cost very much. I believe the improvements that can be carried out in connection with the infirmaries of the country is more valuable than any alterations in buildings.

1336. Chairman.—The general idea is the conversion of the workhouses into district hospitals, so as to take away the old houses and associations?—There is something, I admit, in the association, but example is doing away with that.

1337. You think the change of management is doing away with that?—The change of management is doing away with it; respectable people have no hesitation in sending in patients to the fever hospital.

1338. Have they to the workhouse?—They don't as often come. They don't ask to come to the infirmary; but if we had the imbeciles out of our workhouse, the treated rooms could, with slight expense, be made into wards for paying patients, and I think they would come, because they would get better attendance.

1339. Dr. Broom.—Could it not be separated from the rest of the house?—The understanding has always been that if a workhouse was turned into an asylum of any kind, the whole hospital system—

1340. I am speaking of the conversion into a district hospital; could you not use your building, have a separate entrance, and call it a district hospital, and

place it under a head nurse?—If that could be without expense, it would be a most desirable thing to do; if the thing gets fair play there would not be very many empty beds there.

1341. Chairman.—As regards the difficulty of making improved provision for classification?—I have a very strong feeling about that. I found the question asked at the Coleman Board by a gentleman the other day. He said he would be a bold man who would say that if the workhouse system were now being initiated there would be four workhouses planted in the County Derry. I quite agree with him, but I don't see anything in his argument. I think there would be no workhouses now at all if the Poor Law system was being initiated. I think it was a thing done hastily to meet a want at the time during the Famine, and it ran on wrong lines.

1342. A long time before the Famine?—I say the system came into operation to meet the wants of the Famine years.

1343. Long before that?—The Poor Law Acts commenced in 1838; the only ones we have any experience of.

1344. 1845, 1846, 1847, and 1848 were the years of the great Famine?—Well, 1838 is not very long before it.

1345. It was not in view of the Famine years?—Not in view, but to meet that lots of things were next turned on to local management, which made it a mistake. I hope that this inquiry will result more than anything else in classification of the present class of persons who go for indoor relief.

1346. What kind of classification; what would be the mode of classification?—My idea is that even if you maintain the workhouses as they are, with scarcely any additional cost, that those who should be classed as the deserving poor, that found their way into these places without any fault of their own, because they earned no wages, and when they got old and infirm were unable to earn, and their children having married had their own families to support, people of that class that behaved themselves well I think they should not be kept in the workhouse at all. I would not keep them under the present system of outdoor relief, because I think it is badly abused; but I would advocate the boarding-out of all of that class, together with all children under fourteen or fifteen, with poor relatives or friends in their own position, and I would undertake myself within a month to board out in a satisfactory way all that class in the Limerick Workhouse. I will undertake to have them satisfactorily placed out in that way in a month, and they will have more of a home life, and it is better than any system putting them into almshouses or workhouses. On Saturday last I went through our own workhouse at Limerick, and went in with the master into all the cases. I know them personally. A good few of those I would class as deserving poor. There were nine children under fifteen I would board out, ten women of the deserving poor, and twelve men; in all, thirty-one. There were in the house on the same day, lunatics or imbeciles, thirty; there were thirty in the infirmary, and there were in the house, either through drink, or immoral conduct, or bad behaviour, thirteen, making a total of 104, the exact number in the house on Saturday last. If you deal with that thirty-one in the way I say that I believe it could be done to the utmost satisfaction for the poor themselves, and perfect edify, by putting them under the supervision of your lady inspectors, or other inspectors, who could go about and examine their state and condition, and how they were treated, the same as your lady inspectors do now in conjunction with the relieving officer and doctor. I believe they could be classified very satisfactorily from every point of view. I believe that the 4s. which would be roughly the maintenance cost in the workhouse—

1347. That is as regards the existing inmates of the workhouse?—Yes.

1348. Would you be apprehensive that a number of people in poorhouses would come flocking to you and ask you to board them out?—I would not see any difficulty in that; we could go into their cases just as easily as the thirty that do.

1349. How you had people so very poor that they were willing to come into the workhouse; do you think you would look into cases sufficiently closely and well as to board out other cases who had not shown by their willingness to come into the workhouse the same sign of destitution?—If you maintain the existing test, the workhouse test.

Aug. 11, 1898.
No. 1 D.
Supt.

Aug. 11, 1903.

Mr. J. D.
Byrd.

1380. Dr. BROWN.—Would you make them go into the workhouse for a certain time before you boarded them out?—We do that with a certain kind of relief now. I don't think that would demoralise them at all.

1381. CHAIRMAN.—An observation would?—I would go strongly for removing the decision out of the hands of local people, because the clergy of the different denominations would be inclined to get ruled for those who were poor, and the Guardians themselves, I find, often would advocate relief of that kind in order to make themselves favourites with the electors. I think an conjunction with the doctor and relieving officer, an official of the Local Government Board, who could not be got at by local influences, should have something to say to their cases. They would be taken under observation until he came round, and it would be his business to see that they were properly adapted to that favoured condition, and although 4s. a week is a small sum, with us in our district a labouring man for his whole family will not have more than 9s. close of his home rent. And if it is his old father or mother he has had to let go in there because he cannot keep them, if you add 4s. to 9s., he will have 13s.

1382. He would probably make a profit on it?—Perhaps he would, and he would have someone to look after his family when he was out at work. My theory that lunatics and imbeciles should be removed away from the other class. For the infirm, I would still like them to be properly treated in some infirmary or hospital; whether you make it a district one, or return the present one under improved conditions, it does not so very much matter.

1383. Mr. MURKIN.—Before you pass away from that subject, you are making a strong statement in favour of the amalgamation of Limerick Union?—Against it.

1384. No, but for it; you have said that there are thirty-one inmates in the house that you would desire to see boarded-out in cottages?—Yes.

1385. Then you say there are thirty epileptics who should go to the asylum; that takes sixty-one out of your house—what would you have the house for after that?—I would just have it for the infirmary. I suppose there is no intention of doing away with that.

1386. You have been advocating altogether the wiping out of your own union. You ask that thirty-one should be sent to cottage houses, and thirty epileptics sent to the lunatic asylums, and you tell us there are thirteen people of vicious character, so that the house would be for them and the thirty infirm?—Yes.

1387. Don't you think that would be an expensive thing, to keep up a large institution for forty-three people?—It would be very expensive; but how are you to get rid of it? If there is any way to be shown through amalgamation of how you can get rid of that condition, then I am silenced, but I have not seen that suggested by any person. You may get rid of it by district hospitals, but that is creating a more expensive hospital system for the small number of thirty; you must get cheaper before you reject it even, for the number is small. Say you shift them to the district hospital at Coleraine.

1388. When you get rid of the two-thirds we will have to look for some place for the other one-third?—Then you take them out of the control of their own ratepayers, Guardians, and people, and do away with representation altogether, and there is no good, even in that case, that there would be any great saving. Even go further, and leave only the thirty, the existing number in the infirmary—even if you were to keep it there for the thirty I would go further, and keep those that brought themselves into the house by drink or immoral conduct, I would keep them under a stricter discipline or less favoured circumstances than the boarded-out ones; or I would adopt a plan of making arrangements with some other union for keeping our paupers at so much a head, and I would not have any hesitation in dealing with the immoral class in that way, because you deserve to differentiate between them and the respectable ones, and I think it would be a hardship on them that you would remove them from their friends by sending them to Coleraine, Ballymoney, or somewhere else. I think they deserve that difference.

1389. CHAIRMAN.—You prefer divisional rating, I see?—Yes.

1390. You had experience of the old system, and you have had experience of the new, and you would like to go back to the old?—I had four years of the old and seven of the new. I was in favour of the

new system at first, until I saw it tested. I have expressed myself so; and that is pure a sense of responsibility, it kept a particular division from passing upon some other division some change that they thought they could do, without passing upon them, because it cost those who proposed it nothing themselves. But I find in the working it acts the other way: makes them careless. And it operates far worse in the District Council than in the Board of Guardians, because there is more room for abuse, with regard to labourer's cottages and sanitary work. I have seen wonderful attempts, because it was coming from broad lands, to get something done; whereas if it was divisional rating they would have to pay for their own case. There is the matter of the tramps I have heard discussed here.

1391. Query 51.—That is with regard to changes in the existing hospitals; I have already expressed my views. I would say, however, in connection with that, that no doubt there will be amalgamation of some workhouses, if the people are allowed to get their own way, and perhaps the proposal to convert existing empty workhouses into district hospitals. I think it would meet the common desire, especially of those who might be paying patients, better if the same amount of money was expended on a more modest district hospital in each dispensary district.

1392. A new building?—Yes. I made a calculation that it would take about £3,000 in our own district.

1393. For how many beds?—About twelve beds would be quite sufficient, both to accommodate paying and pauper patients—about £3,000 in each dispensary district; but, of course, you will see that it would bring the poor much nearer their own friends and homes to have them in their own districts; and the dispensary doctors are crying out they are not well enough paid, and if they were made the head medical officer of each of these hospitals you could afford to double their salary at any rate. With one trained nurse, one matronly nurse, and wardmaid, it would take, in Limerick, a sanitary rate of 7d., as well as providing for the boarded-out and the unimpaired. At the same time, my impression is that to plant one district hospital would cost quite as much. I may be wrong in that. I know the cottage hospitals are the favourite places to go, wherever established, for paying patients; and I believe a very considerable amount of income could be got from that.

1394. Dr. BROWN.—Have you any personal knowledge of such a cottage?—Only with respect to Coleraine—from respectable people going there.

1395. From your district?—Oh, no. But if they were planted in the dispensary districts they would be just as near.

1396. You think there should be one for each dispensary district, or one for two dispensary districts?—That would be a matter of arrangement with regard to convenience.

1397. Would not that be expensive—one for each dispensary district?—Yes. This is also in the abstract. I am not looking at it with the possibility of Limerick being wiped out. I preferred this with the statement that I had no doubt there would be here and there workhouses affected as the result of this Commission, and I only made the suggestion that might be an alternative scheme for providing hospitals instead of one large central institution; that was all.

1398. CHAIRMAN.—What, now, would you do with the tramps?—I think the claims of humanity require that something should be done—some shelter. I go for what I would call tramp shelters, outside the workhouse, because I think those people are a class of people, as a rule, in my experience of them, that ought to be kept in very close touch with the police, and workhouse authorities have no right to be troubled with them. The expense is not very great; the average expense for all Ireland is only 2d. per head per night, and in Limerick it is only about 1d.; and it would not be on that account. But half of them are people that the police will look out for, and I think they should be discouraged from coming about in every possible way. I remember, when I was younger than I am now—thirteen years of age—there was a Bill brought in by Mr. MacCarthy, who was member for the Co. Tyrone, for the amalgamation of workhouses, and the tramp difficulty, when raised in the House of Commons, was what made him withdraw the Bill. It was just at that particular time that the bedwells were being abolished altogether—about

forty-five years ago—and I thought that they might be utilized, with a very slight addition, at that time, for tramps, and I think so still. I think, in many places, either the town hall or the bedwells could be utilized as a tramp shelter. I made inquiries in Scotland, where, under some of their old laws, where the towns are governed by a provost and magistrates, they adopted that there, and it worked very well; they took no trouble; they brought the tramps into these shelters rather than have it said that the tramps were allowed to perish through cold or hunger, gave them a bread bench and a blanket, and in winter a fire, and some bread and water, and next morning turned them out. I think the same thing will meet the want still. I wrote recently to the town of Edinburgh to see if the system still prevailed; and although it worked well enough it did not now exist, because the Local Government Board in Edinburgh found out that the law did not give them any right to shut out of the Burgh Rates for the provision of these people. I would have all these places connected by telephone with the police barracks, so that if there was any disturbance the police could be brought on the spot. I think at present all the workhouses should be connected with the police barracks, because there are rows sometimes. In my capacity as a magistrate I have sentenced two tramps to a month in jail. They came in three times within the last three months. I don't think they deserve any commiseration. With regard to the right of admission, I don't think they have any right; I don't think the workhouse authorities

have any right to be troubled with them at all; they have been seen going up to the workhouse and taking halfpence or money under a stone, and coming back next morning and carrying it away. They put their wives into common lodging-houses with £d., and go themselves to these places, and their wives would keep the money for them until they came out. But like the Scotch people, I would not like to see them perish; but I would make a very small provision do for them. We had a division on the question of amalgamation before our own Board a fortnight ago, when by seven to seven they voted for every proposition I have put before you.

1361c. Had you seven in favour of amalgamation?—We had seven in favour of amalgamation and seven for it.

1362. I did not know you would have had any for it?—Yes; but within the last two years they voted the other way, until they began to look closely into the matter, like the Antrim County Council.

1363a. Mr. MURRAY:—They voted for amalgamation previously?—They did on two occasions, and on two another way; but on the first two occasions by very narrow majorities.

1363b. Perhaps the recent change was due to your discharges?—Oh, no, they are men able to think for themselves. All the arguments for that they attempted before was simply that the house was built for 700, there are only 100 in it now, and therefore there must be a change, and there must be a saving in amalgamation. I never heard anything better than that.

Aug. 14, 1903.
Mr. J. D.
Boyd.

Mr. SAMUEL CHASEY examined.

1363c. CHAIRMAN:—You are a member of the Urban Council of Lonsdale?—I have been a member of the Urban Council for twelve or thirteen years, and the Council are unanimously against amalgamation.

1363. You heard Mr. Boyd's evidence?—Yes, sir, I did.

1363a. Do you agree pretty much with him as regards the arguments against amalgamation?—Yes, I do.

1363b. Have you anything further that you would like to add?—Well, no; the Urban Council as a whole do not consider that it would be to the advantage of the poor to be amalgamated, as it would put them under very great inconvenience and hardship in being

removed from their friends; and they did not consider it would be to the advantage of the ratepayers to be amalgamated. That is the reason they very much prefer matters to remain as they are. With regard to the expense of the upkeep of the establishment, it is wrought on very economical principles; there is a small farm connected with the union, and the master is able, on an average, to make a clear profit of close on £200 a year, and therefore it is not considered to be very extravagant.

1364. Have they their own cows there now?—Yes; they keep a number of cows, and labour this farm to great advantage, and use the produce for the feeding of the cattle, and the potatoes for the house.

Mr. Samuel
Chasey.

The sitting was adjourned.

FOURTH PUBLIC SITTING—WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 12TH, 1903.

At the Courthouse, Londonderry.

Present:—Mr. MICKS (Chairman); Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. COBY BAKER.

Dr. THOMAS McLAUGHLIN examined.

Aug. 12, 1903.

Dr. Thomas
McLaughlin.

1365. Dr. BROWN.—You have been appointed by the Derry Board of Guardians to give us evidence?—Yes.

1366. Is there anything you would wish to state to us?—I am not in favour of any amalgamation.

1367. Why?—I think the pension claims would be rather a sort of counterbalance to any benefits arising from amalgamation.

1368. If there was not such a thing as their dying out?—It would be a long time before that.

1369. Would not the benefit be an increasing one?—Well, I suppose it might in time.

1370. Regarding the different classes that are in the Derry Workhouse, have you any opinion to express as regards some of the classes that might be removed?—I would like to see a better classification of the infants, and with regard to the aged couples coming in I would like to have them a little better cared.

1371. Give them separate apartments?—Yes.

1372. Do you know that in some of the workhouses in England that has not been a very great success?—I don't know; I think it ought to work. It is a great pity to separate aged couples when they are driven to the workhouse.

1373. About the children?—Boarding out, by all means.

1374. Would you be inclined to increase the boarding out?—If it were possible I would have no children about the workhouse at all.

1375. About removing children from the care of their one parent, illegitimate children?—I would say a good deal would depend on the character of the mother; but, in the first case, I would hardly go so far as to take the child away; but if the mother was showing signs of leading a vicious life, or of falling again, I would take the child from her.

1376. CHAIRMAN.—You think it would be prudent to take discretionary power?—I do.

1377. Dr. BROWN.—Regarding the lunatics?—I think they should all be sent to the asylum; the workhouse is not the place for them at all; they would be better looked after in the asylum.

1378. You would remove them entirely from the workhouse?—Yes.

1379. Have you any ideas on the point of making a diseased workhouse into an auxiliary asylum?—I would not approve of it; you would require an extra staff to look after them. I think the best place for them is the asylum.

1380. On financial grounds, what have you to say about the removal of lunatics; have you gone into it?—No, I have not very specially.

1381. Have you gone into the cost at all?—I have not.

1382. CHAIRMAN.—You know how much they cost in the workhouse?—Indeed I could not tell you.

1383. Dr. BROWN.—About the criminals and tramps?—I think things should be made a little more stringent than they are at the present time. I would be inclined to not let them out on giving three hours' notice. I would extend the Criminal Act of England, and I would be inclined to be even a little more stringent. Let them keep them in for two days, but on a second offence I would increase it from four to seven days; and another thing, too, I would be inclined to make the distances walked a little longer than at the present time. I would not allow them to walk from Derry to Limavady and get admission there, and from Limavady to Coleraine. I would make them walk from Derry to Coleraine.

1384. You said you were not in favour of amalgamation; now you say you would not have the different workhouses open for tramps?—No.

1385. You would exclude them from some workhouses?—Yes.

1379. You have not thought of any plan how that might be carried out?—Not specially.

1380. CHAIRMAN.—One witness suggested the police and the bridewell instead of the workhouse?—I think the police should have something to say to it; to give a little more assistance than they do.

1381. Do you think it would be possible to head that ever altogether to the police, or do you think desperate people could come more fully to the workhouse?—That is a very broad question.

1382. Dr. BROWN.—I see there are four patients in extern hospitals from the Derry Workhouse. What is your idea about sending patients from the workhouse to extern hospitals?—You mean from the workhouse to the infirmary.

1383. There are four patients at present in extern hospitals, that is other hospitals than union hospitals, and the Derry Guardians are paying for them?—I would approve of that. With regard to operations, I would not have any operations performed except in case of extreme urgency in the workhouse. I would have them all sent to the infirmary; that is in surgical cases.

1384. You would have all sent that were capable of being sent?—Yes.

1385. Would you give any reasons for that?—Well, the infirmary is better for any capital operations; of course there are some small operations performed in the Derry Workhouse. We have furnished an operating room there with an operating table and sterilisers.

1386. Is that more for minor operations?—For minor operations.

1387. For operations that could be performed on patients that could travel some distance before being operated on?—Yes.

1388. You would deal with those in the workhouse?—I don't think so. I would be inclined to have them sent to the infirmary.

1389. You have a fever hospital in connection with the workhouse?—Yes.

1390. I understand it is very often closed, and for long periods?—It may be closed for a month at a time; it is empty at the present time.

1391. Then there is the fever hospital for Derry?—Foy's Hill Hospital.

1392. Could you give us any information of how patients are admitted to Foy's Hill; what class of patients are admitted?—I think all classes are admitted. I know there were dispensary patients admitted some time ago, over which there was a law suit.

1393. What was the law suit?—It came before the Recorder. The Corporation claimed maintenance of the Guardians, and said the patients should be sent to the workhouse fever hospital.

1394. Were they able to sustain it?—I cannot say whether the Recorder has given a decision or not.

1395. Would it be possible for some arrangement to be entered into by the Guardians and by the Corporation whereby Foy's Hill might be made available for all the fever cases of the union?—I am afraid if you did so Foy's Hill would require to be very much enlarged.

1396. CHAIRMAN.—Is it capable of enlargement?—Oh, yes.

1397. Dr. BAKER.—You have a smallpox hospital there?—Yes; I think there should be an arrangement between the Guardians and the Corporation.

1398. In case some arrangement was entered into, would the fever hospital at the workhouse be at all suitable for the treatment of consumption?—It would be very suitable.

1399. A little expenditure would make it suitable?—It would not require much.

1400. Would that increase the number of consumptives going to the workhouse?—It might, because there are a great many cases of consumption through the country.

1401. And in the city too?—Yes; they could be better treated there than in their homes.

1402. Have you any idea of the proportion of deaths from consumption?—It is very large. I could not give the exact statistics.

1403. You are not a member of the Corporation?—No.

1404. But, as a medical man, you are conversant with the arrangements on which patients are admitted?—Yes.

1405. CHAIRMAN.—If fewer cases could be treated in Foye Hill for about the same amount as in the workhouse, would you approve of making arrangements with the Foye Hill people to take all fewer cases?—I would be inclined to do so if they could be treated as cheaply.

1406. Dr. BAKER.—Have you two nurses at Foye Hill?—Always two.

1407. Day and night, and a servant?—I don't know that.

1408. There is a porter of course?—Yes.

1409. And a staff practically there for any ordinary cases unless there would be an epidemic?—Yes.

1410. There is some ground about the fever hospital; I mean the workhouse fever hospital; do you know the extent of it at all?—I cannot tell you.

1411. Do you think that accommodation could be increased for consumptives if consumptives were admitted to the fever hospital?—I am sure it could.

1412. The grounds are suitable, or could be made suitable?—Yes.

1413. Are the Guardians at present doing anything in the way of isolating wards for consumption?—Yes, we are fitting up a couple of wards at the present time.

1414. What do you think of those arrangements?—I think they do very well as a sort of stop-gap.

1415. CHAIRMAN.—Better than nothing?—Yes.

1416. Dr. BAKER.—That is they protect other people; would they be any benefit to the unfortunate patients?—I think they would.

1417. Is there any ground available for their own exclusive use?—I think the consumptives that are in hospital at the present time are confined to bed in an advanced stage.

1418. Do you think medical men would be inclined to send them in earlier if there were suitable arrangements?—I think they would.

1419. And in that way the number of consumptives would be increased?—Yes; there are only about two at the present time.

1420. You are a member of the county infirmary staff?—Yes.

1421. CHAIRMAN.—You are aware that there has been a great deal of consumption in Derry?—A great deal.

1422. And the fact that there are only two or three cases in the workhouse is no efficient?—No.

1423. Dr. BAKER.—Dispensary doctors and other doctors when they know there are not proper arrangements of course won't send patients in. You have an idea about the cost of keeping patients in the county infirmary?—I could not tell you.

1424. You approve of the management of the county infirmary?—Oh, yes.

1425. CHAIRMAN.—Are there any arrangements about sending patients; do you often send patients from the

workhouse infirmary to the county infirmary?—Sometimes; there is an occasional case sent over, but not often.

1426. Dr. BAKER.—Do the Guardians pay for the cases they send over?—Dr. Cooke will be able to answer that question.

1427. CHAIRMAN.—Do you approve of the bearing out of children as distinguished from keeping them in the workhouse?—Most decidedly.

1428. You have 15 boarded out at present; are you aware whether any of the 45 who are now in the house could be boarded out; whether they are orphans or deserted children?—I cannot answer that question.

1429. As far as you know, does the master bring the Board any eligible cases?—Yes.

1430. Would you be in favour of extending the powers of the Guardians for boarding out other children?—I would. I would not have any children about the workhouse at all that were capable of going out.

1431. The people who came in and out for a short time and took their children with them, would you suggest any method of dealing with those?—That is a point that has been discussed pretty often before the Board; we have some characters answering to that description, and we have tried every means in our power—the law and other arrangements—but we have signally failed. I think that more power should be given to the Guardians to take charge of the children in the case of their parents being of a vicious character.

1432. Would you take legal conviction as the test?—I don't think that legal conviction seems to have any effect in the present cases.

1433. Would you consider that a disqualification for people to have charge of children if there were legal convictions against them for cruelty?—Certainly; drunkenness and vice.

1434. There was a discussion yesterday as to the best method of dealing with women who have illegitimate children, who come into the workhouse and have illegitimate children. One of the ideas mentioned was that it would be better for those girls that they should be sent to penitentiaries under the management of religious persons of their own persuasion, rather than have them brought into the workhouse?—Do you mean before the confinement?

1435. That there should be a lying-in ward attached to these penitentiaries, and they should never come into the workhouse at all?—I think that would be a very good idea.

1436. With a view of reclaiming them, and that the Guardians should pay the cost of the maintenance of those people?—Bringing them about the workhouse has a very demoralising effect.

1437. And you would be in favour of sending them out?—Decidedly.

1438. You are satisfied now with the arrangements in Derry for nursing of the sick?—Perfectly; we have three probationers in training; one of our nurses resigned the other day—the fever hospital nurse; we have an assistant trained nurse in the infirmary, and we have appointed one of the probationers to be an assistant in the fever hospital when required, and we are not appointing any trained nurse.

1439. Dr. BAKER.—This assistant has been some time under training?—She has been six months under training.

1440. If you had cases there you would require trained nurses?—But we have a trained nurse; there were two trained nurses.

Mr. JAMES STEWART EXAMINED.

1441. Dr. BAKER.—You are Secretary to the County Infirmary?—Yes.

1442. Would you tell us the number of admissions during the last year, and the cost per patient?—There were 652 patients treated last year, the year ending 31st of December, 1902, in the infirm department.

1443. You have an extern too?—We have an extern department also.

1444. CHAIRMAN.—Do your nurses do anything in the extern?—Oh, yes.

1445. I mean visiting houses?—No; I mean there is a dispensary in connection with the hospital for treatment of cases not attended in the house.

1446. They don't do any distinct nursing?—No.

1447. Dr. BAKER.—You have the numbers of the cases treated in the extern department?—I have; 1,187 last year.

1448. Do many of the extern patients come from a distance do you know?—You must ask the doctor on that point; probably I should say from the city.

1449. About the intern cases, do you know the number of operations performed?—There were 280 operations performed.

1450. About the cost of the upkeep, how are you supplied?—We get £1,454 per annum from the city, the county borough £1,350, and from the county at large £244.

1451. Is that an old arrangement?—No; that was made under the Local Government Act. There was a Commission set and took evidence on the subject of the fair contribution to be levied off the city and county in respect of the number of cases admitted from each; they took evidence on that point and fixed the amounts to be paid by the city and county. Formerly under

Aug. 12, 1903.
Dr. Thomas
McLaughlin.

Mr. James
Stewart.

Aug. 12, 1903.
Mr. James
Stewart.

the old Act the county at large, which included the city, paid £1,434, but it was levied according to the rateable valuation, so that the far end of the county paid a very large proportion and got very little benefit. This is an arrangement which was looked upon as equitable both by the county and city; it is considered fair by the county, and the county considered they were unfairly treated before; the city got largely the benefits and did not pay in proportion to the benefits they received. I think the county is satisfied now.

1462. What other means have you?—Voluntary contributions, which amounted last year to £485.

1463. That was for maintenance only?—Voluntary contributions.

1464. Does that support your county infirmary?—Like all other hospitals, we are always getting the devil by the tail for money, but we manage to get the money—we have got a good deal of money this year.

1465. That is for structural alterations?—We get it for maintenance as well as structural alterations. We get a good deal of private money for structural alterations. We got over £2,500 within the last couple of years for structural alterations, which we are at present engaged in.

1466. Have you reckoned at all the cost per patient?—Yes; the total cost, that is the daily cost of each patient, including all the expenses, last year amounted to 2s. 6d.; it varies between 2s. 9d. and 3s. per day.

1467. That is the total cost of everything—upkeep, maintenance, and small alterations?—Everything.

1468. Is the dressing for extern patients included in that?—Everything; the cost of the extern department is added on to the daily cost per intern patient. We don't keep any separate account of the extern amount.

1469. CHAIRMAN.—It is comparatively trifling, I suppose?—It is principally made up of dressings, which are very expensive.

1470. Dr. BROWN.—There were 1,100 cases?—Yes; that means cases; the attendances amount to over 5,000.

1471. So that there were 5,000 dressings?—They may not all be cases for dressings.

1472. Does the county infirmary limit the class of cases they take in?—They admit cases on lines from the governors, and it is then for the doctor, when the cases come in, to say whether they are suitable or not.

1473. The county infirmary is situated in Derry, very near Donagall?—It is just on the border.

1474. Do you get many cases from the County Donagall?—We get a considerable number of accidents, which we always admit without question as to where they come from, and we get a great many cases of accidents from Donagall.

1475. Do you ask the Donagall County Council to contribute to the upkeep?—No, we have not.

1476. Did you ever approach them?—We have not.

1477. You don't know whether they have power, do you?—I believe they have power. In point of fact, I know they have power, because we got it put into the Local Government Act that two or more county infirmaries could join together, but I don't think it works, or is likely to work.

1478. But as to every case coming from Donagall?—If a case comes in from Donagall, we don't take a case from Donagall unless for payment, except accidents.

1479. You do take them if the patients themselves pay?—If the patients themselves pay, and we have room for them, we take them, but we would not give them a preference.

1480. Regarding these accident cases coming from Donagall, what is your idea with regard to them?—My impression is the fair thing would be that the district that they come from should pay the cost.

1481. So much per day or per week?—Yes, until they are cured. If a Donagall farmer comes into Derry and falls off his cart and gets a broken leg I think the County Donagall should pay; or if a Derry farmer is in the vicinity of Lifford and breaks his leg there I think the County Derry should pay; either the county or the district.

1482. That would not interfere with the management or anything of that kind?—No.

1483. Regarding the management, what committee have you?—25.

1484. Do you think that is sufficiently large?—Quite large enough.

1485. What is your average attendance at your committee meetings?—We must have a quorum of seven. We occasionally cannot get a quorum, but there is usually a quorum.

1486. About supplies, do you advertise?—We advertise for everything.

1487. Are your accounts audited?—By an auditor appointed by the Board.

1488. They don't come under the County Council audit at all?—Not so far, but I understand they are to be.

1489. CHAIRMAN.—You did not ask to have them audited?—We did some years ago, but they refused.

1490. They do audit the Casual Infirmary accounts?—I am not aware.

1491. By invitation?—I thought under a recent Act there was some clause.

1492. Was anything done last session?—I had a sort of an idea that there was some clause in an Act with reference to it.

1493. Dr. BROWN.—Regarding the class of patients that are admitted to the county infirmary?—I think the doctor could tell you.

1494. You have never considered the advisability of establishing a nursing home in connection with your county infirmary?—We used to send nurses out for payment.

1495. Was that some years ago?—Some years ago, and there were some ladies collected a sum every year for us to establish it, and then the collections dropped off; it did not pay.

1496. That was a sort of district nursing?—No, private nursing; there is no such thing as district nursing; we never had anything of the kind.

1497. Do you know is there any district nursing in Londonderry?—There are the Jubilee district nurses; a very active body; five or six nurses.

Dr. Cooke.

Dr. COOKE examined.

1498. Dr. BROWN.—You are the Medical Officer of the County Infirmary?—Yes.

1499. Have you held that position for some time?—I am surgeon for the last three years.

1500. Then you are conversant with all the details regarding the county infirmary. What class of cases are admitted?—The majority of the patients come in on governors' lines. When we have spare beds available and paying patients apply to come in a better class of people—we take them in without any governors' lines, and they pay the charges.

1501. What are the charges?—Either the bare maintenance—that is, roughly speaking, 3s. a week—or the average total cost of 3s. a day—a guinea a week.

1502. You rarely charge more than one guinea?—We never charge more. We have no separate accommodation for paying patients; they go into the general wards.

1503. What is your idea about treating paying patients along with free patients in the general wards in the infirmary?—My personal opinion is that unless the hospital was supported by paying patients as a means of income, of making money, when, of course, they would have to have completely separate arrangements,

and a separate part of the hospital—separate wards and separate nurses, but carrying on a hospital on such lines as we do it is very desirable for all concerned that paying patients should be in the general ward. For one thing, it does not induce a class of people who would be taking advantage of the hospital—the bare cost of living—to come into the hospital, as the staff take no time for work done in the hospital from any patient, and it is good for the very poor class of people, of whom we have an enormous proportion, to see the better class of people willing to come into the wards and take the same attendance as they do.

1504. Have you ever heard complaints from the better class that they should be treated along with the poor?—No; I have had people coming in, paying patients, who did not come in when there was no separate accommodation.

1505. After they are really in the wards, have you heard complaints?—No.

1506. CHAIRMAN.—Would not paying patients really be happier in an occupied ward after the first day or two than they would be in a private ward by themselves, cut off from everybody?—It would be my idea that they would, but there are some people so con-

stated that they would not like it. We get as many paying people as we can deal with, and they don't complain of it.

1467. Dr. BROWN.—Regarding your staff—the county infirmary staff—would you let us know some of the particulars regarding the mode of appointment, and also the emoluments they have, if there are any?—The way in which the place has been worked since the late surgeon's death in 1905—he was paid a salary of £300 a year—

1468. Did he live in the building?—No; he had no home in the place.

1469. Since his death?—Since his death the government made another arrangement. They had under the Act of Parliament to appoint a surgeon to the hospital, and they appointed me as surgeon to the hospital, giving me a salary of £150 a year, and requiring me to reside in the hospital, but allowing me to do consulting practice in the city; that fulfilled the requirements of the Act of Parliament. They then appointed an honorary staff of two surgeons and two physicians, who are not paid anything, and an anaesthetist, who is not paid anything.

1500. That is five of an honorary staff, who receive no emoluments?—Yes.

1501. Was there any competition for the post?—There was for the physicians' positions, but there was not for the surgeons' positions.

1501a. It was a foregone conclusion who was going to be appointed?—Yes.

1502. If it had not been, do you think there would be a competition?—I think there would be.

1503. The experience they gain and the name and so on are really of great value to them?—Yes; and the practice. The honorary staff and myself are on a complete equality as members of the hospital staff.

1504. But you look after their cases in their absence?—Yes; I am the executive officer.

1505. CHAIRMAN.—There is not a midwifery ward?—No.

1506. What midwifery accommodation is there for Derry besides the workhouse?—As far as I know, none.

1507. Dr. BROWN.—Mr. Stewart mentioned about the number of internal and external patients; in the case of the 600 internal patients, were there many operations performed?—Yes; the major and minor operations totted to 390.

1508. Does that mean that chloroform was given?—Anaesthetics were given in 133 cases.

1509. Then there is a considerable amount of operative work?—There is.

1510. Which requires a good deal of attention from the surgical staff?—In this year up to now there have been 225 anaesthetic cases; it is steadily increasing.

1511. So that the honorary staff give their services ungrudgingly to the infirmary?—They do, most ungrudgingly.

1512. Do you get cases from the workhouse?—No, they never send us over cases.

1513. They don't pay you as an extern hospital?—No, they never send them over at all.

1514. You get cases, that is instead of going into the workhouse the dispensary doctor and others would send the case direct to you?—Generally.

1515. Do you limit the class of cases that are taken in?—Of course patients coming in with government lines have the first claim, and then the others, if they are suitable cases and there are beds for them; the committee hold me responsible for the suitability of cases applying for admission.

1516. Do you really only take in acute cases?—We are not by way of not taking in chronic cases, but we really cannot keep chronic cases from the number of our beds; we always have a chronic case or two. We take in chronic cases sometimes, but when we find they are chronic we discharge them.

1517. How many beds have you at present?—We have two wards closed on account of alterations, but before the alterations were begun we had fifty beds.

1518. But when the alterations are completed?—That will give us sixty-two beds, as well as more sanitary accommodation and an operating theatre.

1519. Would not that be sufficient for the county and city of Derry?—It depends on how many the county would be disposed to send in; many parts of the county rarely send in cases, the neighbouring portions of the county do send in cases.

1520. Have you made out any statistics on the matter, that is within the ten miles of the hospital how

many cases, and how many within twenty miles?—We never keep any statistics of that sort.

1521. Have you any knowledge of the statistics?—I don't think I could give you any information that would be worth while.

1522. Could you give any idea?—I would say the Coleraine cases are very few.

1523. CHAIRMAN.—Magherafelt?—Very few, or Maghera or Desperstown very few. County, Fenny, and Enniskillen, those parts of the country send in a good many cases.

1524. What is your maximum number of cases, say in Winter?—What was the largest number at any time?—When we have stretches up we might have fifty-two or fifty-three patients, but our daily average—

1525. I meant the maximum?—That would be full beds of course.

1526. And you have that sometimes?—Yes.

1527. Dr. BROWN.—Have you ever refused cases on account of your limited space?—Oh, yes, occasionally.

1528. CHAIRMAN.—Could you add to the building; does the site permit any addition?—It does.

1529. Dr. BROWN.—What is the extent of your ground?—About three acres. There is a good large garden behind the place.

Mr. Stewart.—I would say 2 acres or 2½ acres.

1530. Dr. BROWN.—But you have refused cases on account of not having available space?—Occasionally.

1531. And frequently you are working even above your maximum number?—We are.

1532. You would rather put up a stretcher than refuse a bed case?—The class of cases we have to deal with you cannot refuse, even if sometimes you have to put them on the floor; when a bad accident comes in it must be admitted, and usually when there is a rush of accidents we get a little bit overcrowded.

1533. What is your hospital staff?—Eight nurses, a superintendent and matron, seven female servants and one man servant, in all seventeen.

1534. How many do you calculate it would really take to work your extern department: have you one always on duty?—We will have to increase our staff when we have additions; there will be a new theatre.

1535. You would really require a nurse to look after the theatre and instruments?—Yes.

1536. Does the extern add to your nursing and require you to keep an extra staff?—We could keep a nurse going there. The way the extern is worked is, any case of injury or surgical case requiring immediate treatment is treated in the extern without any questions being asked. We give the first dressing to every case; we don't prescribe there at all; it is a surgical extern there altogether. When anybody gets a first dressing, if I see they are a class of people that ought not to be a charge on the hospital, I say, "Go to your own doctor." If they are a class of people that ought to be treated, or the injuries are of such a class that we could treat it better than it possibly could be by an outside doctor, I tell them to come back for dressing. The dressing hour is 11.30, and often lasts till 1 o'clock.

1537. You have two nurses there?—Two nurses.

1538. As to the cost of the extern?—It is a thing I cannot accurately tell you, but I have roughly estimated it at about £50 or £55 a year. I speak roughly. It is all dressings.

1539. You don't take any consumptive cases into the county infirmary?—We occasionally get a case in, but we have not any place for them.

1540. Would you let us know your ideas—have you thought of the subject at all—what might be done about a sanatorium for the County Derry?—I have thought a good deal of it; consumption is terribly prevalent in the town, largely on account of the young people working in shirt factories. The death-rate, as far as we can make out, in the town appears to be from tuberculosis about one in six of all the deaths. Of course, that is very much under the real amount, because a great many cases which are considered to be bronchitis and pleurisy are really consumption; about 35 per 1,000 living.

1541. Has there been any discussion about providing for the treatment of these cases?—We are not a rich enough community here to provide for the treatment of these cases by subscription. It would cost an immense amount to get up such an institution, and keep it going.

1542. Do you think such an institution is urgently required?—I do, very badly required; some place where the people would be taught a commonsense way of treating consumption; a place where there would

Aug. 19, 1905.

Dr. Cooke.

be plenty of space and ground and open air, and where the patients would be under supervision as regards their expectoration. I think the drift the people would get under these circumstances would be of enormous practical benefit. I cannot think anyone would be so criminal as to deliberately spit about when they have consumption, if they had been taught the danger of doing so. I think the drift in a well-managed sanatorium would be of enormous benefit.

1543. CHAIRMAN.—You think it would be an enormous benefit if in the fever hospital of the workhouse they made a beginning there without much cost?—I don't know the fever hospital of the workhouse, but I should imagine any place with plenty of air about it and a suitable staff to work it is bound to do a great deal of good, and I think if it was only taking away these people even for a few months from their friends, it would be a very good thing. I don't think the death-rate given for Derry represents the actual death-rate from consumption. Factory girls come in from the County Donegal; they live in lodgings, and as long as they are able to work they go on with it; they get weaker and weaker and come to us; they don't care for going to the workhouse, and they stay in their lodgings for a while. The lodging-house people turn them out because they cannot pay for their lodgings, and then they go to the country and die there.

1544. Dr. Broome.—You think many get the infection in Derry and go home to country places?—I know a great number of girls, when they can get no other place to go to, drift home.

1545. CHAIRMAN.—Is there any medical inspection as regards the factories to prevent the workers who have consumption from continuing to attend at the factories?—Not that I know of. The factories are very well ventilated.

1546. There is no public health inspection?—I don't think there is with regard to consumption. We, the local Society for the Prevention of Consumption, tried to get the sanitary authority of the town to adopt a form of notification, and undertake the disinfection of houses where consumptives live. If the people were willing to notify the cases, we asked them to undertake the disinfection of the houses, but we did not succeed in getting anything done.

1547. Dr. Broome.—In your county infirmary do you allow patients to wear their own clothing?—If they have clean good clothing; otherwise we give them hospital clothing. We don't give them a coat or trousers, or that sort of thing; we lend them things, of course, if we have them. Their nightshirts, and that sort of thing, if they have them clean and good, we allow them to wear them.

1548. Do you train your own nurses?—Yes.

1549. Give them lectures?—Yes.

1550. Mr. Stewart mentioned that sometime ago you had a nursing home?—Yes, we used to send out nurses,

but it was found that there was occasionally a rush for nurses, and when the cost per nurse was added up it was found it was not paying. We had very bad accommodation for them.

1551. Do you know that some other county infirmaries make money from their nursing home?—Very possibly; we had not the accommodation; we would want a lot more buildings, which would mean a large initial expense, and when we did nursing outside it was largely supported by private subscription.

1552. Do you know anything about the extern case that came from a distance—a radius of eight or ten miles round the town?—They do come that distance.

1553. At the same time they avail themselves of the treatment in the county infirmary, with very little cost to the infirmary?—Very little cost; farm labourers getting injuries to their hands, and things of that sort.

1554. Which in another place, if they did not have an extern, would require a bed inside the infirmary?—If they are not properly attended to that class of case goes wrong very quickly.

1555. If there were not an extern department they would perhaps have to be intern patients?—Yes, but they don't come as a rule further than they can conveniently walk.

1556. Have you any idea of the number of intern patients you get from Donegal?—I could not tell you exactly, but the number of accident cases from the county in the last twelve months would, roughly speaking, be about twenty. Most of them intend to pay, but they are taken in at a risk. The clergyman of their parish perhaps will pay something, or their neighbours; most of them in the end pay something; we don't, of course, press them.

1557. Regarding the payment, do you take some payment from them?—No; the only scale of payment we have in the hospital are the two charges, and the police pay 1s. 6d. a day—12s.

1558. 10s., 14s., and a guinea?—Yes.

1559. You don't take a small fee from a person who sends his child in, at a few shillings a week?—No; I think it is rather a pity myself that they don't take a few shillings; they would get some money.

1560. CHAIRMAN.—Better than get nothing, would you not take almost anything—say what a child or a young person would cost in his own home?—Yes, roughly, about 5s. a week; a child might cost less. It is not altogether fair to say that those patients don't pay something; often a person goes away given something, but we cannot put it down as paid money because it is not our scale of pay.

1561. Dr. Broome.—A sort of subscription; it is not good that a person should feel they are not taking charity?—I feel that very much. I think the small farming class would be better satisfied if they were paying a small amount. I would not compel them to pay it, but I suggest it.

Mr. John Foster.

Mr. JOHN FOSTER examined.

1562. CHAIRMAN.—You are the only Relieving Officer for the Derry Union?—Yes, sir.

1563. Take the beginning of this year: there were 306 persons in the workhouse, of those there were ninety sick—where did they come from mainly?—I don't know just at present, but speaking generally, I would think that two-thirds of them or more came from the city.

1564. Would the same proportion apply to the infirm class—ninety-four?—I believe it would, and to all the classes.

1565. When you get out to the more distant parts of the union, do you get any considerable number of cases?—Very few.

1566. What are the most distant populous parts of the union?—Clandry is the most distant populous part.

1567. Have you many patients from Clandry among the aged and infirm?—Very few.

1568. What do they do: how do you account for their not coming in?—I cannot say. I think in the country they have a better spirit of independence, and they don't run to the workhouse.

1569. And would you say get more help from their neighbours?—I believe that also.

1570. Are you as relieving officer often asked by people for outdoor relief owing to unwillingness to come into the hospital or into the workhouse from those distant parts of the union?—Sometimes, not very often. Of course, nearly all the people who come into the workhouse if they could get relief out would prefer it.

1571. Is there a special reluctance among people at a distance to come in?—Yes, there is a sentiment, and the further you get away from the workhouse it is the stronger against the workhouse as a workhouse.

1572. Are there many applications for outdoor relief made to you?—No, not many.

1573. About £20 a year is paid for purely outdoor relief?—We are just paying 32s. a week as present.

1574. Where would that be chiefly paid?—It is all round the union in the rural districts. There is only one case inside the boundary; that is a blind girl.

1575. Is most of that outdoor relief given to extreme distant parts?—It is pretty well scattered all over.

1576. What class of cases are they chiefly?—Generally of the decent labouring class.

1577. Would they be old?—Old with the exception of three widows with young children.

1578. What would be given to those widows with children?—4s. in two cases, and 3s. in one case where there is a girl working; that woman gets 3s.; she had got 4s. previous to the girl going to work.

1579. That is the largest amount that is given?—No, we give 5s. in some cases of an old couple, and the lowest we give is 2s. 6d. We give pretty generously when we do give.

1580. You don't give any grants of 2s. or 1s. 6d.?—Nothing so small.

1581. How many cases are there on your books at present?—Twenty-one—also cases of twenty-one persons.

1588. That is pretty much an average state of affairs—Yes, just about the average for the last twenty years.

1589. Are there many applications made and refused?—No, no applications are refused; we give them provisional relief, either in the workhouse or—

1590. I mean applications for outdoor relief: you offer them the house sometimes when applications for relief are made, and they don't take it?—Quite so.

1591. When they wanted there was outdoor relief: were many cases refused outdoor relief?—Not very many; they don't apply, as a rule, here. I had a case the other day that applied for outdoor relief, and I offered the woman the relief of the house, which I thought suited her best; the result was she did not get it, and she is now in the hospital. These cases, when they find they cannot get outdoor relief, go to the hospital; the majority of the cases are old people, who need nourishment and some person to clean them and look after them, and they are much better in the hospital, and when they get to know what treatment they get in the hospital, they come in, and when they see for themselves what it is like they are satisfied.

1592. Are there any cases in which you recommend outdoor relief being given and which the Guardians refuse to grant?—Oh, no; in all cases where I find it necessary I give provisional relief for a week and report, and the Guardians as a rule confirm it.

1593. Mr. MURKIN.—And then what happens: if you give provisional relief and these people don't come into the workhouse, what happens?—The Guardians generally continue the relief in money, and it goes on to the end of the year.

1594. When you give provisional relief you only give it for a week?—Yes.

1595. Then when those people don't go into the workhouse, what becomes of them; you stop paying money after the first week?—In all cases where I give provisional relief, if it is necessary to continue it, the Guardians do continue it in a grant of money. There are some cases where the relief is only temporary, in the case of sickness for a week or so, and in that case, as soon as they are better, the relief is cut off.

1596. CHAIRMAN.—But it is very strictly watched by the Guardians?—It is.

1597. You visit the house always in these cases?—Oh, yes, the first thing I do.

1598. Mr. MURKIN.—I suppose you have in your mind that there is no use in applying for outdoor relief, because the Guardians have a general rule against giving it unless there is a doctor's certificate that they cannot be removed?—The Guardians have a general rule to that effect, but each case is treated on its own merits before the Board.

1599. But practically that rule is enforced?—It is.

1600. And the people know that won't get outdoor relief, and come asking for it?—It may be that is the case.

1601. Don't you think such a stringent rule often acts very harshly?—I don't think it acts so harshly as it appears, because my experience of unions who go in largely for outdoor relief is that it does not lessen the number in the house. Take Strabane. I think our population is larger than Strabane, and their numbers in the house are pretty well up to what we have in the Derry Union of paupers, and they pay a very much larger amount in outdoor relief. I think it is something like a railway company advertising cheap fares—it increases the traffic. If you begin to give outdoor relief largely it will be largely availed of.

1602. There must, from what you have said, be cases in which outdoor relief would be an absolute necessity; for instance, in those cases where you give provisional

relief, do you not think that that provisional relief is necessary?—Yes.

1603. Suppose those people that got that don't come into the house, don't you think when it is cut off from them they must suffer?—I don't know a case where it is cut off. The Guardians always confirm in money if I recommend it, if I give provisional relief in kind.

1604. Your recommendations must be very few when you have only nine cases over the great extent of area?—Certainly they are few cases, because the applications are few.

1605. Because they think they would not get it?—That may be the conclusion you come to, of course.

1606. CHAIRMAN.—As regards boarded-out children, there are fifteen in the union, and as a rule they are very well managed by their foster parents?—There are eighteen at present; they are better brought up than those children would be in an institution.

1607. Do you find they are healthy children, apparently well nourished?—Yes.

1608. Look happy?—Yes, they look happy and contented, and would not wish to part with their foster parents; as a rule they all remain on with them.

1609. The boarding-out has been in force a long time, Mr. Scott told us yesterday: have you followed the career or life of many of these children?—Yes, I know a good many of them, men and women.

1610. Who are doing well?—Yes, the great majority—there are only one or two exceptions—have turned out very well for their class in society.

1611. Have any of them gone back to the workhouse as ordinary adult inmates?—No, I never know a single case to go back.

1612. Have you known many of the workhouse children to go back as adults?—I And as a rule you can never get them away; they look upon it as a home, and at all set times when they are out of work they generally turn in again.

1613. There is one class of workhouse child, that is the orphan child, who was not boarded out: do you find that these children come back to the workhouse in the same way as the children of families come back to the workhouse?—I don't know of any case of orphan children who were not boarded out; we board out all.

1614. In some unions they find these children less likely to come back; I thought you might have had some experience of them?—We heard out all orphans and deserted.

1615. Do you think it possible to board out any other class of children if the law were changed?—I think it would; there are some children in the house who might be boarded out but don't come under the law as it stands at present.

1616. If the law were changed, what class would you be disposed to board out?—I would hardly take it on me to say whether it would be better to take these illegitimate children from their mothers—

1617. And let their mothers go to work and board out the children?—I think that is a matter for the Board, but they could be as well brought up, and I think brought up healthier in the country.

1618. You have some cases, I dare say, of the children of virtuous, dissolute parents: do you think it would be for the public good to take those children from their parents?—I think it would, if you could take the parents from the children.

1619. If you could keep them apart?—Yes, but the difficulty would be to keep the parents away from them, and that the foster parents should not be troubled with these characters calling on their children.

1620. They would be sure to find out where those children were?—I think so. I knew a case where a woman troubled a nurse so much that she was near giving up the child.

Dr. D. J. BROWN examined.

1621. Dr. BROWN.—You are Medical Officer of the Londonderry Workhouse?—Yes.

1622. And have been that for a number of years?—Yes.

1623. You have made a good many improvements in the nursing?—Oh, yes.

1624. Do you think the nursing staff now a good one?—I do; I think it a very good one at present.

1625. It meets the wants of the union?—Yes, it does.

1626. Do you perform many operations in the workhouse?—Yes, we do.

1627. Minor operations?—Yes, and sometimes major operations.

1628. Have you got any extra assistance?—Yes, my son assists me now.

1629. If the case is a large one, would it not be better to send the patient on to the county infirmary, if he was able to be removed?—Yes, it would be better for them to go to the infirmary.

1630. Better arrangements, and a better operating theatre on modern lines?—It is; they have made great improvements at the county infirmary of late in that line.

Aug. 12, 1928.

Mr. John Foster.

Dr. D. J. Brown.

Aug 12, 1905.

Dr. D. J. Brown.

1625. Regarding the treatment of consumption, I think you stated that there are only a few cases of consumption in the workhouse?—At present there are only three cases.

1626. These cases, it has been stated, are advanced cases?—Well, yes.

1627. Do you ever get cases in the early stages of consumption?—Occasionally, but seldom.

1628. The dispensary doctors don't send in cases?—Not for treatment.

1629. It is only when a person has no home or no other place to go to?—That is it; where there are members of the family sleeping in the same room, they are sent then to get them away from the other members of the family.

1630. Not to any extent?—Not very much.

1631. You think that might be increased with advantage?—Yes, if there was proper accommodation.

1632. At present you don't consider the accommodation proper?—We are getting up two small wards at present; merely for isolation, not for treatment.

1633. Do you think the patients would be much benefited by their staying in these new wards?—It is not so much for the benefit of the patient or for the protection of others.

1634. There has been a suggestion made that possibly the fever hospital might be made a place for the isolation of consumptives?—Yes, the Guardians asked me to devise some method for treating these cases, and I made that suggestion to them, to send the fever cases to Foyle Hill, and have the fever hospital at Waterford for consumption; that was a few months ago.

1635. Did they take any action upon it?—Yes, I think they asked the Corporation to take them, but the conditions were such they could not comply with them.

1636. What were the conditions?—I don't exactly remember, but it was something about supplying them with food, attendance, and nurses. The conditions were such they could not comply with them.

1637. Do you consider that suggestions of that kind were made seriously?—As far as I remember that was it.

1638. That you should send your nurses from the workhouse and feed from the workhouse to Foyle Hill, a distance of how far?—It is over a mile.

1639. CHAIRMAN.—And pay how much?—I don't remember exactly. I think if the Corporation and the Guardians could agree on that it would be a good idea. There is no great necessity for two fever hospitals in Down.

1640. Dr. BROWN.—You think it would work for the benefit of the recipients?—Yes, there is accommodation there for both pay patients and paupers.

1641. You don't consider a patient going into a fever hospital a pauper?—He is not looked on in that way. But he is treated sometimes in that way, because when unwell he is supposed to put on the clothes, and I think that is a mistake. They should supply them

with a suit of tweed or serge that they could put on. The same thing would apply to patients coming from outside into the workhouse infirmary for treatment.

1642. Paying patients?—Yes, or even coming in for treatment, and that is not like to put on those clothes. It is not fair to ask them when they are coming in ready for treatment.

1643. The same class of persons going into the county infirmary for surgical treatment for an accident, and the same person taking fever and going up to you, is then called a pauper?—They look on it like that themselves, and that is the reason they object to come then; there is a lot of sentimentality.

1644. CHAIRMAN.—You have a number of people of independent means who have to go in there to be treated for fever sometimes?—We often had people of that class some years ago, but since Foyle Hill Hospital was opened they go there.

1645. Dr. BROWN.—Regarding the fever hospital at the workhouse, would it make a useful place for consumptives?—For that it would require to be entirely separated from the workhouse.

1646. CHAIRMAN.—Is it not?—No, it is a separate building, but still it is in communication with the workhouse.

1647. In what way?—By walks and telephone.

1648. Dr. BROWN.—That is more sentiment again?—Then there is a workhouse nurse.

1649. CHAIRMAN.—You can have any nurse you like?—You would require to have a separate staff.

1650. Dr. BROWN.—If it were recognized as a consumptive hospital with a separate staff and separate grounds?—Yes; a separate opening from the street.

1651. CHAIRMAN.—That is all possible, owing to the situation of the place?—Yes.

1652. Dr. BROWN.—Would there be much ground apportioned off?—Yes; there is a wall opposite the fever hospital that could be taken down, and there could be an avenue made from far up the Glendormet Road to it, and there is as much ground as they want there right opposite the door of the hospital.

1653. Would that increase its usefulness; would many cases be likely to go in there if it was generally known?—I expect if it was entirely separated from the workhouse and it was known it was fitted up for that sort of cases there would be a good many.

1654. CHAIRMAN.—How many beds could be put up there?—There is room for fifty beds and plenty of air space.

1655. Dr. BROWN.—And at present are you sometimes two months or three months without a few patients?—Sometimes; not often.

1656. CHAIRMAN.—It is a good airy situation?—It is.

1657. No objectionable surroundings except the workhouse?—It is a good distance from dwelling-houses; I never knew any harm from it.

1658. Dr. BROWN.—Dispensary doctors would be likely to send in cases then?—They would.

Mr. William Brown.

MR. WILLIAM BROWN EXAMINED.

1659. CHAIRMAN.—Would you kindly let us know your views on the various subjects that are in this abstract?—The first is on the amalgamation of unions. I do not think honest poverty is a crime, and I am of opinion that it would penalise poverty to dissolve a union and bring people to a distant union and deprive them of the only comfort they have—that of seeing their friends and relatives.

1660. You think that if a workhouse were dissolved the best solution of the difficulty would be that the aged and infirm classes should be boarded out?—Yes.

1661. Suppose the Limerick Workhouse were broken up and the people were to get outdoor relief in the shape of being boarded out it would be likely to lead, one would suppose, to a great number of applications for similar relief from persons who would not go into the workhouse?—That would be the abuse of it.

1662. On your view of any way in which that abuse could be guarded against?—It is very hard to guard against that abuse, except that the sons of these people might be made compulsorily to contribute for their maintenance.

1663. Suppose the son is the very first who tries to promote the granting of the relief, so that he may have his father and mother boarded out with him?—In that case I don't think it would be fair.

1664. Suppose he is a man with a small income, and that he would pull along somehow and support his

father and mother; but if this plan of boarding out old and infirm people were adopted, would you not have that man and a very large number of other people looking for support from the Guardians for their own relatives?—Undoubtedly that would be the abuse.

1665. On any way in which it could be guarded against?—I do not, except you might try to keep that man in his house for a couple of shillings a week.

1666. Then you would be giving them what they looked for?—I am afraid the abuse would be heavy.

1667. That is what I would be afraid of; if you could see any way of getting round it, any test?—There is a very good provision made for them in the workhouse—an improved dietary.

1668. For that reason you would rather keep open all the workhouses?—Yes; because abuses would follow if they were boarded out with relatives.

1669. Do you think it might be a test if an old person had to be provided for under the Poor Law, and if the Boards of Guardians were to advertise for tenders from persons to know for how much they would maintain the present workhouse inmates?—I think something like that would prevent this abuse, and a respectable person might be willing to take them for a small sum.

1670. The rate for the average maintenance of an inmate does not represent what the inmate costs the

State. Now you have this about the chargeability, you would like to go back to the old divisional charge?—Yes, sir; I find that with the Derry Board of Guardians there is a rule that has been in force for over twenty years that no person would be entitled to outdoor relief except the doctor sent a certificate that such a person could be sent to the workhouse. The Guardians held that they are not compelled to receive an application for outdoor relief. I remember one case that came up in Clonady.

1871. You may remember the case in your own mind, but you need not go into the particulars—I think that where the representative of the division make an application for outdoor relief it can be given without any abuse, because he is responsible to his own constituents if he has abused the grant of outdoor relief.

1872. They got to know how much is given?—His constituents would know whether the case was deserving or not.

1873. Do you think under the old state of things the representatives of the district got to know what people in the divisions were on outdoor relief?—Yes; they all have a local knowledge of it from the relieving officer calling at the houses.

1874. You would like to tell us something about district nursing?—I think Mr. Gregg put a very admirable scheme about nursing before the Commission yesterday—having a depot attached to each dispensary.

1875. You cordially support his views on that?—Yes; I know district nursing has done a large amount of good in Derry city, not alone to the individual, but gave practical knowledge to the people attending the sick.

1876. You think the Guardians are not sufficiently liberal in adding a family when the breadwinner is stricken down by disease?—No, sir. I know of my own knowledge that if it were not for the fact that every religious denomination round here have to look after their own sick and poor serious consequences would have followed the interpretation of this rule by the Derry Board of Guardians. It means every religious denomination have to look after their deserving poor, and these people are already paying for the poor through the rates.

1877. They are not paying anything, practically, for outdoor relief?—No, but they are paying rates, and they are also assisting religious denominations.

1878. You would not think that there ought not to be any charitable aid given; you would not say that everything given to a person in need should be through official organisation?—I think once a case is strong enough to merit something from a charitable organisation that that is a case for State aid.

1879. This is not the law you see at present?—It may not be the law.

1880. The law is destitution as the test, not poverty.

1881. You think that some children are badly in need of food?—Yes.

1882. The children of reckless or extravagant parents, you say?—Children who, through the energy of the Inspector for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children—

1883. And the School Attendance Committee?—Are compelled to go to school, and sometimes they have to go to school hungry. I think the teacher should have power to give such a child as that a ticket to secure a meal from the rates.

1884. At present does the child remain hungry?—Except some person comes to know about it. I think such a rule as that is in existence in England.

1885. And you would like to see that rule applied in Ulster?—Yes; if they want children to go to school they must feed them.

1886. Would you propose that the cost of the meal should be paid for from the rates in the first instance, and then recovered from the reckless and improvident parents?—Yes.

1887. There is a paragraph in your abstract about the fever hospital at Foyle Hill?—That is a grievance that has cropped up here among the people of Derry. A man takes ill—

1888. With fever?—Yes, and he is only a pauper because he has not the fee for Foyle Hill.

1889. Have they charged a fee?—Yes.

1890. Under what authority?—I cannot say, but there were some proceedings in court to recover it. And if they cannot pay the fee they must get someone to give security for it.

1891. This hospital was established for the prevention of fever in Derry, but unless a person can pay the fee he is allowed to infect his neighbourhood?—That is not the case now; there was a case before the Recorder.

The people have a feeling that they are prospered if they go to the Waterside Hospital.

1892. You were a guardian for a number of years?—I was.

1893. You are acquainted with the situation of the fever hospital?—Yes.

1894. If that hospital were closed, as Dr. Bigger suggested, for consideration; if that hospital were closed as a fever hospital, and all fever patients paid for by the Guardians at Foyle Hill, do you think that would be the solution?—It would be a solution that would meet the views of all classes in the city.

1895. Dr. Brown.—If the fever hospital at the Waterside was turned into a consumption hospital do you think they would avail themselves of it?—I do; I believe that in time they would. When I became a guardian I knew the sentiment that was amongst the people, and I requested the Guardians to change the name of the new hospital when it was finished, which they kindly did. They changed the name to the Waterside Infirmary.

1896. Is that what Dr. Brown's hospital is now?—Yes; Dr. Brown calls it the Waterside Hospital. Taking the sting out of the name is taking away a good deal of the sentiment. There have been fifty or sixty people there.

1897. Do you think better nursing has anything to do with it as well as the name?—Certainly; I believe Dr. Brown thought that if the consumptive patients were made wear a different garb—

1898. CHAIRMAN.—That is in the power of the Guardians, and they have been recommended to do it?—I remember putting that question to Major Scott.

1899. As regards tramps, you would be rather slow, I judge from the abstract of your evidence, to do anything against them?—Well, there is a small minority of tramps that are bona fide tramps; there is nothing to be said against them.

1900. Bona fide; is that the tramps that have travelled three miles?—No; I know that two-thirds of the people who occupy the workhouse belong to the city, and use the workhouse as a lodging-house five or six nights a week, and early in the evening they secure a ticket from the Relieving Officer, they beg money up to a late hour of the night, and then they arrive drunk at the workhouse. I believe that this particular class should be made pay when they have money, or that the master should make them work it out, or that they should be kept in for at least a week. I believe they should not be in the workhouse at all, but bound by themselves.

1901. Dr. Bigger.—In charge of the police?—Yes.

1902. CHAIRMAN.—And in a building under the control of the police, not the workhouse?—Yes; I think it would be good.

1903. The people that you think ought not to be interfered with are the people who are really and honestly looking for work?—That is what I meant when I say bona fide—a man who would be travelling through here looking for work, an artisan who found himself without any money, and who would have to go from one town to another. There are sometimes men of that class.

1904. And they will come to a place like Derry, which has the name of being a place where employment is plentiful?—Yes. About the children in the workhouse, no person can advocate anything better than the present system of boarding out, but there are a number of children who go from town to town, and I believe it would be a mercy to these children to take them and rear them up, not in the workhouse, but outside with other children. It would be a mercy to take them from the father and mother.

1905. Do you think they would object?—They should have no right to object; they should be compulsorily taken from them and reared up as good men and women, because otherwise they come to live in the workhouse.

1906. I think it was said yesterday that if the case was as bad as to make it desirable to take away the children the parents ought to be put in jail as long as the Guardians had charge of the children?—That is a very strong remedy.

1907. As regards the infirm classes, you think the stronger ones make it uncomfortable for the feeble ones?—As the workhouse is at present constituted, as far as I could see of it, there is one class called the aged and infirm that occupy a separate place by themselves; there is another class still called the aged and infirm that occupy the sitting-room with the men, and

Aug 21, 1898.

Mr. William Brown.

Aug. 22, 1893. take their meals with them, and I have frequently
 board complaints that the strong able-bodied ones kept
 them away from the Sea.
 Mr. William Brown.

1708. Is not that rather a matter for the wardman or

the workhouse master?—The wardman in that case is a pauper.

1709. The workhouse master?—Well, if he is called upon by the wardman.

Mr. SAMUEL LONEY examined.

Mr. Samuel Loney.

1710. CHAIRMAN.—You are the Clerk of the Coleraine Union?—Yes; I was also master for five years, and relieving officer for fifteen years.

1711. Are there any of your Guardians here to-day?—No, the committee appointed had important engagements for yesterday and to-day, and it was arranged that when I had their views I should come to the Commission and give their views, as far as possible.

1712. What are the views of your committee?—On the first question of amalgamation of workhouses, the Guardians are unanimous on the question of amalgamation of one of the workhouses in the County Derry. They think one ought to be taken up. If that workhouse can be utilized for an auxiliary asylum, and relieve the pressure on the present asylum, and stop the expenditure on Grange. The Guardians had thought among themselves, although they did not suggest it, had thought generally that Linsavady would be the workhouse most suitable for that purpose, and that it could be utilized without appointing a separate staff. It could be made an auxiliary by having a staff that would be suitable for it without going to an extravagant staff for simple lunatics only. I think it was said at the meeting of the County Council, of which two of our Guardians are members, that there were sixty people in the asylum that could be transferred to Linsavady if it was an auxiliary, as well as a few that are in the workhouses, and then it would not be necessary to have a very efficient staff, that is a staff with great knowledge of the treatment of lunacy. They are mostly idiots and people who would not want exceptional treatment. Any case that would want exceptional treatment should be kept in an asylum. The Guardians are of opinion that no lunatic of any description should be kept in the workhouse.

1713. From your experience as workhouse master, would you cordially agree with that?—Most undoubtedly; it is a great deal better now than it was twenty years ago, but still a workhouse is not the place for the treatment of lunatics, and I do agree with the Guardians that Linsavady as a workhouse might be done away with entirely, and even as a hospital; a general infirmary ought to take its place—a district hospital. It was said here in evidence—and I took it up yesterday as a good suggestion—that thirty-three of those people in Linsavady are lunatics, who would go to the asylum, of course; the remainder are children who could be boarded out and otherwise disposed of. That would practically leave only about thirty people—people in hospital. Fifteen of these Mr. Boyd said could be disposed of by boarding-out. I don't care for the boarding-out system, but take it far granted that they would be, that would only leave about thirty. Take it that fifteen of those thirty were people that had not much connection with the district that is always the case in workhouse infirmaries; one-half of the people have no connection with the district farther than that they were there in their youth and come back when they are old—these people could be removed to Derry or Coleraine, the remaining ten or fifteen could be accommodated in a cottage hospital, and to that could be attached two wards for paying patients, which would be very useful in Linsavady; we have one in Coleraine, which is very useful.

1714. How is the Coleraine one supported?—By voluntary subscription.

1715. Do you mean you are against boarding-out grown-up people or the children?—Grown-up people; it is open to so many abuses.

1716. You are in favour of boarding-out children?—Most undoubtedly in this way; it is the best system that is being adopted now, much superior to treatment in the workhouse, but I have in my mind—I don't know whether the Guardians would agree with me—my personal opinion is that it is not the best system in this county. It is not nearly as good here as in Armagh and Monaghan, where they have small farmers who will take the children for a small fee. In this county—I speak especially for Coleraine—we are de-

pended for the boarding-out of our children on the labouring classes.

1717. Won't the small farmers take them then?—We have really no small farmers to take them. Our farmers are farmers that would not be troubled with having children about their houses; would not nurse them for pay. Some would adopt a child, but that would be a different thing altogether.

1718. Does adoption really mean they would adopt them as a member of the family, or merely take them to get work out of the child without paying them?—It would be a case where a child would be adopted for the sake of having a child.

1719. Where there would be a children family?—Yes. We have sixteen children that are nursed, mostly with the labouring class; that is the class they come from.

1720. That is right, is it not?—I don't agree with that. We are bringing up orphan children in the same position as they were before. We put them in the houses of the labouring classes, where they have not the means of learning to be industrious; they have not cows and cannot learn to milk, in the case of the 19th girls, and they have not horses. When girls come to twelve or thirteen they learn to sew, and they are useless for anything but sewing.

1721. Are not the girls employed by neighbouring farmers?—They are, but not until they come to fifteen or sixteen. A child brought up in a labourer's house, and going to work with a farmer, is expected to assist in milking the cows. And they don't then get into the farmhouses; they mostly go to shirt factories and large towns, in private house service, and even then, in the rural districts in Coleraine, a great many people keep cows, and it is impossible now to get a servant girl to milk a cow. That is one of the things that would lead me to say—if it were possible in each county—to have a separate part of the workhouse set apart for an industrial school that would be entirely free from the other part of the workhouse. Appoint a thoroughly good schoolmaster and schoolmistress; let them not mix with the other part of the house; be entirely off it by themselves—sleep by themselves—and be altogether separate, and learn to milk cows and wash clothes, and other things, and not leave them to sit with their hands folded when they are not at school, and not learn the ordinary work of servant girls. I think they could be properly trained in several institutions.

1722. You think you could in an institution rear up a little boy or girl to be as useful as in houses outside?—I am of opinion that they could, much better than in a labourer's house. I remember a school under the control of the Society of Friends, in the County Down, at Brockfield, where the children of small farmers were brought in there and educated.

1723. How long would they stay there?—From five to six years.

1724. It was a boarding school?—Yes, it was kept for a very small fee—in some cases a couple of pounds—and they were clothed, and these children, children of parents who were poor, they all turned out to be house servants and farm servants, and a great many that were intelligent came to be land stewards; and I don't think there is anything to hinder a school under the Poor Law being managed the same way. I think, as far as amalgamation is concerned, the Guardians think Linsavady might be done away with, and that the amalgamation of one workhouse in this county would be good. We would answer the second question, if the workhouse could be utilized, and I think there is nothing to hinder that.

1725. The third question does not arise, because they don't want to join any union?—No, and I would not agree with the boarding-out of lunatics. We pay between £600 and £700 a year for outdoor relief; it was double that amount twenty years ago, and it was greatly abused, but I think at present with as it is not abused. It is given in every deserving case where the relieving officer—an independent man—reports, and the Guardians are guided by his opinion.

1735. Query 4: is there any change in the law that the Guardians think desirable?—I don't know that the Guardians have considered the question very much.

1737. They have not asked you to say anything on that?—No, I have my own opinion upon the question of union charges.

1738. As clerk of the union, I suppose you would rather keep up the union charges?—No, sir; if divisional charges can be made as a whole, by all means make everything divisional charges, but I don't think it would be desirable to make divisional charges for outdoor relief or maintenance. When I was appointed relieving officer in 1855 the outdoor relief was between £50 and £30 a week. The Guardians found it coming very heavy on them, and the idea then was that every Guardian that came up from his division and presented an old woman and said, "I want outdoor relief for her," the Guardians gave it to her. But after I was appointed the Guardians generally set their faces against it; memoranda were brought to Guardians, saying—"Get such a woman outdoor relief." I always did invariably oppose, it was so badly abused, and the Guardians were glad to get out of the responsibility. The Guardians who are advocating the cost of outdoor relief as a divisional charge will find afterwards they will be glad to get rid of the responsibility.

1739. Your experience is that there was double the outdoor relief when there was divisional rating at Coleraine?—That is so, and the Guardians themselves say it was abused, and did away with it.

1740. There is no additional hospital accommodation, is there, required in Coleraine Union?—I think not; we are very well off for hospital accommodation.

1741. How far from the workhouse is the most distant part of the Coleraine Union?—Seventeen miles—Tamlaghtbeg—were we have a contract for an asphalting.

1742. Is that a populous part of the union?—Fairly populous, but very healthy; not many come in. The Guardians, whenever they have an old man or woman that can be comfortably kept out, give a little outdoor relief. They very seldom give outdoor relief except in the case of an old man and woman living together, who have a comfortable house, but when they get sick they come to the workhouse, and we send a four-wheeled ambulance, and, where necessary, a trained nurse.

1743. Are there many pauper patients?—There are in the fever hospital, but not in the infirmary; our district is a healthy district.

1744. If the Guardians were given power to charge what they in their discretion thought would be fair, having regard to the circumstances in each case, do you think it would be a good thing to have a small fee, say from 6d. or 1s. or 2s. 6d. a week, up to whatever the actual cost would be?—I think it would be if the Guardians could charge it, but I don't think it would be very much avoided.

1745. I mean if it were practically made compulsory?—If it was, it would keep a good many out.

1746. Do you really think so; supposing you were sitting as a member of a committee, and the child of a man earning £1 came in—supposing he had a large family you would say: "This child at all events costs him 1s. a week at home, and we will charge him 1s. a week"—do you think that would keep that child out?—I don't think it would, but we have very few of those cases about Coleraine; generally speaking it would be a good thing in Derry but not in the rural districts.

1747. Who are the people who come into your hospital chiefly?—People suffering from accidents, and old people generally who are wearing down.

1748. You don't think from your class of inmates that very much could be got in the way of contributions?—I don't think so. We have arranged with the medical officer, and we have one ward better done up

than the rest, and where a patient wishes to pay, the fee is so small, he gets the accommodation of that ward. In both these wards we have men and women who pay; that ward is never taken up with anyone except respectable poor people.

1749. Do you think any improvement ought to be made as regards the treatment of convales?—I think a great deal more is made of the tramps than is necessary. I think if the general law as to vagrancy was thoroughly carried out by the police, and the regulations of the place strictly carried out, there would be an improvement, but I think a great deal of the tramp system is encouraged.

1750. Do you think it is right that a man should be able to claim his discharge after three hours?—In some cases I would keep him longer, but I think generally that if the regulations are strictly carried out, that they come into the workhouse at 7 o'clock at night, and the master sees that they are dressed in workhouse clothes and washed—not necessarily in cold water—and their clothes are taken from them, and their pipes and tobacco, and they go to bed and are up next morning at 6 o'clock, and that they wrought for three hours and get their breakfast, there would not be much trouble. The casuals are the worst, I think the principal part of them—the loafers—should be kept in the workhouse at least a week, and if they continue, increase that time.

1751. As soon as they would have a character for being casual loafers?—Yes, keep them in. There is one other class which is a great trouble in inland parishes, and it has not been touched on by any witness—it is the class that brings itself for treatment to the hospital from drink. Speaking of the Coleraine Workhouse, from an experience of over twenty-three years, we have those people coming in five or six times, and in fact their whole lives they are suffering from drink; they come in and get patched up, after a great deal of proper nursing and care and trouble and expense; they go out and perhaps come back in three weeks the same way again. I think where a man or woman comes to the workhouse hospital more than twice in his or her life, I think the second time they come, and have brought it on themselves, they should be punished as vagrants; give them a month in jail or six weeks. It is a great nuisance not alone to the officials, but it is a nuisance to the other patients; they have to be held in bed, and they are a great trouble to the other patients. It is a thing as to which the Guardians have had time after time to see if anything could be done, and nothing could be done. I think that the tramps don't cost very much, and if you make any hard and fast rule with a tramp, you then put him that he will lie down in a haystack, and perhaps set fire to it, which would cost the country far more than keeping him. About sending them to jails, I don't agree with that; if a man is really destitute, it is better to make a mistake in admitting him than to put any poor person to the trouble of going to the police and getting the stigma of being a criminal. I think in all cases of casuals and tramps they should go direct to the master of the workhouse, and not to the relieving officer. My experience as a relieving officer in Coleraine was that a tramp came to me at 5 or 7 o'clock and got a line; he immediately started begging through the whole town, and turned up at the workhouse very often at 10 or 11 at night nearly drunk. The master could not refuse him. In some cases I know the master did refuse him, and was reprimanded for doing so, and rightly, because they were left at the gate, but if the master of the workhouse was the only person who could give a line to the tramp, they would go there in proper time and be admitted. I think it is a thing that should be looked into.

Mr. E. M. Macneary examined.

Perhaps you would allow me to say a few words as one of the members of the Londonderry County Council, and a former Guardian of the Londonderry Union; it was merely with reference to our County Council that recommended one of the workhouses in the County Derry to be dissolved; with that recommendation I entirely agree. It would appear to rather point to the Londonderry Union as being the Union that should be dissolved; I quite agree with that, too. But as a member of the asylum board, I hardly agree with the recommendation that it should be converted into an auxiliary asylum, owing to several reasons, with which

you are no doubt all conversant, that is the State grant, and cost and difficulty of providing attendants. I think an asylum should be concentrated, as far as possible, and having regard to the fact that we have got a very fine piece of ground at Glenties—

1752. CHAIRMAN.—Where you have already undertaken considerable works?—Where we are undertaking considerable works, and have already located thirty of the inmates. At present we are building to accommodate 100 inmates, and ultimately the entire asylum will be moved down there, but I rather think that the Londonderry workhouse, if it is dissolved, might be very

Aug. 12, 1902.

Mr. Bennett
Looky

Mr. E. M.
Macneary.

Aug. 12, 1903.

Mr. S.M.
Macrory.

advantageously turned into an agricultural school, and I might in that connection point out the fact that we in the County Londonderry had the most useful agricultural school that existed in Ireland, at Templemore. I daresay you have all read Thackeray's "Irish Sketch Book." The last chapter of that gives probably the very best description of Templemore, and Mr. Thackeray passed a very favourable criticism on the management of Templemore; and from my own knowledge I believe that school did more good to the County Derry, and nearly every other county in Ireland, than anything else we had. If something of that sort could be established in Limerick I believe it would be very greatly to the advantage not only of the County Derry, but also to the whole North of Ireland.

1763. The land at the workhouse is very well situ-

ated?—It is. Owing to the recent death of a lady, the late Mr. Alexander's farm behind the house—sixty or seventy acres of land—is now available, so in every way it would be very desirable for that purpose. That is really all I wish to say about the matter.

1764. The matter has not been considered locally in connection with the Agricultural Department, I suppose?—It has not. I mentioned the matter to Sir Horace Plunkett last Autumn, and I think he seemed disposed to look at it favourably. I also advised him to read Thackeray's "Sketch Book," which he did not appear to have read, in connection with the school we had at Templemore.

CHAIRMAN.—There are no other witnesses, I think, here to-day. We will sit to-morrow at 11 o'clock and take up the boundaries.

The Sitting was adjourned.

FIFTH PUBLIC SITTING—THURSDAY, AUGUST 13TH, 1903.

Aug 13 1903.

At the Courthouse, Londonderry.

Present:—Mr. MACKS, (Chairman), Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. COREY BOGGER.

CHAIRMAN.—There is one general witness whose evidence will take a short time—a doctor who could not

attend until this morning. It will only delay the boundaries question by a few minutes.

Dr. LEONARD KING examined.

Dr. Leonard King.

1743. CHAIRMAN.—You are the Surgeon of the County Fermanagh Infirmary?—Yes, sir.

1746. You attend here to-day to give evidence on the question of hospitals; would you kindly state what you wish to say on that subject?—Well, broadly, Mr. Chairman, my conclusions are these, that there are too many hospitals of all sorts, and I base my reasons there:—The population of Ireland is 4,484,000; the united population of Dublin, Belfast, and Cork comes to 123,000, and for my purpose I take the rest of the population of Ireland as rural—that leaves a rural population of 3,750,000. It is admitted by authorities that the standard number of hospital beds in the rural population is one to 1,000. There are peculiar circumstances in Ireland; an unusual number of crippled people of one kind or another left owing to the tide of emigration, so that possibly this standard had better be raised to one bed in 800. That means you would require as hospital beds for hospital patients, distinguished from aged and infirm in workhouses, 4,750 beds. The question is how is this to be grappled with. To be on the safe side, make that 5,000 beds. The average occupation of a bed in Ireland will be thirty days, and 5,000 hospital beds ought to provide in the year for 50,000 people. The means that at present exist are—there are some thirty county infirmaries outside Cork and Dublin. I include Antrim because the county infirmary is in Larchmont, and there are 150 workhouse hospitals; lump them all at an average of fifty beds and you get some thousands of beds too many. We want to provide for 5,000 beds. There are thirty county infirmaries, with an average of fifty beds—that is 1,500 provided for—and only leaves about 3,500 to be provided for in union hospitals; that will be met with by taking seventy of the union hospitals from the 150, in my opinion, leaving some eighty that may be eliminated altogether as hospitals distinct from villages for the aged and infirm; but for pure simple surgical and medical purposes there seems to me there are some eighty hospitals too many. I think the county infirmaries, or the best of the union hospitals converted into district hospitals, should be raised to a very high standard of efficiency, constructed, equipped, and furnished on the most modern lines for surgical cases, and all the grave cases of each county and district should be concentrated in these central hospitals. You will probably require also a certain number of union hospitals, less expensively equipped, for less severe cases and chronic cases. But acute medical and surgical cases, to secure their having the full advantage of the advance of science, should be concentrated in a central hospital, possibly the county infirmary, or the best of the union hospitals, situated in a convenient district; and, I take it, that under ordinary circumstances, one such hospital, at all events in the smaller counties, would be sufficient. There may be some of the counties would require two such hospitals, possibly Cork or Tipperary, and two or three other counties may require two each, but the majority of the counties would be amply served by one hospital of about sixty beds, without the use of the union hospitals, provided that in outlying districts a certain number of small cottage hospitals were supplied and put in charge of the doctor of the district.

1747. Then you would close the workhouses and put cottage hospitals in their place?—I would close up, I should think, some eighty union hospitals.

1748. Have a smaller number of beds in smaller centres?—Precisely so; a limited number of cottage hospitals with eight or ten beds as the locality required.

1749. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—Leaving them in charge of the dispensary doctors?—Leaving them in charge of the dispensary doctors.

1750. Dr. BROWNE.—You mentioned the proportion of one bed to 1,000; where did you get that statistic?—I cannot give you the statistics, but that is accepted as a fair average, by hospital authorities, for rural populations.

1751. For infectious diseases?—No, I am talking altogether of medical and surgical beds.

1752. You would require that proportion for infectious diseases alone; that is the proportion laid down by all sanitary authorities?—But I should think that would scarcely apply to rural districts.

1753. Is not that the number provided in any well-maintained institution?—I think it is.

1754. If that is so for infectious diseases, would it not require a larger number for all the other cases?—I don't think it would, because a great many people come to hospitals in Ireland, simply because there are no out-patient departments.

1755. CHAIRMAN.—No place for dressing wounds regularly?—Quite so; constantly people in the country come to hospitals for treatment of chronic cases which could be managed at home.

1756. You think a smaller number of beds spread over a small district would meet your views?—Yes.

1757. Is there anything else on the hospital question?—Dr. Bogger referred to the fever hospitals; I can only speak about Fermanagh. There are three fever hospitals in Fermanagh; these are frequently without a patient at all, and the area of the county is such that there would be nothing to prevent fever patients being transported to one central hospital, which would serve the entire county for fever, assuming that the hospital were constructed on proper lines, and I think any fever hospital should be constructed so as to treat infectious diseases without risk of contact—at least three varieties of infectious diseases in each case—and if that were the case, one central fever hospital in such a county as Fermanagh would be ample to serve the whole county.

1758. Dr. BROWNE.—For three diseases it would need at least seven or eight wards, male and female, and for isolation purposes?—It would; but then the question arises, what are you to do in the event of an epidemic. It would be much cheaper to provide for an epidemic in case of emergency than to leave large, permanent buildings idle waiting for an epidemic.

1759. As regards nursing?—My idea is that each county should be self-contained, with regard to the nursing arrangement, and that each county hospital or district hospital, which is brought up to the standard of the efficient county hospital, should be regarded as the local training centre; that is that each hospital must be brought up in construction, equipment,

Aug. 13, 1902.

Dr. Leonard
Kidd.

furnishing and the means at their disposal for teaching to make them efficient training schools for any nurses that may be required in that particular county, and each hospital should have a staff somewhat larger than is required for its immediate wants, so that extra hands could be sent from the parent hospital to the local hospital when they are wanted, and be available for private nursing and add to the income of the institution in such a way; such an arrangement as that, especially for those out-lying hospitals would be a material factor in introducing district nursing, which would reduce the number of people who now apply for hospital treatment.

1760. Was there anything else with regard to nursing; it should be a county or a group of counties?—Yes, but personally I prefer to see each county self-contained. I think that, too, involves a question of hospital payment. I think as persons should be admitted free to a rate-supported hospital. I draw a wide distinction between a rate-supported hospital and one supported by charitable contributions. I am not prepared to defend the system of payments in charitable institutions, but in rate-aided hospitals every person should pay something, no matter how small, and that charge should be based, not on what it costs the institution to maintain the individual, but rather what it would cost that person to live at home. If a man has a sick child I think he should pay 2s. 6d., 5s., or whatever it may be, a week.

1761. Or is it?—He should do that; if he does not do that, you put a premium on sickness, and that man is escaping the home maintenance of the child. I would relax the rule as far as possible; but in order to keep your rule let him pay 1d. a week.

1762. But if he had no means?—He has got to live at home, and he cannot live at home for 1d. a week. If he were sick and treated at home it would cost him a great deal more than 1d. a week. I have worked out some figures with regard to the Farmingham Hospital.

1763. CHAIRMAN.—Perhaps you would hand them to the Secretary?—The next question is the question of tuberculosis.

1764. You were going to say something about the aged and infirm paupers?—I think considerable economy might be effected by boarding out a considerable number of aged and infirm people who are now in the workhouse. Personally, I am totally against boarding out the children, but I am not against the boarding out of people in the other extreme of life, but I am aware that if you go to the workhouse and ask these people how many have friends willing to take them at a small sum it would only reduce the aged and infirm about 10 per cent. The average cost of people in the workhouse appears to be 3s. 6d. a week.

1765. That is merely for food; it runs up to 5s. or 10s. 1—Well, I think that many of those aged and infirm people might be kept by their friends if they were given 3s. or 4s. a week, but that should be done under the most rigid inspection by relieving officers assigned for the purpose, and where there is out-door relief there should be the same rigid inspection.

1766. You see the danger of it?—Quite so.

1767. That would be the only test you could suggest?—I would give no out-door relief except for work done.

1768. But if people are not able to work—say a woman with three or four young children?—But as a rule there are some members of the family who can work.

1769. A great many of the cases who get out-door relief are cases where the person cannot work?—There are very often some members of the family who do something. I think, as far as possible, it should be a broad principle that no out-door relief should be given except in receipt for work done.

1770. That would be an abolition of out-door relief?—It would reduce it very much, I think.

1771. Why do you object to the boarding out of children?—For this reason; as far as I can judge, the chief reason for taking children away from the workhouse is owing to what is called the "atmosphere of the workhouse," "the taint of the workhouse." A workhouse has no business to have these "atmospheres" or "taints," but in the next place I think it would be better if children were separated from the ordinary workhouse and concentrated in separate establishments, called industrial homes.

1772. Institutions?—Institutions of that kind; and from the time they are three and a half years old their education should be conducted by people who

are properly fitted to teach them at that age; and so soon as they are fit for it, every child, male and female, should be technically instructed in some trade. As far as the means at my disposal permit me I want to visit in my district the children who are boarded out. They are brought up in the worst habits of idleness, and ignorance, and dirt of the poorer class Irish peasantry. I only speak of what I have seen myself. One woman told me, "If I keep these children the way the lady inspector wants me, the sum I get from the workhouse—25s. a year, is 11d. a week—would not do it." and, as far as I can see, they are taught nothing. Their latest ambition seems to be a cattle head or farm drudge, and they are not taught to be a good cattle head or farm drudge. I think there is a great responsibility on the people who have charge of the poor; I don't see why they should not be lifted and their whole tone raised.

1773. Above that of the ratepayers?—Yes; I don't see why they should not be, because eventually, although the Guardians may say these children are better educated than our children, it would raise the status of the whole country.

1774. Dr. Broom.—Farmers will always require labourers?—Yes; but take the ordinary Irish servant in your house; she does not do anything right. A trained domestic servant who has been properly trained will do twice as much work, and much more cleanly, than she would. Girls come into my hospital to do work and begin to clean the grates, and then they put their black hands on the painted wall; they don't know how to do their work, and somebody else has to come round and clean up after them.

1775. CHAIRMAN.—What are your views about epileptics and lunatics?—I think they should all be taken away from the workhouse, and that raises the question as to whether workhouses should be turned into auxiliary asylums. I don't think they should. I think all epileptics and insane should be concentrated in the asylums, which should be sufficiently large to accommodate them, because the risk of turning the workhouse into auxiliary asylums is that they might be left without regular attendance, and that leads one to the question of providing an extra medical staff; it would not do to lock them up in a place like the Zoo; they should be under careful medical inspection.

1776. Dr. Broom.—Would it be cheaper?—I think it would be cheaper to put them into the asylum.

1777. CHAIRMAN.—You wish to make some suggestion on the question of tuberculosis?—There are two things that have occupied my attention very much as doctor to the infirmary—the first is the appalling amount of tuberculous cases of one kind or another that come in—surgeon tuberculous, not lung tuberculous—and also the extraordinary number of people who come suffering from blood poisoning, due to the defective condition of their teeth. If these two things could be grappled with it would prevent the crowding, and there would be much less demand for hospital beds, and it must be admitted that prevention is better than cure. The only suggestion I could make is to make consumption notifiable, not with the idea that they should be brought to hospital, but that cases not sufficiently bad to go to hospital should be under inspection and obliged to report themselves to trained inspectors, in order that they may receive instruction as to how they could diminish the risk of spreading pulmonary consumption, which is contagious, preventable, and curable, and why not lay ourselves out to meet these three broad facts.

1778. First you would have it notifiable; then as regards its isolation?—As far as possible at present, but you could not compel every tuberculous person to go to hospital in Ireland, but a great deal might be done to prevent the spread by having them in their homes under expert inspection. The two chief causes of the spreading is the unsanitary and unswept condition of their houses, and they should be taught how to improve their houses, surface drainage, and the proportion of the size of windows and size of doors, and while these trained inspectors are going round these houses, a great deal might be done by inspecting the members of these families with regard to the condition of their teeth, which would reduce disease in this country by an enormous extent. As regards the treatment of tuberculosis in the urban hospitals, I think they are quite unsuitable, and the only way to manage it would be by selecting specially suitable sites in certain districts, and that creation of

groups of counties should join together in maintaining a sanatorium not only for the treatment of pulmonary tuberculosis, but also surgical tuberculosis; and I fancy once these institutions were started the receipts from patients in these, and other hospitals, would do a great deal towards supporting them, and they in a large measure would become convalescent homes for surgical hospitals. A case of tuberculosis goes into a surgical hospital and remains there for nine months or ten months. I should suggest that if Sligo, Donegal, Tyrone, and Fermanagh were joined, these four counties could obtain such a place in or near Bundoran, and the arrangements for that could be provided by the receipts from the patients of these various hospitals.

1779. Dr. BROOME.—You mentioned one large hospital or two for some counties: what about the staff of these hospitals?—My idea about that is if you do away with a considerable number of union hospitals, it at once creates a grievance with regard to the medical officers. I think the better class of hospitals should be situated either in the county town or the largest town of the district, so as to have a staff of two or three medical men, and a great deal of the grievance of doing away with the union hospital would be met wherever it was possible by transferring the doctor of the workhouse to the staff of the county infirmary, or wherever this large hospital was.

1780. Do you think that would do for all purposes, for instance, large operations?—Quite so. I have an average of thirty-two beds occupied daily, and it takes a great deal of time. I have to ask for assistance, depending on the generosity of my colleagues, when I have any operations.

1781. Every medical man in the country is not qualified to be an hospital surgeon?—Quite so; but I would like to see provision made in the county infirmaries to attract charitable contributors. Under the present Act they are under a committee—a certain number of the County Council and a certain number selected from private subscribers. County infirmaries were originally supported by private money, and the Local

Government Board have capitalised this, and allowed a certain proportion of annual subscribers to sit on the board, and I think that is a wise conclusion, because if you put them all under the control of the County Council you kill whatever charity other arrangements would draw forth, but I think there is one list in the present arrangements—the question of appointments unless the service becomes a State service. I think any man who subscribes £5 a year, or gives a donation of £20, should have a voice in the election of medical officers. At present there are many men who are life governors of my infirmary, and they have no voice whatever in the election of an officer.

1782. CHAIRMAN.—You recommend going back to the old system?—Not altogether, but for the purpose of administration, the Board might be made a composite Board, elected every three years, and every paying governor need not necessarily have a seat on that board, but in the event of an election he ought to have a voice.

1783. Is there anything more?—The only other thing I want to say with regard to the payment by hospital patients is, there is only one way that this can be collected in a businesslike way, that these payments must be small and collected weekly in advance. That is a more matter of routine work for whoever is registrar of the hospital.

1784. Dr. BROOME.—Have you any idea of how much you would raise in that way from the county?—When I was appointed the average was about £20 a year; we have got it up now to over £80, and the individuals are charged less than they used to be, but there are a larger number of people paying smaller sums.

1785. CHAIRMAN.—Now the boundaries question?—I would like to add that I have calculated in my hospital that on the average computation of thirty-two beds, without the smallest hardship on the people who come, we can easily collect an income of £300 a year.

1786. You estimated that?—Yes, and on that scale only two of these thirty beds would be charged 10s. a week, and the majority under 6d. a day.

Mr. M. DETHMUND, K.C. (instructed by Mr. Wm. Wilson), represented Donagall County Council; Mr. T. M. HEALY, K.C., M.P. (instructed by Mr. William O'Doherty), the Inshaven Board of Guardians; and Mr. J. J. CHANCE, M.P. (instructed by Mr. Edward O'Fallon, M.P., and Mr. James Boyle), the Letterkenny and Stranorlar Board of Guardians.

Mr. D. S. HENRY, K.C., and Mr. R. E. OSGOOD (instructed by Mr. Stuart Ross), represented the Londonderry Board of Guardians; Mr. JOHN COOK, K.C., (instructed by Mr. John S. McCay), the Londonderry Corporation; Mr. A. L. HOBSON (instructed by Mr. Stuart Ross), the Londonderry No. 1 Rural District Council; Mr. LARSEN (instructed by Mr. S. Ross), Londonderry No. 2 Rural District Council; Mr. D. S. HENRY, K.C. (instructed by Mr. Thomas Elliott), also appeared for the Stranorlar Board of Guardians.

Mr. DRUMMOND.—I am instructed to appear before you on behalf of the County Council of the County Donegal. Three of the unions in the county—Inshaven, Letterkenny, and Stranorlar—will be represented; Mr. Healy appears for Inshaven, and Mr. Chaney for Stranorlar and Letterkenny. We are all in reality acting in the same interest, but my duty will be to place the condition of the county as far as this inquiry is concerned generally before you, and Mr. Healy and Mr. Chaney will go more minutely into the circumstances of the unions for which they appear. I understand from the public notices that the object of this inquiry is to improve the Poor Law system, and make it more effective and more economical, and I understand the two questions that will be before you will be the advisability of dissolving some of the existing Poor Law Unions and the question of altering the boundaries of some of the existing unions. My object here to-day is in reference to the alterations of the boundaries of certain unions in the County Donegal, but in passing I cannot avoid saying a word to you on the other point, namely, the dissolution of some of the unions, and I sincerely hope that in making the recommendations finally in your report, you will see your way to reducing the unions of Donegal by at least one-half. They are at present eight, and I think anybody who knows the county will conclude that at the very most four union workhouses would be quite sufficient for the necessities of the county. A continuation of the present number is an unnecessary and oppressive imposition upon the ratepayers, who are already burdened to an extent that they can hardly afford. Now the broad principle I take up is this: It is provided by the very first sub-section of the last section of the Local Government Act of 1890, that "A council shall be established in every administrative county, and be entrusted with the management and administration of the financial business of that county, that is the County Council. The object of that Act was to make the County Council the governing body for the purposes of administration and taxation of the entire county. But the County Donegal you will find to be in this anomalous condition. The valuation of the entire county is £303,723. Out of that eight unions have to be provided for, and although that is the valuation of the entire large county, there are two districts, one known as Stranorlar No. 2, and the other known as Londonderry No. 2, which represent valuations, one of £42,700 and the other of £24,700, which are cut out of the county, by far the two richest portions of the county, and one is thrown into the County Tyrone and the other into the County Londonderry. Why this was done so far back as 1823 it is impossible now to tell, nor would the consideration be very profitable, at this time of day, but from time to time complaints have been made about this injustice. It is not a matter that has arisen recently; ever since the Local Government Act was passed the County Council has been constantly agitating about this. But the complaints about this anomaly did not arise then, because twenty years ago it was agitated in this county and brought before the public, and a gentleman who represented one of the divisions of the county, Mr. James K. O'Doherty, felt the injustice of it, but there was no opportunity of remedying it. There is an opportunity now through this Commission, I hope, of remedying such a gross injustice, and it is my duty to ask your attention to a few figures that will place it in a very striking way before you. Of course you understand what the effect of this is upon the County Council; it confuses their book-keeping. For instance, the County Council of Tyrone sends in a demand saying they want so much for this

Aug. 12, 1903
Dr. Leonard
Kidd.

Aug. 12, 1895

large area of Donegal that is placed improperly under their jurisdiction for Poor Law purposes. The County Council of Donegal has then to strike a rate which will include that, and they have to collect it, which has to be collected for the richer county, Tyrone, at the expense of the County Donegal. The County Tyrone demands it and they must get it. In like manner the union of Derry sends in a demand, and the proportion that they call for must be collected by the County Donegal. There are ten rural districts in Donegal, and the bringing back of these two districts that I have alluded to from Tyrone and Derry, respectively, will reduce the number to eight, but it will do far more than that, because these being very highly valued and the very richest districts in the county, the bringing of them into the county will facilitate a readjustment in reference to the remaining districts, and will facilitate the reduction of the number of workhouses, which cannot be done as long as this anomalous state of things continues. Again, to show the inconvenience of it, these two particular districts, Strabane No. 2 and Derry No. 2, hold certain meetings; the county surveyor has to attend these meetings, and one of the reasons he gave for demanding an increase in his salary, which was made, and had to be given by the County Donegal, was because he had to attend meetings of these two districts for road purposes and other purposes. The valuation of the Londonderry Union at the present time, including, of course, this piece of the County Donegal, is £109,000, and when you take from the valuation of Donegal the valuations of these two portions, it will leave only £224,000 of a valuation, and when you divide that among the eight Poor Law Unions, it leaves a valuation of about £28,000 each. And I understand that the Derry Union, which has this enormous valuation, is coming in to oppose the amalgamation of this portion of Donegal with the rest of the county, although they have this great valuation, about eight times as much as some of these Poor Law Unions that have to go to all the expense of keeping up establishments in different parts of the County Donegal. The valuation of the Stranorlar Union at present is £24,000, of the Letterkenny Union, £28,000, and of the Inishowen, £41,000. There are ten electoral divisions in the County Donegal in what is called Strabane No. 2, which is the name which is applied to the portion of the County Donegal which, as I said already, is put into the County Tyrone. There are nine electoral divisions in what is known as Londonderry No. 2—that is the portion that goes in with the Londonderry Union. The Strabane Union has a total valuation of £113,000, and of that £42,661 is the valuation of the portion of Donegal that they have amalgamated with their union. The population of this particular district, known as Strabane No. 2, is 35,000. What the County Council of Donegal desire is that of the electoral divisions that are thrown in with the Strabane Union, seven should go to Stranorlar and the remaining three should go to Letterkenny. The valuation of these seven is £50,000. I will just give you two or three figures to show a reason, if there was no reason in the general policy of the Act, why it would be for the benefit even of the ratepayers of Strabane No. 2 that this amalgamation should take place, that the alteration we seek should be made. There are at present in the Strabane Workhouse an average of 280 indoor paupers; of these fifty belong to Strabane No. 2; the average cost of the paupers in the Strabane Union is 3s. 4½d. per week; the whole at this rate is equal to a rate of 4½d. in the £ on the valuation of the entire Strabane Union. The number of paupers in the Stranorlar Workhouse is sixty-five on an average, although they have a place for two or three hundred, and if you take the fifty Donegal paupers who are in the Strabane along with the sixty-five, it would make 115 altogether; this, at the ordinary Strabane rate of 3s. 4½d. per head, would come to £1,665, and this on the combined valuation of the Stranorlar Union and Strabane No. 2 would be at the rate of 3½d. in the £—that would leave a saving of 1½d. in the £ on Strabane No. 2. The expense of the workhouse is divided into three portions—there are the indoor paupers, there is the outdoor relief, and the expense of the establishment. On the support of the indoor paupers a saving of 1½d. in the £ would be made upon the ratepayers of Strabane No. 2. Now let me look at the outdoor relief.—In Strabane Union, £1,325 a year, that is 3½d. in the £; the outdoor relief in Strabane No. 2 is £438 a year, and the outdoor relief in Stranorlar is not over £104; if Strabane No. 2 is added to Stranorlar, the outdoor relief would be 1½d. on the combined valuation, and

that would be a saving to Strabane No. 2 of 1d. in the £. If you take the establishment charges, the establishment charges in the Strabane Union cost £1,779—that is 3½d. in the £ on the valuation. In the Stranorlar Union at the outside it is £220, and in the last audited half-year it is not half that. Now if Strabane No. 2 were attached to the Stranorlar Union the rate on the combined valuations would be 3½d. in the £, and that would be a saving in Strabane No. 2 of 1d. in the £, so that the total saving in these three upon Strabane No. 2 would be 3½d. in the £. There are various reasons why it should be a benefit, for the people of Donegal in Strabane No. 2 are contributing to the cost of disbursements in Tyrone. Strabane runs out twenty-five miles into Tyrone, and the people of Donegal, who are united to them, must be contributing to all the expenses connected with that vast area. Why these people come in to object to this I don't know; there must be some other reason beyond the saving of the rates; it will be a saving on the expenditure to themselves. What reason they have, a number of individuals—for I am inclined to think it will be more the opposition of a number of individuals than of the people—it cannot be a bona fide opposition on the part of the ratepayers, and when I come to say a few words about Derry, you will see it is on the same lines. With regard to the question of convenience, taking the advantage of the poor people into consideration, the Strabane Union comes down to within three miles of the town of Stranorlar—that is thirteen miles from Strabane—so that you have parts of the County Donegal at the door of the Stranorlar Union, who are brought thirteen miles down to Strabane because this arrangement was made long ago in 1838. The electoral divisions of Strabane No. 2 are distant from Stranorlar on an average from three to eleven miles. Stranorlar Union only goes fifteen miles in any direction, while the Strabane Union extends over twenty-three or twenty-four miles in the County of Tyrone. Now we come to the Londonderry Union.—The valuation of the Derry Union is £189,000. The Derry No. 2 valuation, that is the portion of the County Donegal that is thrown in with the Londonderry Union, is £34,727. I am instructed that the average number of paupers in the Derry Union is about 290, and it seems almost incredible, but I am instructed to state it to you, that the number in the Derry Workhouse out of Donegal is, on an average, about five or six. From a portion of Donegal representing a valuation of £24,700 there are five paupers in the Derry Workhouse; it happens to be a rich district; it happens to be the richest district in the county. So the districts that are rich are taken away from Donegal altogether, one given to Tyrone and the other given to Derry, and the support of the poor of the entire county is thrown upon the very poorest parts of the county, the remaining eight unions, which, as I said, represent about £23,000 valuation each. That is a very extraordinary state of things. You are familiar with an Act passed not many years ago on reference to the city of London, where, although in a vastly greater way, the same state of things applied. There was an Act passed making the rating apply to the whole of London, so that the rich parts should help the poorer parts, but in Donegal the rich parts of the county are entirely excluded and given over to two counties, either of which is far richer than Donegal, and the support of the poor for the entire county of Donegal is cast on the portion least able to bear it. Why this was originally done it is hard to understand; there may have been some reason in 1839. The population of Donegal and of all Ireland was double then what it is now. The population of Ireland that was over eight millions, it is now only over four millions, and I suppose those districts were cut off because they might have thought it would have been a great burden in consequence of the great population in other parts of the county. That is, unfortunately, reversed now, and the population of the other parts of the county is growing less year after year, so that if there were any justification or excuse for making this unreasonable division, the only thing the Derry Union can say is this—they have got an advantage, they are making no return for it, there are no paupers coming from this district, they are doing nothing for the people of the district. It is a peculiarly selfish position the Derry Guardians take up, because the people of this district of Donegal get their labourers and servants from these poor districts—they get the advantage of proximity to these districts—while they are making no return at all, and the poor rate leviable or collectible from them is to be handed over to the

Aug 25, 1890.

Londonderry Union, who have already this vast valuation that I have drawn your attention to of £129,000. What reason is there why with five or six parsons out of this part in the workhouse of Derry, what reason is there why this state of things should continue, that the richest part of the whole county should continue to go into Derry. There is no reason or justification whatever for it. The County Council of Donegal think that of the nine electoral divisions which are now united with the Derry Union, six should go to Inishowen—Belturbet, Burt, Fahan, Inch, Killybeg, and Three Crosses—and three—Castledward, Killybeg, and Newtownabbey—should be handed over to Letterkenny. The distances of these six electoral divisions from Inishowen vary from ten to sixteen, and from Derry from nine to thirteen, miles, so that no question arises. That will facilitate such an arrangement as will enable you to recommend a reduction from eight parsons to four; some people think even less than four. I think there ought to be some readjustment of the area of the unions that you would recommend the continuance of. Probably the four that you would recommend, looking at the convenience of the county, would be Donegal, Stranorlar, Milford, and Inishowen.

CHAIRMAN.—Those are the four you think might be done?

Mr. Drummond.—Those are the four I think you might continue; however, that merely occurs to myself.

CHAIRMAN.—That is not the opinion of the County Council?

Mr. Drummond.—No, I am not expressing any opinion on the part of the County Council; there will be conflicting views on the County Council. I can voice their opinion in one respect, namely, that the number of eight should be reduced. It is unnecessary to have eight workhouses. The County Council think that four would be quite enough, whatever four you may recommend. There will be no doubt at all that it will be necessary for you to have the whole county included in your scheme, in order to enable you to recommend such an adjustment as will lead to a diminution of the number and, of course, a diminution of the very great expense that is connected with the keeping up of all these establishments. It is unnecessary for me to point out that the making of railways has altered altogether the conditions of the county. When the Act of 1828 was passed there had to be considered the question of the convenience and carriage of sick and poor people; are you have a railway running up to Stranorlar.

CHAIRMAN.—The sick are not carried by train.

Mr. Drummond.—In the vast majority of cases the question of sickness does not apply. When you are

bringing people to workhouses, at all events, so far as convenience of conveyance is concerned, the trains have altered the position of workhouses altogether. You have trains to Letterkenny, Stranorlar, Derry, and in different directions that did not exist at that time; they have altered the whole thing. When you look at the train running up the Finn Valley line, the idea of moving up within a couple of miles of Stranorlar and bringing persons back to the Stranorlar Union is too absurd to be seriously entertained for a moment. I am instructed that with regard to the keeping of the accounts of the County Council, it will lead to a reduction of nearly one-third of the clerical staff, because they have to keep a special account for each district, and here they have two districts in regard to which they must keep special accounts, and the chairman of the Finance Committee will tell you what very great trouble and difficulty they have when making out the estimate for the Tyrone and Derry Unions, and the terrible expense it entails on them, and it is a most unjustifiable thing that not only should the rich parts of Donegal be taken from them, but additional expense be thrown on the poor part. The Derry Union includes the city and nearly half the County of Derry, because it goes back to Dungannon. Why should a large part of Donegal be thrown in along with that, to which they are giving no value whatever, from which they are practically receiving no papers, with which they have nothing to do. There never was a more unreasonable thing than that the Londonderry Union should have this piece, or that Stranorlar, which includes a vast tract, running up to twenty-five miles in Tyrone, should have this large slice of Donegal now that there is a railway running through that district to Stranorlar. Considering the convenience of the people, the advantages to the poor, the expense to the ratepayers, or from any possible way you look at it, there is no reason why this thing should be done, and I ask you now to take the broad principle that it was intended by the Local Government Act that there should be an administrative council for each county—that the county should be an independent entity for administration or rating purposes in itself. It is wholly inconsistent with the spirit of that Act that the County Tyrone should have a large part of the County Donegal and the city of Derry on another tract. I ask you to say that these should be restored to the County Donegal in such a manner as you think right, and by doing so you will be conferring a great advantage and making a great saving of expense. I will ask the chairman of the Finance Committee a few questions, and also the clerk of the County Council, and they will tell you much more clearly than I can the disadvantages which the county suffers from the present state of affairs.

Mr. WILLIAM DOHERTY, F.R., examined.

Mr. William Doherty.

1287. Mr. Drummond.—You are a member of the Donegal County Council?—Yes.

1288. And you have been so, I believe, since it was established?—Yes.

1289. Do you represent the Inishowen district, Glenties?—Yes, I am returned for about a third of Inishowen.

1290. Have you been acting as chairman of the Finance Committee of the Council?—Yes.

1291. And in that capacity I suppose the consideration of the striking, and lorrying, and collecting of the rates comes before you?—Yes.

1292. You know this district, No. 2 Stranorlar—I do.

1293. That is the portion of Donegal thrown in with the Stranorlar Union?—I have a slight acquaintance with it geographically.

1294. You know the Derry No. 2 portion?—Yes.

1295. In your experience as chairman of the Finance Committee, does the separation of this district from the county lead to unnecessary expense, in the first place?—It does.

1296. Now, just give us your view?—By increasing the clerical staff somewhat, it leads also to confusion.

1297. How?—If the Finance Committee asked the secretary as to the state of the finances of the county at large, he would require two or three days to prepare the answer before he could give it—would require to

communicate with the Stranorlar and Derry workhouses—and we are never properly conversant with the entire finances of the county so long as there are administered in another place out of our effort.

1298. Has the County Donegal to bear the expense of collecting this rate demanded by Stranorlar and Derry?—Yes, we have appointed collectors, but I am not certain that the fee does not come out of those districts. The County Donegal has to pay them, of course, because we call them two districts the County Donegal.

1299. Do you know how many parsons out of this large district go into the Derry Workhouse on an average?—I got the auditor's abstract for three or four half-years prior to the passing of the Local Government Act, and I made up the calculation myself, and I found that there would be an average of five parsons from Derry No. 2, or the Donegal portion, going into Derry—that is to say five for the entire year. I think the number individually might be ten or eleven, but when I found the number of days each of them went in, it is equal to five parsons for 365 days.

1300. You are aware of the reduction—nearly £26,000—of that district?—Yes.

1301. Would you give your own idea: you can convey the feeling of the County Council of the manner in which the electoral divisions of that district ought to be united with the Donegal council?—We arranged that and passed it to the County Council. We passed a resolution of the County Council in reference to the apportionment. There are six divisions that are really

Aug. 18, 1906.

Mr. William
Doherty.

Inishowen, and have always been in the hands of Inishowen, but are attached to Derry—Three Trees, Birdstown, Burt, Fahan, Inch, and Kilderry.

1802. Would it be an advantage in connecting or re-constructing the remaining unions to have them thrown as with Inishowen?—It would.

1803. How?—It would raise the valuation of every rural district in the county, as well as the three divisions that are the chief complaints, because each of the divisions of the county averages about £20,000 valuation. I believe one of them is only £13,000. It is considered cruel to the ratepayers to have an establishment supported by a £15,000 rating.

1804. CHAIRMAN.—Which is that?—Dromahaire. At the time it was started it was only £10,000.

1805. Mr. Dromahaire.—How much does the rate come to on the valuation in your district?—Our valuation is only £40,000; the standard union rate was 1s. 6d. in the £.

1806. What is it now?—I think it is a little less. I think the Derry rate was 7d. in the £, but I cannot understand how it can be such a figure. I think there must be some mismanagement, surely, when on a valuation of £100,000 they have only half the rate we have to pay on a valuation of £40,000; that is something anomalous.

1807. You don't consider they are acting too economically?—No, because they have not any more poor to support than we have, and they have only half the rate on £100,000 of a valuation. I don't see how their rate should ever exceed 3d. in the £ if properly managed.

1808. Do you think the number of workhouses in Donegal is unnecessarily large?—Yes, and so did our Council at its last meeting unanimously agree that four workhouses for the entire county would be quite sufficient.

1809. In order to be able to effect that reduction, which would be a great reduction on the taxation of the county, do you consider the amalgamation of these districts would be necessary?—It would relieve the county of the establishment expenses of four workhouses, which would be a considerable saving.

1810. Is there a considerable expenditure upon these two divisions themselves?—There is, but it is enriching Londonderry No. 1 and Derry city at our expense, because they have only five of our poor to support.

1811. CHAIRMAN.—Did the County Council, in considering the scheme for amalgamation, indicate what unions might be dissolved?—No, sir; they have left that, I think, to be under the guidance of you, gentlemen.

1812. They have not given us any assistance by any suggestion?—They did not like to go into it, because the entire Council was not there that day, and it would be unfair to ask you to abolish workhouses where there was no representative there, but four was the number that they wished to have.

1813. Mr. MURKIN.—How many members were present on that occasion?—There were only ten. It was in answering these queries that your Commission put before them that they came to that conclusion.

1814. The members could not possibly be aware that the question of amalgamation might come up?—It was not on the agenda at all; it was an ordinary meeting of the Council.

1815. Mr. DROMAHIRE.—At that meeting, or other meetings, how many members of the Donegal County Council were at or opposed to this amalgamation that you seek?—Five or six.

1816. Are those the members for these two parishes?—Whatever members live in Derry No. 2 and Strabane No. 2.

1817. And is all the rest of the county in favour of it?—All.

1818. And there are thirty-two other members?—Yes, there are members of Derry No. 2 that attend the workhouse in Derry. There are several members of that Council living in Derry No. 2 that are not against this change of boundaries.

1819. Mr. MURKIN.—The change would increase their rates very considerably?—It is not so much the increase of rates or decrease of rates that I look on as important.

1820. Notwithstanding that they know it would add to their rates, they are willing to throw in their lot with the rest of the county?—They are; they say they will not perpetrate this injustice.

1821. Mr. DROMAHIRE.—How much is paid into the Derry Union by Derry No. 2?—They pay 7d. in the

£ on that valuation of £35,000 belonging to the County Donegal.

1822. Is it £1,000 a year?—We have it on the evidence of an ex-Mayor of Derry. He said if they lost the Inishowen part their rates would be increased by £1,000 a year.

1823. Then they are getting in the Derry Union £1,000 a year, and they are keeping five paupers at £ a head per week?—Yes.

1824. How much is Strabane No. 2 paying in road numbers to Tyrone?—On a valuation of £40,000.

1825. Am I right in saying they are paying over £3,000 a year?—I am sure they would be paying, on that valuation, £3,000 a year.

1826. Do you know Mr. William Gallagher, the County Councillor for Strabane No. 2?—Yes.

1827. Does he oppose the amalgamation?—No, he is in favour of Donegal getting its own back, although a member of Strabane.

1828. You and he have discussed the convenience and the expense, and everything?—Yes.

1829. Mr. Henry.—The conversation between you and Mr. William Gallagher may be very interesting, but I don't think it would help us very much. The question of rating is a more solid issue?—It is.

1830. What is the real issue?—The real issue is, I consider the first Act for the relief of the poor was that it was intended that the rich should support the poor, and it was immediately reversed in this case—the poor were left to support the rich.

1831. Your complaint is that portion of the Strabane Union goes within three miles of Stranorlar?—I said I did not know so much about the geographical position of Strabane as I do about Derry.

1832. Is not the city of Derry the market town for the entire of Derry No. 2?—It is, and the market town for the entire of the Inishowen Rural District, because we claim that it made Derry.

1833. And Derry claims that it is supporting you?—Have you any idea what proportion of the people in Derry are really Donegal people?—Well, I think the most respectable part.

1834. There are I understand that the respectable portions of Donegal have left it, and the people who are left behind are not so respectable?—Oh, no. The Blacks and the Cocks and all the respectable people of Derry come from Donegal.

1835. A large proportion of the Derry people come from Donegal?—They do; a large proportion of the money they make comes from Donegal.

1836. As I understand, you would throw the six divisions adjoining Inishowen into Inishowen?—Yes, I would ask that Inishowen should get back its own.

1837. And you would throw the other three into Letterkenny?—Yes, that is the decision of the County Council.

1838. I observe my friend did not favour us with a map showing the position of the district. (Thapsus on map). Now indicate the three divisions that you consider should go to Letterkenny?—The three furthest from Inishowen.

1839. Newtownhamilton, Castleforward, and Killesno?—Exactly.

1840. So that patients living in Killesno, within a very short distance of the boundary of the city of Derry, should be brought to Letterkenny?—Certainly; it would pay me to bring them in a coach-and-four.

1841. And patients from Kilderry, Birdstown, and Burt should be brought from Burt, as against their present journey to Derry to have (Carnadoagh)?—They will get a railway that will bring them there.

1842. How many miles is it from the centre of Burt to the workhouse at Carnadoagh?—I am not quite certain, but my idea is about eighteen miles.

1843. Would you be surprised to hear that, via Buncrana, it is 2½ miles?—I would, and I would say it was not right.

1844. As against 6½ to Derry?—I think you mean statute miles.

1845. Now we have heard from the counsel to the County Council that it is a monstrous thing that paupers should be brought three miles from Stranorlar, which would be Cloghward or Castlefinn, into Strabane instead of Stranorlar. If your scheme is carried, will not paupers be brought from Lifford on the other side of the bridge in sight of Strabane all the way to Stranorlar?—Yes, but they have the railway the whole way.

1846. And does not the train run from Stranorlar to Strabane right across the district?—It does.

1847. So your theories as to the advantage to the paupers are entirely based on bringing them by rail?—There are vans for the sick; but my theory is that the sick should never be brought to the workhouse, and the infirmaries should be somewhere else.

Mr. Drummond.—And the county infirmary is at Lifford.

1848. Mr. Henry.—I am much obliged to my friend for that interruption—that is the county infirmary at Lifford?—Yes.

1849. Is not that on the other side of the river from Strabane?—I will say that the principal issue is that it is our county.

1850. Then the principal issue is that Donagel wants, for sentimental reasons, to get it?—No, but for administrative reasons; we require to get the whole county or none of it.

1851. Is not the system at present of getting contributions by the Guardians of the Lendwardery Union from the Donagel County Council this: the expenses are fixed by the Guardians and divided according to the valuation?—That is of the union.

Mr. Drummond.—That is of the five parishes.

1852. Mr. Henry.—Are your figures based on the assumption that there are five parishes in the Derry Union from Donagel?—Yes.

1853. Is not the system a system of division according to valuations?—Yes, it is what is called union rates.

1854. And it is not the clerk of the Lendwardery Union in the one case, and of the Strabane Union in the other forwarding to your secretary the particulars of the estimated expenditure?—For Derry No. 2, only.

1855. I am speaking of the County Council portion; and do you then strike a rate or add that to your ordinary rate for the purpose of meeting it?—Yes.

1856. Except that it will be the clerk of Strabane No. 2, in the County Donagel, that will forward it to the same officer, will you suggest to me any additional advantage to be gained in the matter of saving time or trouble?—No; but I will still object to that amount be claimed being sent over from the County Donagel to be expended in the County Tyrone.

1857. That is another question; but on the question of confusion or inconvenience can you suggest any difficulty or inconvenience except the fact that it comes from one workhouse instead of another?—It would be much more convenient if we had all those parishes at our own office in Lifford.

1858. Will you have them in Lifford if this scheme of yours is carried out; won't you have them in Stranorlar?—But we have the Stranorlar accounts. It would be sufficient to have Stranorlar and Strabane No. 2 combined into one rural district instead of two.

1859. Your office are at Lifford?—Yes.

1860. That is a short mile from the workhouse in Strabane; how far are they from Stranorlar—sixteen miles?—Yes, but we have all the particulars; we have the District Councillor there from Stranorlar to tell us all about it.

1861. Are you not putting it, so far as the convenience is concerned, are you not putting the headquarters of Strabane No. 2 fifteen miles away from where they are at present?—We have two sets of accounts to go into instead of one.

1862. In other words, instead of receiving two documents for the purpose of striking a rate you will in future only receive one?—Those two documents have to be separately made up; all these things mean pains—additional clerks.

1863. You say you have to communicate with the Strabane and Derry workhouses?—If we want the information we often require?

1864. Won't you have, equally, to communicate with the Stranorlar, Lendwardery, and Inishowen workhouses?—We have all these entered in the secretary's accounts in Lifford already.

1865. And you consider that the advantage of this whole question of writing three or four letters in the year counterbalances anything else to be said on the other side?—Not at all. I told you it was only a side issue—all these things about rates and expenses.

1866. Rates are a side issue; the inconvenience of communicating with Strabane and Derry are side issues too?—The worst feature about it is that those are the richest electoral divisions in our county, that they are monopolised by other counties and we require them; our county is not so rich.

1867. You want to put a just proportion of rates on the richer division?—We want the whole county.

1868. Mr. Drummond.—Does the existence of these two divisions necessitate additional road seasons and a number of attendances of the county surveyor and assistant county surveyor?—It does; there are eight for each, and not only the county surveyor but the assistant surveyors have to attend all those places.

1869. Mr. Henry.—He will have to attend still?—But he has a double attendance to make here. If it was only one union he would only have one-half of the attendances, and he urged that as a reason for the increase of salary which he got.

1870. Mr. Drummond.—If you would add Strabane No. 2 to Stranorlar you would only have the one set of attendances, and vice versa; add Derry and Inishowen he would only have one attendance?—Yes.

1871. My friend traps you into saying rates are a side issue; don't you think it would mean an increase for the whole county?—On a particular district I said.

1872. You are looking to the whole county; don't you think it would be a saving; a great saving; it is not purely sentimental at all.

1873. Mr. MURPHY.—Since the passing of the Local Government Act I suppose you felt that this anomaly is greater than it formerly was owing to the fact that the road seasons are now held in Strabane?—We do, but we always felt it a great grievance for forty years, but we never had the means of remedying it.

1874. You feel it has been accentuated by the passing of the Act?—It has by the consolidation of the two rates; the county ones and poor rates—it has made it almost impossible to understand the finances of the county, how we stand.

1875. And the fact that a portion of the work of the upkeep of the roads of the county is being looked after in Strabane you fancy causes inconvenience now?—Inconvenience and increase of cost.

1876. Mr. Drummond.—I suppose when the baronies existed under the old system it was not so troublesome as it is now?—No; we had one session for the whole.

1877. Mr. Henry.—The witness is in error in saying that all the road work is done in Strabane; it is done in Lifford, in Donagel?—I am now a witness for the County Council in this case.

1878. Mr. Drummond.—Sixteen separate attendances have to be made by the county surveyor and his assistants—eight for each division?—Yes.

Mr. COOKE.—I appear for the City of Londonderry.

Mr. Drummond.—I respectfully submit the City of Londonderry has no right to be heard here.

CHAIRMAN.—It is a separate body and part of the Union of Londonderry.

Mr. COOKE.—We propose to show we will be specially hit by any alteration of the boundaries.

CHAIRMAN.—We are rather of opinion that Mr. COOKE should be heard.

1879. Mr. COOKE.—You referred peculiarly to Donagel having made the City of Londonderry?—Well, not peculiarly; I say it has more to do with it than the County of Derry has; Derry has other cities to keep up.

1880. I gather from you that you think the City of Londonderry is really the capital of North West Donagel?—We never regard it as such.

1881. When you say you made the City of Derry, do you mean to imply that the population from the north-west of Donagel flows into the City of Londonderry seeking employment?—No.

1882. Is it not the case that they do?—No; they get more employment in Derry No. 2, with the big farmers.

1883. Then part of your population goes into Derry No. 2?—Yes.

1884. Does not a large proportion go into the City of Londonderry seeking employment in the factories?—Yes, I think so; what I meant by saying that it made Derry?—

1885. Don't you know perfectly well that an enormous proportion of the hands employed in the Derry factories come from Derry No. 2 and Carradonagh as well?—Certainly, and therefore Derry is more indebted to Donagel.

1886. And are we not indebted to Donagel for the poor that come in and fail to get employment in the city and find their way into the workhouse?—I don't think the poor will thank you much for that, for the more respectable poor would never like to enter a workhouse.

Aug. 13, 1903.

Mr. William
Doherty.

1887. I quite sympathise with that, but we are here in a Poor Law Inquiry; my point is, don't many of the poor from the City of Derry, who go to the workhouse, come originally from Derry No. 2, and Inishowen?—Not at all; but what we complain of is the very worst of your tramps from Derry come down and take lodgings in our workhouses.

1888. Are you aware that the average distance of these six electoral divisions that you wish to throw into the Carradagh Union—the average distances from Londonderry is seven and a half and from Carradagh, sixteen miles?—Yes.

1889. Are you, in addition to that fact, aware that there is a mountain barrier—the Sloop mountains—that separates Inishowen from the basin in which the City of Londonderry is placed?—It does not separate the County Derry from the County Donegal.

1890. Does it not separate this very division from the Carradagh Union?—It does not separate Upper Fahan; you go within a mile from Burninnowe.

1891. Is it not the fact that there is a barrier of mountains separating this division from the Carradagh Union?—Not at all; there is a way round on both sides; the mountains is only an ornament.

1892. Do you suggest that a tramp in Derry No. 2 would tramp over these mountains to the Carradagh Workhouse when he can get within seven miles to the Londonderry Union?—I know a tramp will leave on

the fair day of Carr, he will leave the night before, and spend his night in the Carradagh Workhouse, and they will fight on the road as to whether Derry or Carradagh is the best workhouse for a night's lodging.

1893. Do you think it seriously enters into the surveyor's head as to which union he should prefer; does a patriotic precept from Donegal or Derry say "I am a patriot, I will go back to the Carradagh Workhouse, and make my friends in Donegal pay for me"?—I don't complain of language—that will be arranged on another system—we are on boundaries now, and are only speaking of five poor that you support in Derry from Donegal.

1894. Is it not a fact that paupers in the City of Derry, to a large extent, come from Derry No. 2 and Inishowen?—It is not; but the workhouse.

1895.—Mr. Drummond.—As regards the poor, are they treated with extra kindness in the Derry Workhouse?—When fighting among themselves the verdict is always in favour of Carradagh.

1896. Is the Carradagh Union, are there several mountain ranges through it?—Certainly, and we are very proud of them, and in addition we have plenty of lakes.

1897. Is not Donegal filled with mountains from end to end?—Certainly we have got the mountains, but they take the valleys to other counties.

Mr. HERBERT M'FARREN examined.

Mr. Herbert
M'Farren.

1898. Mr. Drummond.—Are you Secretary to the Donegal County Council?—Yes.

1899. Of course you know this district—Strabane No. 2?—I cannot say I know it very well; I know some of it.

1900. Do you know what is the amount, or about what is the amount, that is paid by Strabane No. 2 into the Strabane Union?—It varies from year to year, but all depends upon the demand made by the clerk of the union.

1901. What is it as a rule?—I can get you the rates but I could not give you the amounts; I can get you the rates from the time before the Act came into operation.

1902. Am I right in saying that about fifty is the number of Donegal paupers sent into Strabane?—I don't know; I have no connection with the workhouse; the clerk of the union can tell you—the clerk of the Strabane Union.

1903. Do you agree with Mr. Doherty that the separating of these two districts entails expense and trouble upon the Donegal County Council?—As far as the support of the workhouse is concerned, but I don't agree with Mr. Doherty that it would affect my clerical staff very much. The number of ratings has been made out and they could not reduce the number of ratings; but perhaps in other respects—

1904. Take the county surveyor?—It certainly would reduce the meetings by sixteen.

1905. There are the assistant surveyors and county surveyor?—Yes; there are four quarterly meetings and four adjourned quarterly meetings in the year for each.

1906. Did this raise the salary of officials?—They made claims after the Local Government Act for increased remuneration on the ground that they had an extra number of meetings to attend.

1907. As far as the distance from Stranorlar of this particular electoral division is it quite convenient to Stranorlar?—About the mileage I could not say, but the clerk of the Stranorlar Union will give you all the information about distances.

1908. Does it entail any extra expense upon the collectors having two additional districts; supposing each of these was amalgamated, one with Stranorlar, and the other with Inishowen, would that be a saving of expense and trouble?—If they reduced the poundage fees it might be less expense, but if they kept the poundage fees as they are it would not reduce the expenses very much.

1909. I suppose you have not considered much the effect upon the rest of the county of bringing in these two areas?—No; I have not considered it very much; it is a question affecting the unions more than the County Council.

1910. Mr. Henry.—At present you get a demand note from the clerk of the Strabane Union giving the amount that Strabane No. 2 should contribute?—Yes;

about the end of February, the Guardians estimate the expenditure necessary for the year and it is signed by the chairman and clerk, and the demand is forwarded to me.

1911. And it is distributed according to the valuation?—I think so.

1912. You estimate that on your rates?—Yes.

1913. You don't estimate that any reduction in the clerical staff would come from the change from Strabane to Stranorlar?—I don't think so, unless some circumstances arise that I don't anticipate.

1914. In Stranorlar you have a Rural District Council?—Yes.

1915. Have you any other Rural District Council there?—No, the same men act as Guardians.

1916. So far as the Rural District Council, where the county surveyor attends for road purposes, the chief would be that Strabane No. 2 would meet in Stranorlar, assuming this to be carried?—Yes.

1917. And would not the county surveyor have to attend their meetings at Stranorlar instead of at Lifford, as at present?—Yes, but if Strabane is abolished.

1918. The Rural Council will not be abolished, it may be amalgamated with Stranorlar, but the Rural District Council would still remain for Strabane?—Yes, and the surveyor would have to attend all the same. If there is a quarterly meeting of the Rural District Council, the county surveyor is bound to attend it.

1919. And at present when they meet as a Rural District Council for road purposes at which the county surveyor's presence is necessary, is not the meeting held in Lifford?—Some of the meetings are held in Lifford, I am not sure.

1920. So that he will simply be changing; assuming they meet in Stranorlar, he will have to attend a day in Stranorlar instead of Strabane or Lifford?—That would be a matter of arrangement.

1921. And the same would apply in the case of Inishowen or Lettishowen?—I don't say it would.

1922. Where does the county surveyor for this district reside?—It runs into both county surveyor's districts.

1923. Take Derry No. 2?—He resides in Derry.

1924. So that according to this promised scheme for a saving of trouble, the gentleman who resides in Derry would be hawked down to Inishowen and back?—Assuming the meetings to be held in Carradagh, he has to go.

1925. You don't suppose it would be much saving there?—I don't know.

1926. Were you present at the meeting of the County Council of Donegal last Saturday?—I was.

1927. How many members were present?—There was a quorum of eight.

1928. How many voted for opposing and how many against it; had you to telegraph in order to get the ninth member?—I think there were nine.

1929. Had you to wait and telegraph for the ninth?—I telephoned.

1930. How many voted for and how many against the resolution to appear—was it five against four?—Yes.

1931. Mr. Drummond.—Do you know that with the exception of the four or five who represent these two districts the rest of the entire Council is in favour of this scheme?—According to the resolutions they have passed previously.

1932. Now with regard to the meetings of the District Council: supposing Strabane No. 2 was abolished and there was only one Council for Strabane and Stranorlar, would there not then be a saving of 4000 money there would. Do you mean the rural districts? I don't quite follow you.

1933. Supposing what is known as Strabane No. 2 is abolished altogether, speaking of it in reference to the union, and it is combined with Stranorlar, would there not then be a saving of time and trouble?—If there was only one rural district there would be.

1934. The collection of the rates, of course, are county charges?—County-at-large charges.

1935. So that they are paid out of the county-at-large for the collection of these rates that go to Strabane and Derry?—Yes.

1936. Mr. Henry.—Then it is levied off each district, and each district pays its own portion?—Yes, it is a county-at-large charge.

1937. Mr. MURKIN.—What is levied off the county-at-large?—The collectors' fees for their salaries.

1938. Mr. Drummond.—With regard to that meeting the other day, where you telephoned for a member, was that to make a quorum for ordinary business purposes?—Yes.

1939. And did the two men who came up vote against it?—Yes.

1940. It was not to pass this resolution you got them together?—No; it was absolutely necessary to get a quorum.

1941. Has not this thing been resolved on over and over again before at other meetings since 1899?—Yes, and before I became secretary.

Aug. 12, 1905

Mr. Bernard
McPadden.

Mr. JAMES DUNLEAVY, Solicitor, examined.

1942. Mr. Drummond.—You are Chairman of the Donagel County Council?—Yes.

1943. Am I right in saying that with the exception of four or five who represent the two districts in question, the entire County Council is in favour of this change?—Yes.

1944. Have they been so since the passing of the Local Government Act, and do you agree with them?—I do.

1945. Do you think it would be a benefit to the county to have these amalgamated with the rest of the county?—I do; I think we are entitled to our own portion of the county.

1946. If Strabane was amalgamated with Stranorlar, would there be only one District Council then?—That is all.

1947. It would reduce the expenditure from ten rural districts to eight?—It would.

1948. Are you aware that the County Councils are in favour of reducing the unions to four?—At the last County Council they came to that conclusion.

1949. Mr. MURKIN.—Was it on the agenda?—No, but on the queries sent by this Commission.

1950. Mr. Drummond.—Am I right in saying that you were unanimous as to the reduction of the number of workhouses?—We were.

1951. Was the last meeting a meeting for ordinary business purposes?—Yes. There were sundry items on

the agenda of all classes; we found we had not a quorum, and we telephoned for two members.

1952. And the two gentlemen telephoned for were opponents?—They were. The only question that arose at that meeting was the appointing of counsel and the directions to be given to counsel. That was the only point that arose at the meeting in reference to this question.

1953. You think as the whole, and you know the county very well, it would be a benefit to the county in more than one respect, to have this amalgamation made?—To have the whole of the county for administrative purposes.

1954. Mr. Henry.—How do you propose in the case of Derry No. 2: do you propose to split the existing rural district into two and add one to Letterkenny and the other to Limavady?—Yes, we do.

1955. When were the queries you refer to answered?—At what meeting?—At the last meeting of the County Council.

1956. Was that the meeting of the ninth?—At the ninth meeting.

1957. Did they at all specify what four unions the County Council would like to retain?—No, we did not go into that.

Mr. Drummond.—These are the only witnesses I propose to call.

Mr. James
Dunleavy.

Mr. T. M. Huby, M.C., M.P.—I appear on behalf of the Lishowen district, and I have at the outset to thank you and the other members of the Commission for giving us the adjournment that Mr. Clancy and Mr. O'Donoghue and I asked for for our personal convenience. The position I take up has been to some extent stated by Mr. Drummond, and really I would suggest to you it is more a matter for your consideration than the examination and cross-examination of witnesses that has gone on. Supposing we were drafting a scheme to-day for the delimitation of the boundaries of Donagel, would anybody dream of the system of boundaries that is at present? Donagel of the "thirties" or "forties" was a county without railways; to-day it is perhaps either in one or more one of the best rail-road counties in Ireland, a thing that has been established altogether within the last ten or twelve years. And with the passing of the Local Government Act of 1898, a fatal sense has quickened in the people on the subject of their local boundaries. Any man who contemplates the appalling rates of this country, not to speak of the taxes at all, must come to the conclusion that it is this terrible system of local administration that is really at the root of a great deal of the emigration and destitution of the country, and the question that any sane body of administrators would address themselves to would be in what way, given the necessity of poor relief, and rates, and other local administration, in what way shall we give the people the best value for their taxes. If you could invent a manner by which you could give the people the worst value for their taxes, you would adopt the system which prevails in Donagel.

The old plan of Robin Hood was, he robbed the rich to give to the poor, but under the system here prevailing it is the poor who are robbed for the benefit of the rich. Now let me go back to me what was in the mind of the Legislature, and those acting under its administration, at the time these unions were established. I have, in the first instance, the return dated the 22nd of April, 1841, which was presented to the House of Commons as being the views of the Poor Law Commissioners addressed to the Assistant Commissioners in Ireland for dividing the unions into electoral divisions. That is not quite this question, but there is a very far-seeing observation which is well worthy of attention to-day. They say: "The question as to the size of unions has been much debated"—during that time there were only Bannock's case, and with the exception of the Kington railway, there was not a single railway in Ireland—"some persons contending for small unions of four or five miles radius, whilst others prefer the larger size of ten miles. Without attempting to decide this point at present, it may be sufficient to remark that the larger the union the smaller will be the establishment charge, and the provisions introduced in the House of Lords for lowering the rate upon each electoral division, having also removed one of the objections to large unions chiefly insisted upon, it will now, perhaps, be generally considered that so long as we take the resort to a market town as our guide, we shall not be far wrong; for the people who frequent the market will find no difficulty in attending at the union workhouse, whether as Guardians, or applicants for relief, or for any other purpose." Then they say that.

M 2

Aug. 12, 1902.

"Taking the above principle as our guide, it will still be our duty to attend to local interests. In the formation of unions as well as in establishing the electoral divisions, the boundaries of property should on all occasions be observed, as far as may be compatible with the general interest and convenience; but it is highly important that all the unions should be formed as compact and complete as possible, for when the country shall have been worked up into unions, each having an organized machinery and a principle of self-government, and with the market town as a centre or little capital, it can scarcely be doubted that they will be made available for other purposes, as well as for the administration of the Poor Law." The people had to wait sixty years before that prophecy opened in the Local Government Act. I find that in a circular of 5th of November, 1838, printed in the Poor Law Commissioners' 5th Annual Report, they make this observation:—"The Board now desires to state, for the information of the Assistant Commissioners, that although in forming the unions they are not restricted to county boundaries, it is yet essential, as regards ulterior duties which may possibly hereafter be devolved upon Boards of Guardians, to observe these boundaries in arranging the electoral divisions, so that no divisions shall comprise portions of two counties. For the same reason also the Board considers it desirable that parochial boundaries should be observed in forming the electoral divisions, wherever this can be done without causing material inconvenience or great inequality in the district." Concise the position in which Irishmen stand at this moment. If we were instituting—as I think we must consider that since the passing of the Local Government Act, 1898, we are in that position—if we were instituting local government for the first time in this district through the means of this local system of administration, what is the first thing which should be considered in a county like this? It is very largely a mountainous county, and wherever you have mountains you will have poverty; the plains of it are, to some extent, rich, and no human being—given the condition there is for travelling at this moment, and given the fact that there is no longer that huge population, this population having sunk by at least half in the fifty years that have passed by since then—no human being would to-day think for a moment of gravitating or aggregating—whichever you like to say—into one nucleus all the rich portions of the county, and leaving all the poor portions to bear their own burdens. What is the result? In the Derry Union, as I am informed, there is practically no outdoor relief. It cannot be want of Christian charity in the Guardians; it must be that it is due to the exceptionally rich conditions under which that portion of the union is situated, but in my poor district of Innishowen, a mountainous district, no less than 288 persons are in receipt of outdoor relief, and the burden of the 268 persons an outdoor relief is borne by some of the poorest ratepayers in the county. You have heard that the Union of Derry embraces a valuation of something like £189,000; is it conceivable that you would establish a system by which one union would have £189,000 valuation, and that the richest portion, and the other eight or nine divisions should have valuations like this:—Ballyshannon, £38,500; Donagall, £34,000; Donaghny, £17,000; Glenties, £40,000; Innishowen, £41,000; Letterkenny, £21,000; Millfeld, £32,000; and Stranorlar, £23,000.

Mr. Elliott—£31,000.
Mr. Healy—So that Derry has a valuation in itself equal to six or seven of the unions of Donagall. The average of the Irish unions, as far as I can make it out, seems to be something like £40,000. So you have the Union of Derry 4½ times above its average, and, therefore, when you are asked, as you are asked here, to give us back, or rather give us up a portion of the Derry Union which belongs to the County Donagall, you have more things to consider than the length of the road. My learned friend Mr. Kenny has been strong on geographical inconvenience, but, if it existed, that geographical inconvenience must be considered in relation to the half-a-dozen paupers who come from this particular wretched area. Ask any man is there not something else besides the convenience of the paupers: what about the convenience of the people who are not yet paupers, but are on the high road to becoming so by the heavy rates they have to pay. Is it tolerable then that portion of the Innishowen division which geographically, and I may say also, socially, belongs to the Carnadoagh Union, should be allowed to remain where it is because of the convenience of half-a-dozen

paupers. But then it will be said they have acquired a vested interest—I will be told perhaps that the standard rate in any union is 1s. 4½d. in the £, and the standard rate in the districts that we seek to annex is only 7d. in the £; that it will be an injustice to the ratepayers of this portion which we propose to annex, to burden them with a burden that they have not hitherto had to bear. I say that, on the contrary, if they have escaped hitherto by the manner in which the county was divided, it is time that justice was done; the fact that justice has been delayed in their regard is no argument that it should be delayed for ever. They ought to rejoice that so long they have escaped, but instead of giving that as a reason why they should escape for ever, the real strength of the argument will be that the earliest warrant should be found for laying upon them a due proportion of the expenditure of the County Donagall. They are the rich people—they have not been driven to the mountains—they enjoy the plains, and their forefathers have enjoyed them, and they have acquired wealth in them, or such wealth as is possible in the case of a farmer whose profits are generally poor enough; but at all events they are the better off portion of the community, and we say it is no injustice to them that now, for the first time for sixty years after the Poor Law was established, they should bear the common burdens of the borough of Innishowen. There are two or three other topics I would like to touch upon in that connection. It is certain that if the view which prevails in Donagall be carried out, namely, that the Unions should be reduced to four—I am only expressing my personal view; I am only sorry that the County Council has not seen its way to reduce them still further, because I think in the end, before many years, the ratepayers will rise up in revolt against this workhouse system, which brings so little comfort, joy, or happiness, or even relief, to any human being, and generally succeeds in relieving the most undesirable class of the community—if you succeed in reducing the unions to four, it is certain that the ratepayers of the portion to be annexed will really have to pay a bigger burden. I suggest it is not. I suggest the probability is otherwise, that with the condensed system of administration such as you will then have, you will ultimately get rid of these staffs and of the upkeep of these buildings, and I hope, too, when we hear of these contests between tramps as to in which union they will spend the night, I hope they will have to trudge a little farther on the road, and that these tramps may not be innumerable with these posts, who will be obliged to work, or else go to jail and be supported by the Irish taxpayer, which, in my opinion, is the true mission for that interesting person. The people of these localities rise in protest and revolt at the existing system of administration. The result is this, that practically to maintain 300 paupers in Innishowen with the outdoor relief which they have to provide, it costs something like £3,000 a year for union purposes alone, altogether independent of the county rates to the very poorest section of the county. I have not in the least degree touched upon the case of my learned friend, who will have similar remarks to make with regard to his own area. My learned friend, Mr. Drummond, mentioned, and I think it is not unimportant, that Parliament has taken up an entirely new view in regard to the question of rating when it passed not merely the Extension of Rates Act for London, but it entered in Dublin a contribution from the richer outlying areas of Rathfarnham and Pembroke to the finances of the city. The rich man may wrap himself up in his cloak and surround himself with the fortress and say he has no interest or concern with the woes and burdens of his poorer neighbours, but it is an extraordinary fact that whereas East End, London, is largely the home of Jews and foreign aliens from every clime and country under Heaven, that Parliament, without even the remotest of the House of Lords, compelled the rich area of East-end-square and Berkeley-square, and all the other rich portions of London, who never even see the people in the East End, who know nothing of their modes of life, that there is no community of any sort or identity between St. Giles and St. George, compelled them to bear a substantial portion of the burdens of East End, London. That being the modern view in regard to a city which outnumbers in its population the entire population of Ireland, is it not a priori when you come to consider the case of a county like Donagall, whose local government has, since the passing of the Local Government Act, been made dependent upon the area of the administrative county. I am not going to touch upon what more properly belongs to the sphere of

Aug. 22, 1868.

my learned friend as to how it would affect the general county administrative charges, but this I will say: it must strike anybody as an anomaly that when the county has been selected as the unit for local government, so large a portion of Donegal should find itself hampered by being administered from Tyrone on one side and Derry on the other. Now, I am happy to think that while any report you make to His Excellency must, of course, be in the nature of an independent report, apart from any contention that some of your honorable members may have with the Local Government Board, at the same time I think your decision must be of considerable weight with it in any decision which the Local Government Board may take; and I desire to point out, with regard to some of the questions that have been asked here today, that this is not a question considered for the first time at a scratch meeting at which men had to be telephoned for within the last two or three days. Scarcely had the Local Government Act passed when not only the people of Donegal, but the people of Inishowen in particular—so far as to say that instead of this matter being sprung or started within the last day or two upon the County Council, that you will find that the people of Inishowen, as well as the County Council of Donegal, have been agitating this question for over five years, and they lodged complaints with the Local Government Board again and again that nothing was being done. I find that the Local Government Board required a *prima facie* case to be made out on the 31st of January, 1868. They state:—"I am directed by the Local Government Board for Ireland to inform the Board of Guardians of the Inishowen Union that they have instructed their Inspector, Mr. Richard Kelly, to hold an inquiry on oath in regard to the proposal that the portions of the unions of Londonderry and Strabane, which are situated in the County Donegal, should be transferred to the unions of Inishowen, Letterkenny, and Binnaclear. Due notice will be given by Mr. Kelly of the time and place he may fix for holding the inquiry." That is signed by Mr. Swaine. Over a year and a half have elapsed since that and nothing, I believe, has been done. I believe Mr. Kelly himself was a gentleman connected with this district to be amalgamated, and therefore it was considered undesirable he should hold the inquiry, because I find in the month of February it is stated that the Board have decided to postpone the inquiry until the close of May or June. That inquiry never was held; that is not our fault, and it disposes of the suggestion that this is a new matter sprung by us recently upon either the County Council or the unions of Donegal. I am sorry to have to say—of course, it must have come under the notice

of everybody—that a political tinge has been given to this case by some attacks that have been made with a view to prejudicing this inquiry in the Press. I think it is a poor compliment to pay to a body like this, holding the commission of the Viceroy, to suppose that they would be in any way affected by newspaper paragraphs. But I do say that you will decide this matter entirely from the point of view of fiscal benefit and fiscal justice to the county and to the ratepayers as well. I myself don't know any ground upon which it could be suggested that there is anything like what is called jerry-mandering in connection with this scheme. I cannot myself see what political effect it could have, one way or the other, if the County Derry were compelled to disgorge these portions of the union which do not properly belong to it. But whether that be so or not, while the conveniences of the poor must undoubtedly be given effect to, the conveniences of those who are very near the verge of poverty is, I conceive to be, also a most important matter connected with this inquiry; and I venture to say that whether by the amalgamation of unions or by the cutting off from the union of Derry of the portions that do not geographically appertain to it, this Commission will strive to do justice to the ratepayers of Donegal. The only other remark I would make is this, that I think I gathered from the slight view I had of the map which my learned friend produced, that the union of Derry contains districts much further distant from the city of Derry than any in the two districts would be from Carrindagh, if added to it. (Explains as way). But at any rate this principle I would lay down in conclusion, that the interests of the richest portion of the barony where the poor are concerned are not so closely affected by any question of propinquity as would be the case if this were a poverty-stricken area. It is not a poverty-stricken area; paupers are far less likely to come from it, and that alone, to my mind, if the fiscal argument is with me in the other way, entirely overbalances the suggestion of distance. And, lastly, let me say that we have in Carrindagh a most efficient infirmary, and surely, from the point of view of the restoration of health, persons coming from the Rural District No. 2 Derry will be much more likely to be benefited in their health amongst the breezes of northern Donegal than in the shams of Derry; and, therefore, on the question of the balance of advantages and the balance of convenience, whether upon the ground of fiscal equality or the other topics I have touched on, I say if you were legislating on this matter *de novo*, as substantially you are, all the arguments are in favour of the proposition in favour of which I ask you respectfully to report.

Mr. ROBERT MOORE examined.

Mr. Robert Moore.

1858. Mr. Hooley.—You are the Clerk of the Union in Inishowen?—Yes.

1859. You have been so for over fifty years?—Yes.

1860. Am I right in saying that for several years past the Board have been passing resolutions in favour of the absorption of the portion of Derry No. 2 which they claim?—Yes, the District Council, principally.

1861. Now your valuation, I think, is 24,145?—Yes.

1862. And the valuation of the electoral division proposed to be taken from the Derry Union is 22,497. Now the distance from this electoral division to the Derry Workhouse is about ten miles?—So I understand.

1863. And to the Inishowen Workhouse the farthest point is about eighteen miles?—Eighteen Irish miles.

1864. The total population of the union of Inishowen at present is 25,343?—That is the last census.

1865. And of the part of the union of Derry proposed to be transferred to Inishowen is 5,425. Now the number of paupers in your workhouse is 103?—The present number is 95, but 102 was the average for the last year.

1866. How many paupers are there in Derry Workhouse from the part proposed to be transferred to Inishowen?—There are five charged to the electoral division, and I assumed there would be about five under-charge from information I got from the relieving officer.

1867. Your standard rate in Inishowen is 4d. 4?—Is 4d.

1868. And the standard rate in Derry, I understand, is 7d. 8?—So I understand.

1868a. Now with regard to the question of outdoor relief, how many persons are on outdoor relief in your union?—At present about 258.

1869. What is the average per head they get?—I did not strike the average; it is about 1s. 6d. a week.

1870. Have you an excellent infirmary at present in Carrindagh?—We think it pretty good.

1871. What hospital accommodation have you?—We have forty-nine beds.

1872. How many are occupied?—At present, fourteen.

1873. Would that provide ample accommodation for any possible amount of sickness that you would anticipate from the district proposed to be annexed?—I think it would, except times got very bad.

1874. I understand the district is largely poor and mountainous?—We have also a fever hospital in addition.

1875. That is for infectious diseases?—Yes.

1876. Am I right in saying the present district is largely poor and mountainous in Inishowen?—Principally mountainous.

1877. And the district proposed to be annexed is much richer in character?—It is.

1878. And the valuations accordingly are very much higher there?—The valuation is much higher according to the area.

1879. Your District Council, or Board of Guardians, is unanimous in claiming these electoral districts?—Yes.

1880. And you have been urging this on the Local Government Board for many years past?—For some

Aug. 13, 1903.
Mr. Robert
Moore

time past, especially since the passing of the Local Government Act.

1961. Do you anticipate that if this proposed amalgamation of unions were carried out, and the annexation of the electoral divisions granted, that the rates in your district would be considerably reduced?—I do.

1962. And you think the proposition made by your Board is fair and equitable to all the ratepayers?—I think it is equitable on our side.

1963. You think it is an equitable thing to ask the persons in the district proposed to be annexed to bear a share of your burthen?—We think they should.

1964. In your barony; they are all in the barony of Inchmahon?—They are, and they are the best part of it, and it would lighten our rates to get the best part along with the bad.

1965. Mr. Henry.—You have an excellent infirmary you said: is there a water supply to the workhouse?—There is.

1966. Where from?—From the river.

1967. Is it a pipe supply?—It is taken by a pipe from the mill-race into a spring well, and then pumped.

1968. No filtration or anything of that kind?—No.

Mr. Healy.—One of the present Commissioners has condemned the Derry water.

1969. In the fever hospital, how many wards are there?

Witness.—It is divided into four wards.

1970. Mr. Henry.—Is there a bath in the whole institution?—Yes, three or four.

1971. Hot and cold water?—They can make it hot.

1972. You have 268 at 1s. 6d. a week on outdoor relief?—I don't know exactly the 1s. 6d.

1973. Suppose you succeed in this, how many representatives of these nine electoral divisions do you think would go down to attend your meetings in Inchmahon Workhouse?—I expect they would all go, for they look pretty well after the business.

1974. At the present day they do, but if you brought them eighteen miles there and eighteen back to Carrindrough?—They go there sometimes without business.

Mr. Healy.—The return ticket is 1s. 6d.

1975. Mr. Henry.—Did you ever go on the line—you would require to be paid by time: how many representatives are there for these nine electoral divisions?—Two to each division.

1976. Then you would get twelve: how many members of the Board of Guardians in Carrindrough itself?—Forty-eight.

1977. Is there any connection in the way of business or in the way of markets between any portion of this electoral division and the town of Carrindrough?—Not much.

1978. Is not the entire tendency of all the population of this division to make Derry their centre?—Principally.

1979. I suppose I would not be far wrong in saying that the great percentage of the people in these nine districts have never been in Carrindrough in their lives?—I could not say. I don't think they would be living there long without paying a visit to Carrindrough.

1980. To use the infirmary there and the other equipment?—We had a great number last week.

1981. Mr. Cooke.—Derry is the market town for this district you propose to annex?—I think it is.

1982. It is superseded by a range of bills from the Poor Law division of Carrindrough?—There are hills between.

1983. And all the Guardians from these divisions go to Derry as their market town; it is no inconvenience to them?—Naturally they would go there.

1984. Mr. Healy read out the instructions to the Commissioners in 1839, to the Commission, and apparently with approval, if you took that guide, these should remain in the Derry Union. Derry is their market town?—I think so.

1985. Has there not been a large migration from the Inchmahon Union to Derry city—that is to say, people go there seeking work in the factories?—Some of them do.

1986. Do you know of your own personal knowledge the circumstances of these six districts in the Rural Division No. 2?—I know them all by reputation.

1987. You don't know the larger portion of the population go to Derry city to find employment?—No, I don't know that.

1988. You said the great advantage in this change of these six divisions to Carrindrough Union would be that it would reduce the taxation of the people of Carrindrough Union by 2d., or something like that, in the 6s.; have you estimated how much it would be?—It would reduce it 5d. or 6d.

1989. How much would you throw on to the people that you are bringing into you that they are not now paying; would you increase their rates by 2d. or 3d. for the pleasure of associating with you in the Carrindrough Workhouse?—We would.

Mr. Cooke.—So that it is simply putting it on these six divisions.

Mr. Healy.—How is my learned friend interested in this; he represents the Corporation of Derry.

CHAIRMAN.—It is a constituent part of the Derry Union.

Mr. Cooke.—Surely if the City of Derry has to pay it is interested.

Mr. Healy.—I submit not; the corporation is a county borough.

CHAIRMAN.—We have given notice to all the local bodies concerned.

Mr. Healy.—I think there are limits. My friend may be entitled to ask some questions; he is not entitled to ask all questions.

Mr. Cooke.—We were invited to attend here. The first term in the warrant of your Commission is whether any Poor Law union could be dissolved with advantage to the ratepayers. We are the ratepayers of the union proposed to be dissolved, and we propose to show that it would increase the rates on us.

Mr. Healy.—My friend is entirely wrong.

1990. Mr. Cooke.—That may be. At all events you know that it would increase the rates on this division by 2d. or 3d. in the 6s.—I think it would.

Mr. Healy.—This would not increase the rates on the corporation of Derry in any other way.

Mr. Cooke.—It would.

Mr. Leech.—I appear for No. 2 Connell—the Dergal post proposed to be taken over.

Mr. Healy.—Your duties have been discharged by Mr. Cooke.

Mr. Leech.—Mr. Cooke may discharge as many duties as he likes, but he cannot take mine away from me.

Mr. Horner.—I may state that I represent the Lonsdownery Rural District No. 1, but I don't propose to ask this gentleman any questions.

2011. Mr. Leech.—In the event of a male case of scarlatina coming to your hospital, where would he be put?—Into the scarlatina ward.

2012. Suppose you had him there, and a case of typhus fever comes in, where would you put him?—In the typhus fever ward.

2013. Suppose a smallpox case comes in?—We have still another ward.

2014. How many male wards have you in the fever hospital?—We have four altogether.

2015. Do you mean you would put him into one of the female wards. Have you two male and two female wards?—We have just four wards we can use together.

2016. Supposing you had a male patient—one or more in scarlatina, and one or more in typhus fever—and suppose you had the same number of females, would you tell me where you would put them?—We would be bound to provide accommodation.

2017. But when the last one—a smallpox patient—came in, where would you put him?—We must provide accommodation.

CHAIRMAN.—This objection applies to all the smaller hospitals in Ireland.

Mr. Leech.—But we have the accommodation in Derry.

Mr. Healy.—My friend, Mr. Clancy suggests to ask him where he would put persons affected with gonorrhoea.

2018. Mr. Leech.—That is not an infectious disease. Have you a children's ward?—Just got the four wards, and have found it amply sufficient.

2019. Have you an operating room and a steriliser?

2020. Mr. Healy.—Have you the X rays. Is it true that Carrindrough is the best town for fairs and markets in the North-West?—We think it is the best market.

Dr. O'CALLAGHAN examined.

2021. Mr. Hanly.—I think you are the Medical Officer of the Carndonagh district?—I am.

2022. And also Medical Officer of the Inishowen Workhouse?—I am.

2023. Have you considered, from the point of view of the convenience of the sick poor, the question of their removal to Carndonagh in the event of the Inishowen part of the Derry Union being transferred to the Carndonagh Workhouse?—Well, yes; I see there are worse journeys already in the union.

2024. You have got well-equipped ambulances?—Yes; two very fine ambulances.

2025. And, of course, there is a railway?—There is.

2026. And in any case the number of sick poor coming to you would be very few?—They would be.

2027. Not half a dozen in the twelve months, I understand, of paupers altogether, and the sick paupers would be still fewer?—Yes.

2028. Now, the accommodation in Derry Workhouse itself, I believe, is nothing to brag about?—I believe it is more congested than ours; the infirmary is more congested.

2029. Whereas I understand you have very good hospital accommodation in Carndonagh?—We have.

2030. And your hospital is never more than half full?—Very rarely filled, or the fever hospital either.

2031. And you have ample accommodation in both for any demands that might be made by this extensive?—I think so.

2032. And, of course, as regards the comfort of the poor, once they were in the hospital the pure mountain air of Carndonagh would be preferable to the rather foul air of Derry?—I suppose so.

2033. Have you a well-equipped infectious diseases hospital at Carndonagh?—Yes.

2034. Would there be any difficulty in segregating the various patients according to their disorders?—None; I never saw it.

2035. And, taking the question altogether, you would not apprehend any difficulty either by the removal of the patients into Carndonagh in point of view of the hospital accommodation, nor to the patients themselves?—No.

2036. You think it is infinitesimal; any chance of it?—I do.

2037. Of course there would be far less risk of infection spreading in a country district than in a town, if they are brought into town?—Certainly.

2038. Mr. Hanly. Would you say there are worse journeys at present in the union than there will be when these districts are brought in?—Longer journeys.

2039. What distance?—Fifty or sixty miles.

2040. I may take it it is not desirable to bring patients long distances if it can be avoided?—That would depend a great deal on the ambulance.

2041. Take Burt; don't you know that the distance by road from Burt to Carndonagh would be twenty-three statute miles?—I would rather travel from Burt to Carndonagh than from Strule to Carndonagh.

2042. The centre of Burtstown is twenty-two miles from Carndonagh?—That may be.

2043. The centre of Kilderry is twenty-five from Carndonagh?—As possible.

2044. So that to bring each case into Carndonagh you would have to go something like forty-four miles?—That would be a rare occurrence.

2045. If any illness took place there it would occur?—Yes.

2046. Do you remember having four cases of typhus from near Omelone?—Yes.

2047. How many days and how many journeys did it take to remove the four cases?—I think it was three journeys.

2048. Or four journeys in four days?—I think it was in three days they came in, but I am not sure.

2049. What is the average number of cases admitted in each year to the infirmary?—That was the largest number in the fever hospital since I came to it—four.

2050. And into the general hospital, the average admissions in the year?

CHAIRMAN.—The average number of beds occupied?—I should say not more than twelve.

2051. Surely you had more beds occupied?—We have accommodation for forty.

2052. How many are there, as a rule?—Never more than a dozen; they are in other parts of the house, which carries extras.

2053. You don't visit them daily?—As a rule I do.

2054. Are you the only medical gentleman practising in Carndonagh?—Yes; but there is another quite close to me.

2055. Do you know the average number of admissions to the general workhouse?—I do not.

Mr. JOHN KAVANAGH examined.

2056. Mr. Hanly.—I think you were a Guardian for a number of years before the Local Government Act passed?—I was.

2057. And after it passed, a District Councillor for Glenties division?—Yes.

2058. And you were Chairman of the Union?—I was the first chairman.

2059. And in right of that chairmanship you also held the position of ex-officio member of the County Council?—I did.

2060. Was this question mooted frequently at your District Council Board?—Very often.

2061. It was a burning question among the people?—It was, since I became a Guardian.

2062. Did you pass that resolution (proposed). Just give the date of it?—

Extract from Guardians' Minutes of 12th March, 1900.

The letter of the Local Government Board dated 24th February, No. 58,555, having been read,—

Proposed by Mr. McGLINCHY, seconded by Lord. O'D. Browne.

Resolved:—That we reply:—If the decision of the boundaries between Inishowen and Londonderry Unions has left to the Londonderry Board of Guardians they will naturally possess the important connection of the rich portion of the County Donegal to continue. The fact of few paupers in the portion of Donegal annexed to Derry Union was the prime cause of its annexation at a time when might overcame right. Neither shall the majority of the ratepayers of the divisions in question desire a release of the economy, as they have been accustomed to pay a smaller poor rate by their connection with

a union in the richer county; yet, if they could see it, the amalgamated rate which combined county rate, will be less in the future in Inishowen than in Derry. As to the convenience to the destitute and infirm poor, a conveyance by rail which will now run through the entire length of divisions in question will be to them much more comfortable in going to Inishowen Workhouse than going by peeper and to the County Derry Workhouse; and if the feelings, as well as the convenience, of the poor be worthy of consideration, then even poverty, pestilence, and infirmity do not press so heavily on the patient as the thought of being exported out of his or her own barony of Inishowen into another county beyond the Foyle. That the greatest evil of the existing arrangement is that the amalgamated rate under the new Act, the union charges, district charges, and county charges, are so mixed up that district councillors, county councillors, clerks of unions, and county secretaries, cannot without enormous expense of clerkship, satisfy either themselves or the public that the fiscal business of the two administrative counties is performed with due accuracy. We wish to point out that though the whole question of the restoration to the Donegal baronies of the richer parts of them annexed by some extraordinary measures to Derry and Tyrone at former times is in the hand of the County Council, which has no doubt convinced the Local Government Board of the clear justice, financial and other grounds, of the demand.

The question really is—Should the unjust and oppressive taxation of the poor ratepayers of the mountain parts of Donegal, and the practical annexation of the richer parts of the amalgamated unions from their fair share of the burden of the poor, be continued under any fair system of Local

Mr. John Kavanagh.

Aug. 15, 1903.

Mr. John
Kearney.

Government; and it seems to us that it is with the County Council, which has several unions behind it in its demand, and not for one union, and that on a dishonest side issue, raised by the Derry Board of Guardians, that the discussion should be that it is a dishonest plea put forward is perfectly evident. There is no readjustment which might not be met by such a plea as this. But in this case, with a railway now running through the entire length of the divisions in question, the convenience of the poor is simply provided for on the score of convenience, to which, we presume, your letter refers.

2053. You passed that resolution, and it was upon that resolution that this inquiry was granted, as I understand it—Is that so?

2054. Then the Local Government Board thought a private *forte* case was made out, and directed an inquiry to be held. It was afterwards not proceeded with. You are member for Greenacres?—Yes.

2055. Am I right in saying that Greenacres is as far, or further, from Carradough than any of the districts

of Londonderry No. 2, which would have to come into Carradough if annexed?—I think nearly all the division of Greenacres would be the extreme end of the union, and owing to its being so hilly in this particular part it would make it more difficult to take a patient out of Greenacres than it would out of this part we wish to get annexed to the union.

2056. Again, of course, I take it that your division is much poorer than Londonderry No. 2?—I am sorry to have to admit that it is ever so much poorer.

2057. And it is a congested district?—It is.

2058. There would be far more patients from your area than from the new area?—Yes.

2059. Mr. Henry.—How many miles is the centre of it from Carradough?—Fourteen or fifteen.

2060. And, of course, there is no workhouse nearer than Carradough?—No.

2061. You would be very glad if there was?—I think not.

2062. You would prefer the accommodation of Carradough—like the troops—to accommodation nearer to you?—We don't want any more workhouses; that is one thing certain.

Mr. James
McGlinchey.

Mr. JAMES MCGLINCHAY, J.P., Chairman Inishowen Union, examined.

2073. Mr. Hooley.—As we know, you can carry your mind back for a considerable number of years?—I can.

2074. Do you remember the foundation of the workhouse in Carradough?—I remember it, although I did not live there in those days.

2075. I think the boardings were held out by a number of Englishmen and Welshmen who came over to this country, and did not know anything about it?—So I understand.

2076. And the general body of the sub-payers at that time had no voice in the representation?—None.

2077. I understand the system was, they piled all the mountains, bogs, and lakes into your division?—The existing boundaries of Inishowen certainly contain all the mountains and bogs and poor lands.

2078. And the profitable land largely lies outside it?—Yes.

2079. As I understand, the whole of your division is unanimous in favour of this change except the few interested gentlemen in Derry No. 2?—Undoubtedly so.

2080. Would there be any difficulty from any point of view in accommodating the poor from Derry No. 2 in your union?—None whatever.

2081. And no evil results would arise to the sick or destitute in any way?—None whatever.

2082. You have ample accommodation for them?—More than ample.

2083. It has been suggested that Guardians would not come from Derry No. 2 if it was amalgamated with

your union; do you think that is so?—I think they probably might not come very regularly, but they would come as often as occasions required them.

2084. They would give an effective attendance as the Guardians from any other district?—Almost as much.

2085. Am I not right in saying that markets and fairs are held in Carradough?—No doubt about it; it is the capital of Inishowen.

2086. And the fairs and markets are well attended?—They are, particularly so since the advent of the railway.

2087. Has not the introduction of the railway made a complete change in the division in the point of accommodation and convenience?—Undoubtedly.

2088. It is no longer out of way or segregated from the rest of the county, as formerly?—It is not.

2089. Mr. Henry.—In the portion of the division other than Derry No. 2 they are quite unanimous in getting hold of Derry No. 2?—They are quite unanimous in getting back what was wrongly taken from them.

2090. I suppose they would take the city of Derry too, and come down to the Foyles?—I don't know that, but they have been suggesting this for a long time.

2091. Do you suggest Carradough is the market town for Burt or Fahan?—I don't suggest it is, but the Fahan people come occasionally to Carradough; they come to markets.

Mr. Edward
March.

Mr. EDWARD MARCH, J.P., examined.

2092. Mr. Hooley.—I think you are the Chairman of the Inishowen District Council?—Yes.

2093. And also a member of the County Council of Donegal?—Yes, being Chairman of this Council.

2094. You have heard the evidence that has been given here by the Inishowen gentlemen do you agree with it?—I do.

2095. May I ask you this—from your knowledge of the District and the County Council affairs do you think economy would result from the annexation?—I think that it would be more economical.

2096. Would you tell the Commission why you think it would be more economical?—In the first place, it would prevent complication in the County Council offices, as they have to keep separate books for these districts in the County Council's offices, and besides the deputy surveyors have to attend double the number of meetings they would have to attend supposing these districts were annexed to Inishowen, and on this account they applied some time ago for an increase of salary, which they got.

2097. May I ask whether you yourself favour the amalgamation of some of the unions with others, as put forward by the County Council?—I do.

2098. How many unions do you think could be done without?—Four unions for Donegal would be sufficient.

2099. With regard to the longer distances which people have to come from Derry No. 2, do you think there is anything substantial in that?—I think there is nothing in it.

2100. And, besides, the people that would have to come from it from the end of the district are very few indeed?—From the districts that it is proposed to annex to Inishowen I think they would be very few.

2101. Mr. Henry.—It would be a great advantage to persons to be brought down from near Londonderry at the head to Carradough, which is the fact—I think the fares are very low in No. 2 district.

2102. Don't you know the reason they are low in No. 2 district is because they have a habit of finding their way into Londonderry and going into the workhouse from the city; did that ever occur to you?—I cannot say.

2103. And don't you think they will continue to do so and find their way into the city still, although the rates from No. 2 will go down to Inishowen?—That is a question.

Mr. PATRICK PORTER examined.

Aug. 18, 1905.

Mr. Patrick Porter.

2204. Mr. Henly.—You have been a District Council in this division of Inishowen for some time?—Yes.

2205. Have you observed great inconvenience to the county officials in the discharge of their duties from the present condition of the boundaries of Derry?—I have.

2206. What is the inconvenience you have noticed?—The surveyors are not able to give the proper attention we would expect to the division of Inishowen, and we believe it would be a great saving at the same time, because one of the reasons for their increase of salary was that they had to attend to meetings in both divisions. If this proposed part was taken to Inishowen it would save an extra meeting in each quarter—one meeting would do for all.

2207. I am told that you live on the borders of the district proposed to be annexed?—The division I represent borders part of Fahan, Bardsboro, and Kilderry.

2208. There are no main roads in Derry?—There are very few main roads.

2209. Do the people from No. 2 district legally use the roads in Inishowen district?—They do, the local roads especially, and they contribute nothing to keep up the roads. The roads are set up by the people of the other division; it was only last week we had a complaint about it.

2210. For these districts do they bring coals from Burt?—They do to Buncrana.

2211. Is Buncrana their market town?—To a large extent it is; they sell their produce in Buncrana and take their goods home from it.

2212. Supposing they had to pay anything extra, do you think they would have any objection to come into your division?—Personally, they would not have the least objection, as far as any I have been talking to, only the question of a little extra £ s. d. They would be very glad—the majority of them—if the rates were going to be the same, to come there.

2213. If the rates were lowered in Inishowen, do you think they would be very glad to come in?—I am sure they would not have the least hesitation.

2214. So the objection is not the convenience of the port?—That is only a side issue; there is nothing in that at all.

2215. Then it is cash and not coin?—It is nothing else.

2216. Is there a very strong feeling amongst the people of Inishowen against the rich portion of the barony being excluded?—There is, because the majority of the people are very poor. It is a mountainous district the most of it, and they think it is not fair that the rich part of Inishowen, part of their own peninsula, should be taken to another county. They think those other people should pay their share of the upkeep of the large establishment in Carradough.

2217. They feel the original boundary was made on a wrong basis?—They feel it was made at a time when they had no representation.

2218. And the fact that the railway has been made into Carradough is an additional reason for making the change?—Some fifteen minutes extra would bring the councilors of that division—the majority of them—to Buncrana, and they could be just on the same train that we have to go by in the morning by fifteen minutes under rising.

2219. Do you think there would be any difficulty about these councilors coming into Buncrana?—Not at all.

2220. Mr. Henly.—You are complaining of the use of your local roads by people from Derry No. 2?—Yes.

2221. Does Inishowen not use the roads in Derry No. 2 to get across to Derry and get things?—That is different. We have to make a special arrangement for these roads.

2222. Don't you know that they pay for the repair of the roads that you use?—Yes, but these bog roads are very hard to keep up.

2223. Don't you think you get as much as you give?—We do not.

2224. When they are going to Buncrana they have to spend an hour and five minutes in the train?—No, they have not.

2225. Perhaps the time-table is wrong, 8.45 to 9.00. You propose to amalgamate, as I understand, the No. 2 Rural District Council with the Rural District Council of Inishowen?—Yes.

2226. Won't it be a nice business to bring road contractors and their two stretchers all the way down from Burt and that district to get their heads filled in the

town of Carradough, when they could run into Derry?—No; we have a special arrangement in Carradough that the bonds can be filled the day after in Buncrana with the clerk of the union.

2227. It is felt that it is at present so inconvenient in Carradough that they have fired on Buncrana?—When they send in a tender for any work they have to bring stretchers with them, and in order to prevent them having to bring their stretchers to Carradough it is given out in the notice that the bonds will be signed next day in Buncrana.

2228. They are never signed at the meeting?—They are if they are there.

2229. But in the case of people far away you get it signed next day at Buncrana?—No; but if it is more convenient for them.

2230. A procedure which you know is illegal?—It is not illegal if the council make the order.

2231. That is done for the convenience of road contractors?—For the convenience of the bailiwick principally.

2232. Where do these road contractors and bailiwick come from?—From different portions of the division, it is in order not to have them lose the two days.

2233. Mr. Leach.—If what you suggest is carried out, and No. 2 is taken over, will there be less paupers in the Derry Union?—There will be less if they send them down to us.

2234. You say these five will go down to Carradough or Letterkenny?—We will take them with open arms.

2235. Take Kilderry, the centre of which is nine and a half miles from Derry, twenty-five from Carradough, and twenty-nine from Letterkenny, how are you going to send the paupers from that place?—At the present rate of paupers in No. 2 they will be few and far between.

2236. How are they to get to Carradough or Letterkenny?—They can get by car.

2237. Who is going to get the cars to drive them thirty miles?—That is the business of the union authorities to send the car.

2238. Who is to pay for the car?—The ratepayers—the whole union.

2239. Who is to pay for the car driving them from Kilderry?—It will come out of the rates the same way as taking them from Horn Head to Carradough.

2240. What rates will pay for it?—The rates of the whole of the Inishowen Union.

2241. That is what you call economy—paying the fare to drive them twenty-nine miles?—They are so few and far between that when we have got these five from Derry it may be ten years before there is another.

2242. Do you think that these paupers bring comparatively close to Derry, and such a desperate distance from these other places, do you think they would not go to Derry Workhouse?—I don't think they would if they could get to Inishowen.

2243. Is there anything to keep them out of Inishowen at present if they presented themselves there?—They don't belong to our division.

2244. Can they not get in?—They can, usually.

2245. Do you think that if this change was made, because there has been a change as to who was to pay for them, that instead of coming to Derry, where they have always gone before, they will go to Carradough, thirty miles away?—It is a very small comparison between the number of paupers and the rates No. 2 pays.

2246. Will they get into the Letterkenny Workhouse or be carried off to Carradough?—We will convey them to Inishowen, of course.

2247. Will they come first to Derry?—Certainly not.

2248. How are they to be brought?—The same as we bring them from the rest of the division.

2249. Take a person that is not ill—a strong pauper—when a pauper in Kilderry wants to get into the workhouse, how is he to get there?—If he is a strong, able-bodied pauper he will walk it.

2250. And suppose he walks the nine miles to Derry, what will happen then?—They will take him in there for the night, I suppose.

2251. Mr. Henly.—Kilderry is only fourteen miles from Carradough?—Fifteen miles.

2252. If a man is ill the ambulance is sent for him?—Yes.

2253. And if he is well and able to walk it is not too much that he should go in order to live free at the expense of the ratepayers?—No.

2254. Mr. Leach.—Where is the ambulance sent from?—From Carradough.

Mr. CHARLES CHAIN EXAMINED.

Aug. 18, 1907.

Mr. Charles Chain.

2155. Mr. Healy.—As I understand, you are a member of Derry No. 2 Rural District Council?—Yes.

2156. And therefore of the district proposed to be annexed?—Yes.

2157. You have a large farm in Inch?—It is not very large.

2158. Are you in favour of annexation to Cerdonagh?—Yes.

2159. And can you say whether there would really be any inconvenience to the poor if the annexation takes place?—Well, I don't see that there could be any inconvenience where there are no paupers; we can go to Cerdonagh in a very short time; we have no paupers from my district at all here.

2160. And you think it would only be right that you should share the rates with the rest of the division of Cerdonagh?—I think that we are in the very rich portion of the county; there are very few poor in our district; they are all big farmers and big employers, and I think it is too bad that the wealth of the county should cause Derry and the poor districts not get a fair proportion.

2161. Mr. Healy.—What size is your holding?—It is a small farm.

2162. Roughly?—About eighteen acres.

2163. Your rates won't trouble you much?—I may tell you that in proportion to my pocket these men have the pick of the land. I am a small farmer, and these men are better able to pay rates than I am.

2164. You are the only gentleman I have had the pleasure of seeing here from No. 2 district?—There are several gentlemen in the house here.

2165. In this happy district of Inch, that has no paupers, are the big employers in the habit of making a collection for the poor people to keep them out of the union?—Yes.

2166. Is that a regular thing in this district?—Yes; there is no relief given by the Derry Board of Guardians to our people, and it is inherent principally with us. If a cottier man with a small family applies for relief he must go into the house, and that is the last thing a decent, honest man likes to do. They won't give relief for the nine or ten weeks that would tide this poor man over, so that we have to make up subscriptions in some cases.

2167. That explains why Inch has no paupers?—Practically speaking, there are no paupers in it.

Mr. Healy.—That is our case.

Mr. Chain.—I have to thank you, sir, in conjunction with Mr. Healy, for having adjourned to enable us to be here to-day. As you have been informed, I represent the two unions of Stranorlar and Letterkenny, and I don't think that I can mix their cases up. I propose to begin with Stranorlar. My learned friends, Mr. Drummond and Mr. Healy, have relieved me of the necessity of saying a good deal that I intended to say, because the general considerations which my friend, Mr. Drummond, presented to you also occurred to myself, and Mr. Healy has brought out in regard to Inishewan certain facts and circumstances which also apply to both Stranorlar and Letterkenny in their inferences. The difference between the three cases is this, that Stranorlar is, I should say, by far the strongest case of the whole lot, and in point of fact I don't understand on what ground the claim of Stranorlar can be resisted at all. I would say, in the first place, as a general consideration, that the policy of this Local Government Act, and indeed of all the other Acts relating to boundaries, has been to make all these rating and taxing areas as far as possible coterminous. We have plenty of examples of that. We have the provision by which unions if possible, are to be coterminous with rural districts, and in several places you will find throughout Ireland that unions are actually identical with the rural district of the same name. But in addition to that, the enactments and provisions regarding alterations of boundaries are such that I submit on a fair construction of the statute, you are bound, if you can, to in every case adjust union boundaries so as to have every union within the county. And it is a matter of some importance that the Local Government Board itself has taken that view of the case. If you look to page 79 of Vannion you will find a note by Mr. Vannion. "At the time of the passing of the Act there were forty-six unions in two counties, and thirteen in three counties. The effect of orders made by the Local Government Board since the passing of the

Act, in exercise of the powers under the Poor Law Act, is to leave thirty-eight unions in two counties and eight unions in three." That is to say they diminished, I presume, on the application of the local authorities concerned; they diminished from forty-six to thirty-eight the number of unions which were situated in two counties, and they diminished by five more the number of unions which were situated in three counties; and I venture to say, and I challenge contradiction upon the point, that there is no case in which they have pursued the opposite process, that is to say, extended the union or contracted it so as to make a union which was in one county wholly before now in two or three. There is no such case I venture to submit. Of course I am speaking to gentlemen who have full sources of official knowledge, and I venture to submit most confidently that no case of the process of spreading a union over more than one or two counties can be produced save the passing of the Local Government Act, and, on the contrary, the uniform practice of the Local Government Board has been to confine the union, like the electoral district, like the rural district, like the urban district, to one county. It has done this in thirteen cases altogether. I say that one consideration alone is a very significant of the intentions of the Act of Parliament, and is certainly conclusive as to the manner in which these intentions have been interpreted by the Local Government Board. Now, passing from that, I should like to know what can be a stronger case than that of Stranorlar. My learned friend, Mr. Henry, has been asking questions which assume that the effect of altering boundaries of unions might increase the real ex-pensiture. Well, whether or not in one or two little particular cases it might make any difference, does it not stand to reason that if you have a union spread over not merely one county, but two counties or three counties, if electoral districts, rural districts are spread over two counties or three counties, if you have these overlapping units all over the country, I venture to say that it would be perfectly intolerable, and an Act of Parliament would have to be passed if there were not power to alter that state of things. But because it does not exist all over the country, but exists in certain special cases, is it any the less conclusive, is it any the less plain that the overlapping of this area and union is a inconvenience in itself; that everything would be plainer and straighter if you had every union within a single county; is it not perfectly plain that everything would be easier—the administration of the county, the estimates of expenditure, the estimate of rates, the keeping of accounts. Does it not stand to reason, without giving any instances; does it not stand to reason that this would be much easier if instead of having these overlapping areas you had them all regularly coterminous, and had every union within a single county, and every union coterminous with every rural district. Therefore, for my learned friend to ask what difference would it make if this change takes place in the rural districts for grand jury purposes; I say on the face of it it is an inconvenience not to have these districts self-contained so that there shall not be the necessity for keeping different accounts—more books than are necessary; that there shall not be the necessity for estimating and making cross-accounts. I take it to be perfectly plain, whether or not you can prove it by particular instance, there is much or little difference in the result; that at all events there is some inconvenience in every case; that wherever overlapping exists to any considerable extent it is positively plain the inconvenience must be in proportion. As far as Stranorlar is concerned, there is one fact that stands out in the face at once, and that is that so far as instances are concerned there is a clear case that disadvantage exists at present in the case of the portion that we seek to annex to Stranorlar, and great advantage will accrue if the change were made. I have here a table, and it will be proved by the clerk of the union, which settles the matter so far as Stranorlar is concerned. The townland of Cloughard, the nearest portion of the division which we seek to annex, is four and a half miles from Stranorlar; the furthest townland in that division is seven miles. The nearest townland to Stranorlar is six miles and the furthest is ten miles; but a half is the nearest to Stranorlar, the nearest to Stranorlar is seven, and the furthest from Stranorlar is ten. The electoral division of Castleknock, the nearest townland to Stranorlar is three miles; the nearest to Stranorlar is three and a half; the furthest from Stranorlar

Aug. 15, 1905.

is eight miles, namely Ballylister, and the farthest from Strabane is thirteen miles. Take again the electoral division of Urney West, the nearest to Stranorlar is six miles, and so on. This will be handed in, and I need not now go through it all. The return comes to this that in almost every case, I think there are just one or two exceptions, the nearest townland of each of the electoral divisions is far nearer to Stranorlar than it is to Strabane, and the farthest from Stranorlar is much less distant than the farthest from Strabane. I don't understand what answer they can make to that case. If it stopped there you would be bound to take those figures into consideration, and if you took them into consideration there is only one inference—that Stranorlar is the proper headquarters for all these electoral divisions which we seek to annex; I had better give you their names. The divisions we seek to annex are:—Castleduff, Cloghward, Cloghfield, North and South; Fugart, Raphoe, and Urney, West. It is impossible for my friend to get over the fact that Stranorlar is the proper headquarters for all these townlands, and not Strabane. In the next place Stranorlar has an additional advantage. It might be said you have a railway to one place and you have not a railway to another, but as regards both the centres I represent, Stranorlar and Liffordtown, they are both railway centres, and the railway runs right into the district we seek to annex. So you have not only the shorter distance but the easier mode of travelling, and really on that point I don't think I ought to say any more. It is right to add also, in illustration of the question of distance, that Strabane Union is a much larger union, geographically, than Stranorlar. Strabane Union extends over twenty-three miles between its widest boundaries, while Stranorlar extends only over fifteen miles, and I think it will be proved before you that if the seven divisions I have mentioned were transferred to Stranorlar Union there would be absolutely no inconvenience caused to the poor, but any inconvenience caused to the poor by the present arrangement would be absolutely removed. The valuation of the Strabane Union in the County Donagall is £48,644, and of the Tyrone portion of the union is £70,355; total, £119,000; while the total valuation of Stranorlar Union is only £31,000. Is there no inconvenience or anomaly in that of which any administrator would take account. Here are two unions, one valued at £119,000 and the other at £31,000, and the result of their being constituted in this particular way is this—They have to keep up the same establishment, they have got a workhouse and infirmary, and all the usual medical appliances, and each of them has to have a staff paid out of the rates. Is it not absolutely preposterous—a general public inconvenience in the County Donagall and in the County Tyrone, no less, and also, as I shall show you when I come to deal with Liffordtown, an inconvenience in the County Londonderry—that there should be this vast difference in the valuation of these different unions, inconveniences resulting in a loss of money to the public, because, as I have said, the small union of Stranorlar with £31,000 valuation has to keep up an establishment, and staff, and workhouse, and infirmary, and all those medical appliances attached to the infirmary just the same as if it had a large population and a large valuation like the adjoining union. I say that the very difference between these figures—the population, of course, tells the same tale, and I scarcely need mention it will be given to you by the witnesses—but the difference in these figures themselves suggest a public inconvenience. It will be manifest from the evidence produced before you that if you keep these unions as they are, Stranorlar, with the small valuation of £31,000 and a corresponding small population, if you keep Strabane Union, with its overvaluing valuation and largely greater population, the result will be that you will be inflicting upon the smaller union and the poorer one a burthen in the shape of money, which might be saved if you put the request which the Guardians of Stranorlar ask, I think, all the people of the County Donagall ask you to do on this occasion. I can conceive no greater inconvenience than that of paying too much. You may talk of the difficulty of travelling, the question of distances, and the keeping of accounts, and so on, but in the word inconvenience, upon which Mr. Henry, by his cross-examination, seems to lay so much stress, there is involved all these other consequences, including ex-

cessive pecuniary burdens, which it would be absurd for the Local Government Board, I respectfully submit to you, to overlook. They may say that we have not got accommodation in Stranorlar Union for any paupers or infirm or sick poor who may come from these districts we propose to transfer. The very opposite is the fact. It will be proved to you that 250 inmates are kept weekly in the Strabane Workhouse, and fifty of those only belong to Strabane No. 2. The average cost of an inmate, I am informed, is 3s. 6d. per week, and 150 paupers on that figure comes to £22,500 in 12 months, representing a rate of about 4s. in the £ on the valuation of the union. Now, contrast that state of things with the state of things in Stranorlar. The average number of inmates in Stranorlar is sixty-four; they have accommodation, I understand, for 302; the buildings are absolutely going to waste in Stranorlar Workhouse, although there are portions of the County Donagall not belonging to that union, but, on the contrary, belonging to another union, which, in the main, belongs to another county; could anything be more absurd. If the fifty inmates from Strabane No. 2 were transferred to Stranorlar the total would be 114, which, at the average cost of 3s. 6d., amounts to £1,005 a year, and this sum on the unified valuation of No. 2 and Stranorlar would mean a rate of 3d. in the £, or 1d. in the £ which you save. Putting aside the fact that Stranorlar is the natural headquarters of Strabane No. 2, and that the distances are entirely on the side of Stranorlar, is it not absurd that you should have all this public money wasted on a workhouse capable of containing nearly 600 people, but with only sixty-five within its walls—an infirmary equally well-equipped and equally well-cared for—while there is outside the boundary of Stranorlar Union a comparatively wide district of the same county, which, because it belongs to another union, is far all intents and purposes belonging to another county, and it belongs to another county for the purposes of the Poor Law. All the figures tell the same tale; they all prove that you have a waste of public money caused chiefly by the fact that you have outside, and within three miles of the boundary of the union, a number of Donagall divisions which ought to be within it, but are not. I am told, as far as regards the infirmary, that there are only half a dozen patients in it, and that it can accommodate a great many more. Strabane may say we can provide for them in Strabane Workhouse. Here is a most important point bearing directly on the question of convenience and inconvenience. Inconvenience, I take it, means inconvenience to the poor as well as to the rich, inconvenience to the persons who have, unfortunately, to go into the workhouse and infirmary, as well as the officials of the county, and I am informed it will be told to you in evidence that in order to give sufficient accommodation, in order to prevent the existing inconvenience to the poor lodged in Strabane Workhouse, £1,500 will have to be spent, and, if I know the policy of the Local Government Board, they will be compelled to spend that money, because public attention may be directed to it, and once it is directed there is no escape from the liability. I am told that while there is ample accommodation in Stranorlar Workhouse, the sum of £1,500 will be necessary to put the workhouse of Strabane, with its fever hospital, into proper condition to receive all the patients who crowd into it, and that expense will be avoided, or, at all events, a considerable part, if you take away this district of Strabane No. 2 and put it where it naturally belongs. There are just one or two small points. I think it is an injustice and inconvenience in a real sense, although Mr. Henry does not seem to think much of it, that the rates in any part of Donagall should be collected at the expense of the ratepayers of Donagall and spent elsewhere. Why should Donagall pay collectors for the purpose of raising money for Tyrone purposes. Is there no inconvenience in that, or is there such a narrow interpretation to be given to the word "inconvenience," as Mr. Henry would suggest, that you are not to take into account financial loss. I say such a conclusion would be absurd. You must take all these things into account, and if you do, it seems to me that there is no alternative but, in the case of Stranorlar, at all events, to say that the district known as Strabane No. 2 has been entirely too long in the wrong portion of the union.

Aug. 18, 1906.

Mr. GEORGE McLAUGHLIN examined.

Mr. George McLaughlin.

2156. Mr. Clancy.—What position do you occupy in the Stranorlar District Council.

2157. Do you see that list of distances there (produced)?—Yes.

2170. Is it correct?—Well, I would not like to say it was correct; it was from information I got. I believe it is correct.

2171. CHAIRMAN.—Is it correct as far as you know?—I believe it is, from information I got.

2172. You prepared it yourself?—I did.

2173. You meant it to be correct?—Yes.

CHAIRMAN.—Then you might hand it in.

2174. Mr. Clancy.—You are aware, at all events, that portion of Strabane Union called Strabane No. 2 is only three miles from the boundary of the Stranorlar Union?—Yes.

2175. Do you know also whether the farthest portion of any of Strabane No. 2 is only thirteen miles from Stranorlar?—That is so.

2176. Have you got the valuation of Strabane No. 2?—£42,000.

2177. And the rest of the union, £70,185?—Yes.

2178. Then the valuation of Stranorlar?—£31,000.

2179. Are you aware how many inmates there are per week in the Strabane Workhouse?—250 is about the average.

2180. And how many of these belong to Strabane No. 2?—Fifty.

2181. Have you calculated the average cost?—Yes.

2182. Is this the aggregate, 3s. 6d. per week; 250 at that figure would be £5,307 5s. 10d. a year?—Yes.

2183. Or a rate of nearly 4d. in the £?—Yes.

2184. Now the average number of inmates in Stranorlar Workhouse, I believe, is only sixty-five?—Yes.

2185. And if you added the fifty inmates from Strabane No. 2 the total number would be 115?—Yes.

2186. Which, at an average cost of 3s. 6d. per week, amounts to £1,045 per year?—Yes.

2187. And this sum on the united valuations of Strabane No. 2 and your existing union would amount to a rate of 3d. in the £?—Yes.

2188. That would show a saving of 1d. in the £?—Yes.

2189. To the No. 2 Strabane division?—Yes, on the united valuation.

2190. You have also given me some figures on the question of out-door relief expenditure; it amounts to £1,768 a year at Strabane?—Yes.

2191. And that represents a rate of 2d. in the £?—Yes.

2192. The expenditure under this head in Stranorlar has never, I believe, exceeded £104 a year?—No.

2193. Then if you pursue the same process, as you did in the case of the in-door relief, and add Strabane No. 2 to Stranorlar, the total expenditure on out-door relief would be £332 a year, or a rate of 1d. in the £ on the united valuation, and that would be a saving to the ratepayers of Strabane No. 2 of 1d. in the £?—Yes.

2194. As regards the establishment charges in the Strabane Union these charges amount to £1,779 a year, representing a rate of 3d. in the £; in the Stranorlar Union the maximum of expenditure under this head is £220 a year; I believe the last audited half-year only showed £256 13s. 6d.?—Yes, but I am taking the maximum.

2195. And if Strabane No. 2 were transferred to Stranorlar the expenditure on the rates on both valuations would be 2d. in the £, or a saving of 1d. in the £ to the ratepayers of Strabane No. 2?—Yes.

2196. A total saving of 3d. in the £?—Yes.

2197. How many is the Stranorlar Workhouse capable of containing, exclusive of the fever hospital?—500; the fever hospital sixty-two.

2198. How many have you in it?—Sixty-five as an average.

2199. How many in the fever hospital?—One at present; I have known years without a fever case.

2200. Notwithstanding these figures, you have to keep up the usual staff?—Yes.

2201. The requirements of the law compel you to do it; if you had only half that number you would be obliged to do the same thing?—Yes.

2202. Do you know anything about the Strabane Hospital?—The infirmary portion is said to be completed. Dr. Johnston will give evidence.

2203. Do you know what would be necessary to put the fever hospital into proper condition in Strabane?—One of the Guardians told me yesterday that the esti-

mate was £1,100, and the question was adjourned pending the decision of this Commission.

2204. In Stranorlar you must have ample room?—Yes.

2205. In the male side of the infirmary there is a vacant room capable of holding twenty beds?—Yes.

CHAIRMAN.—I think you may take it that there is plenty of room.

2206. Mr. Clancy.—What is the population of Stranorlar?—13,707.

2207. Of Strabane No. 2?—10,000.

2208. When you tell us what the rates are?—The standard rate in Stranorlar is 5d.

2209. Strabane No. 2?—11d. in county cess; standard rate in Stranorlar was 2s. 1½d., and in Strabane 2s. 4½d.

2210. This year in Stranorlar what is the rate?—On land, 3s. 6d., and on buildings 3s. 6d.

2211. And in Strabane No. 2 the rate is 4s. 3d. on land and 6s. 6d. on buildings?—Yes.

2212. Is there any complaint as to the management either in point of economy or efficiency in Stranorlar Union?—No, there is no complaint.

2213. The result must be if things are left as they are considerably increased expenditure in Strabane Union?—Yes.

2214. And a considerably increased rate on Strabane No. 2?—Yes.

2215. And your contention is that if Strabane No. 2 were transferred to the national union there would be a lessening of rates?—Yes; we would have sufficient accommodation for all.

2216. Mr. Henry.—In fact both people would save money?—Yes.

2217. In your interesting calculation have you taken into account that a gentleman called a clerk of the union might require an additional salary when the number of people were doubled?—He might.

2218. And the master of the workhouse might require an additional salary?—If the Guardians were generous enough.

2219. You would have a good case when sixty-five went up to 115? what would be the effect of the other debt of the union who was losing? I suppose he would be looking for compensation?—He would.

2220. And all that has to be paid for?—Yes.

2221. Did you work out the present average amount in Strabane?—No, 4s. 6d.

2222. What was yours?—No, 6d.

2223. There are sixty-three papers in Stranorlar; Donegal lies how many miles beyond Stranorlar?—Eighteen miles.

2224. Did it ever occur to you that a very good solution would be to put Stranorlar's sixty-five papers and six infirmary patients out of it altogether?—There are thirty-five infirmary cases, but six of these are really medical cases, the remaining twenty-eight could be treated in the infirmary wards, although they require medical supervision.

2225. That would run the general purposes up to eighty?—No; to sixty-five; that includes the lot.

2226. So that the infirmary is run and the workhouse run for the sake of sixty-five patients?—Yes.

2227. What is the total cost of the institution?—About £2,000 a year.

2228. CHAIRMAN.—What was the amount of your last rate for Poor Law purposes?—Something about 9d.

2229. Mr. Henry.—For union charges, on land—3s. 6d., and on other improvements 1s. 7½d.

CHAIRMAN.—That would include medical charges.

2230. Mr. Henry.—You cannot give me the cost of the workhouse as a separate item?—I could not.

2231. Can you give me the cost of the whole house?—CHAIRMAN.—The Commission are getting that in a return for all the unions.

2232. Mr. Henry.—I am going to make five unions for you, abolishing Stranorlar; are you in favour of the five unions theory?—Everyone is in favour of relaxing their own.

2233. Mr. Clancy said that all the townlands of the electoral divisions he proposes to take have Stranorlar as their headquarters, and not Strabane; you won't say that about Clonleigh, North and South, where the paper sees Strabane Workhouse as he is going in the train up to Stranorlar?—As to Clonleigh, South, our Guardians say that if the Guardians think there is any inconvenience to the poor to transfer them to Stranorlar they don't wish to press that point.

2234. Even your own Guardians are so convinced of the absurdity of taking Clonleigh, South, that they are shy of it.
 Mr. Clancy.—If Stranorlar gives up those two divisions Leitrimkenry will claim them.

2235. Mr. Henry.—Then, as far as your Guardians are concerned, they feel a little shy of Clonleigh?—The committee drew up the report, and if the Commission think there will be an inconvenience to the poor they would not press it.

2236. What about Clonleigh, North?—We say the distance from Stranorlar Workhouse to any of these divisions is not more than ten miles.

2237. How would a man come from Clonleigh, North, to Stranorlar?—By the ambulance.

2238. Supposing he did not want the ambulance?—I suppose he would go into Strabane.

2239. Do you want Foddyglass too?—No.

2240. Raphoe?—Yes.

2241. We are told that there is going to be a railway direct from Raphoe to Strabane; what communication is between Raphoe and Stranorlar?—There is no railway communication.

2242. Urry, West; that is nearer to Stranorlar than it is to Strabane?—Yes.

2243. The ordnance gentlemen were under a mistake about that too; in fact Stranorlar is the centre for this, not Strabane?—Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM GALLAGHER, J.P., examined.

Mr. William Gallagher.

2244. Mr. Clancy.—You are County Councillor for the district contained in Strabane No. 2?—Yes.

2245. Are you acquainted with the distances between Stranorlar and Strabane of these various places?—I do know the whole of them.

2246. Have you examined this list; these distances are correct?—They are.

2247. Portion of Strabane No. 2 comes as near as three miles to Stranorlar?—It does.

2248. And the furthest point is no more than thirteen miles?—No, from the top of West Urry.

2249. What is the nearest point to Strabane of Strabane No. 2?—Lifford would be the nearest point.

2250. How far is the nearest point?—Clonleigh, South, is the nearest; it would be a mile from Lifford to Strabane Workhouse.

2251. What is the furthest?—Cleghard would be thirteen miles, at least.

2252. In other words, to bring it to a head, would there be any inconvenience in point of distance, or would there be any other inconvenience, by adding Strabane No. 2 to the Stranorlar Union?—As far as taking all the parishes—taking them all round, even to Strabane—it would be something equal.

2253. There would be no inconvenience?—Not the slightest; it would be as far in the one instance as the other.

2254. And in a great many cases it would be a convenience?—It would; I never saw a pauper yet going by rail to a workhouse; the ambulance goes for him.

2255. In a great many parts of Strabane No. 2 did I understand you to say it would be the removing of an inconvenience to have it transferred to Stranorlar; would it be generally convenient to have Strabane No. 2 removed to Stranorlar?—It would. The people of Castleduff and that locality always went to Stranorlar for Protestant Bazaar. I am a ratepayer in both divisions. I pay in No. 2 on £117, and in No. 1 up to £40.

2256. You live in Castleduff?—I do; the people in Castleduff would go to Stranorlar quite as conveniently as to Strabane.

2257. Do you know anyone in Donagh who is opposing it?—I do; there are District Councillors.

2258. Why?—I suppose for political reasons.

2259. No pretence of inconvenience?—I don't know that there is much question of inconvenience.

2260. Mr. Henry.—In Castleduff who are the two representatives?—Mr. Wray and Mr. Taylor; that is the District Councillors.

2261. Have they both opposed this strongly?—As far as I know they are opposed to it.

2262. Although they are elected?—They are politically elected.

2263. They are elected anyway; the result would be, of course, among other results, that if this was carried out the Chairman of the District Council of Strabane No. 2 would cease to exist as a member of the County Council?—He may or he may not.

2264. If they had their way?—I would not state that.

2265. And the same would happen in Derry No. 2?—I cannot say anything about that.

2266. Are you serious in suggesting that the distance to Stranorlar from this place, as a whole, is practically equal to the distance from Strabane?—It is.

2267. Here is Stranorlar; if you lifted the whole of that division and moved it four miles, it would be just in the same position with regard to Stranorlar as it now is to Strabane; what is the furthest point from Strabane?—Belah.

2268. Is it a mountain district?—It is.

2269. Not very thickly populated?—A great many people.

2270. Is not the great bulk of the population along the Fynn and up there?—No; that is where the good land is.

2271. What is the population of Lifford?—That is a village; it may be 100.

2272. Do you propose to take Clonleigh, South?—I would not mind Clonleigh, South. It appears to be a good distance from Strabane; they have to take the paupers by road.

2273. What distance is it, for instance, to the far portion of Cleghard?—By road it would be thirteen or fourteen miles.

2274. And from Stranorlar to Lifford?—On a straight line it would be about an equal distance.

2275. Even paupers, as a rule, in this world have not wings?—No; they don't fly.

2276. What is the actual distance from Stranorlar to Lifford?—About thirteen miles.

Dr. BROWN.—I may say that we intend to visit all the infirmaries.

The Sitting was adjourned.

SIXTH PUBLIC SITTING—FRIDAY AUGUST 14th, 1903.

At the Courthouse, Londonderry.

Aug. 14, 1903.

Present:—Mr. NICES (Chairman), Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. COBY BIGGER.

Dr. JENKINSON examined.

Dr. Johnston.

2277. Mr. CLEGG.—You are the Medical Officer of the workhouse in Stranorlar?—Yes, sir, for the last twenty-two years.

2278. And, of course, you know all about the house, and especially the infirmary?—Yes.

2279. What is the accommodation in the infirmary?—We have forty-five beds in the infirmary fully equipped; the infirmary comprises most feverishly with any of the union infirmaries in the county; there are forty-five beds—all iron beds, with woven wire mattresses, hair mattresses, and feather pillows—we have that accommodation in the place, along with another ward not at present occupied in the male side of the infirmary capable of containing twelve additional beds; it is thoroughly well equipped.

2280. It is equipped in the best manner. I believe you have an ambulance attached to the hospital too?—Yes.

2281. What are the numbers attending the infirmary?—We at present have thirty-four, but I think you will hardly exactly judge so well from the numbers at present in it as from the report that we annually send forward to the Local Government Board.

CHAIRMAN.—We have it.

Mr. CLEGG.—I presume the Commissioners have got the returns.

2282. CHAIRMAN.—You had forty-one at the 1st January this year, which is a crowded time of the year?—But that only shows the number under treatment at that particular time. In these returns you will see the number of cases treated in the infirmary during the year.

2283. Dr. BIGGER.—425. Do you happen to know yourself from personal knowledge anything of the Stranorlar Infirmary?—The Guardians of the Stranorlar Union asked me to visit the Stranorlar Infirmary last Monday, and I went down and saw the Stranorlar Infirmary in company with Dr. Boyd.

2284. CHAIRMAN.—Of those numbers that you had in hospital how many acute cases had you. I see you had only eleven in the aged and infirm ward; how many of those forty-one cases on the 1st of January were acute cases and how many were what you might call chronic? Not more than six or eight acute cases, but then the remainder are cases we would send down to the infirm ward, but they would be constantly going backwards and forwards on account of their feebleness; they would be in the infirm ward one week and in the hospital the next.

Mr. Thomas Magee.

2290. Mr. CLEGG.—I believe you are Vice-Chairman of the Donegal County Council?—Yes.

2291. What part of the county do you represent?—Stranorlar district.

2292. Do you represent any part of what is known as Stranorlar No. 2?—No.

2293. Your division is on the borders of that?—No; there are two electoral divisions in Stranorlar Union in the Stranorlar County District.

2294. You know the district of Stranorlar No. 2 and the relation to the Stranorlar Union generally?—Yes.

2295. You heard the evidence given here yesterday as to Stranorlar?—I agree with that evidence; I was at the preparing of them.

2296. Did you hear the other evidence given here yesterday?—I did.

2285. Is that the meaning of the 425; are they re-transfers from the house?—It is the total number in the workhouse in general; then you see the number treated in the workhouse infirmary differs from the number admitted to the house, owing to the transfers.

2286. 115?—That is the total number treated, and that includes transfers.

2287. Dr. BIGGER.—During the year, only 115?—Yes.

2288. That includes those that have been sent to the infirm wards and then sent back again?—Yes.

2289. Mr. CLEGG.—You were telling us you were commissioned by your Board of Guardians to visit the Stranorlar Workhouse?—Yes; I went in company with Dr. Boyd, the Union Medical Officer of Stranorlar. In the Stranorlar Infirmary at present every bed is occupied—seventy cases—and Dr. Boyd tells me they cannot possibly admit a fresh case into the infirmary without sending down less acute cases into the body of the house.

2290. I believe they have a regular constitution to decide what cases they must send down?—There is a difficulty about it, of course; in the body of the house they have fifty-nine females and twenty-nine males, all classified as infirm.

2291. CHAIRMAN.—Ninety-three on the 1st of January?—Dr. Boyd tells me that of the eighty cases forty ought to be in the infirmary, if he had room for them, and that he cannot possibly carry on his infirmary at present without very considerable additions.

2292. Did you hear an estimate of the sum that would be required?—I heard it roughly estimated as considerably over £1,000.

2293. Do you happen to know that they postponed deciding whether they would expend this money until after the inquiry is over?—Yes.

2294. Mr. MURPHY.—A great many people seem to go to the Stranorlar Workhouse and very few to Stranorlar?—Of course they are sent from the union.

2295. Don't you think now, after all this is over, that people from Lifford will continue to go to Stranorlar?—Very likely.

2296. The county infirmary is three beddes, and Dr. Boyd is doctor to the county infirmary?—But he won't take the kind of cases that are admitted into the workhouse.

2297. What is your average for the infirmary in Stranorlar?—Thirty-five.

2298. It is really an infirmary with a workhouse attached?—Yes.

Mr. THOMAS MAGEE, J.P., examined.

2300. Do you agree with it generally?—I do.

2301. I believe it is a fact, is it not, that those of the clerical divisions belonging to Stranorlar No. 2 were actually attached to Stranorlar Union before the passing of the Local Government Act?—It was a bazaar for road purposes; they were West Urry, Cloughart, and Cullinstown; they were in the honour of Regbee; now they go to Stranorlar.

2302. Mr. MURPHY.—They have been changed since the Local Government Act?—They have.

2303. Of course you are not in favour of the abolition of the Stranorlar Union?—I am not.

2304. Are you in favour of four unions?—Yes.

2311. What about Letterkenny?—The County Council have not come to any decision on it.

2322. What do you think yourself about Letterkenny?—I am not capable of forming an opinion.

Mr. Clancy.—That is the case, Sir, as far as Stranorlar is concerned.

CHAIRMAN.—Now Letterkenny.

Mr. Clancy.—I have only a very few words to say with regard to Letterkenny, because, as I remarked about Stranorlar, a good deal of what I would have said has already been said by Mr. Drummond and Mr. Brady, and myself in the case of Stranorlar, for I think it is plain on the face of it that it is inconvenient to have portions of Donegal County attached to unions whose headquarters are in other counties; it is an inconvenience to have rates collected in one county which are handed over to the County Council of another county. It is, I repeat, against the policy and the spirit of the Act of Parliament to have those overlapping areas at all, and, of course, if there is any force in that remark as regards Stranorlar or as regards any part of Fintona, it applies with greater force, if you look at the map, to Letterkenny. Derry and Strabane seem to be with their tentacles trying to grab various portions of another county in which they are not naturally attached at all. As regards the actual inconveniences in regard to distance, I admit at once that there is no case to be made on behalf of Letterkenny, but as a matter of fact the distances are about the same, and it so happens that the main railway which serves to bring people to Derry, for instance, brings them also to Letterkenny, and in my opinion there is nothing to be said on that point at all, because it seems to be equally easy to bring the people of those portions which it is sought to add to the Letterkenny Union; it is just as easy to bring them to the one place as to the other, they are about equidistant, and there is a railway in each case; therefore I don't dwell on that. But I think what I ought to dwell upon, and what is absolutely plain to my mind, in face of the evidence at all events, is as regards Strabane; that there is a practical and actual inconvenience and injury to the poor, the infirm and the sick, of those districts in having them for workhouse or medical purposes treated in Strabane instead of in Letterkenny. You will find from the evidence of the doctor in Letterkenny that the state of things there, as regards the accommodation for paupers and the accommodation of patients, is about as good as, and I think it could hardly be better than, in Stranorlar, and you know already what is the case in that respect as regards Strabane. It seems to me a cruelty to continue to send in patients belonging to Donegal to an institution which is already overcrowded, and in point of fact it seems to be a danger to allow the Strabane Union Workhouse and infirmary to be any longer congested. Whatever may be said as regards the divisions in the Derry Union which we seek to annex, I submit that on the one point alone as regards the portions of Strabane we seek to annex to Letterkenny, it would be a regular cruelty to continue the present arrangement. We know that Strabane infirmary and workhouse are congested areas, a very large sum of money must be spent upon them, and under these circumstances I submit that if the further expenditure of money can in any extent be avoided by transferring a portion of Strabane Union to Letterkenny, as well as Stranorlar, is ought to be done in the interests of humanity and of economy. I think it is rather significant that the figures regarding outdoor relief especially are enormously greater in Strabane than they are in Letterkenny. I am told that there is £1,000 of a difference, and I cannot imagine to what that can be attributed except that instead of relieving people outside the workhouse, for whom they would if they could, but cannot find accommodation inside. That being so, certainly it seems to me an additional proof of the utter insufficiency of the Strabane Workhouse and hospital to perform the functions for which they are designed. As regards Derry, much the same observations apply, except that, that I am bound to admit the case as regards hospital and workhouse accommodation is not as serious in the case of Derry as it is in the case of Strabane; but still it is perfectly evident that there must be some inconvenience in keeping up the present arrangement, and that inconvenience must be entirely removed by transferring the Donegal portions to Letterkenny, and not only that, but that poor people from those districts—the poor and the sick—would be far better treated, because there would be far more accommodation, far more time to attend to them in the Letterkenny Union than there would be in the Derry Union. Now, in addition to that, I have to give you some figures—I dare say you have got them already.

The total valuation of the Letterkenny Union in 1901 was £22,468 8s, the area was 101,246 acres 1 rood 35 perches, and the population 13,092. The total area of the Londonderry Union in the County Donegal was 88,947 acres; that is more than half of the whole area of Letterkenny; the valuation was £34,515, and the population 8,633. It is quite evident that if there is to be amalgamation that would be a most proper addition to the Letterkenny portion for union purposes. And, of course, if there were to be an amalgamation of the Donegal Unions at all—it means to say if you don't add all Donegal, or the eastern half of Donegal to Londonderry—so Londonderry and Strabane Unions, the only alternative, if you have amalgamation at all in Donegal, is to take all Donegal and amalgamate it into some number of unions less in number than those that exist at present. It is impossible you could have as any rearrangement of unions in Donegal in any amalgamation scheme; it would be absolutely impossible for you to leave, I submit, any portion of the County Donegal in either Strabane or Londonderry, even if there were inconvenience, because, as I said before, the policy of the Act is evidently, and the practice of the Local Government Board is, to make these areas coterminous, to make each county contain all the unions, and all the electoral divisions, and all the other units of area and taxation. Now, as regards Strabane, the figures are—I am taking it in connection with Letterkenny—63,322 acres, 2 roods, 38 perches; valuation, £41,833 12s; the total area, valuation, and population of the electoral divisions I have here in a table, which I propose to hand in, and the comment I make upon them is this, that the contrast between the smaller unions and the bigger ones is so great there must be amalgamation, I fancy, with some other unions in Donegal. It is impossible to keep up these separate establishments at a cost to the ratepayers when the cost may be avoided. Again, I say if you adopt that policy there is no alternative. It must follow as a necessary consequence that you must concentrate the Donegal unions within the county of Donegal. Now, I am sorry to say that the clerk of the Letterkenny Union won't be here, or be able to be here, until four o'clock, inasmuch as he has a Guardians' meeting to-day. He will be here at four o'clock to verify these figures if you take them now.

CHAIRMAN.—Is he coming for no other purpose except to verify these figures?

Mr. Clancy.—I think so.

CHAIRMAN.—Then you may telegraph him he need not come, because we can verify the figures from our own returns.

Mr. Clancy.—The accommodation for paupers in the three workhouses is as follows: something about 700 in Londonderry.

Mr. Cooke.—740.

Mr. Clancy.—In Strabane—I think we gave the figures yesterday—350.

CHAIRMAN.—The total number in the workhouse at Strabane was 265 on the 1st of January.

Mr. Clancy.—In Letterkenny the accommodation is 668. The accommodation of the infirmaries is 140 in Londonderry; in Strabane we had the figures yesterday; in Letterkenny 222.

Mr. Cooke.—What was the number of paupers in Letterkenny?

CHAIRMAN.—Eighty-eight on the 1st of January.

Mr. Clancy.—The average number in the workhouse for the last three years was 85 '16, the number in the infirmary 3,688.

CHAIRMAN.—It is necessary to take the highest number, and we generally get the highest number in mid-winter, eighty-eight.

Mr. Clancy.—The number of paupers in the workhouse on the 1st of January, 1902, was fifty-six; in Londonderry 341; in Strabane it was 128. In the infirmary at Letterkenny forty-three; in Londonderry twenty-five. The average cost of an inmate in Letterkenny is 3s. 9d. a week, and in the infirmary 2s. 11d. The Letterkenny fever hospital can accommodate at present with beds twenty-two, and Derry can accommodate ninety.

CHAIRMAN.—That is the county fever hospital, not the union.

Mr. Clancy.—I am told the clerk is also prepared to state that each of the workhouses has an ambulance, and also that there are no inmates in Letterkenny Workhouse, while there are twenty-seven in Derry, and I believe only one attendant. Some objection may be made on the ground that there would be inconvenience to the sick poor from being removed from

Aug. 14, 1903.

certain parts of this electoral division we seek to annex to Letterkenny Workhouse. I have already said that there is not much to be said on the question of distances; practically speaking, they are equi-distant, for although they might be further away in one case than the other, but, nevertheless, the same railway accommodates both places. If anybody would be inconvenienced it would inconvenience only about six persons in going to Letterkenny. I don't know whether or not there have been complaints; it is within the knowledge of the Local Government Board that their inspectors have made complaints as to the insufficiency of the Strabane Hospital. I don't know whether any similar complaints have been made in regard to the Derry Hospital, but probably we will hear whether there is or not when some witness regarding that institution comes before you. As regards Letterkenny, the doctor will tell you that there are no complaints, and indeed there cannot be any; the accom-

modation is more than ample both as regards the general workhouse and the infirmary. As regards Strabane, owing to their mismanagement, I understood they have got into debt quite recently—I believe last year to the extent of over £5,500. I should say that is an inconvenience to the people of Strabane Union. On the general point of justice, and also of convenience, it is manifest that what was urged by Mr. Hooley on behalf of Innishowen and by myself in the case of Stranorlar is true also in the case of Letterkenny, namely, that the rich portions of this union have been detached from the poorer portions to which they naturally belong, with the result of burdening the poorer portions in such case with an amount of rates which cannot but be regarded as a direct positive inconvenience, even in the legal sense, and ought to be removed, if it can possibly be done, by the alteration of boundaries.

DR. THOMAS PATTERSON PRESIDING.

Dr. Thomas Patterson.

2313. Mr. Clancy.—You are Medical Officer of the Letterkenny Workhouse?—Yes, sir.

2314. How long have you occupied that position?—Seventeen years.

2315. Will you tell us what the accommodation in Letterkenny is?—The accommodation in the hospital is for 120, and 432 for the body of the house; 555 in all.

2316. Is the hospital equipped in the best manner?—It is.

2317. Beds and bedding?—Yes; iron bedsteads, with wire bottoms, wire mattresses, and feather pillows. It is not all occupied; the central block, which is occupied, has accommodation for sixty-six.

2318. As regards the house generally, what is the accommodation there?—The accommodation is good; there is accommodation for 432.

2319. How many are usually in it?—I think about sixty, or thereabouts.

2320. Of course there is a full establishment in each case?—Yes.

2321. There are nurses?—Yes; two nurses—a day nurse and a night nurse.

2322. Have you an ambulance?—Yes; there is an ambulance for the workhouse and one for the fever hospital.

2323. Have you waterworks?—Yes.

2324. Have you gas?—Yes.

2325. Will it be necessary to make any expenditure upon the institution?—It will require very little expenditure; some of the walls in the unused wings would require considerable expenditure, but there is plenty of accommodation without interfering with them at all.

2326. I suppose what you mean is that inasmuch as they have not been used you will have to spend some money on them to fit them up?—Exactly; but I don't think they will be required.

2327. Did the Derry doctors visit the institution?—They did, but they did not express any opinion to me about it.

2328. Could you see it on their faces?—I won't say that; I leave it to themselves to say.

2329. I believe the Letterkenny Workhouse accommodated the whole of the militia on one occasion?—It did; for four consecutive years it was used as a military barracks; it accommodated 600 or 700 men early in the service.

2330. Do you know the Derry Workhouse?—I do.

2331. You have not inspected that institution?—I have not.

2332. Mr. Murphy.—And even the militia have left you. How many patients have you on an average in the infirmary?—The weekly average was 36·8 for the last three years.

2333. And that is included in the eighty-eight occupants of the house?—Yes.

2334. What distance are you from Stranorlar?—Eleven miles.

2335. And there is another workhouse there with sixty-five occupants. How many miles are you from Millford?—Nine.

2336. Where there is another workhouse. Of course Letterkenny is the natural centre for both these if there was any change being made?—I should say so.

2337. Are these three districts—Newtowncumshann, Castleford, and Killy—their natural place to go to in Letterkenny?—I don't know them.

2338. Are you aware that these three are the three proposed to be put in?—I don't know it at all.

Mr. Clancy.—I don't think I have any more to add in the case of Letterkenny except to mention the names of the divisions.

CHAIRMAN.—We have those.

Mr. Henry.—I appear on behalf of the Londonderry Guardians representing the existing union, and I wish just to state the grounds on which they say that no case has been made for disturbing the existing state of affairs. The case put forward by Mr. Drummond was based on the Local Government Act, and he read the first section of that Act, which provides that each county is to form an administrative unit. But you will find in the same Act express statutory recognition of the fact that the existing state of affairs where a union is contained in two counties is to continue unless the preservation thereof would cause substantial inconvenience. That provision is expressly inserted in sec. 68, and it says, "Boundaries of counties at large and unions, as existing at the date of the Order, shall be preserved except in any case where the preservation thereof would cause substantial inconvenience." The next subsection is "A union shall not, if it is conveniently possible to avoid it, be divided among more than two counties, and shall not, in any case, be divided among more than three." The next one also is important: "Where a union is divided between more than one county, the area of which divided part, so far as it is not contained in an urban sanitary district, shall be of a sufficient size and reasonable value to constitute a suitable rural district." And in clause 5—"That if the Local Government Board amalgamate two unions they may, after communication with the County Council and Rural District Councils, either amalgamate the rural districts in the same county which are comprised in the amalgamated unions or direct that those districts shall continue as separate rural districts." The case for the County Council, which was based on these grounds, has altogether fallen to the ground. The first was the case of the clerical staff. The case of the clerical staff, as the Secretary of the County Council admitted, is an element that does not enter into it at all, because, he says, he sees no reason for any reduction, even if the amalgamation was carried out. As to the question of convenience. You take the entire cost of the union, representing its costs in both counties, and divide it according to valuation, and the Rural District Councils check the figure, and both councils have adequate control. And the last point was that there was more expense in connection with the county surveyors, but the section I have read enabling the preservation of rural districts, even if amalgamation took place, would be applicable here, and the county surveyors who now straddle in Derry and Strabane would be inconvenienced by having to go to Innishowen and Letterkenny, and possibly Stranorlar, so that really the question comes back to the ground that the rich portion of the district should support the poor portion. What I submit to you that this is a sentimental claim; it is because portion of Donagall is attached to portion of Londonderry in one case and in the other to portion of Tyrone. Let us take the Londonderry Union that is composed at present of three unions—the rural portion of County Londonderry, the rural portion of County Donagall, and the county borough of Londonderry—which is, for the purpose of this, a separate county.

Aug. 14, 1903.

although forming one union with the three. Suppose for one moment that Londonderry instead of being, as it is, the capital of Londonderry, were a Dergal town, would anyone have the hardihood to come before this Commission, with Londonderry a Dergal town, and ask them to amalgamate with Inishowen and the town of Carradough, miles away, these divisions of Burt, Stranorlar, and Fahan, and the other divisions proposed to be thrown into Inishowen? The answer would be "It is an absurdity; here you have a workhouse in your own county adjacent to these divisions." For the purpose of Poor Law relief what difference does it make that by accident the City of Londonderry, which is geographically on the Dergal side of the Foyle, happens to be in the County Londonderry? I submit it makes none whatever, and you must deal with this for the purpose of Poor Law relief as if there were no distinctions in counties, and the real basis is what is most convenient for the public, the poor, the Guardians, and the entire district, having regard to its geographical position. The same argument applies even in a stronger degree in Stranorlar. These divisions referred to were made after the passing of the Poor Relief Act, and Mr. Healy has referred to the fact that they were probably made by gentlemen who knew nothing about the country. The way they came to be made was on a report of a Mr. Nicholls, which was laid before Parliament—a gentleman connected with the formation of the English unions, who came to this country in 1836 under directions from Lord John Russell. And at page 29 of his report he says: "In forming the country into unions it will, I think, be necessary to observe the civil rather than the ecclesiastical boundaries of parishes, but care will be taken in which it may be requisite to disregard all such boundaries, it being obviously more important that the district to be united should be compact, convenient, and accessible, and be naturally connected with its centre, than that the old and often inconvenient boundaries should be observed. This applies not only to parishes and county boundaries, but to parishes and other divisions. The principle which has governed the Commissioners in the formation of the English unions, whenever they have not been driven from it by local considerations, has been to fix upon some market town conveniently situated as a centre and attach to it the whole surrounding district, of which it may be considered as the capital—the point to which the general business of the district, both public and private, for the most part concentrates. The roads of the district always converge on the market town. To form such a district into a union under one common government, for general as well as Poor Law purposes, seems therefore an obvious course of proceeding." Those were the suggestions, as the result of experience in England, put forward by that gentleman, and they were adopted, and the result is that in fifty-nine unions in Ireland the boundaries of the counties don't correspond with the boundaries of the unions. Now what you are asked to do in the case of the city, which has grown and prospered in the midst of this district, whose population has almost doubled within living memory, you are asked to take and draw a line a few miles outside the boundary of that city and send back the tide which has been flowing to Londonderry for years and years away to Carradough, away to Inishowen, and to attach districts, which are absolutely drawn to Derry to a town of 500 or 700 inhabitants, with which they have no direct connection, and to take them away from a town where every farmer residing in the district, every labourer, and everyone connected with it, is in the habit of hiring, resort, possibly assist at their every week, and send them back to Carradough. A very strong case is necessary for such a proposition. The only ground put forward is, they have now union rating, they say; portion of their county is available for rating, and they want to take that in for the benefit of Carradough, not for the benefit of the paupers or ratepayers of the district proposed to be transferred, but for the benefit of the ratepayers of another district. In the case of Inishowen only five paupers, it is alleged, are in the Derry Workhouse from No. 2; therefore we ought to be annexed; but in the case of Stranorlar seventy-one are in the house from Stranorlar No. 2, and only sixty-five in Stranorlar, yet we are to be annexed too. Where we have no paupers we are to be annexed, and where we have more paupers the same principle is to apply of annexation. Now, with regard to the five paupers, it reminds me of the evidence given once before a House of Lords Committee where it was stated that the death-rate in Kilmashnam was

only two per 1,000, so that everyone lived for 500 years, but when investigated it appeared that when a man got ill in Kilmashnam he went into Dublin and died there, and Dublin got the benefit of him for the purpose of statistics. That is what has happened here; the inhabitants of the country go into Derry for the purpose of work, and when a farmer or a labourer is about to go under he finds his way into Derry, and there are a greater number of Dergal-born people than there are of Derry-born people. There are in the workhouse of Derry an average of eight coming from No. 2 Derry district. There are something under twenty coming from the rural district on the Derry side, No. 1, and 75 per cent. of the total paupers in the Londonderry Union come from the city of Londonderry. And if this scheme got forward here is carried out the result will be that you will transfer these districts into Inishowen on the one hand and Lettickenry on the other, and the number of paupers in the city will remain constant. They will come in notwithstanding the order for amalgamation. There is no law of settlement in Ireland, and there is no power to make the Inishowen Union contribute in respect of any pauper, although it may be clearly proved he has come from this district, and therefore the city of Londonderry and the portion of the county that will remain in the union will continue to pay large sums of money annually for the support of paupers who come from another union, or just outside the liberties, and there will be no method of adjustment. That is a consideration that ought to weigh with you, because it is idle to say with a city of this size that there is not a steady flow of population from these districts into the city. You cannot go into the streets of an evening without seeing the enormous number of girls who work in the factories, the great majority coming from the County Dergal. And you are asked to draw a line two miles or so outside the city and say Derry has no connection with that; all this tide must go back again to Carradough. This railway idea, in my opinion, is an absurdity; the paupers will not be able to pay their fares; they will walk into the city and then go into the workhouse. The Guardians in the Fahan, Burt, and Burt districts will be practically disfranchised; they won't go to Carradough; it is out of their way; they have no business to bring them there. And, further, the road contractors—even at the present time we have it in evidence that Carradough, even with the existing union, is so inaccessible, and so much does it press on the road contractors and carters that they actually at present have a special day fixed for taking loads in Banama. What will that become when people have to go from Killybeg, Three Trees, Burt, &c., for Poor Law purposes—I submit it is perfectly clear the city of Londonderry is the natural place for this workhouse, and it is in the very centre of the district proposed to be annexed. I don't propose troubling you by making any statement as regards the distances, because it is only necessary to use one's eyes, and no amount of evidence can change the face of the ordnance map. (Map.) In the Inishowen district the amount paid last year for poor relief—outdoor relief—reached £294; with the relieving officer's salary and charges, nearly £1,000 a year. In Carradough itself seventy-eight people were getting outdoor relief, £399 17s. 10d. a year; Morville, sixty-one; twenty-four in Banama, and thirty-three in other portions of the union; and so much so was that the case that Mr. Delahy, who was examined here, on the 14th of May protested strongly against this, and said it was a public scandal. Now, let us take the other portion of the district proposed to be sent to Lettickenry—Newtownstangish, Castleforward, and Killybeg. It is suggested purely that those three are as near Lettickenry as they are to Londonderry, equally convenient. Let me go to the enemy's camp for a minute and see what sort of a claim they are putting forward. The views put forward are merely an attempt to grab these districts for the County Dergal and take them away from the City of Derry.

Mr. Healy.—My friend is speaking of the City of Londonderry; it is the union of Londonderry.

Mr. Healy.—It is part of the union. £29,000 of the valuation of the union I represent is made up of the City of Derry and only £40,000 of the County Derry. The intervention only shows the effect of the argument that is being used. We start with the theory that unions are to be amalgamated, and it is put forward here that there are only to be four in Dergal. What four? Lettickenry has within practically a radius of ten miles of it four to five unions—Stranorlar, Stra-

Aug. 14, 1905.

lena, Milford, Letterkenney, and, fourteen miles away, Donagel. Stranorlar is to capture a certain part of Strabane; Letterkenney is to get part of Strabane and part of Derry; and Bishnawen is to get the rest. But, these certain gentlemen engaged in predatory warfare, they have not quite made up their mind what is to become of the spot. You have four unions all in a row; it is suggested Milford should go. What is to become of Letterkenney and Stranorlar? If Letterkenney goes what are you to do with those three divisions that it is suggested should go to Letterkenney? Are you to go through the absurdity of taking them away from the City of Derry and sending them off to Stranorlar or Milford, across the Swilly. Then if you come again to the Strabane portion you have a large block which they propose to get into Letterkenney and another block which they propose to get into Stranorlar. But who is to tell us that when your report comes in that Letterkenney or Stranorlar will have then any existence on the face of the map as a union? So much was the gentleman examined here on behalf of the Stranorlar Guardians pressed by that that when I called his attention to the case of Clonlough, North and South, what was his answer. He was so pressed by the absurdity of the idea of bringing to Stranorlar paupers from Lifford, where they were looking at Strabane, that he said he did not possibly think they would insist on their claims to that. But you must take it all or none, because there must be enough left to constitute a rural district. You are asked to send a man by rail to Stranorlar; he is to come in across the Lifford Bridge to Strabane railway station and take a train up the Finn Valley to get to Stranorlar. What are the facts in Stranorlar there are sixty-five paupers, and there is accommodation between it and Letterkenney for over 1,000 people, and that accommodation has never been utilized in recent years, and never will, and you have in the two workhouses 140 people to take advantage of that accommodation. The reason is, as it appears in Londonderry, in a modified degree, the tendency is towards Strabane; it is the market town for

the entire district; they find their way there, and the end of it is that the Strabane paupers in the urban district are greater in proportion than the paupers from this district. But even from that district there are seventy-two. In the case of Strabane Union there are seventy-two paupers from the Donagel side of Strabane No. 2, and 110 in receipt of outdoor relief. From the Tyrone portion there are 145 in the houses and 255 in receipt of outdoor relief. The valuations are £42,000 and £70,000, respectively. While from the Strabane urban district, with a valuation of £15,877, and a population of 1,500, there are sixty-two in the houses and sixty-four in receipt of outdoor relief. So that the argument I have already addressed to you with regard to Londonderry applies with greater force to Strabane, because there are no infirmaries there. Strabane is well served with roads and railways, and if there is any line in the railway argument I submit it is in absurdity bringing a district like St. Johnston into Letterkenney across the country, where there is no railway communication at all. Taking the whole proposition, the original laying out of these unions was done after careful consideration; they selected as centres the market towns of the district, and the mere accident that a county boundary has been overlooked is no reason why the general convenience of the district should be given the go-by to, merely to have the pleasure of having the whole of the County Donagel conform with the boundary of the union. And I submit no case has been made for disturbing the existing affairs. It was said the rich should pay for the poor, but when we come to Strabane Mr. Conry's case is that the rich of this district will pay 5d. in the £2 less than at present. What will happen? The doctor of the Strabane Workhouse will lose this district, the clerk will lose substantially, as will the other officers of the workhouse; they will have to be compensated. Thus in Stranorlar a claim will immediately be made for additional salary by the officers there for the extra work, and it will lead to increased rates without any corresponding benefit.

Mr. W. L. FRARY examined.

Mr. W. L. Frary.

2336. Mr. Frary.—Are you Clerk of the Londonderry Union?—I am.

2337. How many years have you been clerk?—Fifteen.

2338. And are you also clerk of the Rural District Councils No. 1 and No. 2?—I am.

2339. What is the valuation of the entire Londonderry Union at present?—£184,000.—County Derry portion, £52,540; County Donagel portion, £34,627; County Borough, £29,837.

2340. Have you a return of the number of inmates in your workhouse?—This is a return of the number of days, which represents inmates for the five years ending the 31st of March, 1899; there were 27,037 days for No. 2 district.

2341. That has to be divided by 365?—Yes; but that would represent about an average of five.

2342. That is saying in every day the whole year round?—Yes.

2343. Take the portion of the County Londonderry?—36,706 days; that would represent an average of about ten.

2344. What is the general average in the home?—About 250.

2345. Would the balance represent the city of Londonderry?—It would represent the county borough union paupers.

2346. Mr. Drummond.—What do you mean by union paupers?—People who come in for a day.

2347. Mr. Reels.—Give us the number of paupers for the county borough?—I have not got that.

2348. Surely you can give us the county borough number?—I cannot, sir.

2349. Mr. Frary.—What is the average rate in the Londonderry Union for five years?—In 1888 it was 5d.

2350. Give us the standard rate?—7d.

2351. Give us the other years?—In 1897 7d., in 1898 it was 6d., in 1895 it was 5d., and in 1894 it was 7d.

2352. Can you give the five years ending 1903?—I cannot, because it is the County Council strikes the rate.

2353. Mr. Reels.—Because they are against you, you are jerryandering the figures. It shows how

this thing has been got up; it is a monstrous denunciation of duty on his part; he knows what is the object of this inquiry.

Witness.—I have it here. The average union rating as per demand notice in 1900 was 9d., in 1901 it was 8d., in 1902 it was 7½d., and in 1903 it was 7d.

2357. Mr. Frary.—It is more in our favour than the other, because the rates are higher. Do you know of your own knowledge, or have you any means of ascertaining where the particular inmates come from?—I have not at present. The master of the workhouse made up a census a few days ago as to the places where all the inmates were born, and I got the information from him this morning. Twenty-seven inmates were born in No. 2 district; three, with the exception of three or four, are aged and infirm, and nine are in the infirmary; this is their own statement.

2358. How many were born in the Londonderry county portion?—I have not that.

2359. CHAIRMAN.—The master took it for all?—He did.

2360. He has the figures if they are wanted?—He has; I took them from his list this morning.

2361. Mr. Frary.—What accommodation have you in your infirmary?—Dr. Brown will give that better than I can.

2362. Have you made large improvements recently in the workhouse?—We have.

2363. What have you spent within the last few years on the infirmary?—We got a loan of £3,200 from the Board of Works, and we spent about £300 or £400 beyond that.

2364. Use the entire of that been spent?—Yes.

2365. When did you get that £3,200?—In 1898 and 1899.

2366. Mr. Cook.—Can you tell me what is received from Londonderry No. 2 as its contribution to the union?—For the year ending September, 1903, £1,389 9s. 10d.

2367. Have you calculated what saving it would be to the remainder of the union if Londonderry No. 2 were cut off from it?—It would be a loss.

2368. What savings could be effected?—We would not have to pay certain doctor's salaries, certain

accounts for medicine, a portion of the relieving officer's salary, and registration fees amounting to about £738.

CHAIRMAN.—These are not Poor Law expenses at all. We have no power in this Commission to deal in any way with medical charities expenditures.

2369. Mr. Cooke.—He is dividing them up to show the loss to Derry. Have you calculated what could be saved to Derry Union if No. 2 were taken away?—Yes; about £732.

2370. What then would be the loss to the remainder of the Derry Union if this was withdrawn?—From £800 to £1,000 annually.

2371. CHAIRMAN.—Now the poundage rate on the remaining portion of the union?—Yes; about 1½ in the £ on the new union, No. 1, and the county borough.

2372. CHAIRMAN.—Can you tell me what Londonderry No. 2 receives in the shape of the Agricultural Grant—that is on the standard rate—am I right in saying it is £305?—£305, at the rate of 7d. in the £.

2373. Was 7d. in the £ the standard rate on which that Agricultural Grant was calculated?—It was.

2374. Am I right in saying that Londonderry Union receives £1,300 as an unchangeable Agricultural Grant?—Yes; those are my figures.

2375. That was calculated on a poor rate of 1s. 4½d. on the valuation of £80,444?—Yes.

2376. Mr. Hovver.—What is the accommodation in the workhouse for inmates exclusive of the fever hospital?—726 in the house, and ninety in the fever hospital.

2377. Has the infirmary been extended lately?—It was extended within the last three or four years.

2378. So that roughly the accommodation in the workhouse is only taxed a little more than one-third of its capacity?—Yes.

2379. During the past few years have extensive improvements been made in the workhouse?—There was a new water supply from the Corporation, and the fever hospital was greatly improved, and the infirmary was enlarged.

2380. Was that done at a very considerable cost?—At the cost of the loan of £3,300—the infirmary portion—and the rest was paid out of the rates; some of it is to be paid in forty years, some in thirty, and some in twenty-five years.

2381. Is the loan borrowed from the Board of Works payable in instalments over a certain number of years?—It is.

2382. Were also other sums spent in improvements—bedsteads and so on?—£400 or 500; there was a drainage and new bedsteads; that money was taken out of the funds of the union.

2383. Mr. Leach.—How much is payable per annum to pay off these instalments for the loan?—£210.

2384. The loans extend over forty years?—One forty, another thirty, and another thirty-five.

2385. Will you tell me what is the average annual expenditure for keeping up the buildings—repairs?—I could not answer that offhand; I have not it before me.

2386. Mr. Drummond.—Mr. Cooke asked you how much poor rate did Derry No. 2 pay into the union and you said for 1900 it was £1,389?—Yes.

2387. What was the rate per £ in that year that you levied on the whole union; was it 8d.?—Yes.

2388. Now in the present year is not the rate 1s.?—It was 1s. last year; it is 1s. this year.

2389. What is it this year?—About 10d.

2390. Take the 1s. of last year—that was 50 per cent.—half over what it was in 1895, so that you would receive on that about £2,300?—But this statement of mine is actual expenditure.

2391. I am merely asking the amount paid in from the Donagel portion to the union?—I am not giving you that; I am giving the actual expenditure of the district.

2392. Did you not give me a rate of 8d. for 1895?—Very well.

2393. And on that rate £1,389 was paid in?—That is not quite the fact; I made up this return for the purpose of showing the actual expenditure; we might have a balance left.

2394. On a rate of 8d. what would be the amount received by the union from the Donagel portion?—I could not answer that now; I have given the expenditure.

2395. Did not Mr. Cooke ask you how much you received from the Derry No. 2?

Mr. Cooke.—I admit that.

2396. Mr. Drummond.—Take last year with 1s., or this year with a little under, and you see the gross amount paid would be about £2,000, and the average is five pence.

CHAIRMAN.—That includes dispensary expenditure.

2397. Mr. Drummond.—Out of the Donagel division there are five parishes in the workhouse. That went to pay dispensary expenses, of course; it went to pay everything; but considering that there are five parishes out of that district do you think that a fair thing to be paid by the County Donagel to go into the Londonderry Union?—Certainly, under the present law. If Donagel had no parishes at all they would still have to pay the proportion of the maintenance of the inmates of the houses on account of its being union rating.

2398. Last year, when it was 1s., what was the demand on Donagel?—I have not that before me.

2399. Did you not know you would be asked that?—I did not.

2400. Out of this £2,000, how much would be spent on dispensary conveniences for the Donagel portion; is there a dispensary in that district?—There are three.

2401. How much do you spend on those three?—The doctor's salaries, £270; rents, &c., £181; medicine, £108; there are 2059, and then there is vaccination, and, of course, there are the relieving officer's salary and registration fees, £847; I have taken the cost of the papers at £156.

2402. Of the papers; the five?—I was calculating fifteen; if it is taken only at five it will be more against you.

2403. Give me all the expenditure on the Donagel district?—£2847.

2404. Last year when you received over £2,000 you expended on all these things, £2850, and the balance represents five parishes. Do you think it is a right thing, or a fair thing, that in the poor county of Donagel about £200 should be paid into Derry for the support of five parishes?—You are not speaking about the establishment charges; that is a misleading question.

2405. I am speaking of what Donagel pays, and what Donagel gets?—But then there is the establishment.

2406. I know there is for the city of Derry and the County Derry, but Donagel sends in five parishes; in respect of these you get about £1,100; do you think that a fair or proper thing?—Yes; according to the law it is fair.

2407. Shylock's bond was fair because the law gave it to him?—I am giving my evidence.

2408. Don't you know that Donagel is a county where the Congested Districts Board and other public institutions are trying to bring in money as charity?—Yes.

2409. Do you think it is fair that the rich part should be cut off to pay money to you while public charity is required for the support of the remainder?—Ask that again.

2410. Would you think it a fair thing if a rich part of the city of Derry was cut off and thrown in with Donagel and Tyrone, and leave the poor parts of Derry to support all the parishes; would you consider that fair?—I would not.

Mr. Drummond.—But when we come to Donagel you think the same principle is fair, according to the law. I won't trouble you further.

2411. Mr. Brady.—Of course there is nothing, as I understand, in any way political in the opposition of the Derry Guardians or the Derry Union to this change?—I cannot answer that.

Mr. Hovver.—Or to the request for the change.

2412. Mr. Brady.—You don't suspect that there is anything?—Oh, no.

2413. Then we may take it that this opposition is entirely non-political?—I don't know.

2414. Do you suggest that there is any motive except benevolence or care for the paupers?—I suppose the Guardians want to look after their own interest and the interest of the ratepayers, and of the paupers too.

2415. I want you to clear away from my mind any prejudice if you can; will you tell me whether you think there is any political motive at the bottom of this opposition?—I cannot tell you.

2416. Do you suspect that there is any?—I cannot tell you.

2417. Will you put it for me in this way, that there is no motive whatever except the interests of

Aug. 14, 1902.

Mr. W. L. Perry.

the poor?—No, I will not; the Guardians are simply defending themselves.

2418. Is not a question of defence; the Guardians of Derry need no defence?—They are on their defence.

2419. Not at all; oh, no, I assure you; brush that away from your mind. Do you suggest that there is any action on the part of the Guardians of Derry in objecting to this change except the interests of the poor?—I do not.

2420. Not do you believe there is?—I decline to answer that question.

2421. You know, Mr. Perry, you are embarrassing me very much.—I hope so, say way.

2422. You are not in the least embarrassed?—Not a bit.

2423. Do you consider that the existing system is the best possible system that could be devised?—Of what?

2424. Of what we are talking about—unions and Poor Law accommodation—do you think the existing system is the best possible that could be devised?—I would not give an opinion as to that at all; I dare say there is room for improvement.

2425. I am speaking of the arrangements of the Derry and Donagh Unions; do you think they are the best possible that could be devised?—I don't know anything about that; I did not consider the question.

2426. Your Guardians have instructed counsel to come here to oppose any change; I am therefore asking you as an experienced administrator, do you think the existing system the best possible that could be devised?—I don't think it could be very much improved.

2427. Not at all; not improved at all?—I don't think so.

2428. Then these gentlemen sitting on a Visiting Commission can make no change to the advantage of anybody?—As far as our union is concerned.

2429. Or as far as the County Donagh is concerned?—I won't go further than our district.

2430. I suppose you are aware that all the rest of Ireland has very generously made sacrifices in the interests of Donagh?—I don't know that.

2431. They have got huge sums of public money, which might have been distributed elsewhere, for their congested districts and railways?—Yes; there were some railways made.

2432. And out of the Church Fund, and otherwise; other portions of Ireland have given up huge sums to Donagh on account of its poverty?—I don't know that; I don't deny it.

2433. Do you suggest that there is not an annual grant out of the Church Fund, out of which Donagh, on account of its poverty, gets huge sums from the rest of Ireland?—I don't know anything about it.

2434. Well, at all events, if the richer portions of this Island contribute for the upkeep and development of Donagh, don't you think the richer portions of Donagh might fairly be asked to contribute to the poorer portions, eh?—Poorer portions.

2435. If the rest of Ireland, having regard to the misery and poverty of Donagh, contributes huge sums for its railways and congested districts, would it not be fair that the richer portions of Donagh itself should contribute?—It would.

2436. But would it not be repugnant to any idea of justice that the richer portions of Donagh should contribute, not to its poorer portions, but to the rich city of Derry and rich county of Derry?—I don't understand you.

2437. Is it my dishonesty, or your stupidity? Do you think it fair, when all the rest of Ireland is contributing to reduce the misery and improve the condition of the poorer districts of Donagh, that the richer portions of Donagh should contribute nothing, but should, on the contrary, contribute to help the rich county and city of Derry?—I say they should help their poorer neighbours.

2438. And at all events it is repugnant to your mind that this rich City of Derry with its manufactures should be getting a contribution from Donagh; is it repugnant to your mind?—No.

2439. Do you think it is repugnant to justice?—I don't think it is.

2440. You know of course that nearly the whole of Donagh is scheduled as a congested district?—I don't know that it is.

2441. Large portions of it—nearly the whole of Eniskillen—you know that?—No, I do not.

2442. Is not the whole of Eniskillen, except a small district, scheduled?—I cannot tell you.

2443. Is that your local knowledge?—I know nothing of that part of Donagh.

2444. Take it from me—a poor Derry man, a man from the South of Ireland—that nearly the whole of Eniskillen is scheduled as a congested district; will you take it from me?—Yes.

2445. And you will take it from me that it gets outside contributions, and has got outside contributions from the rest of Ireland to the extent of thousands of pounds?—

Mr. Henry.—Including Derry.

2446. Mr. Henry.—Would you think it fair that portion of its own resources should make some contributions?—Certainly not.

2447. Then I will pass from that painful subject. We have got from you that Donagh No. 2 contributes £2,000 a year to Derry?—It would not contribute that much in one year; £1,389; it would not run above £1,500 in any year.

2448. This is no question of speculation at all; this is a matter that you have down in your books in black and white, and can ascertain to a farthing; what is your total demand note on the area?—I could not tell you.

2449. Do you, an official of the union, come here to give evidence and you cannot answer a casual question?—If Mr. Ross goes to Mr. Adams he will get the demand note in one minute.

2450. You are the person put forward and reached for by your counsel as the person who could give the information. I am told that you have extracted from this portion of Donagh, within the last twelve months, £2,000; can you contradict that?—I cannot until I see the demand note.

2451. Did you not take the trouble in any way to inquire?—No; I did not think these questions would be asked.

2452. You thought we were fools?—We can easily get it.

2453. It is so easily got that you have not got it?—

Mr. Drummond.—There is no doubt of the figure at all.

2454. Mr. Henry.—You have told us that the master of the union went round diligently yesterday and made a census of the paupers of the union; will you tell me, as a union official, whether it is not the duty of somebody in the workhouse, whenever a pauper comes into the house, to take his place of nativity?—He did not go round yesterday; it was a week ago.

2455. That is a splendid answer. I ask you if the duty of some official in the union is to take the place of birth of every pauper?—It is not.

2456. Is there any form to be filled on the admission of a pauper showing where he was born?—Not that I am aware of, and I don't believe there is—where they come from, not where they were born.

2457. There is a form telling where they come from; and is that duly filled up?—It is, by the master.

2458. Did you take the trouble, when the master went through this laborious task to make a census of, say, 200 paupers—did you take the trouble of ascertaining by looking at the official books where they came from?—No.

2459. Do you think that would have been an interesting inquiry?—It might have been.

2460. But you did not think it would have been relevant. Do you think it would have helped you?—I don't know whether it would have helped me or not.

2461. But whether it would or not, you did not do it. You devised the splendid system of the census last week?—Oh, I did not.

2462. Who suggested it?—It was officially asked.

CHAIRMAN.—The Commissioners.

Mr. Harcourt.—That is for jerry-mandering purposes, too.

2463. Mr. Henry.—The answer is this: that there were twenty-seven born in No. 2. How many were born in the whole of Donagh?—I cannot tell you.

2464. These were born in these nine divisions, according to your own statement. You heard your counsel, Mr. Henry, suggest that a great many of these paupers who were in the union—he instanced the case of Kilmacnam—were there that strongly in your mind—where there were only two per thousand, and the reason is that they all go into the city to die; and commonly he suggested that the reason there are only five returnable from this particular division is that

if their place of nativity was proved it would be found they nearly all came from Donegal. Was that the point of the story?—I heard him saying that there were a great many people living in Derry who came from Donegal. I don't think the majority of the paupers.

2494. That was the point. Then that story had no point. Have you anything to support the statement you instructed your counsel to make?—What statement was that?

2495. The suggestion founded on this little Kilmahon narrative: that a great many of the Derry paupers came from Donegal?—I did not instruct him on that. There are officials instructing him besides me.

2496. That is why he is so badly instructed—too many cooks. Now give me the facts of the nativity of the paupers, and where they came from?—These twenty-seven were born in that district.

2497. I want the rest of them. How many of the rest of the paupers in Derry Union came from Donegal?—I could not tell you. I see the name of one from Monville.

2498. My question is from the whole of the County Donegal?—I could not tell you; you might get it from the master's list. There would not be very many.

2499. Mr. Henry says that they are nearly all from Donegal. Is that point abandoned?

Mr. Henry.—It is not.

2500. Mr. Henry.—I want you to get for me at some stage of this inquiry the number of paupers in Derry Union whom you have registered in your books as having come from Donegal, and as having come from Inishowen. You can get that without any trouble?—I could not.

2501. Don't they all, on entering the house, have to say where they come from?—Yes.

2502. Will you find out for me how many come from Inishowen?—None at all stated that they came from Inishowen; it is outside the union.

2503. Then you have not got any; like the states in Norway. So much for the 2 per cent. from Kilmahon; that little story vanishes. We may take it, then, that Inishowen provides for its own poor?—You may.

2504. Now will you please give me how many of these paupers come from Derry city?—I suppose 75 or 80 per cent.

2505. And Derry city valuation I think you gave us as being £—£80,000.

2506. Derry city has a valuation that would support two workhouses itself, taking 240,000 as the average valuation in Ireland. Derry city has a valuation large enough to support two unions?—I don't know that it has.

2507. If the average valuation in Ireland for a workhouse is £40,000, Derry has valuation enough for two workhouses?—Not the same as the one we have.

2508. You also gave us the valuation of the county portion of Derry as £22,549, and the third time the valuation of Derry No. 2, which you have given. Did you give me the standard rate for the City of Derry, or is there such a thing?—I don't think so, for the county borough.

2509. Mr. Henry.—Don't do yourself such an injustice as not to know there must be a standard rate everywhere.

Mr. Henry.—Overy borough, poor rate 7d., standard rate and county rate, 1s. 6d.

Mr. Henry.—Would you think it would be a good solution of this difficulty, seeing that you have accommodation for 724, and your average is only 280, you could accommodate 500 more paupers?—We could.

2510. Would you think it a good solution of this difficulty to add any of these other unions outside Derry? Do you think you would receive the Guardians for these districts with a good will?—I never considered that.

2511. Do you think you would water your wine? There are four unions at least in Donegal that you could absorb that have an average of under 100 paupers. Do you think you would gladly see the Guardians from these districts coming in to Derry?—We would not have room for them.

2512. That would be your only objection?—That would be one of them.

2513. What would be the other?—They would hardly get in Derry and back the same day.

2514. That is the only objection you would have?—There might be a lot of other objections.

2485. Just think of them. There would be no political objection?—I know nothing about politics.

2486. Would there be any political objection?—I could not tell you.

2487. But you would entertain none yourself?—Not as an official.

2488. But as a man?—I have feelings, too, as a man.

2489. As a man you would have no objection to those outside Guardians coming into Derry?—Not the slightest.

2490. I am sure all the Guardians are like you. As my learned friend made so much of Derry city I want you to tell me how many Guardians you have for Derry?—Sixty or sixty-three.

2491. Out of those sixty Guardians, how many does Derry city elect?—There are five wards, and two for each ward—ten.

2492. Ten out of sixty; do you think that is fair, having regard to its valuations?—There are fifteen in the city, three for each ward—fifteen out of sixty-three.

2493. So that the place with the biggest valuation and the greatest number of paupers has less than one-fourth of the representation?—That is the way it was fixed by a higher authority than me.

2494. If you had the fixing of it would you like to have it changed?—No, we have quite plenty of Guardians; too many sometimes.

2495. Do you think Derry has plenty?—I do.

2496. My friend suggested that there would have to be compensation to the officials of the Derry Union if these divisions were taken away from them. Do you agree to that?—Certainly.

2497. And if your work was reduced your pay should be increased?—Oh, no, it does not follow.

2498. My friend suggested that if Derry No. 2 were taken away from the union that your salary should in some way be compensated for?—Because I would be losing; my situation would be abolished as clerk of the District Council.

2499. Take the union. Would you lose anything as clerk of the union?—I don't think it would reduce my salary; I have not very much as it is.

2500. What you would lose would be clerk of the District Council?—And the preparation of the Parliamentary voters' lists.

2501. I don't want to be intrusive, but would you give me your salary as clerk of the District Council No. 2?—£24 a year.

2502. And that you received since the passing of the Local Government Act as an addition to your salary?—You cannot exactly call it an addition to my salary, because I lost a great deal by the passing of the Act.

2503. Supposing you were continued in that office as clerk to that District Council in case it was annexed to Carradagh, you would have no grievance whatever?—I don't know how that would work out.

2504. Can you suggest any grievance you would have if your salary continued?—I can, surely; where would the District Council meet?

2505. Your grievance would be the additional train fare?—There would be the inconvenience of leaving the office and going away to Carradagh. I would lose in the preparation of the Parliamentary voters' lists.

2506. You know that that is done on a scale. Give me the proportion for votes and jurors from that district?—Voters 221, and jurors £17 7s.

2507. Both these sums come to you through the County Council of Donegal?—Yes.

2508. And it is as their official you receive these sums?—It is.

2509. That money would be still payable to you by the County Donegal?—I suppose it would.

2510. Mr. Henry.—Would you also lose the executive sanitary officership?—What I give includes that.

2511. Would you lose anything in connection with registration?—About 25 a year. And then, under the Labourers Acts I consider I would lose: there is a second scheme going on in the district. I was granted £50 some time ago.

Mr. Henry.—The County Donegal means to treat you very liberally.

2512. Mr. Henry.—You have been asked, with reference to the number of people coming from these electoral divisions, and you told us they were twenty-seven?—Who were actually born in the district.

2513. Is it the custom to ascertain, when a person comes in, where he was born?—It is not.

Aug. 14, 1905

Mr. W. L. Perry.

Aug. 14, 1903. 2514. Suppose I come from Donegal and reside a year or a year and a half in Derry city, and return myself as Derry city, am I registered as such?—Yes; and you may come from Donegal, or the County Donegal.

2515. It has been suggested the city of Derry is extremely rich. There are 240 paupers out of the city alone—four times as many as out of Stranaboe,

and three times as many as out of Letterkenny. As regards No. 2 district itself, how many Rural Councils are there returned from No. 2?—Twenty-one.

2516. Did they pass a resolution on the subject of going to Loughswilly?—They did; they passed a resolution strongly objecting to it, according to the minutes.

MR. WILLIAM J. HANNA, J.P., CHAIRMAN.

Mr. William J. Hanna. 2517. Mr. Henry—Are you a Guardian of the Poor for Londonderry Union?—I am, for twenty-five years.

2518. Are you also a member of the Rural District Council No. 2?—I am a re-elected member for Londonderry No. 2 District Council.

2519. Are you also a member of the Donegal County Council?—I represent the county electoral division.

2520. Have you full opportunity of ascertaining the feeling of the people of this district?—I have.

2521. What is the feeling as to the proposed amendment?—They are intensely opposed to it.

2522. You personally are opposed to it?—I am.

2523. On what grounds?—I am opposed to it because it is clearly against the interests of the sick and infirm, and if unions have any meaning at all it means that they were for the relief of those that are sick and infirm, and therefore I think that distance is the very essence of the work convenience.

2524. It has been suggested here that there is no great improvement in going to Carradonagh from these particular districts, and to Letterkenny from these other districts; but is the entire tendency of the people from these districts towards Londonderry?—It is.

2525. Would it be an advantage to bring sick and infirm people to Carradonagh or Letterkenny as it is to Derry?—I think, when you go beyond a radius that can be reached by the ambulance that you are going beyond a distance that is at all convenient, and railways are of no use. Since I became a Guardian the whole population of the workhouse has changed. Twenty-five years ago, in Derry workhouse infirmaries there were about a dozen or fifteen; now, taking the winter with the summer, there is a daily average of about 100 in hospital, and a great many that are not in the infirmaries are old, weak, and infirm people. Now, a railway is no use for those who are sick; for if it is a contagious disease, or fever of any sort, they won't take them on the railway.

2526. Mr. Henry—There are only five there altogether—not a great many?—If it is a person that has not with an accident you have to send a stretcher and four bearers, and then it takes a competent.

Mr. Henry—£2,000 a year is a high price for a stretcher.

2527. Mr. Henry—Would the representatives of these various districts that are proposed to be taken to Loughswilly attend at Carradonagh?—They could not without losing the whole day; and when they come to attend their duties at the workhouse or the Rural Council they generally come in to attend the market—do their marketing first and their private affairs, and then attend to their public duties.

2528. What, in your opinion, would be the effect on the rates in No. 2 district?—It must necessarily increase the rates.

2529. In addition, have the taxpayers of this district an interest in the buildings of the Londonderry Union?—Certainly. The increase in the valuation in the last few years has been very rapid in Derry; but up to within a few years the valuation of Derry No. 2 was very nearly one-fifth of the valuation of the union.

2530. And if there was any adjustment made, even between the districts, do you think your taxpayers would receive the full benefit of it?—I don't think they will, if carried to Loughswilly.

2531. It would go to union charges?—Yes.

2532. As regards the divisions suggested for Letterkenny, is Londonderry much more convenient for them than Letterkenny?—Londonderry, from the centre of these three, would be about six miles.

2533. And from Letterkenny?—About thirteen, by the available roads.

2534. Is there any outdoor relief in this district?—There is some all over the district.

2535. Does it at all approach the amount of outdoor relief given in Carradonagh?—Not at all.

2536. Mr. Cooke—Do you know anything about the influx of people from No. 2 to Londonderry seeking employment?—I know that from the large number of

short factories that have been established in Derry year after year that a great many of the short working class out from the country, and where there is a family—a lot of daughters—they get employment in the short factories; and a great number of families within my own jurisdiction came in to Derry.

Mr. Henry—I respectfully object; I pressed the duty of the union for the exact facts; personalities are no use.

Witness—These families remain as families until their children marry, then the old man and the old women drift into the workhouse.

2537. Mr. Cooke—Do the paupers first come into Londonderry?

Mr. Henry—I object; books are available, and we should leave the figures.

Mr. Henry—We will prove that there is no record kept of where the people were born.

Mr. Henry—There is a record of where they came from.

Mr. Henry—Yes, immediately before.

Witness—When there was divisional rating we always ascertained where they were born and how long they had remained in the district before relief; but since the passing of the Local Government Act there is no such rating.

2538. Mr. Cooke—I am asking you about migratory labour into the City of Derry?—That has been the tendency.

2539. And when the girls get employment in these factories their fathers and mothers come into the town after them.

Mr. Henry—Let us have the books.

Witness—As long as the girls are unmarried they generally support their fathers and mothers, but when they have families of their own the old people go to the workhouse very often.

2540. Mr. Drummond—Is there not a great amount of migratory labour towards Glasgow for the very same class of employment as they go to Derry for?—I don't know; I know within the last fortnight five or six persons that were discharged from the railway came right into Derry.

2541. Would you think it right that Donegal should send a contribution to Glasgow because a number of Donegal people go over to the factories there?—I don't know.

2542. You make a point about the distances the poor may have to be brought, especially for the infirm. How many miles does this Derry Union run back towards Dungiven?—Probably ten or fifteen miles to the extreme point.

2543. It is a good deal farther than Letterkenny is from Derry?—Oh, dear, no. If you take the western edge of Burt from that to Carradonagh is twenty-five miles.

2544. Does Derry not go back until it meets Maghera?—Oh, no.

Mr. Henry—It is thirteen miles to Park.

2545. Mr. Drummond—It goes away down into the heart of Derry. You have no objection in bringing a person a considerable distance through the County Derry; why do you raise an objection to their being brought to Donegal a corresponding distance?—I think one inconvenience is not rectified by making two inconveniences.

2546. Then it is no harm for them to be brought into Derry; but it would be a harm to bring them a corresponding distance in Donegal?—I don't know what deductions you draw.

2547. Are you aware that there is only one county infirmary for the whole County Donegal?—I suppose that is so.

2548. Is it not a very long distance from Buncrana, and Glenties, and Malin Head to Lifford?—It is a long distance from Dungiven to Magheraish.

2549. Has much trouble or inconvenience been caused because there is only one infirmary there, and that is not must be brought long distances?—Quite so; but I don't

Aug. 16, 1904.
Mr. William
J. Hanna.

see how that bears on the position of unions. I say all these union boundaries were made for convenience to workhouse.

2550. You have said this is objectionable because it would be injurious to the sick poor; what injury have you ever heard complained of, as a County Councillor, because the poor have to be brought to Lifford a long distance—Lifford is not far from here.

2551. Here you, as County Councillor, were complained because patients had to be brought a long distance to Lifford—No. Before they can come to the workhouse hospital or infirmary they must be destitute people. These people have no other means available except what is supplied from the workhouse; they have the ambulances van and the necessary attendants, and they are brought in a proper conveyance and from a handy distance. If you get large distances and avoid yourself of railways, that is not practicable.

2552. Is there an ambulance from Melin Head to Lifford—I am talking of the pauper hospitals.

2553. Did you hear that they have an ambulance at Carranagh, or two?—Yes; but I say that it is not as convenient to send an ambulance thirty miles as to send one seven.

2554. Then, although they have two ambulances your whole objection is based on the convenience of the pauper?—It is. There is nothing sacred in a county boundary; I can stand with one foot in the County Derry and the other in the County Donegal, within half a mile of my own house.

2555. Mr. Hanna—I think you are entirely opposed to outdoor relief?—No, sir.

2556. You are in favour of outdoor relief?—I wrote a resolution, and moved a resolution, that governs the outdoor relief in the Londonderry Workhouse—

2557. Govern is a very good word; restricts, I say?—I think outdoor relief, without it is governed, is a very bad thing.

2558. Can you tell me how many Guardians there are for Londonderry No. 2?—Just the number of Rural District Councillors, with the number co-opted in addition—twenty-one.

2559. Then out of sixty-three Guardians of the Derry Union, No. 2 returns one-third?—Through their dual function of being Rural District Councillors and Guardians.

2560. Could you give me the annual budget of Derry Union—what are your total rates?—Union rates. Well, I am speaking from memory. I know the requisition was £900 and something; it was probably £1,000—I am speaking from memory—I know that it was under-estimated. And the next was high; I think the highest was £1,700 in the requisition.

2561. Do you suggest that the Londonderry Union is run for £1,700 a year?—I am talking of No. 2.

2562. Could you give me the total budget for the entire union?—I cannot.

CHAIRMAN.—It was given in evidence by the clerk before you came, a couple of days ago. For 1902—In maintenance, £2,300; outdoor relief, £173; establishment charges, £2,044; taxable, £55; superintendence, £55; about £5,000 is the total.

2563. Mr. Hanna.—If the total budget for Derry Union be £5,000 you contribute about £2,000 from No. 2?—I think the average requisition for union purposes on the Donegal County Council is about £1,500 a year.

2564. The annual cost is £5,000, and you contribute at least one-third?—Between one-third and one-fourth.

2565. So that the City of Derry and the rural portion of Derry has a contribution of about one-third from Donegal. And we know that County Derry is well-to-do and prosperous, and we know that the City of Derry is well-to-do and prosperous. Do you think that the rural portion of Donegal should make any contribution to its poorer neighbours?—If you mean that the richer districts of the County Donegal should contribute to the ratepayers and to the people that live in other districts, I don't think so.

2566. Did it ever flash across your mind at all as to how much Donegal as a whole, the poorer portions of Donegal, have got from elsewhere. I think this will make the ratepayers elsewhere button up their pockets—£50,000 for railways under the Act of 1886; £150,000 for Glenties; a free grant, £80,000, for the Killybegs line; total, £680,000 for railways. You got £25,000 for the Gwibarra bridge, and £100,000 for pier; so Donegal has got from the Imperial taxpayer, including the rest of Ireland, about £800,000 within the last ten years. If the rest of the United Kingdom has given Donegal £800,000 within the last ten years, how much right comfortable Donegal give to uncomfortable

Donegal?—I don't think well arranged and well-administered taxes in one district should go to support and protect maladministration in another district. Besides, Londonderry No. 2 got none of the money you speak of. It was Inishowen, Stranorlar, and Letterkenny got it.

2567. Do you think that the blue-blooded gentry of Donegal, and the Demosthenes of Donegal, ought not to come to the assistance of the poor hapless Papasos and people of Donegal?—That is a euphemistic way of putting it.

2568. Do you think that the wealth and intelligence of Donegal, and the independence of Donegal, and the prosperity of Donegal, and the education of Donegal, ought not to come to the help of the neglected people of Donegal?—I don't think the industrious farmers of Londonderry No. 2 district should contribute, and be taken in to help the extravagant rates that are struck in Inishowen, because they are paying in outdoor relief 2 per cent. on their whole valuation, and one of their leading Guardians stated at their board that public-houses got a great part of it.

2569. Do you think they should come with their intelligence to their power and more ignorant neighbours, who have no sense except to strike extravagant rates?—I don't quite understand whether you mean the contribution should be to the ratepayers or to the paupers.

2570. This No. 2 district in Inishowen barony is, I understand, prosperous, educated, intelligent, and law-abiding, and if there are any other objects you wish I will confer it on them?—None or less.

2571. Do you think the people in this barony should come to the assistance of the ignorant, priest-ridden, uneducated, maladministered people of Inishowen?—I never took such graphic terms into consideration at all.

2572. I will give you a fresh start. Inishowen is a barony?—It is; but please keep down to my level.

2573. I am a very small man in every way, and you are in the witness box; you are a valiant man and I am yelped, and I am paid to cross-examine. You are there, and you have volunteered. This is a barony, sir; it consists of rich and poor people, does it not—of mountains and of plain, of ignorant and of instructed?—That is common to all people. And then there is good land and bad land everywhere.

2574. Do you think the people of one barony should come to the assistance of their poorer neighbours, or would you take a purely arbitrary division, which has neither geography nor finance, or anything else to support it, and lump all the rich people together?—All our baronies are artificial; county boundaries are just as artificial as union boundaries.

2575. You think so, especially in Donegal?—In any part.

2576. I thought there were places like the Brilly and the Eagle rivers, and the Atlantic Ocean also contribute its aid in giving a boundary. Your plan is this: take all the rich people and all the educated people and lump them together, and let them escape the rates for their poorer neighbours?—Not at all; this is a district that lies within the proper waters from a workhouse that they have contributed to raise, and these destitute people have a better right to get accommodation in the Derry Workhouse, because their ratepayers have paid for it.

2577. Why did the rest of Ireland contribute a million to the people of Donegal and you won't give a penny?—That is an abstract question.

2578. Were you ever in Carranagh in your life?—Yes.

2579. That was on Thursday last?—Yes; under the leadership of Mr. O'Doherty.

2580. You contribute £2,000 a year, or £1,600 from Derry No. 2. Do you think you get value for your money?—I think our ratepayers get value for their money.

2581. Therefore, you don't think the rates in any way could be reduced for them. What is the average cost of a pauper in the unions in Ireland?

CHAIRMAN.—Say nine shillings.

2582. Mr. Hanna.—Take the average cost of a pauper to be £33 a year, and you have only five, you being as rich—that is £115 a year?—I don't consider that that is the only contribution that Londonderry No. 2 should give towards the paupers that are relieved in the Derry workhouse.

2583. If the clerk of the union says that your average contribution from No. 2 is five pence, that would mean that you should pay £115 a year?—He is respon-

Aug 14, 1906.

Mr. Wm. J.
Henson.

sible for that statement and for that fact; but I think it is only part of the fact: I think it is right enough as far as it goes.

2584. I am leading you into a trap, I may tell you?—I suppose you are.

2585. There is a pitfall in front of you now—I am in a tangle when you speak to me.

2586. There is medical assistance all round. Start with the assumption that Derry No. 2 only contributes five paupers to the Derry Union—I don't concede that.

2587. Don't concede it, but assume it—You may renounce in the matter, but I won't follow you.

2588. I am a paid renouncer. If £115 would support the paupers of Derry No. 2 for twelve months, do you think you ought to pay more?—I don't agree with that calculation at all.

2589. I suppose you know what such a thing as arguing from a hypothesis is?—I am not going into the question of equation with you.

2590. If all your paupers could be maintained for £115, would you be willing to pay more?—Yes; but that is not the fact.

2591. If it were the fact would you be willing to pay more?—I don't understand you.

2592. If you had a herd of cows and you could feed them for £115, would you be willing to pay any more?—I don't understand the object of that.

2593. You are the only man in court who does not understand me. If you had five paupers that you could maintain for £115, would you be willing to pay any more?—I am afraid both you and I are in the minority.

Mr. Healy.—Then the Deanehouse of Donegal may go down!

2594. Mr. O'Keefe.—I believe you are the chief opponent of this proposed scheme?—I represent in the Donegal County Council this electoral county division.

2595. You are the leader of the opposition in the Donegal County Council to this scheme?—Naturally; because the people I represent are opposed to it.

2596. Your opposition, I take it from what you have said already, is entirely in the interests of the sick, the poor, and the infirm?—Yes; I believe that if these union boundaries are altered it will be greatly against the interests of the sick poor, mopey-poor, and general convenience, also Guardians could not attend these distant workhouses.

2597. Your opposition is entirely on the ground of benevolence?—On the ground of increasing the inconvenience instead of abating it.

2598. That is benevolence to the poor: no other ground?—There is my answer.

2599. Have you any other ground of opposition?—I believe it would increase the taxation of Londonderry No. 2.

2600. Any other ground?—If you suggest it I will answer you.

2601. I want you to say whether you have any other ground of opposition?—I really cannot tell you.

2602. Have you not come here to give evidence in opposition?—I have given all the evidence I can; I may have some other objections which I cannot just recall at the moment.

2603. So far as you can recall at this moment you have no reasons except those of benevolence and probable increase of taxation?—No.

2604. Do you know a place called Ballymillan?—I know it is somewhere out in the County Derry. I never was there.

2605. Do you recollect any incident connected with the relief of the poor in Ballymillan in 1900, in what you yourself were concerned?

Mr. Henry.—Is it in No. 2 at all?

2606. Mr. O'Keefe.—Is it not in the Derry Union?—It is; it is in Derry No. 1.

2607. Do you recollect, in 1900, your proposing a resolution against outdoor relief being given in Christmas week to two women who were eighteen miles away from the workhouse?—I think I did oppose. They were neither sick nor infirm.

2608. Mr. Henry.—You were asked with reference to this portion of Londonderry—Park—in three any workhouse nearer?—No.

2609. So, although it is an inconvenience you have to put up with it. Is that quite different in this case, when you are dealing with No. 2?—Derry Workhouse is nearer.

2610. You have been put hypothetical cases about £115. If you are put into Carnadough Union will the rates be higher in this district than they are at present?—Certainly.

2611. Therefore, with your five paupers, instead of paying a certain sum you are to be transferred to Inishowen, and pay still more for the same paupers?

Mr. Healy.—So he ought.

2612. Mr. Henry.—Do you, as between paying more in Carnadough as compared with Derry, prefer the greater convenience of Derry and the less money?—Certainly.

2613. You also rely on the fact that the representatives could not attend the meetings?—They could not; they are virtually disfranchised.

2614. Mr. O'Keefe.—You heard Mr. Healy talk of the thousands of pounds poured into Derry. Was not one farthing given to No. 2?—Certainly not.

2615. Was it poured into Inishowen, Milford, Gweedagh, and all these impoverished districts?—Yes.

2616. So far as Derry No. 2 is concerned, it might have been part and parcel of the County Derry for all it got out of it?—Yes.

Dr. Sproule.

Dr. SPROULE examined.

2617. Mr. Henry.—Are you the Dispensary Doctor of Kilderry District?—I am.

2618. And do you reside in Calmeau, inside the Liberties?—Yes.

2619. How many years have you been dispensary doctor?—Ninety.

2620. Taking your own district, Kilderry, how is it situated with regard to Derry and Carnadough?—Much more convenient to Derry.

2621. What is the nearest part of your district to Derry?—About three miles.

2622. And what distance would the same portion be from Carnadough?—Over twenty.

2623. In your district is there any possible way that could be made of the roadway to get to Carnadough?—I don't think it is practical in the case of sickness.

2624. And is there a direct road through your district into Londonderry?—There is.

2625. Do you remember, some time ago, having a case of typhus fever outside your district towards Movilla?—I do; in the Movilla district.

2626. How many cases were there?—Four cases went to hospital.

2627. And how many days did it take removing them to Carnadough?—I am informed—

Mr. Healy.—I object; the doctor was produced yesterday; this is not in his district.

2628. Mr. Henry.—You heard the clerk give evidence yesterday that it took from three to four days, and you agree with that?—I do.

2629. In your own medical experience as a doctor, assuming that your district was transferred, would you direct the removal of cases to Carnadough that you at present send to Derry?—I would not.

2630. Would you prefer to take the risk of losing them in their own houses?—Unless it was an infectious disease; and in such infectious diseases they would come into Derry, stay with their friends for a few days, and enter the Derry infirmary.

2631. Do you know them to do that?—I do.

Mr. Healy.—That belongs to the curate.

2632. Mr. Henry.—Then Donegal people are actually using that curate infirmary?—Yes.

2633. Sooner than go to Lifford, would the effect of including that in Carnadough be to deprive the inhabitants of that district of the benefit of the workhouse infirmary?—It would deprive them of the best of almost any infirmary.

2634. Mr. Barker.—And part of the reason of that is that immediately north of Kilderry there is a range of mountains?—Yes; the direct road goes down to the river.

2635. Does that itself rise up a range of mountains?—Very large mountains.

2636. This low-lying district sloping down to the river is separated from Inishowen Union by a physical boundary of mountains?—Yes.

2637. Mr. Drummond.—Is there a good public road to Carnadough?—The road is fairly good, but it is a tremendous length.

2638. Mr. Barker.—From Kilderry to Carnadough is there a long road?—It is twenty miles; it is the only road.

2639. Mr. Lord.—What, in your opinion, would be the effect of sending people with acute diseases a distance of that sort?—It would be injurious to them.

2640. Would it increase the risk to their lives?—Enormously.

2541. In the case of accidents, would it be impossible to send them that distance?—I could not advise them to go.

2542. Would you prefer retaining the people in their own houses?—I would much prefer retaining them at home than sending them a long journey.

2543. Mr. Heneg—Have you your books here?—I have not.

2544. But you have a good memory?—Fairly.

2545. Within the last twelve months how many

persons afflicted with acute disease did you send into Derry workhouse?—I could not tell. Aug. 14, 1862.

2546. How many stretchers did you requisition within the last twelve months?—None. Dr. Spradell.

2547. How many of those terrible accidents had you out there within the last twelve months that you had to send into the Derry workhouse?—I don't think we had any.

2548. For the last twelve months, if these unhappy people had been joined on to Carrinduff they would not have known the difference?—I don't think they would.

Dr. DAVID HAMILTON examined.

2549. Mr. Heneg—Are you the Dispensary Doctor of Burt?—Yes.

2550. And have you been there for fifteen years?—Yes.

2551. What is the distance from the centre of your district to Carrinduff?—I believe it is about twenty-one miles.

2552. And to Londonderry what distance is it?—Eight.

2553. Did you hear the evidence of Dr. Spradell as to sending cases to Carrinduff as compared with Derry?—Yes.

2554. Do you agree with that evidence?—I do.

2555. Mr. Heneg—The same, doctor, as in the last case; how many people had you afflicted with leprosy in the last twelve months that you had to send in to the Derry workhouse?—I sent one patient on Wednesday last.

2556. I suppose you knew the Inquiry was coming on?—I did not.

2557. What was his name?—It was a girl.

2558. What was her name?—Mary Brown.

2559. What was the matter with poor Mary?—It was my first visit. I am not certain; I believe it was Bright's disease of the kidneys; but unless there was an examination made I could not say whether that is positive or not.

2560. That is not an infectious disease?—No.

2561. Not a disease requiring a stretcher?—Well, a car was sent for.

2562. Would it not be as easy to send a car for Mary from Carrinduff?—Of her own free will she consented to go to Derry, although their own residence is only six miles out of Letterkenny.

2563. It would have been handier for her to go to Letterkenny?—No; she consented to go to Derry. Dr. David Hamilton.

2564. The attractions of the city?—I don't know.

2565. Before Mary's case, who, I hope, will recover completely—before her case how many did you send in?—I don't really know.

2566. How long are you there?—Fifteen years.

2567. In the fifteen years how many did you send?—I know of several people that are in at present.

2568. There is no use trying to get away from the guns, I will come back. In the fifteen years how many did you send in?—I remember one at least.

2569. Mr. Heneg—What district did this girl live in?—In Burt.

2570. She was six miles from Letterkenny?—No; her own home was six miles from Letterkenny; she was a hired girl.

2571. Where did she fall ill?—Carrinduff, Burt.

2572. How many miles?—I should say it is about five.

2573. Mr. Heneg—And she would have to be carried over to Carrinduff nearly twenty miles?—It would be more.

2574. Do you know of people from your district at present in the workhouse infirmary?—I do.

2575. Do they go in themselves frequently without your sending them?—They do.

Mr. Heneg—The demand note for Derry No. 2 in 1861 was £1,159 15s. 1d.; in 1862 it was £1,070 7s. 6d.; in 1863, £1,710 11s. 10d.; and for the existing financial year, £1,420 11s.

Mr. Heneg—Perhaps you would give us the papers now.

Mr. THOMAS GREENWELL examined.

2576. Mr. Heneg—Do you reside in Inch?—Yes.

2577. And are you a large ratepayer there?—Fairly large.

2578. Do you know the feeling of the residents of that district on this question?—I do.

2579. What is their view?—They don't wish to be annexed to the Carrinduff Union.

2580. Is that the universal opinion?—Yes.

2581. Do you object to that on the ground of inconvenience and distance?—Yes.

2582. Have you any traffic towards Carrinduff at all?—None whatever.

2583. Or do the people in your district ever go towards it?—Some of them may go down to a fair.

2584. In your district the number who obtain relief, I believe, is very small?—Very small.

2585. Are you in the habit of subscribing amongst yourselves to relieve them?—We are.

2586. And is that the explanation of so few going to the workhouse?—We subscribe, and they don't go to the workhouse; we don't want them to go.

2587. If you are attached to Carrinduff, and your rates are raised, do you anticipate that would continue?—I am afraid there would be a great many complaints; I don't think they would subscribe.

2588. Mr. Greenwell—Are you not aware that the District Councillor for Inch is in favour of that?—I am; and I think he is the only one in favour of it.

2589. Was he elected by the ratepayers?—I can answer that question, if you wish.

2590. Was he elected by the ratepayers?—I don't think he was; he was elected by a certain man giving orders for him to be elected.

2591. Who took the orders?—The labourers took the orders. He is not representing the ratepayers at all.

2592. Mr. Heneg—The labourers don't count?—They have a vote. Mr. Thomas Greenwell.

2593. They ought to be abolished?—No.

2594. Mr. Greenwell—About how many ratepayers do you represent in Inch?—I am voicing the opinion of the principal ratepayers.

2595. Twenty?—More than twenty.

2596. Thirty?—I could not tell you.

Mr. Greenwell—But the man who was elected by the people of the district comes in here in favour of this and you come in to oppose it.

2597. Mr. Heneg—Were you a candidate against him?—I was.

2598. And he beat you?—He did, when he got his orders from the priest. And I was selected by the people at a public meeting presided over by his reverence; my name was spoken of and approved of.

2599. There is nothing to excite yourself about here, even when there is a priest in it?—I am here to give evidence voicing the opinion of the principal ratepayers of Inch.

2600. Craig was elected by the priest?—I say the priest gave his orders to the labourers or, rather, his hearse, to vote for Craig or to vote for the Nationalist, and I have that from Craig's father.

2601. And you were opposed to him?—My name was brought forward before a public meeting, and I was elected as one of the candidates.

2602. And you were beat?—Certainly; when the people would not be allowed to vote as they wished.

2603. They had vote by ballot?—They had.

2604. How did the clerical intimidation get into the booth?—Well, Craig's father himself told me at the election, when I offered him a seat here "Are you going to give me a seat, and I voted against you?"

Aug. 14, 1903. said he. "I am," said I, "I don't care who you voted for." He said, "You know I would not have voted against you only for what passed on Saturday."

Mr. Thomas Crowell. 2705. He would not have voted for his own son?—He would not; he got his orders.

2706. He got his orders to vote for his own son, and, bager, he did; but only for the priest he would not?—He would not.

2707. A father would not vote for his own son, in Donegal, only for the priest?—He told me so himself.

2708. And you believed him?—I did believe him.

2709. Did you ever read "Aladdin and the Wonderful Lamp"?—I don't recollect.

2710. You live on the island of Inch?—I do.

2711. Surrounded by the melancholy ocean?—Surrounded by water.

2712. Don't you think it is very unfair that you, who have not a pauper on the island, should pay for the people on the mainland?—We have none at present.

Mr. JOSEPH McARTHUR, J.P., examined.

Mr. Joseph McArthur. 2717. Mr. Henry.—Are you Chairman of the Rural District No. 2?—Yes.

2718. You are also a County Councillor for Donegal?—Yes.

2719. And member of the Asylum Board?—Yes.

2720. Do you live at Burt?—Yes.

2721. What is the feeling of the people in your district?—They are all against a change of boundaries.

2722. Would it be possible for Guardians from that district to attend at Carnadoagh?—No.

2723. You would have no representation?—I am sure we would not. Burt and Inch are the furthest off.

2724. Mr. Drummond.—What do you mean by saying they would have no representation?—I am confident the Guardians and District Councillors would not go down there; I know I would not, myself.

2725. And don't you think it very unfair that you have to pay for the people on the mainland?—I don't think we have to pay for the people on the mainland.

2726. When you have not any paupers, don't you think it very unfair that you should have to pay for the people on the mainland?—I think it would be very unfair to annex us to Carnadoagh Union, when it is admitted by people from the Carnadoagh Union that people there are receiving outdoor relief when they should not get it.

2727. Don't you think it very unfair that you, a prosperous, law-abiding Presbyterian farmer in the island of Inch, should have to pay for people in the slums of Derry?—Do you think we would fare any better if attached to Carnadoagh?

2728. Mr. Henry.—Is Mr. Craig the only inhabitant of No. 2 that appeared here in support of this?—He is; his brother-in-law, Mr. Green, a District Councillor, did not appear, and I understand he is opposed to it.

2729. You could go, if you liked?—We could not get people to go.

Mr. Henry.—There was a resolution passed at No. 2 against this; Mr. Craig moved an amendment; he got a seconder, Mr. Quigley, and on a division the original motion was carried by 10 to 2. That was a resolution against this.

2730. Mr. Henry.—The man up in Meff supported it?—Yes.

2731. I think you are a member of the Asylum Board in Letterkenny?—Yes.

2732. How is it you can trust yourself with all these Papists up there?—I am not afraid of the Papists; I have every confidence in the gentlemen I meet; but after all, we must take the distance and the roads.

Dr. SMILEY examined.

Dr. Smiley. 2733. Mr. Henry.—Are you a medical officer practicing in Derry?—I am.

2734. Did you examine the hospital attached to Carnadoagh?—I did.

2735. As the Commissioners are going to see it I will ask you a question: Is the accommodation for the sick poor provided in Derry Infirmary very much superior to that provided in Carnadoagh?—I think so.

2736. Is there an operating theatre and modern appliances provided in Derry?—Yes.

2737. Did you also visit Letterkenny?—I did.

2738. Does the same remark apply to Letterkenny as contrasted with Derry?—It applies more strongly.

2739. Mr. Henry.—Letterkenny is as good as Derry?—It is the worst of the three.

Mr. Henry.—So we are second, even in your affection.

Dr. JOSEPH THOMPSON examined.

Dr. Joseph Thompson. 2740. Mr. Henry.—Did you visit three hospitals with Dr. Smiley?—Yes.

2741. Do you agree with his evidence as to the relative superiority of the three?—I do.

Dr. W. HANNAH examined.

Dr. W. Hannah. 2742. Mr. Henry.—You are the Dispensary Doctor of the Killes district?—Yes.

2743. How far is the nearest part of Killes from Derry?—Four statute miles.

2744. How far would that be from Letterkenny?—One part of my district would be 16½ miles from Letterkenny and the other about eighteen.

2745. And you would be further away again from Carnadoagh?—Oh, yes.

(Examination of witness now here adjourned.)

Mr. JOHN GREGG, J.P., examined.

Mr. John Gregg. 2746. Mr. Henry.—Are you Chairman of No. 1 Rural District?—Yes.

2747. Do you live at Culmore?—Yes; about five miles from Derry.

2748. What objection has Derry No. 1 to this proposed scheme?—The objections we have to the scheme are stated exactly in the resolution that was produced by Mr. Ross.

2749. We will hand in a print of it. That is a resolution of 1st February, 1902?—That was passed unanimously, with eighteen present.

2750. How long have you been residing in this district?—About thirty years.

2751. Do you know what is the tendency of the inhabitants of Meff and Culmore?—Meff is in No. 2 district; I live on the borders of Meff. The tendency for two miles from the city boundary, going outwards, is to migrate into the city. The population of Meff and Culmore has gone down 20 per cent, and I venture to say 75 per cent. have gone into Derry.

So long as No. 2 remains, we have no objection to pay our share, because we always consider our prosperity is largely bound up with the city, and we consider the prosperity of No. 1 and No. 2 is largely responsible for, and is brought about by, Derry going ahead both in prosperity and otherwise, and our people

have been continuously drifting in, and, in fact, make a large proportion of the Derry population, and we are associated with them both socially and in business, and every way. We object to No. 2 going, because it will decrease the valuation; if No. 8 were taken away to-morrow I am satisfied there would not be a pauper less, and we would have to support the whole number with a less valuation. An ex-Guardian for Kilderry told me yesterday that he thought the people of Kilderry would rather go to America than Carrisnagh.

2764. Mr. Healy.—You are not in No. 2, and not a bit of you, geographically, is to be annexed? No. 1 is not to be annexed.

2765. You want, in No. 1, to get the contribution from No. 21—No; but we think that No. 2 should

share with No. 1, and help to support the poorer portion of the city.

2762. In other words, you don't want to part with that £1,500 a year that No. 2 contributes to you?—Exactly.

2761. Mr. O'Connell.—It is a very unusual thing that it should go to Letterkenny?—Very unusual.

2763. But not at all unusual that it should go to the relief of a district in the County Derry?—No. 2 belongs to us in every way.

Mr. Cooke.—There were two witnesses I proposed to examine—Sir Henry Miller and Sir William McLaren. A note of their evidence was sent in to you; it largely contains statistics. I propose to hand in the resolution to oppose the scheme. (Resolution handed in.)

Aug. 14, 1903

Mr. John
Gress.

Dr. Rankin further examined.

2763. Mr. Leach.—I was asking you about your district and the distances. I may pass on now. In the event of your being obliged to remove any patients who were suffering from acute disease or accidents, would it be practicable to send to such a distance from your district as, say, the Letterkenny Workhouse?—In my opinion it would not.

2764. Is it immensely more convenient to send them to Derry?—Very much; the greater portion of my district borders on Derry.

2765. You have also Newtown Cunningham and Castleward as well as Killea; is that applicable to all the districts?—All but Newtown Cunningham, which is nearer to Letterkenny than Derry.

2766. That is the only part of your whole district?—Yes; it would be a little nearer Letterkenny.

2767. With the exception of that it is all very much nearer and more convenient to Derry?—Yes.

2768. Part of your district is within three or four miles of Derry?—The border is not more than four statute miles.

2769. Would they get better accommodation in Derry or in Letterkenny?—I don't know about Letterkenny, but the accommodation is good in Derry.

2770. I believe they have got everything necessary?—They have modernised the infirmary.

2771. Is it not practically up to date?—It is.

2772. Mr. Drummond.—What is the nearest part of your district to Letterkenny?—I should think about nine miles.

2773. How far would that particular point be from Derry?—It would be about twelve.

2774. And you think the patient should be sent from there out of his own county into Derry?—That is the only one spot.

2775. How many patients have you sent into the Derry Infirmary?—It would average about six in twelve months.

2776. What were they suffering from as a general thing?—There were some accidents, pneumonia, and some cases of fever.

2777. Was there an ambulance sent for them?—There always is.

2778. Is there an ambulance in Letterkenny?—I cannot tell you.

2779. Would it be an inconvenience to send them eighteen miles to Letterkenny?—I should also tell you that there are not so many paupers in the electoral division of Newtown Cunningham as in the other divisions.

2780. Mr. Leach.—Are there other patients who go without being sent by you?—I am only talking of persons going for hospital treatment.

2781. Mr. Clancy.—Do you know how many paupers there were from your division during the last twelve months?—I do not. I am only speaking from the medical point of view; there were only six patients requiring hospital treatment, but there would be very many more if you could do away with the stigma that seems to attach to them on going into the workhouse hospital.

2782. Do you say it would not be practicable to send them to Letterkenny?—I do not; but I say they could be treated very well in Derry.

2783. Don't you know that there is an ambulance in Letterkenny?—Yes.

2784. And that there is a good hospital there?—I don't know anything about the accommodation at all.

2785. Mr. Leach.—How long will it take to send four persons from your district to Letterkenny for an ambulance and get it back?—It is eighteen miles.

2776. CHAIRMAN.—You can telegraph?—Yes.

2777. Dr. BOSSER.—You mentioned that you have patients who require infirmary treatment but they object to go to the workhouse hospital?—If that stigma were removed there would be far more patients for hospital treatment—I mean the destitute poor people not actual paupers, but people in receipt of medical relief, as all labourers in my district are.

2778. If the workhouse infirmary were separated from the workhouse you think it would increase the usefulness?—Undoubtedly.

2779. CHAIRMAN.—Do they ever go to Lifford?—I have sent some; but the same applies to my cases, as Dr. Hamilton said, that many of them migrate to Derry and stay there for a few days for the purpose of acquiring a residence and then go into the Derry Infirmary.

2780. I did not know that people, for the purpose of obtaining hospital treatment, go into Derry?—Indeed they do; they go into Derry and remain with friends for two or three nights and then get lines from some person and they go into the county infirmary.

2781. Dr. BOSSER.—And then they give their address as Derry?—Yes. I know many of them and they won't go into Lifford on account of the distance.

2782. Mr. Leach.—Many of those come from Donegal?—Yes; many from my own immediate district.

2783. Mr. Drummond.—How far are you from Lifford?—Thirteen or fourteen miles; the average of my district would not be more than six, or six and a half, miles from Derry.

2784. Dr. BOSSER.—If there was some arrangement by which they could go direct into the county infirmary would be an advantage?—Very great; many patients of mine, who require hospital treatment, have to remain at home.

Mr. Henry.—Perhaps I might put in the list of distances (prolonged).

CHAIRMAN.—Of course; we will check all these distances.

Mr. Cooke.—My friends think it would be a convenient time that I said anything I have to say. I appear for the Derry Corporation who have passed resolutions opposing the suggested amalgamation of Londonderry No. 2 with Innisowen by the large majorities of thirty-one to four, and thirty-two to three on two occasions, on the 11th of February, 1902, and on a subsequent date. My clients of course desire to associate themselves with everything that falls from Mr. Healy and Mr. Clancy on the general subject of reviving the system of union boundaries throughout Ireland so as to reduce the rates. They recognise, of course, that the system which now has been in force for sixty years had been devised to meet the wants of a population of somewhere about eight millions, which my friends are fond of reciting, though sometimes forgetting that two and a half millions of that population were able-bodied paupers, who had to depend on the workhouse for their support. No doubt everything that would tend to cheapen that system and reduce the rates, while at the same time giving effective accommodation to the poor, is most desirable. But you have been detained for the last two days inquiring into a wholly collateral matter, not that the ratepayers in general should be able to support their poor in a cheaper, more economical, and more efficient fashion, but whether the burthen of supporting the poor in this particular district should be shifted from one set of shoulders to another.

Dr. Rankin.

Aug. 14, 1906.

It is not suggested in any way that the process of shifting Londonderry No. 2 to Inishowen would champion the methods by which they could be supported. It could not be suggested that they would be more efficiently relieved in the Carrindagh Workhouse than they are at present in Derry Workhouse with all the medical appliances in their immediate vicinity and the extra accommodation that that workhouse can afford. What the City of Derry says is that if you were the original Poor Law Commission or were dividing the districts again irrespective of the mere boundaries of counties; if you were selecting an area you would select it to precisely the same way as it now stands. We say that we gain a great advantage from the present system; that if District No. 2 were withdrawn from us it would practically increase our rates by approximately £1,000 a year, throwing the burthen on the City and Londonderry No. 1 of £1d. in the £. The Corporation naturally, and the dwellers in No. 1 naturally resent any alteration that would increase their rates to such an amount as that. No further reason need be cited though Mr. Healy tried to drag out of witnesses that a person in the North of Ireland should have a collateral reason in his head along with not wishing to have his rates increased by 1d. in the £. Surely it is sufficient to say that the proposition would increase our rates without groping for any other reasons which, as far as I can learn, have no existence in fact. It would appear at first sight that District No. 2, has a good deal of reason to complain paying so large a contribution to the city rates, if, in fact, their respective paupers, or the origin of their respective paupers, could be taken as a criterion of the relief afforded. What we say is that Derry is naturally the centre of this basin shut off from Inishowen by a chain of hills which extends one-third of the distance down and reaches across from Three Trees to Fahan, the upper portion of this district being unobstructed. If you are to take as your guide the instructions apparently quoted with approval by Mr. Healy that the main guide in selecting an area was to be the market town to which the people resorted why Derry would be the natural centre. It cannot be suggested for a moment that the market town of all this area is not the City of Londonderry. But we say further that all that portion—as was depicted by Mr. Gregg—with all that population, to a large extent, goes to seek employment in the City of Derry; that they are drifting in continually, and that the prosperity of the city and of this neighbourhood is unspeakably bound up. It is a matter of common knowledge that Londonderry has large manufactures; and that consists mostly in the making of shirtings; that it gives vast employment to the female portion of the community; that these girls that get that employment to a very large extent come from Donegal; that when they get that employment their parents follow them into the city in order to derive support; and in process of time, when these girls either marry or cease to be the support of their parents, the natural thing is that those parents drift into the Londonderry Workhouse. If that was not the case District No. 2 ought to be in a state of the greatest possible resentment that it should contribute an undue proportion of its rates to support the poor of Derry. But they know perfectly well that the poor of Derry are their own poor; they know perfectly well, as Dr. Rankin says, that the people whom what is called a location by a few months residence and call themselves Derry people, although their origin was in these outlying districts surrounding Londonderry. But we find from Mr. Hanna, and from the unscientific elected representatives, that they are satisfied with this arrangement, that they think it is an equitable arrangement, and when we examine into the true bar's it is that their poor seek employment and get relief when they are unable to get employment in the City of Londonderry. You must take the natural boundaries if you are to do justice in forming a union. If you withdraw Londonderry No. 2 to Carrindagh you would simply leave the workhouse of Londonderry in the main supporting the poor of that district. By withdrawing Londonderry No. 2 in part to Inishowen, and in part to Letterkenny, you will not get rid of the fact that these people come into Londonderry, and as they are poor are there relieved. That is the main contention of the City of Londonderry, that no alteration of these boundaries can alter that fact. In all this matter there does not seem to be much consideration shown to what would be for the benefit of the poor either by the County Council or by their witnesses. Can it be contended for one

moment that a city like Londonderry with as a firmity supported out of the county with all the most modern surgical appliances, with a modern staff, and with a fever hospital, which the Corporation of Londonderry have put there at their own expense, are the poor of this district—which geographically lies in the City of Londonderry, which is not one-half as far from the City of Londonderry as then Carrindagh, the distance making it almost prohibitive for people to be taken to Carrindagh in the ambulance—are they to be denied the advantages, and the right they have of resorting to the City of Londonderry and the excellent medical aid they can get there. Now Mr. Henry has opened so largely the case for the city in conjunction with his own case, and said it so much more effectively than I could do that I don't intend to detain you at any length. One aspect affecting Londonderry No. 2 does not appear to have been mentioned; if you took those six elected districts and transferred them to Inishowen, what would you have? Because they happen to have been more industrious than their neighbours, to have had few poor and subsisted for their own poor to keep them out of the workhouse, what crime is it to be industrious and to have few poor that they should be awarded with excessive taxation by being thrown into Inishowen because they successfully kept down poverty.

Mr. Hanna.—I thought my friend was appealing for the Corporation.

Mr. Cooke.—I am, but Mr. Henry dwelt so much on my case that I may say a few words on this matter. It is not only that that occurred to me to be unfair, but it is an additional fact that if you had this carried out you would have Inishowen receiving an Agricultural Grant of somewhere about £2,500 in perpetuity in relief of the poor, and you would have the District No. 2 receiving only its proportion of the grant of £800, that would go to these electoral divisions, and if you take the difference of these grants is added to the two districts, which would be within the same union, you will find it work out to this: that instead of the people in No. 2, who have no poor paying a smaller rate than the people of Inishowen, you will find Inishowen rates always 6d. less than in these districts, because their grant in aid worked out on this valuation would amount to that. I think that it is a most preposterous thing, to have two districts in the same union, one having no poor, the other giving out-door relief apparently to come, and yet the district that you throw in along with them will be obliged in perpetuity, or rather Inishowen will always be perpetually, be paying 6d. less than the people in the district of Londonderry No. 2. I would think that that would be an anomaly you would be very sore to get in force by accepting such a scheme as this, and I think there is a good deal to be said also for the fact that it would be a practical disfranchisement of District No. 2. A man may go and attend a Board of Guardians when he can conveniently go to the law where it is held, and do his business at the same time, but to expect these handworking people to march off to Carrindagh, an hour and a half by railway, where they have nothing to do, is to disfranchise that prosperous community that has always been famous in looking after themselves. Mr. Healy has spoken of the money poured into Donegal; this money has never reached the industrious classes in this district here; the relief has always been given to the poorer congested, but as for Burt, and Birdstown, and Fahan, and Killa, it has never received a fraction of this money that has come from Imperial sources to aid Donegal. It only asks to be let alone; Londonderry asks the same. We have accommodations in our workhouse for 740 people; one-third of it is occupied. We are perfectly prepared to receive patients, to give them the highest possible medical assistance, and we have the highest possible appliances in aid of the poor. Londonderry City simply says "It is our good fortune or bad fortune to be the real capital of these districts; they concentrate here, and, as far as we are concerned, let them all come and we will provide a workhouse for them, and let the rates be so distributed." That and nothing in the resolution passed by the Corporation is the reason for their appearance here, and we respectfully submit that the particular district, which is contemporaneous with the Lower Liberties and Upper Liberties of Londonderry, should remain a part of the union system of Londonderry.

Mr. Hanna.—I wish to make a few remarks for No. 1 District supplementary of the remarks made by

Mr. Henry who appears for the union at large. My learned friend, Mr. Drummond, at the opening of the investigation complained of this anomaly of two sections of Donegal being carved out for the purposes of two unions. Mr. Henry has dealt so clearly with that that it is scarcely necessary to refer to it further than that Mr. Nickolls in his report in 1833 before these unions were carved out in the different districts in Ireland—

Mr. Cleave.—May I interrupt my learned friend. I expected from what Mr. Henry said that the evi-

dence would be concluded before any further speeches were made; there is one district not dealt with yet—Strabane.

Mr. Henry.—I am the only person concerned about Strabane, and I am only going to examine the witnesses.

Mr. Horner.—I appear for No. 1 Rural District Council.

Mr. Cleave.—I would ask counsel to postpone his speech until the witnesses for Strabane are examined.

Aug. 14, 1903.

Mr. T. W. D. HUMPHREYS, J.P., examined.

2284. Mr. Henry.—Do you reside at Donaghmore House?—Yes.

2285. Is that on the border of the Strabane and Stranorlar Unions?—It is the last townland on the railway.

2286. And how long have you been a member of the Board of Guardians?—Fifty-five years.

2287. Are you intimately acquainted with all this district on both sides?—I know the district.

2288. What distance is your place from Stranorlar?—My place is seven miles.

2289. And how far from Strabane?—Six.

2290. Taking the district as a whole, would it be more convenient to Stranorlar or Strabane?—Strabane.

2291. Is Strabane the market town of the district?—It is.

2292. Have you three stations on the Donagall line, inside the district, leading into Strabane?—Yes, coming in Castlefinn.

2293. With the present workhouse and infirmary in Strabane, which is the more convenient place to have the workhouse for this district?—Strabane by a great deal.

2294. If the change was made and Stranorlar substituted do you think the paupers of this district would go to Stranorlar?—Some of them might, but the majority would go to Strabane still.

2295. And would the number of paupers in Strabane Workhouse be practically very much the same?—Very much the same.

2296. Did your Guardians and both the Rural District Councils pass resolutions against this proposal?—They did; both No. 1 and No. 2.

2297. What is the feeling in the district itself?—The great majority of the ratepayers are entirely against any change.

2298. Was there any complaint on the subject of convenience for the purposes of Poor Law relief of the Strabane Workhouse?—Never that I heard.

2299. What, in your opinion, would be the effect on the rating of the district if the proposed change was carried out?—My opinion is that the rates would be raised; but it is only my personal opinion.

2300. Mr. Cleave.—I think you stated that your own place was six miles from Strabane and seven from Stranorlar; do you know that part of this district is only three miles from Stranorlar?—The upper part of it is—the outside boundary.

2301. Do you think that it would be also more convenient for those people who live within three miles of Stranorlar to go to Strabane than to go to Stranorlar?—Yes, and I will tell you the reason; they all market there.

2302. Do the paupers market?—No; I don't know about the paupers.

2303. We are talking of the paupers that don't go marketing; we are talking of the convenience of the paupers, and I ask you is it more convenient for the paupers who happen to be living within three or four miles of Stranorlar, is it more convenient for them to go to Strabane than to go to Stranorlar?—You are talking of the extreme boundary and I am talking of the centre.

2304. You were talking of the district that raised you and I was not?—Oh, no.

2305. Are you acquainted with the workhouse accommodation in Strabane?—Yes.

2306. Do you think that that is as good as it is at Stranorlar?—Not at present.

2307. When will it be as good?—There is a scheme before the Board of Guardians at Strabane to spend £1,200 to make the accommodation complete as far as we can at present.

2308. Do you know that there will be no expenditure necessary at Stranorlar?—I know nothing of the sort.

We shall have to spend money whether this scheme is carried out or not.

2309. Who will have to spend it?—The Strabane Guardians.

2310. You don't deny that the accommodation in Stranorlar is infinitely superior to that at Strabane?—I don't know that it is superior; I don't know the house itself.

2311. Were you ever in Stranorlar?—Very often.

2312. Did it ever occur to you to go to the workhouse to see it?—I never visited the house.

2313. Did you say that the general feeling in Castlefinn is against this change?—Certainly, of the ratepayers, and the largest proprietor in Castlefinn town is against it—Mr. Stewart.

2314. Is it not very curious after all that the representatives of the district on the County Council in the other way?—Not the slightest; different people have different opinions, but the person who has the greatest interest in the town of Castlefinn is against it.

2315. Do you think that a person who does not represent the ratepayers of the district is a better authority than the man who does?—I think the man who pays the rates is the man who has the strongest opinion on the subject.

2316. Mr. Drummond.—How much, in round figures, does Strabane No. 2 pay—take it in gross—to the Strabane Union?—I really cannot tell you.

2317. Do they pay £2,000?—I suppose so; about that.

2318. Did you hear it stated here, and I will take your own counsel to be correct, that the number of Donegal paupers in Strabane Union was seventy-two?—The clerk of the union will give you the exact amount.

Mr. Henry.—Yes, seventy-two.

2319. Mr. Drummond.—Of course you know the Strabane Union goes back a long way into the County Tyrone?—It does.

2320. And of course you know that you—the Donegal men—are subscribing to the support of the dispensaries and other things all over that large union?—Yes.

2321. How many dispensaries have you in Strabane No. 2?—There is a dispensary in Castlefinn and another in Hagboe; there are two.

2322. I think that is the same number as in Deery No. 2, and the expenditure was put down there, in round figures, as about £750.

Mr. Henry.—There is £120 on outdoor relief; the figures cut the other way in this case.

2323. Mr. Drummond.—Don't you think you are paying a very high figure for the support of these seventy-two paupers, deducting the dispensary cost from your £2,000?—I don't think so.

2324. Are you aware that you are paying more than double the average amount?—No, I am not.

2325. You have not gone into these figures?—No.

Mr. Cleave.—Here is the demand note for last year—

£4,111.

Mr. Henry.—There is something to come off that.

Mr. Cleave.—Here is the demand note, 26th January, 1903—£4,111.

Mr. Henry.—There is a reason for that; will you read the other two years before.

CHAIRMAN.—There was an insufficient estimate the year before.

Mr. Henry.—The rates are 16d., 16½d., and 14d.

2326. Mr. Drummond.—Do you think it is fair or just that ratepayers in Donegal—a large tract of Donegal—should be subscribing towards the expenses of dispensaries through the County Tyrone, some of them over perhaps twenty miles; do you think that is just or fair sending money out of your own county into the rich County Tyrone?—I think if you take into consideration the sick and the poor, and their convenience, it is quite right.

Aug. 14, 1905.

Mr. T. W. P.
Bamphreys.

2822. To send Donagall money, although you have portion of this district within three miles of Stranorlar, and portion a very short distance from Letterkenney, and an ambulance to take people there; don't you know that in keeping up one of these vast establishments the whole establishment must be kept up, no matter what number is in it?—Yes; you have mentioned two outside townlands, and said nothing about Fethall, St. Johnston, and Glenlough.

2823. Do you think it fair that Stranorlar, with the great expense of that establishment, should be left practically vacant, with its vast number of rooms lying idle and unoccupied, while you are sending the paupers into the County Tyrone; do you consider that fair?—I do;

if Stranorlar is in that situation it ought to be dissolved and put into the neighbouring unions.

2824. You think it should be left there or abandoned altogether?—I don't know.

2825. And in your own country the workhouse in Stranorlar should be shut up and abandoned in order that you may send the County Donagall poor into Tyrone?—I did not say that; but I took your statement that Stranorlar was derelict.

2826. Do you think it right to send Donagall money into Tyrone, or fair?—We paid for the building of the house, and I think we ought to enjoy it.

2827. What house?—The poorhouse in Stranorlar.

2828. Have not the Donagall people paid for the house in Stranorlar?—I don't say they have.

Captain BROOK, D.L., examined.

Capt. Stoney.

2829. Mr. Henry.—Do you reside near Raphoe?—Yes.

2830. Are you a member of the County Council?—Yes.

2831. Are you also familiar with the working of the union?—Yes; I have been twenty-five years a member.

2832. Is almost the entire of this district within a radius of eight miles from Stranorlar?—Yes, except three small corners that jut beyond it.

2833. What portion of the union is included within eight miles radius from Stranorlar?—Only one-third.

2834. If the portion proposed to be transferred to Stranorlar were transferred, what would be the distance the poor would have to travel on an average?—The nearest point from Stranorlar Workhouse to the union of Stranorlar is three miles; that is only one point. The furthest point of the area, North Glenlough, is thirteen miles. The average distance that the poor would have to travel to Stranorlar Workhouse would be eight miles.

2835. What is the average distance they have to travel at present to Stranorlar?—Four miles.

2836. What is the opinion of the ratepayers on the subject of amalgamation?—I think it would be an injury to the ratepayers.

2837. What valuation does each Guardian represent at present?—Each elected Guardian in the Stranorlar Union at present represents a valuation of £2,100.

2838. What does each Guardian of the Stranorlar Union represent?—£1,400.

2839. And in Letterkenney Union?—£1,100.

2840. And if you were amalgamated either with Letterkenney or Stranorlar £1,400 or £1,100 would have the same voting power as you have?—The result would be that eleven Guardians of Letterkenney, representing only £12,000, could out-vote ten Guardians from Stranorlar, representing £13,000.

2841. Have you compared the taxation per head in Letterkenney and Stranorlar with the taxation in Stranorlar No. 2?—The result of the vote I mentioned would be that the Guardians of Stranorlar by taxing themselves at the rate of 2½d. per head of the population could tax Stranorlar at the rate of 4d. per head, the valuation of the two areas are so different.

2842. What is the feeling of the people of your district on this subject?—Entirely against amalgamation.

2843. Even in Raphoe, which is comparatively near?—Quite as much there as anywhere else.

2844. In your opinion, taking this district, which adjoins Stranorlar, would it be absurd to bring them to Stranorlar?—It would be very hard on them.

2845. Would some of the paupers find their way into Stranorlar?—I think most of them.

2846. As regards the attendance of Guardians, would it, in your opinion, be as good at Stranorlar or Letterkenney as at Stranorlar?—I don't think there would be much attendance at all. Most of the Guardians have business to do in Stranorlar, and they told me they would resign rather than go there, especially in winter time.

2847. Mr. Drummond.—I think you told me that the most distant part of Stranorlar from Stranorlar was thirteen miles?—Yes.

2848. What is the mileage of the most distant part of it from Stranorlar?—About eight and a half or nine miles at the outside.

2849. The part that runs within three miles of Stranorlar, how far is it from Stranorlar?—About eight and a half miles.

2850. Then the difference is between eight and a half or nine miles and thirteen; what is the distance of Raphoe from Stranorlar?—Six miles or six and a half.

2851. As the present time there is no railway from Raphoe to Stranorlar; what is the distance of Raphoe from Stranorlar?—Nine miles, I think.

2852. I am told it is only six?—I should say it is between eight and a half and nine miles, statute.

2853. Raphoe is one of the most important places in the Stranorlar Union; do you think the difference between six and a half and eight and a half is of much importance?—For the poor it might.

2854. How many persons would it affect?—I think the difference on the average of four miles for the poor to travel is a very serious consideration.

2855. How many poor go from Raphoe?—From the district seventy-two go for the year, we know.

2856. Mr. Clancy.—It is a great hardship to put a district which is only three miles from Stranorlar into the Stranorlar Union?—I don't say that.

2857. Is it a great hardship to put those who are twelve miles away?—It is.

2858. Do you happen to know whether or not, as a fact, that the extreme point in County Tyrone from Stranorlar is twenty-five miles?—I don't know; it may be.

2859. Supposing it was, would not that be a hardship?—It would.

2860. Mr. Henry.—This district in Tyrone is a mountain district?—Yes, very sparsely populated.

2861. And the only option is either going to Stranorlar or crossing over the mountain to Magherafelt, which, I suppose, you never mind. . . . Supposing your Rural District Council were abolished, would the same figures you have given us apply to the taxation for roads?—Yes; the same voting power.

Mr. J. D. SHANLEY examined.

Mr. J. D.
Shanley.

2862. Mr. Henry.—Are you Clerk of the Stranorlar Union and also of the District Councils 1 and 2?—Yes.

2863. Was this portion coloured pink originally portion of the Stranorlar Union?—Yes.

2864. That contained 81,287 acres, valuation £62,836, and 20,271 of a population. When Gortin was dissolved you got this (shows on map)?—Yes.

2865. With 55,565 acres and a valuation of only £7,631, and a population of 5,123. Is that principally mountain?—Yes.

2866. In the pink portion of the Stranorlar Union are there 53,103 acres, with a valuation of £42,760, and a population of 10,463?—Yes.

2867. Making altogether a valuation of £113,499 and 20,659 of a population?—Yes.

2868. Over and above that, is the urban district of Stranorlar included in that with a valuation of £13,227 and a population of 5,001?—Yes.

2869. How many persons are in receipt of outdoor relief; how many persons are inmates of the workhouse from this district taken from Gortin?—Twelve.

2870. And how many in the infirmary from Gortin?—One.

2871. And how many in receipt of outdoor relief from that district?—Thirteen.

2872. Take the original portion of Tyrone; how many are in the house end of that district?—145 at the last of August.

2870. How many of these were in the infirmary?—Twenty; fifteen, and five in the fever hospital.

2880. And how many were in receipt of out-door relief?—215.

2881. Now come to the portion in dispute, Strabane No. 2; how many were in receipt of in-door relief?—Seventy-two.

2882. Out-door?—119.

2883. And how many in the infirmary?—Fifty-nine.

2884. How many people were in the workhouse from the town of Strabane?—Sixty-two.

2885. And how many in receipt of out-door relief?—Sixty-four.

2886. Now I want to bring you to the rating; what were the average rates for the last five years in Strabane Union on lands and other hereditaments?—£ 0/6 and 11/34d.

2887. Now reference has been made to your demand note for the present year at the figure of £4,003!—That is right.

2888. What is your rate for the present year on land?—5 2/3d.

2889. What is the other rate?—14 4/6d.

2890. That is quite an exceptional rating!—Very exceptional.

2891. Was that caused by the fact that you were under-estimated?—Yes.

2892. And two years before, namely 1901 and 1902, were your rates 15s. and 1 6/4d respectively?—They were.

2893. Have you your demand notes for the last five years including the present, been £3,604 for 1900, £3,558 for 1901, £1,528 for 1902, £1,755 for 1903, and the exceptional figure for the reasons you have given in the present year of £4,111?—Yes.

2894. So that your average would be something about—£2,500 a year.

2895. Do you also, as was told us by Mr. Perry, discharge duties in connection with the registration of voters and the duties of executive sanitary officer and clerk of this District Council?—Yes.

2896. Have you the average rate for the last five years in Letterkenney and Stranorlar. Is it Letterkenney?—6/6d. on land and 12 8/10d. on other hereditaments, and in Stranorlar?—7/3d. on land and 12 5/6d. on other hereditaments?—Yes.

2897. Have you taken out the number of paupers—first, for Strabane No. 1 Rural?—One pauper represents a valuation of £210 on Strabane No. 1; in Strabane Urban one pauper represents £110, and in Strabane No. 2, one pauper represents £224 valuation.

2898. So that if this was carried the extra cost of the paupers in the Strabane Urban District would be all thrown on the rural district?—The Tyrone people would have to pay for Strabane.

2899. Does Strabane No. 2 use Strabane as its market town and centre?—Yes.

2900. Mr. Draxwood.—Is Raphoe a market town?—Yes.

2901. Is not that in the district?—It is.

2902. Is Stranorlar a market town?—I believe it is.

2903. Is not that close to the district?—Three miles from the boundary.

2904. What are you proposing to expend this sum of money upon that you have agreed to borrow from the Board of Works on the Strabane Union, £1,200?—It is to improve the infirmary that that money will be borrowed.

2905. Is it to be spent entirely on the infirmary?—Yes.

2906. Is there any of it to increase the space in the workhouse?—It is to improve the infirmary and get more accommodation for the infirmary only; we have more than enough space for the paupers; the accommodation is 235.

2907. You have not accommodation enough for the infirmary?—We have any amount for the ordinary paupers, not for the infirmary.

2908. If Strabane No. 2 was taken off your union you would have more than enough accommodation?—It would relieve us to that extent.

2909. Mr. Clancy.—You say that this is an extraordinary estimate?—Yes.

2910. When was it an ordinary one?—Two years ago.

2911. That was about a year after the agitation for this scheme commenced?—It has nothing to do with it.

2912. These things never have any connection with each other at all?—Never.

2913. And you are prepared to say that?—I am prepared to swear it. When I found, in March, 1903, that our estimate was wrong I brought the matter before the Board and got a supplementary estimate passed; that was sent to each of the County Councils; Donegal would have taken it up, their books were not ready for rating; Tyrone could not, and the result was that the Local Government Board would not allow one part of the union to be assessed more than another and it had to be held over.

2914. Was not that your own mismanagement; does that represent the total of your demand on Strabane No. 2?—That represents the total of our demand for the Donegal part.

2915. What about the demands of the District Council?—I thought you were talking of the Guardians.

2916. What is the demand in respect of the District Council charges?—£484.

2917. What did you become in credit to the bank?—We have a debit of £1,400 or £1,500.

2918. Are you over in credit?—We will when this rate is collected.

2919. If you get that extraordinary demand every year?—We won't want it again.

2920. What was the vote upon the question of this scheme the first time it was brought up at the Strabane Board of Guardians?—It has been running on for two or three years.

2921. Do you recollect that the opposition was carried only by a majority of one?—That is very possible, but there has been a big change in the Board since.

2922. Mr. Henry.—Were all these put out?—They were.

2923. And other men put in who were opposed to it?—They were.

Mr. WILLIAM STEWART examined.

2924. Mr. Henry.—You prepared this map and coloured it?—Yes.

2925. Is it correct?—Yes.

2926. Have you shown on it an eight miles radius from Strabane?—I have.

2927. Have you also shown an eight miles radius

from Stranorlar?—I have.

2928. And from Letterkenney?—And from Letterkenney as eight miles radius.

2929. Mr. Draxwood.—Were you speaking of the workhouse or of the town when you said Stranorlar?—The workhouse.

Mr. W. J. WHEAT, S.P., examined.

2930. Mr. Henry.—Are you the Chairman of No. 2 District?—Yes.

2931. We have had Mr. Gallagher introduced as representing Castlefinn; as a matter of fact was Mr. Gallagher elected by two divisions outside Castlefinn?—Yes.

2932. So that he is partly pickled; what is the feeling in Strabane No. 2?—It is against amalgamation; and in regard to the Finn Division, which I represent, it is very strong against amalgamation.

2933. And is that much nearer Stranorlar than the other divisions?—Yes; it is the nearest.

2934. Would it be productive of great inconvenience to the poor and the representatives of the people if the centre was changed to Stranorlar?—My division runs

from three miles from Stranorlar to three miles from Strabane.

2935. But taking all the divisions as a whole?—It would be a very great inconvenience.

2936. Mr. Draxwood.—You say the majority of the people are against this?—In my district.

2937. You represent the town of Castlefinn; if the inhabitants of Castlefinn were polled how many of a majority would be with you?—My idea would be against amalgamation.

2938. By what majority?—I am not going to say.

2939. I will ask you one question in confidence; don't you believe, in your heart of hearts, that that majority would be drawn by a religious line?—No, sir.

Dep. 14, 1903.

Mr. J. D. Starkie.

Mr. Wm. Stewart.

Mr. W. J. Wheat.

Aug. 14, 1903

Mr. W. J.
Wray.

2940. How many of the Roman Catholic population would be against this scheme?—I won't say that.

2941. Would there be one in ninety-nine of the whole of Strabane No. 2; if you went from house to house and asked the opinion, would there be one Roman Catholic out of each 100 who would not be in favour of it?—I think not.

2942. Is it not altogether a religious and political question?—No.

2943. How is it you have the people in favour of it and the others against it?—I believe I represent both sides of the question.

2944. If you take the Unionist and Nationalist inhabitants, would you say there would not be one in 100 of the Nationalists in favour of it?—I would not say.

2945. Mr. Clancy.—Do you know Mr. Cunningham?—Yes.

2946. Is he opposed to this scheme or in favour of it?—I believe he is opposed to it.

2947. Is he the Poor Law Guardian of the district?—No, sir, of Clough.

2948. Is that far away?—It is the next division to Castlefinn.

2949. Is he against the scheme or in favour of it?—He can say for himself.

2950. I want your opinion?—I believe he is in the amalgamation.

2951. And he is a worse authority on the feelings of the people than you are?—I don't say that, but I know their feelings as well as any man in the district.

2952. You represent both parties?—Yes, I do.

2953. I thought there were no parties?—I have no party.

2954. Is everybody against this scheme; is it not your opinion that there is no one at all in favour of the scheme in your district?—I said the large majority of the ratepayers were against it.

2955. Do you know William Gallagher?—I do.

2956. He is a large farmer?—He is; but I think I represent the feelings of Castlefinn better than Mr. Gallagher, because they refused to put him in as District Councillor and put me in in his place.

2957. Does not Mr. Gallagher, the County Councillor, represent the whole district?—And part of Stranorlar too.

2958. And you are a better authority than he is?—As soon.

2959. Mr. Henry.—He has two stools to sit on and you have only one?—Yes.

Mr. James
Stewart.

2960. Mr. Henry.—Are you a member of the Strabane Urban Council?—I am.

2961. Was a resolution passed on this subject by that Council?—There was.

2962. Was it against amalgamation?—Yes.

2963. Was it carried unanimously?—Unanimously.

2964. Mr. Drummond.—Was it put and carried regularly?—It was, but Mr. Gallagher's objection to the matter was this—It was a committee meeting at which the whole Council was present and the chairman brought up the questions from the Local Government Board and we made certain replies to them.

Mr. James STEWART examined.

2965. Was it not objected that it was not on the agenda?—No; it was not on the agenda, these papers only came from the Local Government Board and there was not time to call a special meeting; the chairman himself introduced the subject and certain replies were made by the whole Council.

2966. Why did the chairman refuse to recognise this as regular?—Because he is a brother of Mr. William Gallagher.

2967. Mr. Henry.—Was it brought forward by the chairman himself?—It was brought forward by the chairman himself.

Mr. Henry.—That is the Strabane case.

Dr. D. J.
Brown.

2968. Mr. Leach.—You are the Medical Doctor of the Londonderry Union?—I am.

2969. How long have you been so?—Twenty-seven years.

2970. Were you present here when the clerk gave his evidence?—I was.

2971. And you heard what he said about the accommodation?—Yes.

2972. That is correct?—Yes.

2973. Within the last ten years or so have there been considerable improvements made in the union?—Yes; very great improvements.

Mr. Drummond.—There is no doubt about that at all, you may state that fact and I will admit it.

2974. Mr. Leach.—Have you got now complete sanitary arrangements?—Yes.

2975. You have a fever hospital?—Yes.

2976. And you have a separate nursing staff in connection with this?—The nurses are transferred from one hospital to another.

Dr. D. J. BROWN examined.

2977. How many nurses are there?—Four qualified nurses—two probationers and another nurse that has been three for some years and is not trained at present.

2978. Is there a children's ward?—Yes.

2979. And as there a lock hospital?—There is.

2980. Are there separate wards for consumptive patients?—They are just being erected at present.

2981. And, I suppose, with all the latest improvements?—It is merely for isolating those cases.

2982. I believe that the workhouse is connected by telephone with the city?—It is; and the fever hospital is connected with it, too.

2983. Have you for the infirmary and the fever hospital, too, a complete sanitary system?—Yes.

2984. And there are ample arrangements?—There are.

2985. Have you bath accommodation?—Yes.

2986. Hot and cold water?—Yes.

2987. And is it a completely up-to-date system?—It is only lately put in.

Captain BROWN, R.L., further examined.

-Capt. Brown.

2988. Mr. Henry.—What would be the effect, in your opinion, of the proposed amalgamation on the rates in Strabane No. 2?—If Strabane were incorporated with Letterkenny and Stranorlar the result would be that the rates in Strabane would be increased, and the rates in Stranorlar and Letterkenny decreased.

Mr. Henry.—We have had a dash of politics and a dash of religion, but I represent a part of the country where, so far as attendance to the destitute poor is concerned, we have regard to neither politics nor religion. I have been listening to hear what was the principle upon which my friends with this Commission to proceed when they asked them to make this subdivision either in the Londonderry or Strabane Unions. Of course, with regard to the Strabane Union I have nothing to say. But the principle on which the original Poor Law Commissioners acted was the principle

laid down by Mr. Nicholls: "In forming the country into unions it will, I think, be necessary to cherish the civil rather than the ecclesiastical boundaries of parishes; but cases will arise in which it may be requisite to disregard all such boundaries, it being obviously more important that the district to be united should be compact, convenient, and accessible, and be naturally connected with its centre, than that the old and often inconvenient boundaries should be observed. This applies not less to territorial and civil boundaries than to parishes and other divisions. The principle which has governed the Commissioners in the formation of the English unions, whenever they have not been driven from it by local considerations, has been to fix upon some market town conveniently situated as a centre, and attach to it the whole surrounding district, of which it may be considered as the capital:

Aug. 14, 1903.

the mart in which the general business of the district, both public and private, for the most part concentrates. The roads of the district always converge on the market town, the communications with it are constant, the people settle within the range of its influence and constitute almost a distinct community. To form such a district into a union under one common government for general as well as Poor Law purposes, seems, therefore, an obvious course of proceeding." In the second report he made I may quote an observation that applied to the then Commissioners, and also with respect to the present Commission. "The Commissioners are based on every principle of public duty"—it is in consequence of the speech of Mr. Healy that the Commissioners were English and Welsh that I read this—"to form the unions in the best manner. Their credit as public officials and individuals would alike be compromised by any violation in this respect. It is also impossible for men to be called upon to act under paper impulses or to be more actively freed, from the nature of their duties, from local or personal bias." That applies to-day as fully as it did in 1830. These principles are convenient all through of the parties interested—the destitute poor and those interested in the destitute poor. The question was not the equal distribution of rates, but the public convenience of all parties concerned. That has been recognised in the Local Government Act of 1903, sec. 60, sub-sec. 3. (Bonds sub-ventures.) The principle there, or the test to be applied always was the convenience of the parties. Now, so far as this investigation is concerned, it is the first time I have ever heard that physical boundaries are to be set to the terms "destitute" and "poor people." Why a person living in Donegal must go for relief twenty-five miles to Carrindagh, when the same person, by going across the River Foyle, can receive relief for the destitution he or she may be suffering from is, to my mind, a curious thing, indeed. The principle I submit is the principle of convenience, and, looking at this map, it is perfectly obvious that if you take Londonderry as a centre you circumscribe an area that is influenced in every way by Londonderry. There is not a measure of corn sold from No. 1 or No. 2 districts that is not sold in Londonderry market—not a stone of potatoes; and when the Land Commissioners are fixing fair rents on these holdings one of the very elements taken into consideration is what is known as proximity value, a special value laid upon farms owing to their proximity to a market town like Londonderry. I take my learned friends on their own grounds; it is admitted by all the witnesses that the eight Donegal unions should be cut down to four. The County Council have not taken the trouble to inform you which of these unions they wish to do away with. Mr. Drummond suggested that they should keep Donegal, Stranorlar, Millfield, and Inishowen. Which of these unions are going to have a share of the nine electoral divisions of No. 2? Every argument, as far as I can see, that has been used with respect to District No. 2 in favour of separating it and aggregating it could, with equal force, be applied to my District Council No. 1, if I were indeed to use the same arguments to slice off No. 1 from Londonderry and attach it to Larnaby Union. Every argument that my friend used on behalf of District No. 2 could with equal force be applied to District No. 1, if it were sought to apportion it to the Larnaby Union. The only argument my friend used with regard to the question of convenience was that the bulk of the Donegal County Council were more difficult to keep.

Mr. Drummond.—I make you a present of that.

Mr. Horner.—Therefore, it is simply and solely a question of sentiment. And with regard to the destitution of poor people a question of sentiment is actually set of it; it is entirely a question of the convenience of the poor and of the convenience of the Guardians in coming to attend their meetings. These are the two chief elements of convenience to be considered in this matter.

Mr. Leach.—I am sorry I have to trouble you with a few remarks. You have already had such a number of observations addressed to you, and it is really difficult to produce any further argument that has not already been addressed to you. However, I represent the crowded ground that everybody wants to have, and of all the persons interested in this inquiry it is the poorest I represent.

Mr. Drummond.—Did not Mr. Henry represent them, too?

Mr. Leach.—He represents the whole union; I represent the district alone. I think we should be allowed to have a voice in our own destiny, and should be allowed to say where we should ultimately find rest for the soles of our feet. We say that we should be where we are; that we are satisfied with what we are paying, and that it will cause great injustice if we are to be removed. I have listened, as you have carefully listened, to the evidence given in support of the proposed change. The case of making a case for a change lies upon my learned friends; and what is the ground they put forward for a change? I confess I have listened with some amusement to the different grounds put forward. They have first put up one ground, and then abandoned it. My learned friend has even now made as a present of the first ground he put forward, and, we must assume, his chief ground when he put it forward first, for the proposition he is here to advance.

Mr. Drummond.—It was a mere detail.

Mr. Leach.—Let me refer to one or two of them, and see whether there is any substance in them, and whether any Commission could be asked to act on such grounds, to change the present state of affairs, and that against the wish of the persons chiefly concerned. The first ground put forward was that it confused the book-keeper of the County Council; that is a very solid ground for making such a change as this and sweeping away a whole district from the Londonderry Union. Then Mr. Drummond also, in his opening speech, said that railway trains had altered the whole position—in other words that when this union was formed, and there were no railways, this union was in its proper position—but now because railways have been made you are asked to remove this portion from the Londonderry Union. I need not labour the effect of the railways, you know yourself what it is, you have heard the evidence given, and the railways have no bearing whatever on the question; it is absolutely impracticable to send these people by rail, and it has no bearing whatever. Then he said it would cause a reduction of one-third of the clerical staff; that has gone. When the clerk of the County Council was produced, and asked about this, he said he did not believe it would cause any reduction at all. That ground also is out of the case. These are the solid grounds which were put before you at the opening of this inquiry, on which you were asked to make this change against our wishes. Then Mr. Drummond said the convenience of the people; that was the first thing. "I don't know exactly who he meant by 'the people'; if he says the paupers, then I am prepared to agree with him, and if he means the people in this district, I say yes. But what has been the evidence? With one exception—and that a man who practically pays no rates—they are all who wish to remain as they are. Mr. Doherty was put up as their first witness to bolster up their case; he said the principal issue is 'it is our county, the others are side issues.' The only substance he saw, and was able to advance was that, because it was in the County Donegal—and that was to be the substantial ground, that sentimental ground upon which you were to make such a sweeping change. "All these things," he said, "about rates are only side issues." That is rather amusing when we come to hear what Mr. Healy put forward. When he came to state the ground upon which it was to be done, he said you will decide this case solely upon questions of local considerations. Where are we; what is the ground on which they wish this change to be made? Does it not come to this, that they have no solid ground on which to ask you to make this sweeping change? They were eating about for one reason or another, and as the case went on they had to shunder them and try to fish up some other ground. Mr. Drummond says it is an unimpeachable division that has been made of the unions; and Mr. Healy in opening said, would any man dream of a boundary such as the present. I venture to say that Mr. Healy, in his wildest nightmares, would never have dreamt of a boundary such as he wants you to manufacture now. They say gentleness came over from England or Scotland to carry out this matter—gentlemen who could have had no interest in it. I ask you is it not common sense on their side; could anything be more reasonable; the unions are formed by taking a large town and the district which lies immediately around it—the district which is fed by the town and in its turn feeds the town. Could anything be more reasonable? And again, when you come up here they take Inishowen and Carrindagh; could anything be

Aug. 16, 1893.

more reasonable. What they did was, and I submit it was the only proper and reasonable thing to do, they took the town as the centre and the district which formed round the town, and yet we are asked would anyone in his sense dream of such unions being formed as were formed then. They were formed by hard-headed men of conscience, who formed them with a view to the practical use and benefit of the people and the paupers, and there is nothing that has happened since will change that. The whole physical construction of the county lends itself to the same thing; you have a chain of mountains cutting this off; if you look at the ordnance map and the roads across that will have to be traversed going to Carradonagh you will find the heights given, and you will find one road going from thirteen feet to 500 feet; the country is naturally cut off in that way, and not only the question of distance but the natural configuration of the country has lent itself to this most reasonable and proper construction of the union which was made before the unions were being originally formed. Apart from that you have the fact that Derry, which is the centre of this whole district, has provision for the whole district, and a great deal more. What they want now is, notwithstanding the fact that large sums have been recently spent in improving it, what they want you to do is to retain the number of 280 for a union that will hold 700; to reduce it to a still greater extent, and turn the paupers from these divisions into other unions, which, if they are to be made suitable, would cause a fresh expenditure, and these districts, which would then be brought into these two, would have to contribute again to the amount which would be necessary in these unions, whereas they have already contributed to all the building improvements and modern sanitary arrangements which have been made for the Derry Union. That is not justice, and I submit, would not be fair to No. 2 Council. You heard the amount that has to be paid annually for the repayment of these loans is £210. It is proposed to remove this district and throw the repayment of the whole of that on Derry alone. The question of the difficulty of sending paupers is a very serious one; you have heard the distances given, and the distances in every case to these two unions are greater than those to Derry, the natural centre. Suppose that one pauper is sent from each of these detached divisions to Derry, the amount which those paupers would have to travel would be eighty-five miles between them. Suppose these nine paupers are sent to Carradonagh—one from the centre of each division—the distance they would have to travel between them will be 210½ miles. Suppose they are sent from the centre of each to Letterkenney you will find the distance they will have to travel will be 182 miles. Besides that they have the difficulty of going over this range of mountains in order that they may get to Carradonagh. I ask what corresponding advantage is there to counteract these great disadvantages which must necessarily result on the unnatural breaking up of unions and farming, instead of natural unions, wholly unnatural ones. Then there is the great difficulty of the Guardians themselves going to attend meetings from here over to Carradonagh. If you look at the railway, they have to go to Carradonagh to hold their meetings and back again away from the city of their business, from their market town, from the place where they constantly are without any inconvenience; they will have to go to a place which is totally foreign to them, and as one of the gentlemen here, Mr. Hanna, told you, though he has attained a substantial age and lived in this territory so long, he never was in Carradonagh in his life until Thursday last. That shows that the district is cut off and that it is a place they are not accustomed to go to. Derry is their centre, and the place to which they all congregate, and they are to be asked to leave that and go away. One of their own witnesses admitted that if this change was made the Guardians would not attend regularly at Carradonagh or Letterkenney; of course they would not, and the result would be that these districts would be practically disfranchised, because the representatives who should go to represent them at such remote distances would be unable to do it, and they would be left unprotected. Suppose paupers are to go to these places how are they to be sent; if a pauper had money to pay a couple of shillings to go round to Carradonagh he is not a pauper at all in sense of a person who should be put into a workhouse. Who is to supply the train fare? Does it not

come to this; if the train fare were to be paid it would add greatly to the expense of the Poor Law system; but does it not come to this in essence that the pauper who will be really materially benefited by the change will go to Derry still; the result will be that paupers from this district will go to the workhouses which cannot levy a single penny of rates upon the district they come from, and there will not be a single representative in the Derry Union of the district from which these paupers come. That is contrary to the whole intention of the Poor Law; the idea is that the place which supplies the pauper should supply a contribution for the expense of the pauper and should supply representatives to look after the interests of the district and of the paupers who come from that district. The result would practically be no rates to support these paupers and no representation for the place they come from. I submit that being so, which is what for here is altogether without reason, and the boundaries of the union should be left as they are. Let me take Killybegs, the centre of which is nine and a half miles from Letterkenney, it is twenty-nine miles from Letterkenney, and it is twenty-five miles from Carradonagh; is that within reason; is it sensible, and yet we are asked would any sensible man think of making the present convenient arrangement. Take Burt, the centre is eight miles from Derry, twenty-three from Carradonagh, sixteen and a half from Letterkenney. Take Killybegs, it is six from Letterkenney, thirty-one and a half from Carradonagh, and fourteen from Letterkenney. Take Birlinane, nine from Letterkenney, twenty-two from Carradonagh, twenty-two from Letterkenney. Take Inch, twelve from Letterkenney, twenty-four from Letterkenney, and twenty-one from Carradonagh. And yet you are asked to transfer these to these remote workhouses. Sec. 63, sub-sec. 2, gives power to make the alteration; but what is the first and most important restriction; it is "the boundaries of counties at large and unions as existing at the date of the Order shall be preserved except in any case where the preservation thereof would cause substantial inconvenience." Will it cause substantial inconvenience to leave this district where it is? And unless it is proved to you that it would, you are, by the Act of Parliament, bound to leave it where it is. I say that the whole question of inconvenience would arise by removing it and transferring it to the other workhouses. I have only just to refer you to the warrant under which the present Inquiry is held "To inquire whether any Poor Law unions could be dissolved with advantage to the ratepayers and without hardship to the sick and destitute poor." Our case is that it would cause very great hardship to the sick and destitute poor to do what you are asked to do; that that warrant coincides with the Act of Parliament under which the power is given, that under the circumstances no case has been made for the alteration asked for, but all the evidence tends to show that this district should be left as it is, part of the Letterkenney Union.

Mr. Drummond.—I am sorry for the arrangement that has necessitated my sitting so late, and I would not press you of all work it is not for the fact that this is the first public sitting of this very important Commission, and principles must be laid down and set upon, which to the end may, and probably will, have very far-reaching consequences. Because I am satisfied that the question this Commission has to deal with is so important and so complicated and so it needs of reform that it will not merely rest with the Local Government Board Orders, but I am perfectly satisfied that in the end it will result in legislation.

CHAIRMAN.—That is the object of the Commission.

Mr. Drummond.—The question is of such vast importance, dealing with the life of the poor all over Ireland, that it will necessarily lead to legislation. There is one thing I take the liberty of impressing on you, and that is, that if the Poor Law unions, no matter what alterations may be made with regard to dispensaries, infirmaries, or workhouses themselves, if they are to be properly controlled so that the people of each county will know how their rates are being dealt with and the persons responsible for these rates will have a proper mode of dealing with them and seeing how they are applied. The whole aim of this Commission should be to make the county the unit, self-governed, self-controlled, and responsible to the people through their elected county councillors. As long as you leave large tracts of any county over- I am not dealing with Donegal or Derry alone, it

Aug. 24, 1908.

applies to all Ireland—you put away portion of the rates into another county to be applied as they think right by another body, you deprive the County Council of control over the proper administration of those rates; in other words you deprive the ratepayers, and you leave an irregularity inconsistent with the spirit of the Local Government Act. The County Council was to be the little Parliament of each county, and to make it effective, to make it operative, to make it, above all, economic, I think it is absolutely necessary for you to stop at making the county the unit, because where you have a large sum of money like this holed away, as in Strabane, to the County Tyrone, they apply it to their dispensaries, and here and there they may have a necessity for doing something that is purely local, and they may make the people of the County Donegal responsible for that. Whereas if the County Donegal Council had the administration of the whole of that rate they would not allow that to be done. You may be forming the greatest injustice upon a particular county by levying their money to be administered away and spent in another county, they are to pay, to have no real control, only answer a demand note and send a vast sum of money out of this county. I think that is the vital thing in this case that you should look at, making the county the unit. That the workhouses of Donegal should be reduced goes without saying; it is a cruel thing to have eight workhouses, many of them half idle, indicated on this poor county. What is to be said for this cutting up of Donegal. It was done in 1838; nearly seventy years ago this arrangement was made. Look what has happened! Since—the county cut up, divided into four Parliamentary divisions, divisions for county councillors and for district divisions, the old unions practically swept away, hamlets divisions swept away, all changed, and you are asked to leave these old overlapping and irregular areas which may have been right enough then—you are asked to leave this anomalous state of things, and have the County Donegal parcelled up between Tyrone and Derry. The thing does not admit of argument. I regret that so far as I was concerned I went into petty particulars and details. I don't think that minutes of the evidence given before us was of the slightest value. It is not a question of details; it is a matter of keeping books or of abolishing them, and a few miles here or there—all these things, when one takes a broad view of the case, vanish. It is a question of the administration by the ratepayers of the rates of a whole county, and I think, taking the principle laid down in the Equalization of Rates Bill in Parliament as the modern principle, there was far more violent opposition in the rich parts of London to contribute to the poorer parts than there is here in Derry and Tyrone, but Parliament laid down the principle which I ask you to bear in mind. Legislation is declared by law to be a county; the county is to strike the rate and administer the rate, and rich and poor alike are to be rated for the support of the poor. And why should it not be; is it not an extraordinary thing; look at what you have here, not rarely in the vicinity of Derry but take Strabane, there is a vast tract running from Strabane with its vacant workhouse down to Strabane, thirteen miles, and back to Raphoe, sending its rates into the most richer County Tyrone and leaving the poverty and misery behind. Take two divisions; in Strabane there is one electoral division, Cloughard, with a population of 2,304 and a valuation only of £2,547. Go to Castellan in Strabane, population, 1,378, valuation, £3,486, and contrast the wealth of one at the door of the other. The right principle to adopt is let the County Council of Donegal strike a rate and let that rate fall upon the rich and poor. You have the wealth of Donegal concentrated in Strabane No. 2 and Derry No. 8; that is the rich land of the County Donegal. These are the lands that were handed over to the planters—they have come down from generation to generation. It is not a fair thing to say that all the others are thriftless. This land—the rich land of the county—was given to a class and possessed by a class. I wish to be understood as not saying a disrespectful word of any gentleman in the case; one of the most prominent gentlemen appearing as happens to be an old personal friend of mine where I am intimately acquainted with for many a day and year, who took a very active part in the liberal politics of Donegal in years gone by; but I am looking at things as they stand, and it is not correct for my friend to say the people of this district are all opposed to it. The County Council is elected by the people; a justice of the peace, Mr. Gallagher, a man rated at £180 a year, he comes for-

ward; who elected him—the majority of the people. It is a matter of prejudice. I respect these men's prejudices, they have a right to their prejudices—religious or political—it is not in any unpleasant manner I speak of them, some of them are old friends of mine. It is not the people of Strabane who are opposing this; a rich minority are opposing this who have strong views and strong prejudices; but the vast majority who elected Mr. William Gallagher are unanimous in favour of it; the rich minority are against it. But you are above one and the other; you are here to look at great questions, and on the opening of this Commission, that will lead to vast consequences, I say take the principle of making the county, self-governed, a unit. It is an outrage on decency and common charity, and on every principle that one respects, to find a county like Donegal, where you have on the western seaboard a vast number of poor people going to Scotland to earn the rest to keep the roof over them, and to find on the other side of the county the occupants of lands that were given to favoured people who say "We don't want to have anything to do with you; we prefer to be in either Tyrone or Derry." That thing should not be permitted. And I will tell you the consequences—being a Donegal man myself, I know the county and every term of its people, and no one has more respect for their strong and honourable views—I will tell you what will happen. Assuming for a moment that you will come to such a conclusion that will lead to these two divisions being in Donegal, these gentlemen, unwilling at this moment will, to-morrow or next day, be forced to come into closer contact and kindly intercourse with their neighbours; they will be humbled by it and lose these prejudices and be made better men; they will come to find that in the poor creatures at Carrinagh or Strabane or anywhere else they will meet kindly and sympathetic neighbors to whom, when they have more associated with them, they will cease to have the aversion, or dislike, or mistrust they entertain at the present moment. I believe you will be doing a moral good by saying that it is time the miserable prejudices that are disgracing this country so long and humiliating the country should cease. In Strabane they are losing money; by having this district thrown in with Strabane they will save money, it will cost them less, but perhaps the election will be somewhat different, and that is what is at the root of the whole thing—the voting power—that is what is distrusted. When all is over and said and done they will not regret if you make them Ouel. The valuation of Strabane Union is £112,000; you have heard already, and know that about £40,000 on an average is the rating of the Irish unions; take away £32,000 from Strabane and you are leaving £78,000 for Strabane.

Mr. Meehan.—Belfast has a valuation of over a million.

Mr. Drummond.—They say there are seventy-two Donegal occupants; if you take them away they will have a very small number. When you come down to Derry, you have Derry County and City, £158,000; suppose you take the Donegal divisions from them, you have nearly four times the amount of an average union. There is not a large number of inmates in the Derry Union, but you will have a rating at the back of it to support it of £158,000, and although they have that vast rating power, beyond the average proportion of the rating of Irish unions throughout the country, they say that Donegal, the rich district representing £34,000, should be added in whole only sending in five paupers. It is said of the 220 paupers that they must be nearly all Donegal people, because these workers in the shirt factories come in from Donegal and are the materials from which the paupers come. If you look at the number of paupers in Derry Union it is extremely small, something over a couple of hundred; the number of these factory girls is to be counted literally by the thousand, and if you consider the number of paupers and take away the factory girls there will not be even an average number of paupers for the ordinary inhabitants of Derry. But although these poor Donegal girls are to be counted by the thousand, working in these factories, the numbers of paupers is only a couple of hundred altogether, and you have a large city over and above them supplying that and half the County Derry, so such an exaggeration never was committed. There is no man in my occupying your time any further; you are asked now at the beginning of this Commission to leave Donegal split up. I ask you to make it one solid unit, and by doing that you will help the county in this way. We are all agreed that these should be

Aug. 14, 1901.

at the very most four unions; suppose you leave these two vastly wealthy divisions as they are, then you would have to begin to set out the areas for these other four unions, and you would be met at every point by the poverty and the misery and the disadvantages they are under. Whereas if you throw this in the people will have a better valuation to work on, the thing will be much more easily managed—they will not have to rest the thing on the poor people, but will equalise it all over. The county must be re-adjusted altogether to have four unions, and would it not be an extraordinary result for you to divide all the poor parts of Donegal into four unions for their own support and strike out the two rich portions and turn one into the rich County of Tyrone and the other into the rich City of Derry, who have too much, for neither of them is very generous, especially Derry? This thing about distances, I would not waste your time speaking of; there are ambulances in all directions. The Strabane Union goes twenty-five miles into Tyrone, and there is no complaint about distances there. The Derry Union goes twelve miles into the County Derry, and there is no question about distances; but when you come to Donegal, "Don't do this or that because the five papers that come out of this district will be inconvenienced." Considering there are ambulances provided these arguments are waste of time. It is not a question of a few miles one way or another. Of course the conveyance of these people is to be thought of, but it is just as convenient now with roads

and railway trains to go to one place as to another; but these are not the grounds. It is perfectly plain, upon which this opposition was made, because it is only right, you would not have truthful evidence, you would not understand this case if I did not ask the question—a question I would rather avoid asking—but you have two classes of people. In this district you have a rich minority who oppose it, but go among the Nationalists—the Roman Catholics—who are in touch with the country, they are all in favour of it. A strong prejudice leads the minority to prefer to go with their neighbours on the other side, and, as I said, on the other side, it is far for you not to recognise these prejudices, but to take the county symmetrical. It won't be symmetrical, economic, or in accordance with the Act of Parliament or the example set by the Equalisation of the Rates Act in London, once you have a County Council, once you have a penny a unit, whether a city like Derry, or Belfast, or London, once you have the unit, unless that unit has the control of its taxation, and if you have not the control there must be waste and injustice. You cannot have control unless the rates are expended in such a way that the County Council will have it under their eyes and know what is being done. Knowing the gentlemen who have come in to oppose this, and respecting them as I do, I think they will not regret it, and when the little, petty, old-fashioned prejudices are broken through they will shake hands with their neighbours and perhaps be glad of it.

The Sitting terminated.

SEVENTH PUBLIC SITTING—MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 21st, 1903. Sept. 21, 1903.

At the Board-room, Magherafelt Workhouse.

Present:—Mr. MICKS, (Chairman), Mr. MURTAGHAN, and Dr. COY BINGER.

CHAIRMAN.—I have just been asking Mr. Hastings, the Clerk, whether he wishes to give any evidence; we will be getting statistical information from him later

on. He does not intend to offer any general evidence himself, but some of the Councilors here will.

Mr. JAMES E. O'NEILL examined.

2899. CHAIRMAN.—You are aware, Mr. O'Neill, of the terms of reference to this Commission?—Yes, I have a copy of them. I understood we were just here to answer any questions.

2900. Yes. I was just going to ask you whether you would wish me to proceed by questions, or is there any preliminary statement you wish to make. We will deal with each of these heads as they appear on the terms of reference. Having regard to the circumstances of this union, do you think it would be wise to dissolve it and incorporate portions of it with other neighbouring unions?—That is a matter that has been frequently before the Board of Guardians here and discussed at considerable length, and the result of that discussion was that the Guardians were strongly opposed to the amalgamation of the Magherafelt Union with any other union, or to the introduction of a portion of any other union in the county into it. We think that, considering the size of it, that it would be very undesirable to add to it; the area is a very wide one, and the valuation being almost one-third of the entire county, we think that in case it is decided to dissolve any of the other unions—

2901. Such as Limeravady?—Such as Limeravady; that it would not be fair to have any portion of Limeravady taken on to us, or our large area extended in any way, for the strong reason that even if Limeravady Union was divided between Coleraine and Londonderry No. 1, neither of them would have a much larger area or valuation than we have.

2902. Your position in the Union here is very unusual, so far as the latter part of your view, that is not wishing to get further territory to increase your valuation; your Council, as a body, are against that?—Yes; we feel that if there was any increase in the area of any union it would mean a corresponding increase in officials that would not compensate us in any way for the extra valuation.

2903. About how far is the most distant part of your union on the Limeravady side from the workhouse?—Our union here is very compact, and in fact it does not come close to Limeravady at all.

2904. It touches the boundaries, of course?—It does. Carnmoney lies alongside Glenshane, that is in Limeravady, and Owenagh.

2905. How far is Carnmoney from here?

Mr. W. Hastings.—It would be at least six Irish miles.

Witness.—Don't you mean how far it is from the town of Magherafelt?

Dr. A. Bigney.—The farthest point towards Limeravady?

2906. CHAIRMAN.—Yes, the farthest populous part?—There are two divisions here that in case the Commissioners would think it desirable to increase the boundary of our union that it is very likely would be considered—one of them is Glenshane, and the other Owenagh. From here to the boundary line in Glenshane would be eleven or twelve English miles.

2907. To the extreme bounds of your own union?—To the extreme bounds of our own union, from this point of view. (Applause on the map.)

2908. Where are these two divisions, Glenshane and Owenagh?—They are in the Limeravady Union.

2909. Are they thickly populated or mountainous?

Mr. Conway.—For the district of the country they belong to they are populous.

Witness.—It might be suggested that The Grove, another division, which is part of the Coleraine Union, ought to be merged into Magherafelt.

Mr. Hastings.—At one time it belonged to Magherafelt.

Witness.—With regard to that, the distance from Magherafelt to The Grove would be sixteen miles, that is estimating eight English miles from Magherafelt to Swatragh, and it is six English miles from Magherafelt to Swatragh, and two English miles from Swatragh to The Grove.

2910. CHAIRMAN.—I understand your general principle guiding you in this matter is that you would not like the boundaries of the union to be extended much, if at all, beyond a ten-mile radius?—We would not like it extended at all; but in case the Commissioners in their judgment thought it ought to be extended, we are simply pointing these places out to give you some idea as to how the matter should be dealt with, in case there should be any portion of other unions added on to us that the divisions which lie nearest to us ought to be taken in, and which could be most easily got at, and I would say, in case the Commissioners were of the same opinion, that Owenagh and Glenshane ought to be the two, but we would prefer not having them at all.

2911. For what reason do you think you ought not to have them?—Because we consider the union large enough, and we have our fair one-third of the entire county. There are large unions in Londonderry at present; supposing you dissolved the Magherafelt Union, it means there will only be three. We say that if there is only to be three unions we should be one of the three who have one-third, or almost one-third, of the entire county.

2912. Dr. Bigney.—Supposing there was another union dissolved, not Magherafelt?—It would be out of the question altogether.

2913. CHAIRMAN.—There are two considerations generally against adding—in the first place, that it would be inconvenient for the removal of the stock; do you think it would be very inconvenient to have the stock removed from Owenagh and Glenshane, if they are added to Magherafelt? Are the roads good, or fairly good?—The roads are fairly good. The only difficulty in reaching Glenshane or Owenagh is that we go there there they have to cross a long hill of about two miles, and it is a very bleak road. There is no doubt in the winter season it would be very undesirable to remove a stock person from either of these places.

2914. Even in a covered ambulance?—We have such an article here, but Mr. Agnew does not seem to think much of it.

Mr. Conway.—I suppose if we economise on the amalgamation we could afford to have it.

Witness.—The doctor is quite familiar with both these districts—his practice before he came here was about there—in fact, he has been over the whole district, and I think there is no person in the county could speak with more authority on the question than the medical officer.

2915. I am very glad we have him here. Was The Grove taken out of your union and put into Coleraine?

Mr. Hastings.—Not in my time, but I think there was portion of this union put into Coleraine.

Mr. James E. O'Neill.

Sept. 21, 1905.
Mr. James E.
O'Neill.

3006. What is the market town for these two divisions?

Mr. Convery.—Dungiven and Maghers are the two market towns. They sell their flax and pork in Maghers and Magherafelt; they come here with the flax generally. Derry city is a long way off, and an uphill road.

Mr. Hegarty.—They take some flax to Limerick, but latterly they come here.

Mr. Convery.—It is much easier to come here than to go to Derry city.

3007. Now, Mr. O'Neill?—Query No. 2 I think we have come to—"In the event of any union being dissolved?" I don't know whether, seeing that our union is going to be dissolved, the opinion of the Magherafelt Board would have any weight, but if it has any weight, we are of opinion that the workhouse should be used for the accommodation of epileptics and other demented persons, and, to simplify matters, we adopted the views expressed by Colonel Clark at a meeting of the County Council, which expresses our wishes:—

"The Chairman said that there were many present that day who, not being members of the Lunatic Asylum Committee, were not conversant with this subject. It would perhaps be desirable for him to mention that as yet the only county that had taken advantage of Section 75 of the Local Government Act, which enabled County Councils to take over workhouses or other suitable buildings for auxiliary asylums, was the County of Cork. By the indemnity clause and perseverance of the Bishop of Ross the old industrial schools at Youghal had been converted into an auxiliary asylum. The Chairman then read the following letter from Bishop Kelly:—

"Bishop's House, Skibbereen,
4th March, 1902.

Dear Lord Montagu.—Before undertaking the necessary works at the Youghal Auxiliary Asylum, the Cork Asylum Committee formally asked and obtained the Lord Lieutenant's sanction to the proposal of placing the institution under the superintendence of a good business layman, of having an external medical officer who would pay a daily visit, and of conducting the place generally in a plain comfortable style, fully providing for the physical wants of the inmates, but discharging altogether the expensive equipment required for the care of acute lunatics and the care of dangerous lunatics. To give His Excellency an idea of our intended style of treatment, we proposed to expend on the inmates 5s. 6d. per week per head, of which 2s. would come from local taxation account, and 3s. 6d. from the rates, against 2s. 6d. per head per week expended in the district asylums, of which 5s. would come from the local taxation account and 5s. 6d. from the rates. His Excellency formally sanctioned our proposed plan of conducting the institution, and we then proceeded with the works, which are in an advanced stage. As to the structural requirements, the matter is not quite so definite. The Youghal building would accommodate only 200; we proposed to enlarge it so as to accommodate 450. On the new building and remodeling of the old we proposed to spend £18,000. The Inspector of Lunacy proposed amendments in the plans, so that the cost would be £26,000. We fought the matter out—that was the first fight—and finally had our original plans approved of. The contract was taken substantially under £18,000. I do not remember the exact figures; I think £14,000 odd. Having fought out the structural question, we took out the treatment question, with the result already stated. If we were starting again we would not spend £14,000 on building. But you see we were on a tour of discovery—we were groping our way—and got committed to a building scheme before we thoroughly understood our position. Carl wants a second auxiliary asylum, and as soon as Youghal is completed I intend to propose the taking up of a workhouse for the number the actual buildings accommodate, and to spend in fitting it out only a many hundreds as Youghal is costing thousands. From the former discussion the Government cannot offer the slightest objection to that course. No doubt the inspectors will not be pleased, but their displeasure must remain an idle emotion. I entirely concur in your Lordship's view in regard to making 4s. per week from the local taxation account for these cases. If the claim is allowed the fund must run short. To allow the claim is,

in my opinion, a financial fraud. The 4s. is granted by law for acute and dangerous cases; it is granted for harmless cases. But the lunatic who is granted a harmless lunatic may at any moment become dangerous, and therefore the 4s. is paid. According to that argument 4s. a head should be paid on all of us, for unhappily, none of us has a guarantee against mental failure. Our proposed method of conducting the auxiliary asylum removes the greatest difficulty in the taking up of a workhouse, for the medical officer and the officers of the union can now be stationed in the auxiliary asylum and at increased salaries. Of course some of the union officials would be useless, and persons specially suited to the work should be introduced. But, however, the proposed method amounts to any many difficulties. I hope your association will be able to shine on the movement."

3008. Yes, I saw that?—We adopt the views as expressed in that, but at a meeting held here previously we came to an agreement which was almost identical on that question. Colonel Clarke has gone fully into the thing, and given quotations from the letter of the Bishop of Ross, and other quotations, which would strengthen our view in the matter.

3009. That would be an auxiliary lunatic asylum for the Derry lunatics only?—Yes, on certain conditions, which are there set forth.

3010. I mean it would be an auxiliary for the Derry County Asylum?—It would.

3011. Would you not be rather awkwardly situated here as regards means of communication between it and Derry to be an auxiliary to the parent lunatic asylum of Derry; lunatics would have to be brought round by Coleraine, there is no direct communication between you and Londonderry?—Oh, yes, all our lunatics have to go to Londonderry.

3012. It is rather a difficult place to get to from here?—I am a member of the Asylum Board in Derry, and I can leave Maghers for the Asylum Board meetings at a quarter to 9 and be in Derry at a quarter to 11.

Mr. Convery.—Limerick is nearer to us again. It would leave us in Limerick in half an hour.

3013. It was mentioned at the inquiry in Derry that they had no reason to be surprised at numbers from here not turning up at Derry owing to the difficulty of communication between the two places?—It was not due to that; it was entirely due to the fact that I had overlooked the date, and I thought there was no use going up without sending in notice of my evidence. I was under the impression the inquiry began a week later than it did, and as far as that is concerned, that was the reason of my absence. On the question as between Coleraine and Londonderry, I have often stated at the County Council meetings that as far as Mr. Convery, Mr. Kernan, and other members of the County Council from the South Derry Division were concerned, it was immaterial to us—we were out for the day in any case—whether we went to Coleraine or Londonderry—it means the loss of a whole day—and supposing we would have to leave by an earlier train for Derry, it would mean we would get through the business quicker; it was no great loss by keeping down about sometimes.

3014. As regards the removal of patients, it would mean extra cost sending them on a two hours' journey by rail here; if they were sending the surplus lunatics it would mean considerable expense?—It would.

Mr. Convery.—And larger on the road.

3015. Then if they were sent to Limerick?—Yes; and besides it would not be quite so central as Limerick.

3016. If the union were broken up, what do you think would be necessary here in the way of provision for hospital accommodation for the sick?—I don't see how we could do without an infirmary here at all; at present a very large number of the inmates are in the infirmary. In considering that aspect of the question, in the infirmary we had sixty-five on the date of this return, 23rd of July, and in the house we had seventy-six, or, roughly speaking, we have almost half the inmates in the infirmary, and from that point of view it would be a very awkward position to be placed in to have no infirmary.

3017. You think it would be absolutely necessary to keep on some hospital here for the treatment of the sick of the union?—I think it would be absolutely necessary, because considering the remote position in which we are placed, I don't see how we could get on without a workhouse infirmary and hospital. The last

pital here is utilised for nearly all cases, seeing that the county infirmary is in the City of Derry, and considering that we have here what is considered the best medical aid that is procurable in the county, they flock to our infirmary and hospital from various parts of the county, when perhaps they might go somewhere else. I am a member of the Infirmary Board, and I have offered the suggestion that they ought to go to the county infirmary. "Oh, no, we would much prefer going to Magherafelt," Dr. Hegerthy is there. I have been often answered in that way.

3028. That is as regards the sick; now, as regards the aged and infirm, would there be any difficulty in sending these to another workhouse? I don't suppose there would be any great difficulty, but then you remove them entirely outside the range of coming in contact with any friends in the locality. We have twenty-one male and female infirm, and some of the Guardians here think—I think the majority of them—that it would be a great hardship on these poor old people, a great many of whom had respectable lives and are in the workhouse through no fault of their own, that they should be entirely removed and isolated from all communication with their friends, and very often those old people when they are taken out to be buried by their friends in the local cemetery.

3029. These cases would not be suitable cases for any system of boarding out or out-door relief?—Well, in my opinion, no.

3030. You think it would tend to extravagance?—Apart altogether from the extravagance, I think that we could scarcely, at any reasonable rate of expense, provide for their comforts in a manner equal to what is provided for them here—they are kept clean, they get a suitable class of food, they are under the supervision of nurses who take an interest in them and who look after all their wants.

3031. I am speaking of the aged and infirm, not of the sick; have they nurses too?—Yes, there is a person in charge—the matron—she is in reality a nurse, but supposing now you transfer those people to houses in the locality and board them out, what class of houses would they be transferred to; the better class people or the ordinary class people would not have them at all. You must then transfer them to the smaller class of houses, or perhaps to labourers' cottages, and in what conditions would they be placed. We are aware that the accommodation in labourers' cottages is very limited, in fact, hardly sufficient for their own families, and to put these poor old people in the unhealthy atmosphere that they would unquestionably be in in any of these houses, would not tend to improve their health.

3032. From what class do the aged and infirm inmates come that are in the workhouse; do they come from the labouring or the farming classes?—They are not altogether from any one source, but I think a fairly large proportion are of the labouring classes.

Mr. Hastings.—I would think so.

3033. Farming, labouring, and also, of course, there are some house workers?—There are also some poor people who occupied small holdings, and perhaps got into difficulties and were obliged to sell out, and when their money was done came in here.

3034. They would not be much removed in position from the people who might be willing to take them in?—I think they would be a little removed, but not very much, but at the same time, we all know that a stranger taking in old useless people, who are simply taking them in for the purpose of getting so much per week for the keep of them, would not take the same interest in them as give them the same attention and care as they would if they were his own friends, or as they would receive in an institution which is looked after in the manner that a workhouse is.

3035. You would rather have them in the workhouse?—As their own interest, unless you wanted to put them in such an atmosphere as would kill them right off, and get rid of the expenditure; if you had that object in view you could attain that quite readily.

3036. A doctor recently said that the duration of life of infirm persons in a workhouse is very much shorter than that of infirm people outside the workhouse—I don't know what county he resides in.

3037. The evidence was given in Dublin—by Dr. Macleod, of Coonshill, I think!—All I know, as far as Magherafelt is concerned, that we have old inmates who are over ninety years of age, and who, I believe, have been in the workhouse for twenty-five or thirty years, and if the surroundings had been very unhealthy and the care bestowed on them very bad—if their food had been so bad as sometimes we are led to understand—they must have had remarkably healthy constitutions.

Dr. Hegerthy.—There are several over ninety.

Witness.—And Mr. Agnew tells us our institution is not the model place it ought to be, so what would it be if, in accordance with Mr. Agnew's ideas, it would be so attractive we would have these driving in their carriages here, like our friend in Denagh.

3038. Dr. Broome.—Could you give any idea of the number of returns of that class that are permanently here—the ones that are not sick, but aged and infirm?—I think the doctor will be able to answer that question, but I can give you a return showing exactly how many were in the workhouse on the 22nd July last. (Produced).

3039. Of the seventy-six in the house, how many have been in the house for a number of years—how many are coming and going?—The master would be the best to give that information.

3040. Perhaps you could tell how much it costs per inmate, taking all the costs of the workhouse?

Mr. Hastings.—The average cost is 3s. 3d.

Dr. Broome.—That is only for provisions; I want all the officials included.

Chairman.—Establishment charges, and everything.

Dr. Broome.—The total cost of the workhouse divided by the number of inmates?

Mr. Hastings.—I will make that out.

Witness.—I have a return here that Mr. Hastings made out.—Return of the number of inmates for the last five years, and the cost of maintaining same.

3041. Chairman.—I don't think that would take in as much as Dr. Bigger wants?—As far as the system of classification is concerned, we think that there could be a better system of classification in the workhouse without incurring much extra expense. It has been suggested that these should be divided under five headings—the first is lunatics and imbeciles—but if you decide on sending all to Lunawady, that would get rid of them. Then the children over three or over two; the children at present are kept separate. Then able-bodied paupers—the feeling seems to be that all able-bodied paupers—we have very few of them here—should be made to do whatever work they can, or some form of employment provided for them, so that they would be able to be self-supporting. The aged and infirm, the Guardians here seem to be of opinion that the aged and infirm who are in the workhouse through no fault of their own, but through force of circumstance over which they had no control, should be kept separate and treated separately from the ordinary rank of the workhouse class, such as tramps and new-comers.

3042. Would you say that most of the aged and infirm are of that class, that is of respectable people who come in through poverty; would you exclude from that list of institution people or deserving poor, would you exclude people who come in owing to drunkenness?—Yes, I think the Board would be inclined to do that.

3043. Would you consider want of thrift as a reason for excluding?—Well, people who are known as of the corner-boy class.

3044. You would not have many in Magherafelt of that class?—Not very many. I suppose 25 per cent. of the aged and infirm in the Magherafelt Workhouse would come under that head.

Mr. Hastings.—Who came through destitution, or no fault of their own?

Witness.—Oh, no, I would say 75 per cent. of them would be that.

3045. Would you say there would be 25 per cent. of the aged and infirm of the corner-boy and new-comer class?

Dr. Hegerthy.—Not at all.

3046. Do you think you would generally know the antecedents of the people who come in here well enough to know what it was drove them into the workhouse?

Dr. Hegerthy.—Generally; but sometimes they have spent a good deal of their time abroad—in Scotland, or England, or America.

3047. The questions you put to people seeking admission now are so vague you get no knowledge of their previous history, or to test their statements to see whether they are true or not, you accept them?

Mr. Hastings.—Quite so.

3048. Do you think there is much accurate knowledge of the causes that have brought them into this workhouse?

Dr. Hegerthy.—In nineteen cases out of twenty some-one, either of the Councilors or the officers, would know them.

Witness.—Had I known that question was likely to arise, we could easily have got the information. Unfortunately, the master is away on holidays now, but if you wish a summary of that we could supply it.

Sept. 21, 1900

Mr. James R. O'Neill.

Sept. 27, 1922.

Mr. James R.
O'Neil.

3039. No, I don't think so; it is a general question. Now this sick, and the tramps, all these classes exist at present: what variation in classification would you suggest?—We think that by adopting the General Act of England, we would to a large extent meet that. We have a power here who has got rules—

Mr. Hastings.—It was a letter we had seen from the Inspector-General to the Royal Irish Constabulary to look after the tramps. He had an extract of that printed, and I think he occasionally reads that for their information, and, as a rule, gives them a very long lecture, with the result that there are not nearly so many coming here now as used to come.

Witness.—The general opinion is that if the English Act was applied to Ireland it would, to a large extent, meet the difficulty, for it would bring them in contact with the Constabulary. I don't know whether you read the report of the General Council of the County Council of Ireland with regard to this matter.

3040. I have—I was one of the committee who drafted that report, and entirely concur in the resolutions arrived at, and also in the subsequent resolution of the General Council, which asks every Board of Guardians to give expression to their views on the report.

3041. Has that been printed in pamphlet form, the proceedings of the Council?—No, they have not yet.

3042. But they will be?—They will be.

3043. Would your mind letting me have a copy of them?—Certainly.

3044. What variation in classification would you make beyond having extra privilege for the poor and infirm who come in through no fault of their own?—I think if it was left optional to the Guardians to give them some little extras.

3045. Privileges to the deserving aged poor?—Yes, and some little extras; give them, say, first-class diet, supposing there were two or three classes of dietary.

3046. It has also been suggested they should have rather more liberty about going in and out of the workhouse for recreation purposes?—It might require some person to go with them.

3047. If they deserve treatment worthy people?

Mr. Hastings.—The condition they returned in would not be deserving poor.

Witness.—If we could deal with them in the way handiwork are treated in certain asylums. I was once attending an entertainment of the asylum there. I went over to him and said: "What are you doing here?" "Oh," said he, "I am in charge of these chaps; we took them out to see the regatta." So if we could fall in with an inmate that could be trusted to that extent to take charge of the rest, I would certainly say they should get out; but to incur the expense of an attendant, we would not like that.

3048. What Mr. Hastings says would be a very good test of their character?—Yes; when they came back you could see whether they were deserving poor or not. The odd times they get out now it would be hardly fair to judge them by.

3049. With regard to the boarding-out of children: have you any boarded out in this union?

Mr. Hastings.—None.

3050. Did you never try?—We were thinking of trying it, but the Local Government Board disposed of that by making it a necessary part of the arrangements that we should send an attendant with them to the schools, and we came to the conclusion that the children, in a great many cases, might be just as well here. There is no doubt about it that if they got into respectable homes and were looked after in the same manner as the people's own children would be looked after, it may be all right; but we are told that in some instances where they are boarded out they don't receive that attention, and care, and supervision that they ought to receive, and as a result the children that are brought up in a workhouse are just as good members of society as perhaps the so-called boarded-out. There are exceptions to every case, but generally speaking.

3051. I think you may take it that in a very large number of unions there has been a very careful inspection. In Cork and Limerick, where the system was first started, and they have hundreds boarded out, and in the Dublin unions, the reports of the Guardians themselves, the Visiting Committee, Inspectors of the Local Government Board, and of the Inspectors recently appointed, are very satisfactory; some few cases are found in which an unfortunate choice has been made of the foster parent, but in the general run of cases the natural kindness of the human heart is sufficient to induce people to take these children?—There is cer-

tainly a great deal more to be said for boarding-out children than old persons—people would be very human not to take an interest in children; but it is natural not to take much interest in old people.

3052. I suppose you have no statistics about the children who have gone through the workhouse—their after life?—I have not, except from what we see of them.

Mr. Hastings.—The schoolmaster might be able to give you information on that point.

3053. Do they come back again?—I don't think they do, as a rule.

3054. How are they absorbed into society, as a rule?—As farm servants and house-servants. I knew we had a girl in our place that was taken from here, and she was one of the best girls we ever had.

3055. What happened her when she left you?—She is still a servant, and a well-conducted servant, too.

Mr. Hastings.—I think the schoolmaster occasionally has communications from some of the boys who were in school and are now in Africa.

3056. Would it be any harm if you tried a couple of cases of boarding-out?—I don't believe the Guardians would have the least objection.

Mr. Convery.—Not if there was a suitable home.

3057. That is necessary; you could not do it unless you found suitable people. I think a trial of the system in a few cases would be interesting?

Mr. Convery.—But the minds of the Guardians, from their knowledge of the district, was that there would be a great drawback to it, the difficulty of getting suitable homes.

Witness.—There is no reason two or three of them should not be tried, seeing, from what the Chairman has stated here, that the thing has turned out satisfactorily in other districts where it has been tried, there is no reason we should not try it.

3058. Is there anything else under No. 3 query?—Well, chargeability is most a matter in the hands of the Commissioners.

3059. Have you many people in this union who are outsiders and who are charged to the union; for instance, would people from Coleraine come here?—I could not answer that.

3060. You have not felt that as a pressing injustice that you are supporting the people of other districts?—It rarely arises.

Mr. Convery.—It occurs here occasionally.

3061. The Guardians under those circumstances as 3061. The Guardians under those circumstances as rather apt to say that part of the rule at all events ought to be over a larger area, and the union ought not to bear the cost of people outside the union altogether, and it would be better to have some portion of the cost of maintenance spread over the whole county? That would apply more to places like Coleraine and Londonderry; we have a more rural portion here, and it would not affect us.

3062. Someone said just now that people who had been working in England and Scotland came back here?

Mr. Hastings.—Occasionally, but not very many.

Witness.—That is only people who originally belonged to the locality. We had the case of a man sent back from Scotland, and he had been thirty years in Scotland, so we thought it was rather hard that after spending the best part of his life in Scotland, when he became useless for all purposes, he should be sent back and charged on the district in which he was born; he never acquired a settlement.

Mr. MURPHY.—Five years' residence in Scotland would be sufficient.

Mr. Hastings.—But after inquiry we found he had not been one year in any particular locality; he was going about labouring.

Mr. MURPHY.—Five years' residence in Scotland entitles him to relief or one year's residence in a particular union.

Mr. Convery.—Is there an amendment of the law, because as far as our knowledge went they would never then have no matter how long they had been in Scotland.

Witness.—Has that change taken place as regards lunatics?

3063. CHAIRMAN.—I think it is only as far as paupers are concerned; there is a special law about lunatics?—A grievance that we often met in Derry is people who land in the port of Derry from various other centres going on the spree and constantly becoming insane, and they are put into the Derry Asylum and kept there for perhaps an indefinite period. Of course it does not touch this inquiry; is there any amendment of the law as to that?

3064. We have no power to go into that!—Then, surely, the chargeability of relief, the Guardians are unanimously of opinion that it should be made an electoral division charge, and placed on the division in which the person relieved resides.

3065. You would rather outdoor relief was made an electoral division charge?—Yes, and charged on the electoral division in which the person relieved resides.

3066. Do you think there is sufficient provision in this union for the hospital treatment of the sick; do you think any other additional hospital is necessary in your union?—We do not.

3067. Now, does any change occur to you as being desirable, either in administration or finance?—We have no answer to make to that at all; we made no suggestion.

3068. As regards No. 7, how far payments could be got in aid of the expenditure upon the sick and insane in hospitals and infirmaries?—Our answer to 7 is that we consider it would be very desirable to have a few wards made available for those persons destitute who are desirous of contributing towards their support.

3069. You would have pay wards?—Yes; people who are not absolutely destitute and who could afford to pay something, from 2s. to 5s. Under existing circumstances there occasionally come in people who are willing to pay, and who actually do pay, and we think these people should be in a ward by themselves; there is plenty of room for them, anyhow.

3070. How would you fix the amount of the charge: would you leave that to the Guardians, acting under the advice of the medical officer?—I think so, because the circumstances of the family may be different, and while some might be able to pay 2s. a week, others might be willing to pay 10s.

3071. I suppose you would take really anything you could get; if they could pay 1s. a week even, it would be better than getting nothing?—In the Derry Infirmary the way they work it is this, they fix the lowest amount at 5s. a week.

3072. Of course, that would be absurdly high?—Yes, I know; and then anything that the governor who recommends the patient suggests over and above that in consultation with the patient, the patient is asked to ask: "Do you wish to pay anything?" And supposing a person says he does not want to go in as a pauper, they will not refuse anything, but 5s. a week is the lowest I have heard suggested by any of the patients.

3073. Take a labouring man whose child becomes ill; he may be able to pay 1s. a week?—Yes, but the point is, would he be willing.

3074. Would you think it wise that Guardians should have power to recover?—I would say, with an ordinary labouring man, it would be hardly fair.

3075. I mean giving you the discretion, it would not oblige you to recover, do you think the Guardians should have power to fix the scale of contribution?—It would be all right to have the discretion.

3076. If you came to a case where a labouring man was making from 12s. to 15s. a week and one child got ill—if the child were at home, I suppose it would cost 1s. a week to keep it—it would not be too much to ask him to pay what he would save by the child being away?—I don't know what occurs in other dis-

tricts, but here the wages are so small it would not be fair.

3077. No matter how small, the child would cost something—I understand the point, however, if it were made discretionary.

3078. Every little thing of that sort will reduce the amount going on the rates?—I think that is stopping at straws and jumping over—

3079. If you leave it in the discretion of local people you would not have hardship indicated, you would give them a chance of recovering, which they have not now got?—If you give them discretionary power; but I should not like it to go out that a labourer should be called upon to pay for the treatment of his child or any member of his family, because my experience of labouring men is that they find it very hard to exist under the circumstances.

3080. Dr. EGERTON.—Circumstances alter so much; a labouring man might have two or three of his children working, and in that case you would insist on his paying, and in the other case you would let him off?—When it is left discretionary, of course.

3081. CHAIRMAN.—As regards tramps, what would you do?—We have already dealt with that—the English Casual Relief Act.

3082. You would not go beyond that; you would not put them absolutely in the hands of the police, and let them go to the look-up if they wanted any refreshment or entertainment?—No; I think with regard to tramps, considering the very small sum it costs annually, that after all, making provision for tramps is not an un-mixed evil. What we find here is that in localities such as Naghera, where there is no union, when a tramp comes there and he finds he has not the means of getting a lodging for the night, there is danger of his going behind some man's haggard, and perhaps smoking, and setting it on fire, or going to the cottages of farmers and stealing fowl. The cost of maintaining these people in the workhouse is so small it is in the interests of the people to keep them there; they are safer there, but I would certainly agree to have the Casual Act extended to Ireland.

3083. You think that would meet the difficulty?—I think it would; tramps may be a very undesirable class, but they are human beings, and it would be too hard that they should not have a place to cover them, considering it only costs 11d. here to provide a tramp with his supper, breakfast, and bed.

3084. What is your total for the year for tramps?—Mr. HASTINGS.—24.

Witness.—Then there is a corresponding benefit to the people, who have to run no risk from these fellows prowling about at night; it is well-spent money. I don't say that is the view of all the members of the Council, but it is my personal view, that we are really doing the people a favour in the end by the few shillings we spend on tramps.

3085. Is there anything else you would like to add?—I want to go as near as possible to what was decided upon at our meeting. I don't think there is any other point that I was instructed to give evidence upon that has not been touched. Mr. Smyth, the Chairman of the Board of Guardians, was appointed with me to give evidence, but he is not yet in attendance. Perhaps Mr. Convery, the Chairman of the Rural District Council, would like to supplement what I have said.

MR. CHARLES CONVERY EXAMINED.

It is more by accident than anything else that I am here. I know the views of the Board very well with regard to all these matters, and Mr. O'Neill, I think, has fairly stated them.

3086. CHAIRMAN.—Is there any point on which you differ?—The differences are so trifling it would be scarcely worth while. A great many Guardians, with regard to tramps, agree with Mr. O'Neill, that it is a side way of dealing with tramps, that the law should be made more stringent to deal with them; for instance, absolute men travelling through the country call at houses, and if they find there is no person in the house but a woman—

3087. They are a bit sturdy?—Yes, I think the law should be remedied in that respect.

3088. That would be by means of police supervision?—Yes, the police have pretty far times just at present, and if there was a law passed dealing with tramps, a good deal could be done to do away with the tramp

relieve altogether. You will find in some places two or three generations of tramps travelling all together—father, son, and grandson. If that could be dealt with it would be a great relief to the country.

3089. I suppose you have got to know a good many of these people by sight?—Yes.

3090. Have they any contrivance or real way of making a livelihood?—Their principle is: the father perhaps, or mother, come in advance and collect charity along the way; the father will have some kind of musical instrument, or sing a song, and have another collection; the little ones will come later on, and when they get into town, will enjoy whatever they have collected by the road, and, as a rule, they manage to get to the barracks.

3091. Are they chippy musicians?—I don't say they are musicians at all; they are usually all musicians.

3092. And tinkers?—They are partly tramp, too; they do a little work.

Appl. 21 1902.
Mr. James E.
O'Neill

Mr. Charles
Convery.

Sept. 21, 1905.

Mr. Charles
Convery.

Mr. O'Neill.—We had an entertainment here on one occasion, and the fact that we had so many musicians in the house added very much to the entertainment.

Witness.—In case anything would be added to the Magheradelt Union, it is in the midst of the Guardians generally that owing to the large size of the union for administrative purposes, we would be perfectly satisfied with the union as it is, but looking at the map, Ovenshagh and Glenshane would be much more suitable for adding; it would be easier for the people to come here than to go to Derry city.

3093. Or Coleraine?—They are off the Coleraine direction altogether. I would say that these lie principally between Magheradelt and Derry. The Grove already belongs to Coleraine; the people there are connected with Coleraine by business, and every other way, and the facilities for travel are very much in favour of Coleraine.

Mr. Agnew.—The Grove belonged to Ballymoney until lately.

Witness.—With regard to the system of rating, there is some difference of opinion; a great number of gentlemen think that by reverting back to the old order, it will confer immense good on the ratepayers. I have some experience of the old system and of the new, and I don't know that the change would tend to much more economy or saving of rates, because there were three classes of rating under the old system; all these things have now been put together, and, in my opinion, it would not be worth changing and keeping different accounts.

Dr Andrew
Hegarty.

Dr. ANDREW HEGARTY examined.

3096. CHAIRMAN.—There are some matters on which you can give us information: where do the majority of the sick come from: are they spread pretty well all over the union?—They are; they are spread over the whole union.

3099. There is no part of the union that is really too remote for the people to come in?—No, there are some parts twenty miles; it is twenty miles from this to Six Towns.

3100. Do they come in from there?—There are a few laborers up there; they are nearly all mountain farmers.

3101. Have you many cases that district coming in, or do you think the distance is rather prohibitive for hospital treatment: do you get any cases of fever or accident?—There is no case of fever from that district since I came here, or any accident either; there was a case of hernia up there not long ago.

3102. Is this the nearest workhouse to that district?—It is.

3103. What would be the next nearest?—Omagh.

3104. It was close to the old Gortin Union?—Yes; it is twenty miles to Omagh from Six Towns.

Mr. Hastings.—I don't think it is twenty miles from this; 15½ at the very outside according to the scale.

Dr. Breen.—It measures about twelve according to the map.

Witness.—The last visiting ticket I had took me within half a mile of the police barracks.

Mr. O'Neill.—Would you ask the doctor did he ever know, when he was doctor in Draperstown, any case of hardship occurring by reason of the distance of the locality from Magheradelt?

3105. CHAIRMAN.—Were there any cases which you thought ought to have been sent into hospital, but were not?—I daresay there were, but I tried to deal with them myself.

3106. Mr. O'Neill.—No case of particular hardship has arisen during that time?—I have had hernia cases at night, and things of that sort, that I would have sent in if there had been a nearer place.

3107. CHAIRMAN.—If it had been within two or three miles?—Yes.

Mr. Convery.—Having regard to the class of roads from that to Omagh, would you ask the doctor would it be any more inconvenient to that district to go to Omagh than to come here; the facilities of travelling here are much superior?

Witness.—Oh, yes.

3108. CHAIRMAN.—If you had a hospital in Draperstown, would you have been able to send those cases of hernia to it?—Yes, but they can be dealt with at home.

3109. Dr. Breen.—Would Coolstown not be nearer to Six Towns?—It would, but then there is the mountain between.

3094. Has outdoor relief increased much since the change of rating?

Mr. Hastings.—A little, but substantially it is going back again.

Witness.—A Guardian looks at the list and don't see anybody from his district perhaps, but it may be that there are people from another district that under the old system he would have to pay for. There are districts where the poor can be lodged with farmers; there are other districts where the larger farmers don't care to give shelter to the poor. The poor go to those districts although they belong to other districts, and I don't think it would be a recompense for the change.

3095. Do you think the Guardians are more ready to vote outdoor relief when it is a union charge than they would be under the old state of things?—They are not just so particular, but I can speak for this Board here. When we find there is any extravagance, we take pains to check it. In my experience it does not amount to anything material.

3096. About how much is the outdoor relief at present?

Mr. Hastings.—£15 or £16 per week.

Witness.—It is about the average that it was five years ago.

3097. Was there anything more you wish to add?—Well, no; Mr. O'Neill's evidence has covered everything and represented the view of the Council. Anything I have to say would be merely a corroboration of what he put before you. I was listening carefully to his answers.

Witness.—Magheradelt is very central for this district; it is only four miles from the Lough, and after all it is very central for the road.

3110. CHAIRMAN.—And you have a good ambulance for bringing the sick in?—After this Commission I expect we will get a four-wheeler.

3111. You would like a four-wheeler?—I would.

Mr. O'Neill.—Supposing you had a four-wheeled vehicle and had to go up some of these lanes in Glenarvan, how would you manage?

CHAIRMAN.—I can tell you how it would be done, by taking it up as near as possible to the place, or by going into a field and turning it.

Witness.—As a matter of fact, there are hundreds of horses in the district to which you could not take the two-wheeled machine.

3112. You would have to carry them; there would be a heavy chair inside the ambulance, and the patient could be brought down by two people and put into the ambulance?—In some of the houses in the Draperstown district you could not get unless you had a horse.

3113. How many sick have you in the infirmary at present?—Sixty-five or sixty-seven.

3114. Are many of these chronic cases: are they incurable cases?—There are not many curable cases at present; there is a fractured arm that will get better, there are several epileptic cases, and there are fits; they are running about together.

3115. Are they in the sixty-five?—I would expect so.

3116. How many would you have exclusive of that?

—Eighteen of that.

3117. Then between forty-five and sixty would be your real sick?—There are then a lot of old people, and some days some of them are sick and some days they are not; some days they are not able to be up and some days they are.

3118. You keep them on the sick list?—Yes; and there are others that are altogether bedridden.

3119. Have you many of the same class of people in the infirmary ward?—In the body of the house there are; they are relatively better in the way of strength.

3120. Are there any bedridden people in the aged and infirm wards?—Oh, no, everyone is able to get up, and as soon as they cease to be able to get up, we take them into the infirmary.

3121. What is the number of beds in the infirmary proper?—I don't remember now.

3122. You have never been pinched for space?—No, but a few more would have occupied all the beds in the spring of the year.

3123. Are you in favour of sending the insane cases to an asylum?—I don't think there is any necessity, except a noisy one, that comes in and disturbs the rest.

3124. What way are they cared for here?—It could not be better; there is a wardmaid, besides the nurse.

Sept. 21, 1900

Dr. Andrew Higney.

3125. The nurse of the infirmary has died charge over them?—No, the workman has died charge.

3126. Then she is supervised by the nurse?—That is on the female side, and there is a workman for the male side, both paid.

3127. What class of people were they originally, the workman and workwoman?—Respectable people.

3128. I mean they were not inmates here?—No, not that I am aware of.

3129. Have you many consumptive cases?—There is just one at present on the female side; she came from Belfast.

3130. Have you many of these cases coming in?—Only an odd one, and I don't encourage them to come.

3131. Dr. BROWN.—Bringing them into a ward where there are nine or ten other people is not desirable?—No.

3132. CHAIRMAN.—Could you not get a separate ward?—There is not an available ward here at the present time.

3133. Do you think it would be a great advantage if there was a country or other institution, say for a group of counties, or for a single county, for receiving consumptive patients?—I do believe that would be an advantage.

3134. Yes, as medical officer, would be very glad if you had power to send a consumptive case to a large extern hospital?—I would, certainly.

3135. You then would encourage consumptive people to come into your infirmary, so that they could be sent there?—I would.

3136. Do you think that would be a more suitable use to make of a workhouse than as an auxiliary asylum?—I would say so.

3137. Owing to the large amount of consumption there is in the country?—It is terrible, and in this union is spreading rapidly.

3138. Is it thoroughly well known by the people that it is an infectious and hereditary disease?—You cannot get these people to be careful about their spit.

3139. Do you think it would be desirable to have these people in a special hospital?—I do, if it was in a suitable place.

3140. You discourage them coming in owing to having no separate accommodation for them?—I don't encourage them, but if there was a place purposely for them I would.

3141. Do you think it is realized generally in the county or district the great importance of dealing promptly with consumption; do you think it is realized what a danger it is?—People have a very lively feeling of the danger of it to themselves, but you can hardly get them alive to the urgent necessity of watching the expectation or disinfecting it. You will get intelligent people sometimes, when there is a large number in the house besides the sick one; they begin to dread its attacking the others.

3142. Dr. BROWN.—Have you seen any cases in which they are isolated, that is prevented from sleeping with the other members of the family?—The houses in the country at the present time are not large enough for that. I don't allow anyone to sleep in the same bed with the consumptive.

3143. Not here, but in the country I am speaking of?—I am speaking of the country, but you could hardly provide a separate room for each; it would be out of the question in nine cases out of ten.

3144. They often suffer from consumption for a long time before they come under your notice?—Yes.

3145. Therefore they have been sleeping with others and spreading the disease?—Oh, that is so. It is wonderful the ravages it is making in the Draperstown district.

3146. CHAIRMAN.—Is that among factory people or the ordinary agriculturalists?—There is no factory there, but the infection has got into the district some way or other, and it is spreading. I remember registering twenty-one deaths in the quarter; there were seven of those consumptives, and six people over sixty years.

3147. Dr. BROWN.—Then practically it caused the larger part of the death-rate?—Practically; it is not uncommon for a husband to take it, and in a year or two the wife will follow. I heard of a woman's death the other day, and her husband died two years before.

3148. CHAIRMAN.—Fever never made such ravages?—Not at all.

3149. I mean in the old times?—We have not much knowledge of that.

3150. Could you not by any management set aside, or recommend the Guardians to set aside, or find out some way of setting aside a ward on each side of the infirmary?—You would have to build.

3151. Could you not make any provision without building?—You can see for yourself if you take a run through the house.

3152. If you take away the inmates you would have two wards then: could you not put such pressure on the asylum authorities as would induce them to take away the inmates?—It would hardly correspond with my views to send those people to the asylum; they have enough in the asylum without them.

3153. They are building a large addition at Grantha?—These people are able to run about.

3154. But meanwhile you have no ward for treating the greatest scourge of the country?—That is a fact.

3155. These inmates may be running about here, but they are not running about with any advantage.

3156. I don't know whether the committee had before them at that time the idea of trying to get the inmates drafted away?

3157. When will the new buildings at Grantha be ready?

Mr. O'Neill.—It will be a considerable time, but even when they are ready I question very much whether they will be enough.

3158. You have only fifteen or twenty inmates here; if you could get these people away it would not create a crisis in Derry. It may give you the means of saving many a useful life.

Mr. Hastings.—There are many wards in connection with the body of the house that might be utilized for the benefit of the inmates, if that is permissible.

3159. It is permissible. Did the Guardians go into the question of relative cost of maintaining inmates here and in the asylum?—How?

3160. Did you ever consider the relative financial cost of maintaining an inmate here and in the asylum?—There was some talk about that.

3161. What conclusion did you come to on that?—We did not come to any conclusion on that.

Mr. Hastings.—If you removed these inmates to the body of the house you have plenty of space there—if that is permissible at all—and then they would have to have someone with them.

3162. We will take a look over the house, although it is not one of our functions. But it would be, as the doctor's evidence so clearly and forcibly shows, of the greatest advantage to consumptive people that you should set apart two wards?—Yes, and induce people to come in.

3163. Of course, but it would relieve a great many families. You could take whatever cases you thought most urgent or desirable in your medical opinion. It is a question that must be settled on bigger lines?—Yes, but I would rather two or three counties would combine and form a sanatorium for their special use.

3164. Yes, but merely for the emergency, without incurring any great expense?—Yes, as a temporary expedient.

3165. Dr. BROWN.—Did the Guardians post up the large posters with reference to consumption which they received from the Local Government Board?—Yes, all over the union, and sent them to managers of schools and clergymen throughout the union.

3166. CHAIRMAN.—Members of families get careless as to the risk?—Yes, and then other members of the family think it is not consumption at all.

3167. Dr. BROWN.—Do you think the usefulness of the infirmary would be increased if it was separated from the workhouse?—I don't think it would be increased.

3168. People would come into it more readily if it was not a workhouse infirmary?—Even under the Guardians I think the usefulness of it could be enlarged in this way: if there were two wards provided for private patients, for any doctor in the union to send patients in and come and look after them.

3169. You would not suggest that it should be open for other doctors to come in?—I would indeed; I would make it more or less a local hospital.

3170. CHAIRMAN.—You would make the dispensary doctor honorary outside medical officers of the workhouse?—For their own patients.

Sept. 22, 1902.

Mr. T. F. Henry.

Mr. T. F. Henry examined.

3171. CHAIRMAN.—What exactly is the evidence you wish to give?—I was a member of the District Council some time ago, and I was one of the committees appointed to meet with the Coleraine and Limavady Guardians on the question of amalgamation.

3172. During what years were you a Guardian here?—When the Local Government Act came into force; for two years, until I resigned.

3173. What happened at that committee?—The thing dropped through; the Guardians seem to all the unsons to be against it; everyone was afraid of his own union rising.

3174. What was your own private opinion?—My own private opinion is that there should be only one workhouse for the whole county.

3175. Where would you put it?—At Coleraine.

3176. Would you break up Magherafelt, Limavady, and Derry?—I would.

3177. What provision would you make for the sick of these three unions?—I would have a cottage hospital, or hospitals, on the same system.

3178. You would have a cottage hospital in Magherafelt and Limavady, and what would you do as regards Derry city?—I have not considered Derry city much. I would expect there is a cottage hospital there likely at present.

3179. It would hardly be a cottage one for Derry city?—I would expect it would be a hospital where paying patients could pay.

3180. You would not propose to send any of the sick to Coleraine from these three unions?—Not except chronic cases. I would consider these should be a carriage set apart on the railways.

3181. I don't know whether the doctors would approve of that mode of treatment?—I was sick myself in another country, and it seemed to work well enough.

3182. Where was that?—In Australia.

3183. You were moved when sick on the railway?—Getting better, convalescent; bad cases, of course, would be attended here.

3184. What advantages do you think would accrue from your scheme?—I think it has come to this in Ireland, that there is no call for so many workhouses, owing to the few patients. When I walk through this workhouse, and other workhouses, I find there is a large amount of empty space.

3185. You heard the doctor's evidence about the difficulty of providing two extra wards for consumptives?—I would not agree with him in that; when I walked through it a few years ago there were plenty of wards with no person in.

3186. In the main building?—In the main building.

3187. Then it would be chiefly on the ground of economy you would suggest these changes?—And the people have a prejudice against going into workhouses and workhouse hospitals.

3188. Then you would give them a cottage hospital?—Yes, or district hospital.

3189. Unconnected with the workhouse management, of course?—Yes.

3190. Who would you make the doctor of that institution?—I would say honorary doctors after the present ones would die.

3191. The present workhouse doctors would remain, and then after that?—Honorary doctors.

3192. Do you think there would be much competition for the post?—Every place I have been I have always

found that the honorary doctors attended the patients well.

3193. I don't know how many doctors there are here?—Dr. Hegarty.—There are five in Magherafelt at present.

3194. You would make them honorary doctors of the hospital?—Yes.

3195. Derry?—There is a cottage hospital at Coleraine.

CHAIRMAN.—It is not on the rates.

3196. CHAIRMAN.—You mean a district hospital?—Certainly.

3197. Sufficient accommodation for the sick of the district?—Yes, it would be.

3198. Kept up partly by the rates and partly by paying subscription, and then the ordinary patients coming in, you would let them go to Coleraine?—Certainly.

3199. The great argument against that is that the present staff would have to be kept up or pensioned off, and that there would be no economy: you think that would be getting less year after year?—I do, and if it was tried I see no reason why there should not be a grant to the rates.

3200. From what source?—From the Government. I believe it would be a saving in the end.

3201. Of course you know there are large Government grants at present?—But I mean a lot of the staff would have to be pensioned off.

3202. You think the Government ought to pay the pensions?—Yes. They created a Poor Law system that is not required in Ireland, and I would be of opinion they should pay something towards doing away with it.

3203. The sick you would keep in the local hospital. The able-bodied would go to Coleraine without any difficulty, you think the chronic sick could also go there?—Yes.

3204. Now as regards the maternity, women going to be confined, would those go to the local hospital?—Certainly, to a ward.

3205. Under the supervision of whom would outdoor relief be given?—Of the doctor.

3206. Of course, the Coleraine Union would cease to be the Coleraine Union; it would become the County Derry Union, so to speak?—Yes.

3207. And every district would return representatives, according to your idea?—I would still say there should be a District Council for the roads.

3208. We have nothing to do with that?—The different districts should be represented at the Guardians, or the same Guardians appointed a committee to look after the patients in Coleraine; go a certain number of times.

3209. Mr. MURPHY.—Do you think that the workhouse in the County Derry would be sufficient?—I do.

3210. Do you not think that it would put the people to great inconvenience going to Coleraine from other districts?—No, I do not.

3211. Then your suggestion is that the present workhouses should be utilized as district hospitals?—Some of them may be too large for that, but perhaps the buildings could be utilized for something else.

3212. You think the only objection is that the local people don't wish to give up the institutions because they are a means of profit to the neighbourhood?—I don't think we wish to give them up; they would be afraid of a different system; they all like to hold their own. What is the reason for that I cannot tell.

Mr. Lewis Barrett examined.

Mr. Lewis Barrett.

3213. CHAIRMAN.—Now, Mr. Smyth, we will hear your views. The first query we issued was "Whether, having regard to the extent, population, necessities of the sick and destitute poor, facilities of locomotion, economic condition, and proper administration of the Poor Law in the County of Londonderry, it would be expedient to dissolve any of the unions, wholly or partly contained in the said county, and, if so, what arrangements, whether by amalgamation or otherwise, should be substituted therefor?"—As far as I am concerned I am strongly opposed to any of them being dis-

solved, because I cannot see that it will save the rate anything, and that is why people are calling for a change. I think we are quite as economical on the home side as we have been any time before, but when we have to keep up dispensaries, and a medical staff, and nurses, I hold we would be saving nothing, but causing a great inconvenience, and my opinion is that the Poor Law system should be altogether for the benefit of the poorer classes, and what would inconvenience them least. That is the main object, and if you have to remove them to great distances, that is a very great inconvenience.

3213. You think the existing arrangements in your union are sufficient and satisfactory, and you would have them done?—I do, we are situated in the centre of the union, and anybody can come in here without any great inconvenience. Some people have to come from sixteen miles from the mountain district, but if they had to go in addition the thirteen miles to Coleraine, Lomavady is the only one I could see possibly that could be dissolved, but there would be a great inconvenience in that, so, for people from the outlying districts to go to Coleraine, I have every road in the County Derry as well as I know the streets of Maghlinah.

3214. The second query is only contingent on your thinking that a union might be dissolved. Then the third question is a very wide one: "Whether, with or without a dissolution of any union, it would be possible—(a) by an arrangement for the maintenance of any class or classes of paupers in the workhouse of another union; or (b) by combining a number of unions for the purpose of Poor Law relief; or (c) by boarding out workhouse inmates, to make better provision for the classification and treatment of the inmates chargeable to the said unions?"—It is a big question; it has cropped up here previously, individually, but perhaps it might not work well. I would be in favour of boarding out, but the question arises, what class of people would you give them to. However, I think there are reforms to be made in the relations between the Local Government Board and the local boards, so that there may be less friction and less red-tapeism, but, on the whole, we work pretty well, I must say.

3215. You think the Guardians are too much restricted by red tape in their proceedings?—Yes.

3216. In Scotland they sometimes board out inmates of the harmless kind—something like the inmates that Mr. O'Neill had the pleasure of seeing at the Derry workhouse—those would appear to be the people that might be boarded out?

Mr. O'Neill.—In my opinion, those are the people that should not be there at all.

Witness.—I think if any class requires to be within doors it is the insane or semi-insane.

3217. People who are never dangerous in their actions?—There is nothing here to hurt the feelings of old people who were well brought up. It is a certain degradation to be a pauper; those have not the same feeling, and I would have them inside.

3218. You would not board out inmates?—No, I think not.

3219. Do you think any change is necessary to be made in the chargeability of relief: do you approve of union rating?—Divisional rating; our Board have a strong feeling on divisional rating for outsiders. I think indoor should be a union charge.

3220. There seems to be a general opinion among the witnesses examined up to the present that the hospital accommodation in the union is quite sufficient: do you agree with that?—I think so.

3221. The only district about which there seemed to be any doubt was Six Towns?—It is remote, but we have no complaints. I think if there was any greater distance there would be.

3222. Do you think if people who had been accustomed to go shorter distances were obliged to go very much longer, would there then be complaints?—I think there would.

3223. Does anything occur to you at all—any means by which you could secure a more economical system for the carrying out of the Poor Laws in this country, for the maintenance of the sick, the insane, and other classes in the workhouse?—The general feeling here is that we might have, as we had in the past, when I came here as a Guardian first, four nurses; that is the only thing we could see where economy came in. I don't say that we could dispense with any of these; to have a Poor Law system at all, I don't see how it could be carried out more economically.

Dr. Hogarty.—I think the expenditure on the nurses at present is less than it was ten years ago.

Chairman.—That would rather surprise me.

Dr. Hogarty.—Between parties occasionally employed, Mr. Hastings—I think the expenditure now would be greater than it was ten years ago.

Mr. O'Neill.—I would agree with the doctor if he said four or five years ago.

Chairman.—That was the transition period.

Witness.—That is why I would not go in for any great change.

3224. Chairman.—You really think the present system, on the whole, is an economical system, and that

it is administered economically here, and that the sick poor of the union are sufficiently well cared for?—I think so; at the present time everything appears to be going well. I was a Guardian during the "sickness" and I came back to the new Board, and I must say things have been improving; everything appears to be going well, and there is less discontent than there had been in the past.

3225. Is there much discontent about the rates outside. I don't mean casual grumbling; is there any real discontent, or do the people think that considering what has been done the rates are not high?—If there had been separate rating there would be no complaints about the rates being high. The expenditure on the Poor Law side of the house is not great at all, but the county work expenses have increased. In the Poor Law there is no increase.

3226. It is as it was except for the nurses?—Yes, and that is comparatively small.

3227. I expect there is a little increase on the nurses?—Oh, yes.

3228. Dr. Broome.—You don't object to that; you don't think it is excessive?—I think it is almost insupportable; everything has been going so well that no one will find fault. The people are quite satisfied when they find everything is going well in the boardroom, and they think the poor people are attended to.

3229. And the hospital has a good name in the country, and they don't object to come into it?—Only that it is a union hospital.

3230. Would you rather have it a district hospital?—There might be some paying patients, only they don't like the idea of coming to the union hospital, but otherwise I know the country appears to be well satisfied with the way everything was carried out.

3231. Chairman.—You would approve of paying wards in the district hospital under the Guardians' management?—I would.

3232. You think it would be possible to make a material deduction in the rates by means of getting payments or contributions?—It may not be very much, but I think some parties would avail themselves of it.

3233. It may more than counterbalance the increase in the nursing expenses?—I think it would.

3234. Would it not give the hospital a better name if the people had to pay a little for coming in?—It would, and there are parties who would come in that would not come in under present circumstances.

3235. And there are a great many here who could pay a little, or for whom something could be paid?—I don't think there are many at the present time.

3236. I have found in a great many workhouses people in the workhouse who could pay a little; it may not be half the actual cost of the food maintenance, but still every little helps their independence, and means a reduction in the rates?—I don't think those who come here could, as a rule, afford to pay.

3237. Take a payment of 1s. a week; that would not appear to be much, but yet it would amount to a great deal of money?—Would you not require to have a statute?

3238. You would, but we are here to collect information on which a statute could be founded. What I asked Mr. O'Neill was, whether he would approve of discretion being given to the Board of Guardians or District Council, whichever was managing the hospital; discretion to charge such sums as they might think proper—not obliged to charge it, but if they thought a payment could be made they might fix the amount?—My opinion is that it should be left to their discretion.

3239. But you would not see any objection to their being given a discretionary power to charge?—I think they should be given a discretionary power; it would give the Guardians a sort of standing; if they had more power they would look closer into it; it would give them a greater sense of their own responsibility.

3240. And it would give them a power of reducing the rates. As regards tramps, would you let the existing state of things go on?—You would nearly have to change human nature before you could stop that.

3241. And you would give them the accommodation they have been getting?—I cannot see anything to improve on it, except the authorities get some measure outside; it is not a very big cost, and my experience of tramps being out is that they commit far more depredations than would counterbalance the cost. I have known first in hay stacks, and the like, and thieving; but I would like to keep them separated from the others, and not in touch with them. There are even different tramps, they are not all alike.

Sept 21, 1908.

Mr. Luke
Hwyth.

Sept. 31, 1903.
 Mr. Louis
 Bayly.

3242. Some, I suppose, are men really looking for work?—Yes, a great number are professional vagrants; there are others differently circumstanced. I see them from time to time.

3243. Is there anything else you think of yourself that you would like to add to what I have asked you?—I don't think there is any more.

3244. Mr. HUNTERMAN.—You said you were opposed to amalgamation, and the reason principally was that you saw no economy in such a course: if it could be shown to you that there would be economy in amalgamation, would it change your view of the matter?—If there could be economy to any considerable extent, that would counterbalance the inconvenience to the patients.

3245. Are you aware that the large cost of the Poor Law service is due to the establishment charges, and if those establishment charges could be reduced, considerable economy could be effected in that way?—Except you cut down the official staff, and it appears you cannot easily do that.

3246. The present professional staff would have to be provided for, but the future takes care of itself: do you not think that if, instead of having so many institutions under the present costly system, we had one or two large institutions in a particular county, and had in addition more district hospitals, that would provide for the needs of the sick, and if this could be done on a cheaper scale, would it change your view of amalgamation in any way?—If I saw the reality of that, that it did cut down the expenses without inconvenience; but certainly as this is for the benefit of the poor.—

3247. If you could be shown that better provision could be made at a less cost—because that is the object of our being here to-day—if that could be shown to you by a change of the system and amalgamation?—I have seen nothing yet to convince me of that.

3248. It is simply because you don't see that there would be any economy in amalgamation you take the strong ground of not wanting any change?—Yes.

3249. About the boarding-out of children: you don't seem here to have adopted that system?—We have not adopted that.

3250. If it could be shown to you by neighbouring institutions that the boarding-out works exceedingly

well, would it strengthen you in the view as to boarding-out children?—Yes, I would be in favour of boarding-out.

3251. Omagh is not very distant, and in the Omagh Union they have adopted that system for a number of years. The little children are sent out to the houses of farmers, and we have applicants for every child, in fact competition for children in respectable houses; and those children are visited not only by the relieving officers regularly and at stated times, but by a committee of ladies, who go and look after them, and see how they are taken care of—look to their hair to see they are kept clean and well looked after. The larger children that remain in the institution are sent to the National school?—I am strongly in favour of their being sent out to school.

3252. Would it not be a good thing for you to make some inquiries on that subject?—I am more in favour of boarding-out than I am for amalgamation.

Mr. O'NEILL.—If the evidence has closed, I should like to draw attention to the reply of the Chief Secretary with reference to the medical officers, in which he stated:—"I note the medical officers of Ireland have a great deal to do, and their salaries are not high, but for all that I think their claims would be most deserving of recognition if they abandoned those positions and awaited the result of the Commission which is now sitting." So far I have not noticed that you have taken any evidence with reference to that.

CHAIRMAN.—Have you seen the further answer of Mr. Wyndham?

Mr. O'NEILL.—I have not seen it. Some people, and I share the opinion with them, are of opinion that if it is part of the functions of this Commission to report on this question.—

CHAIRMAN.—It is not.

Mr. O'NEILL.—We should at least have an opportunity of giving evidence.

CHAIRMAN.—No, it is not.

Mr. O'NEILL.—That settles the matter.

CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Wyndham explained subsequently that it was not part of our function.

The sitting terminated.

Sept. 25, 1903.

EIGHTH PUBLIC SITTING—TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 29TH, 1903.

At the Workhouse, Letterkenny.

Present:—Mr. MICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURTAGHAN, and Dr. CONY BIGGER.

CHAIRMAN.—Do you represent the County Council?

Mr. Edward McFadden, M.P.—No, I do not.

CHAIRMAN.—Are they represented professionally?

Mr. McFadden.—I don't believe they are.

Mr. John Mackey, Solicitor.—Not so far. Mr. William Wilson is the solicitor for the County Council. I don't believe they are represented.

CHAIRMAN.—I suppose the secretary will come here?

Mr. McFadden.—Not for the inquiry, I think; he is here at the Revision Sessions.

CHAIRMAN.—The first witness I should have called, if he had been here, would have been the secretary of the County Council. I suppose you are all familiar, gentlemen, with the objects of this inquiry. It is unnecessary for me to make any statement on the subject; you will understand the nature of it. Is the chairman of the County Council present?

Mr. McFadden.—No, he won't be here. The vice-chairman will be here, Mr. Magee. Have you got the resolutions of the County Council?

CHAIRMAN.—I have.

Mr. McFadden.—The secretary could only tell you that they were passed.

CHAIRMAN.—They are rather bald. I want somebody that will give us a little in detail what the Council thought.

Mr. McFadden.—That was not raised in my time.

CHAIRMAN.—You appear now for Letterkenny?

Mr. McFadden.—And for Milford along with Mr. Mackey.

Mr. Mackey.—I appear for the Milford Board of Guardians.

CHAIRMAN.—Are there any other unions represented here?

Mr. McFadden.—Glenties is represented by Mr. McNelis.

CHAIRMAN.—You propose first to offer some evidence on behalf of Letterkenny and Milford?

Mr. McFadden.—Yes, but our witnesses are not here at present.

Mr. Mackey.—My Milford witnesses are not here yet.

Mr. McFadden.—The Letterkenny Urban Council is represented by the Town Clerk and two witnesses.

Mr. JOHN G. LARREN, Clerk of

the Urban District Council, examined

3253. CHAIRMAN.—The Urban District is altogether within the Union of Letterkenny?—It is, sir.

3254. And has the Urban District Council passed any resolution on the question of reform of the Poor Law or the proposed amalgamation of unions?—Beyond, sir, giving replies to the queries sent out to them.

3255. You have got the queries before you?—I have.

3256. What is their answer to the first query?—That it would not be expedient to dissolve any of the unions wholly or partly contained in the County Donegal.

3257. They think everything ought to remain as it is?—So far as the County Donegal is concerned; that was by a majority of the Council.

3258. What was the voting?—There is two.

3259. A majority of one. Are either of the gentlemen who voted in the minority present?—Yes.

3260. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—What is the number of the whole body?—Nine constitutes the entire number.

3261. CHAIRMAN.—Are you aware of the names or signatures used during the discussion. What were the reasons put forward in favour of and against amalgamation?—Some thought that as far as taxation was concerned—

3262. Those who were in favour of amalgamating some of the unions, what did they think?—They thought it would reduce taxation.

3263. Did they go into any figures or calculations?—No.

3264. Those who were against breaking up any of the unions, what was their view?—They believed that the taxation would be reduced, and that there was not the same call for the number of workhouses now as at the time they were originally founded.

3265. And they thought a smaller number of workhouses would meet the requirements?—Yes, but those that were against amalgamation considered that it would be a hardship on the poor; travelling, and covering them so far.

3266. Did they answer the second query, which was that they would propose should be done in the event

of amalgamation?—They did. In the event of any union or unions being dissolved, and the workhouse or workhouses being no longer required for Poor Law purposes, such workhouse or workhouses could be utilized for the purpose of technical instruction; a better purpose they thought they could not be put to.

3267. Then they are apprehensive that some workhouses might be broken up?—Quite so. In the event of any being broken up they thought that a better provision also should be made for the classification of inmates.

3268. Did they sketch at all or outline what they meant by a better classification?—They thought the inmates could be divided into classes. The deserving poor should have separate accommodation from the tramp or disreputable class, and married couples should not be separated on coming into the workhouse, as at present.

3269. The classification they wanted to make was one between deserving and undeserving poor?—Exactly.

3270. Did they look into the question at all of hospital accommodation?—Yes, they considered that.

3271. What were their views on that?—They considered that, seeing the situation of the Denagall County Infirmary, it is not adapted at all for the county; it is on the verge of the County Donegal at Lifford. They think the county infirmary should be in a more central position.

3272. Did they at all consider where that would be?—Naturally, they considered near Letterkenny.

3273. Dr. BIGGER.—They did not consider the railways into Strabane were any great advantage to the county infirmary?—They considered the county infirmary of Denagall is on the verge of Donegal, and you have to travel the whole county to get to it; it is not central.

3274. For driving?—Moreover, they had it in their minds that some years ago it was contemplated to have that infirmary transferred to Letterkenny.

Mr. John G. Larkin

Sept. 25, 1882.
Mr. John G.
Larkin.

3275. Don't the railways run into Strabane?—They do, but not all; from Farnah side you would have to go round by Derry.

3276. The larger proportion of the railways?—Yes.

3277. CHAIRMAN.—As regards Query No. 4, which is: "Whether, in the event of an amalgamation or combination of unions being carried out, or any other arrangements being made for the relief of the destitute poor, any changes in the laws and procedure as to administration, and in the chargeability of relief, would be desirable?"—No; they think there should be no change in regard to chargeability of relief. They are in favor of union rating for all Poor Law purposes.

3278. Mr. MURPHY.—Sanitary also?—All Poor Law purposes, I said.

3279. CHAIRMAN.—Did they say what other area of chargeability they would consider except the union. What did they compare with the union; was it the old divisional?—Yes.

3280. And no other. They did not consider the question of county chargeability?—No.

3281. Or even they did not consider the question of what you might call the country rate—that is, the rate all over Ireland for certain purposes?—No; they compared it with the old electoral divisional.

3282. I don't mean for bearing all expenses, but some sort of division, which would ease the taxation on those most highly taxed, and come to a sort of rate-in-revival?—No, they did not consider that.

3283. They merely were considering whether union or divisional rating was better?—Whether union or reverting back to the old divisional rating, and they were in favor of union rating.

3284. This query was also meant to touch wider questions. The Council did not view it in that light. The fifth query was:—"Whether, having regard to the number, capacity, and situation of the workhouse hospitals, county infirmaries, county fever hospitals, and other hospitals existing in the county, additional accommodation is required for the proper treatment of the sick poor in any union, district, or locality in the county, and if other accommodation seems desirable, how it may be best provided without entailing undue hardship upon the destitute or on the sick poor of the union?"—Their answer to that was that as the county infirmary was not in a suitable situation, they think there should be one provided at Letterkenny which would be central.

3285. One could hardly expect the Urban Council of Letterkenny to consider the hospital accommodation in very remote parts of the county, such as Gweedore, and the Glenties, and Glenties?—No; they did not consider that question.

3286. Query 6:—"Whether any administrative and financial changes are desirable in order to secure a more economical system for the relief of the poor, including the sick, the insane, and other classes of the destitute?"—To that query they gave no reply.

3287. Query 7:—"How far, in the case of persons who are not destitute, it would be desirable to introduce a system of payments or contributions in aid of the cost of treatment of the sick and insane in hospitals or other such institutions?"—The Council considered that a system of payment should be introduced in infirmaries, as far as possible, the amount of such payments to be a matter of arrangement between the persons receiving the relief and the governors of the institution.

3288. When they talk of governors they include Guardians?—Certainly.

3289. The amount of payment is to be a matter of arrangement?—Yes.

3290. That could hardly be done if a man comes in with a broken leg. You could not keep him outside the gate until he arranges how much he will pay?—Oh, no; they meant when requiring into the circumstances of each case—a sliding scale.

3291. That it should be discretionary on the part of the governors or committee to charge what they considered would be desirable?—Yes, after inquiring.

3292. Into the earnings and condition of the people?—Yes.

3293. "8.—What change, if any, seems to be possible and desirable as regards the treatment of the vagrant poor generally known as tramps or casuals?" What is their view on that?—The Council considered that the law as regards vagrants should be more rigidly enforced on the admission of tramps into the workhouse—the rules regarding tramps should be strictly enforced—and, further, that the tramps should not be

entitled to discharge until after the expiration of such a period as may be decided upon, the present limit of three hours being too short; and they should be made to do a certain amount of work.

3294. That would mean a very large expenditure, of course, in enforcing the work?—Yes, but there would be some work against that.

3295. There was nothing else except these answers?—That is all.

3296. Is there anything else that comes to yourself?—No, I don't desire to add anything.

3297. Mr. MURPHY.—In the event of this workhouse being dissolved, did the Council consider how it should be divided except for technical purposes?—No; but the Council did not contemplate that Letterkenny should be dissolved.

3298. They never considered it should be converted into an auxiliary asylum, or a separate asylum?—They did not.

3299. What would your own views be?—I don't think it would be suitable; it would necessitate an additional staff, and would be adding to the taxation.

3300. But one staff would be able to manage the whole?—I don't consider it could.

3301. It is quite near the asylum?—It is. An additional staff would be required; you would always have to have a doctor on the premises.

3302. Did you consider the 76th section of the Local Government Act as to alternate lunatics not requiring any special medical attendance. Could it not be converted into an auxiliary asylum for the treatment of those cases?—It could, but you would have to have an additional staff.

3303. Attendants, but not doctors?—I don't know whether it would be necessary to have a doctor resident or not.

3304. CHAIRMAN.—Are there two doctors at present?—Mr. MURPHY.—Yes.

CHAIRMAN.—I suppose you could put up one of them here?

Mr. MURPHY.—Yes.

Dr. BACON.—Don't the grounds adjoin?

Mr. MURPHY.—There is about 250 yards between.

3305. Dr. BACON.—Has the asylum ground on both sides of the road?—Yes.

3306. And the inmates work on both sides?—Yes.

3307. And are the grounds on the workhouse side very near the workhouse?—It is just a few minutes' walk.

3308. Mr. MURPHY.—Of course, every person knows the asylum is overcrowded?—It is.

3309. And they are building an additional wing at present?—They are.

3310. Mr. MURPHY.—I believe you have lived in Letterkenny all your life?—All my life.

3311. And you have seen a large number of inmates of the present asylum occurring in the streets of Letterkenny?—I have.

3312. Don't you think those are perfectly harmless lunatics?—Yes.

3313. As much as fifty or sixty?—Yes.

3314. And 200 sometimes?—Yes.

3315. Dr. BACON.—With one attendant?—There may be more than one attendant.

3316. Mr. MURPHY.—Those men are all capable of doing work?—They work on the farm.

3317. Supposing those men were transferred to the present workhouse, would that relieve the congestion of the asylum?—Very much.

3318. Would you not think that desirable, having regard to the taxation?—But then what are you going to do with the inmates you have in this infirmary—going to cost additional hardship on them, removing them elsewhere.

3319. Assuming for a moment that this workhouse was done away with and turned into an auxiliary asylum, would you not think that Letterkenny would be more suited than any other place?—It would, except that, be more suited than any other union in the county.

3320. That would be for the reception of lunatic inmates and idiots?—There would have to be several structural alterations that would be very costly.

3321. That would be a matter of more detail afterwards. Supposing that was done, where would you suggest, as you have a very good local knowledge, where would you suggest that the infirm inmates of the and some more unions should be treated, allowing all the accommodation here entirely for the idiots and lunatics of the whole county?—I suppose Milford would be one and Stranorlar would be another.

3322. You think these two would meet the requirements of the County Donegal generally?—These two workhouses.

CHAIRMAN.—Breaking up all the other unions except Milford?

Mr. Mosley.—Not necessarily; but break up Letterkenny Union as a union, treating it as an auxiliary asylum for the whole county, and then have two unions hospitals for the County Donegal, one at Milford, and the other any other place you like.

CHAIRMAN.—But Milford, certainly?

3323. Mr. Mosley.—Or take Donaghmaddy, or any place at all—we will have something to say to Milford presently—but Letterkenny would be more suitable as an auxiliary asylum than any other place.—Now, I am afraid if you make Letterkenny an auxiliary lunatic asylum, you won't get the same capitulation grant for the lunatics relieved.

3324. ASSESSING the harmless lunatics were transferred here, could they not be kept in this place at a much cheaper rate to the county than up above?—I am afraid not, if you only get half the capitulation grant.

3325. Do you know the average cost of an inmate in this particular work?—No. I know it used to be, in years gone past, over £24.

CHAIRMAN.—That is for food only; you would have to add all other establishment charges.

3326. Mr. Mosley.—What would it come to when you added all others?

CHAIRMAN.—You never made it out?—No, I did not.

Mr. FRANCIS WARD EXAMINED.

3327. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the Urban Council?—I am.

3328. And a member of the Board of Guardians, too?—Yes.

3329. The Urban Council considered this question of the amalgamation of unions, and there was a voting of three to two. Were you among the three or the two?—I was in the majority.

3330. What was the view of the majority?—The view of the majority was, as the Town Clerk, Mr. Larkin, has very succinctly stated, and I could not do more than just repeat what he has said. About Query 4, I have seen reason to change my mind since.

3331. "Whether, in the event of an amalgamation or combination of unions being carried out, or any other arrangements being made for the relief of the destitute poor, any changes in the law and procedure as to administration, and in the chargeability of relief, would be desirable?"—I have been since studying the matter over, and I think that a change in the procedure of the law and in the chargeability would be necessary, in fact essential, and that for the purpose of introducing technical instruction, which would become a source of regeneration, able-bodied and intelligent men would be able to earn a living themselves, would be more than self-supporting. I have seen sixty years ago in the Blind Asylum at Glasgow, where blind people were doing handwork that was in a great measure self-supporting; such as basket-making. One of the reasons is a feeling of touch. These things could be taught in Donegal as well. I even introduced here the basketmaking which would generate the growing of ories, and would be an industry that is not known here hardly at all. The swamps that are now unproductive could be made very productive by the growing of osiers, by giving technical instruction in the arts, and several other purposes—could be made self-supporting in this institution—and therefore I say that there should be a change as regards Query 4, a change that would not only benefit the community generally by giving technical instruction, but the children at home in their places could also be employed at this business.

3332. That is not technical instruction, though; that is factory work you are talking of?—I think it comes under the head of technical instruction. I may be mistaken, but I am still of the opinion, and will hold that opinion until I see reason to give it up for a better. The reason I changed my opinion from agreeing with the original answer to Query 4 is that I saw reasons alone in the writings of others to change my opinion, and whenever I found a better reason than I thought I had myself, I thought it would not be right to be wedded to my own, but to give in to those who know more; therefore I do not hold with the Council in Query 4. These observations, coupled with what the Clerk has stated, is all that I could say. I agree with him.

3327. I don't think it was ever done. They like saying our average cost is £24. 9d. as compared with £25 a year in the asylum, and that looks a very big thing; but then the asylum takes in everything—cost of buildings, and everything—and when you tot up all the expenses of the union on the same lines as the Letterkenny Asylum, they are very different figures, and then the capitulation grant reduces the cost of asylum inmates. I suppose one of your grounds for stating that this would be more convenient would be in the event of any one of these insane or idiotic developing serious symptoms, that he could be more easily removed to the ordinary asylum?—Yes, it is so near hand.

3328. Have not the asylum authorities acquired a very large farm?—They have.

3329. On which, of course, the people confined here could do manual labour?—Yes.

3330. CHAIRMAN.—How many people have you here that could handle a spade?—As a rule they are not able-bodied.

CHAIRMAN.—Are the County Council procuring any evidence to-day?

Mr. McFadden.—I don't think so. They named Mr. Donaghy, the Chairman of the Council, and Mr. William Doherty, the Chairman of the Finance Committee, and I communicated with both, and I had a conversation with Mr. Donaghy, and he told me he did not intend to offer any evidence. Mr. Wm. Doherty wrote he was not sure whether he could come or not.

Sept. 25, 1902.

Mr. John G. Larkin.

Mr. Francis Ward.

3327. You thought that no workhouse should be broken up at all?—In the county, except this is an exception to that. Query 4 would be an exception to that, and it modifies my opinion.

3328. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—In regard to Letterkenny?—Yes.

3329. Dr. BRIDGES.—Then you are of opinion that it would be good to dissolve some unions?—I don't go beyond the county; I do think it would.

3330. CHAIRMAN.—What unions would you break up?—As regards the breaking up of some unions, and the leaving of others, I think as a central place it would be well to leave Letterkenny and Donegal Unions, which would be a central portion of the North-west of Donegal, more so than Milford. Milford and Letterkenny are rather near each other. I am only making suggestions. I think that that would serve, or if Donegal would not be chosen, say Inishowen. It is partly strangely circumstanced to Donegal; it is in the centre of a large tract of the county.

3331. Is there anything else you would like to say?—No, there is not, except an extension of technical instruction which would become self-supporting, in order to any institution in which it would be followed up. We are greatly at a loss for technical instruction. We have poured in on us the products of other countries from the Continent that our children could be employed at here; we are trying them and paying dearly for them, whereas it would give an immense amount of employment if adopted here, but we cannot do that without technical instruction. We have not sufficient funds to apply for that purpose; we are helping them accumulate, but when they are accumulated, it is expected we will be able to bring in technical instruction on a large scale.

3332. Mr. Mosley.—You have lived in Letterkenny for a long time?—Over fifty years.

3333. You know the Letterkenny Asylum, I suppose, from it was built?—I do.

3334. Of course it has been tremendously enlarged?—It has.

3335. At present I think, I am right in saying that there are a large number of harmless lunatics confined there?—I believe so.

3336. Have you not from time to time seen them going up the streets of Letterkenny when they were making a new burial ground?—I have.

3337. Large numbers of them in charge of a few men?—Yes.

3338. Those you would consider harmless lunatics?—I would, indeed.

3339. Assuming this Commission would think that some of the unions should be dissolved and a workhouse made an auxiliary asylum, would you not think that Letterkenny would be more adapted for that than any other union?—I do.

60s. 10s. 10s. 1s.
Mr. Francis
Ward.

3380. You know the accommodation you have in this workhouse?—Yes.

3381. For how many, please?

Mr. S. B. Walters.—680.

Mr. Mackey.—And the hospital, I suppose, would accommodate fifty or sixty more?

Mr. S. B. Walters.—That includes all.

3382. Mr. Mackey.—Assuming there were 150 or 200 taken out of the present Letterkenney Asylum, would it that relieve the tremendous congestion we hear about at every meeting of the Board?—It would.

3383. And would save for some years any further expenditure on the institution?—I would modify my answer in this way, that if they are taken out of the asylum and brought into the workhouse, that it should be with a view that it would lessen taxation generally.

3384. Irrespective of whether you think it would have an effect on their minds, do you not think that associating persons of the worst class or harmless class of lunatics with people who are really lunatics, does them harm?—No; I would be for a separation, as far as possible.

3385. Is not that impossible with the present building, having regard to the congestion?—I think not; in all these arrangements the view would be to lessen taxation generally.

3386. I quite agree with you if such a thing can be done, but you think that if any such union was tried up as an auxiliary asylum, Letterkenney would be more suitable for it?—I do think that.

3387. Mr. McPadden.—At present the Lifford Infirmary is very difficult to get at from Derry and Milford?—It is.

3388. Letterkenney would be the most central as case of any change of hospital accommodation?—Yes.

3389. I see the Guardians recommend this workhouse should be converted into a shirt factory. You are not in favour of that?—No; but the trend of public matters is such that there must be change, having regard to the great taxation. £4 is given to officials for taking care of the destitute poor, while only £1 is expended on the destitute poor. I think it would be well that the wise legislators of our country, and the administrators of the law of our land, should see to the lessening of this taxation, and at the same time have a view to the accommodation, and comfort, and requisites of the poor and needy, but it is an awful thing to say that £4 is expended on officials. And in saying this I make no reflection upon officials, but it surely could be done with less.

3390. Chairman.—Is that as regards this workhouse?—No, generally of workhouses.

3391. Out of £5 raised on Letterkenney Union, you spend £4 on officials and £1 on the poor. Is that true as regards this workhouse?—I believe it is. No; I will modify my saying. It is true, but in a general way, taking all the workhouses as a standard.

3392. Did you take that as a general statement from anybody else, or have you gone into the calculation yourself?—No; I have seen it written, and very reasonably, and in fact it was so over.

3393. You adopted it as your own opinion?—I did.

3394. Now can you tell us the heads and groundwork of that statement?—The groundwork is in the public press, the very regurgitations of the country.

3395. Have you made a calculation on that general statement, to see whether it would be true as regards

the Letterkenney Union with which you are well acquainted as a Guardian. Have you tried with the clerk of the union or any person to ascertain how much of the amount that is raised for Poor Law purposes is spent on officials, and how much is spent on inmates?—I have not, sir; but this appears in the public press.

3396. You don't adopt everything you see in the public press?—Not everything; if it is contradicted in the public press and western given.

3397. You have the means of testing at least?—No, I have not.

3398. You have the accounts of the Letterkenney Union at your disposal, and can see whether the four-to-one proportion is true here; you can satisfy yourself very easily of that?—I have that at my disposal, but I have not the time at my disposal.

3399. Did you ever ask Mr. Walters, the clerk of the union, to make that calculation for you?—I did not, for I did not see Mr. Walters in that line since I saw that information.

3400. I would recommend you, before you give such evidence again, to check it with Mr. Walters?—Mr. Walters is only one individual.

3401. But he is the individual who keeps the accounts of the union?—It does not follow it is necessary for him to do that, because I give that as a standard of all the unions of Ireland.

3402. You don't know what sum was taken as poor rate all over Ireland?—I don't know now. I could know it from statistics I have in my keeping, but I don't have the time to look into them; but, in fact, to doubt that statement I might as well doubt some of the statements of Ministers of State that I hear, and there is no proof required of them.

3403. What would you take if you were testing that four-to-one ratio. What sum would you take as the total amount raised to be divided between the four-to-one?—I would take that.

3404. What sum would you take for the Letterkenney Union?—I cannot say now.

3405. Surely you can tell me how much a year is spent in the Letterkenney Union, of which £4 goes to officials and £1 to the inmates. What sum would you take as the sum to be divided?—If I admit the premises, you would have me in a *cul-de-sac*.

3406. I think I would have you there in any case before long, because I am sure the statement is grossly absurd?—I must wriggle as best I can to get out of it.

3407. You have adopted a general statement without testing it as regards your own union?—I don't admit I have adopted it. I say I have seen it, and it has changed my mind from what it was before.

3408. Now these wild statements that £4 are spent on officials for every £1 spent on the poor are very wild but very attractive to some minds. It would be better to test them by figures, than to be vapouring about them?—I put them forward for what they are worth, and they are not contradicted at present.

3409. You come before a Commission appointed to inquire into these things, and give that as a fact as portion of your evidence?—Will you allow me to withdraw giving it as a fact?

3410. Then I am to take it you saw that in the papers?—You say I took that as a fact. I don't think I said that. I said I saw it in the papers.

(Shorthand writer reads Questions 3360 to 3368).

Mr. PHILIP QUINN examined.

Mr. Philip
Carroll

3381. CHAIRMAN.—Are you a member of the Urban Council?—Yes.

3382. Were you of the majority or minority?—The minority.

3383. Will you tell us what considerations influenced you in voting for the closing up of the workhouse?—I considered this house a resort for tramps. Week after week there is a long list read out, in the summer time particularly. During the militia training, in one week I believe I am correct in saying there were eighty-six tramps. We applied to the War Department to be received, and they refused, for the reason that these men were not in the pay of the service. And another reason is the inconvenience of the county infirmary. This workhouse could be converted into an infirmary.

3384. The tramps largely influenced your mind?—They did.

3385. Would you be in favour of breaking up the Letterkenney Union?—As a workhouse, I would.

3386. How would you deal with the sick and infirm that are now in this building?—They could be transferred to some other union.

3387. Where would you transfer the Letterkenney sick and infirm to?—I think Milford would be a very central place.

3388. Would you add the whole of the Letterkenney Union to Milford, or would you break it up between Strabane and Stranorlar?—I would not go to Strabane at all, but Stranorlar or Milford; either of the two, or any place convenient that would not entail a hardship on them.

3389. In what proportions would you divide the union?—I have not considered that.

3390. How much would you need to see and how much to another place?—That would be a matter of the accommodation they would have in the different houses.

3390. But you would break it up most probably between Stranclar and Milford?—I would be in favour of that, and converting that into a fever hospital.

3392. Not the whole building; you have a fever hospital next door?—That is very small.

3393. A county infirmary you would say, rather?—I would suggest also that in the event of not breaking it up, to make it a kind of home, and classify the people. Some people come here that are very well able to work, and I should detain them. Those are tradesmen come here—painters, carpenters, and shoemakers. I should detain them for a certain time, and make them make shoes and mend clothes, and so on.

3394. Have you looked into the figures of the numbers in the house?—I am not a Guardian now.

3395. Do you really think you would find many persons amongst those admitted here fit to exercise any trade?—I believe there are people in the house at the present time very well able to work; as able as people outside.

3396. I have been through the house this morning, and I must say they are a very debilitated set of old people?—You are an official.

3397. You think they go to bed when they see me?—I say that people nowadays are very cunning. Of course, that is a matter for medical opinion, not mine.

3398. A practical man's opinion is very good?—I may consider them able to work perhaps, and the medical man would not.

3399. Have you any people in your mind who are at present in the workhouse and able to work?—I have, but I would not like to mention names.

3400. I don't ask you to mention names, but you have people in your mind?—I have. When I was a Guardian, I believe there were a good many well able to work, men and women; some, of course, are not.

3401. The majority are not?—Oh, no.

3402. Now is there anything else that you would like to mention?—Provided this workhouse was kept as it is, the tramp question is cropping up in every corner, this bridewell below is now diseased, and I would send the tramps to the bridewell for a few nights.

3403. If Letterkenny Workhouse were closed up as a workhouse?—But even as it is.

3404. You would make the tramps go to the bridewell?—Or leave a discretionary power with the relieving officer.

3405. It would keep up the bridewell. Would you put that in the hands of the police or the Poor Law Guardians?—There is a man there at present paid for looking after it.

3406. He is under the Prisoners Board?—Mr. McFadden.—The County Council.

Witness.—Could it not be converted for that purpose; it is now disused.

3407. That is a suggestion that has been made to us already in different places. What do you think would be the effect of that?—To stop a good many tramps from coming in.

3408. Would they stay out or cease being tramps?—I expect they would cease to be tramps.

3409. Don't you think it is possible they might go into the farmers' out-houses or sleep in the hayricks?—I don't think it.

3410. A great many Guardians have given evidence, and said they very much prefer having things as they are?—There are houses burned in towns, and there are no tramps in them.

3411. You would like to try the experiment of putting the tramps under rigorous treatment?—Those who are going from town to town and making it a profession.

3412. You could not very well draw the line and say there are some tramps we will receive and some we will not; that will altogether come under the direction of the relieving officer or master?—That is what I have stated. The relieving officer has a very good idea who they would be.

3413. He would send the deserving poor here?—Yes, and those not deserving he would send to the bridewell.

3414. The question of payment by the sick. Would you be in favour of that as a practical man. At present a large amount of money is spent on relieving the sick?—If able, they might pay a small amount.

3415. Some are able to pay it a week, and others from perhaps 2s. to 10s.?—Well, a sliding scale; I would be in favour of that.

3416. Would you be in favour of authorising a Board of Guardians or governors to charge any from 1s. a week to 10s.?—I don't quite understand what you mean. Of course, if they are able to stop out, they won't require to come in.

3417. I was talking about the sick. Supposing a person wants to come in for treatment in the sick wards; if it is a member of a man's family who is in receipt of 2s. a week?—Very few will come in that can stop out.

3418. Even the sick to be treated?—They don't like to come to the workhouse.

3419. Mr. Mealey.—Free?—In any case they don't like the workhouse.

3420. CHAIRMAN.—You have an idea of turning this place into an infirmary?—I have.

3421. Did you consider the question of a district hospital at all?—No.

3422. Do you think union rating is right?—I do.

3423. You would rather have that than electoral division rating?—Personally, as regards Letterkenny.

3424. Would you like to get still further relief by getting portion of the expenditure on the county, or some other larger area?—There is no doubt about that. I think every person will admit it.

3425. Or it might be increased by having a larger area?—We don't want any increase.

3426. You would rather have the rates more uniform. You would not like the rate uniform unless it was in your favour?—Well, I would not, speaking honestly.

3427. You know that some of the very poor unions have exceedingly high rates?—I know in my time they had. The division I represented—Sewer?—It was 2s. 6d. at one time, and there was no pauper in it.

3428. In Anaghy it was 2s. in the 2s. in the old times?—But there was no pauper in the Sewer Division. Some other divisions in my time were 3d. or 10d. Letterkenny was 1s. 2d.

3429. Would you look with favour on a proposal that the county should try to give some relief to the very poor districts, such as Sewer, or even three times as bad as Sewer?—Of course, I would be in favour of any district getting relief.

3430. Out of the rates—a rate-in-aid?—The other portions would not like to do that; no, I would not.

3431. Mr. MINICOMENT.—You would not wish to extend the chargeability beyond the union?—No.

3432. You knew what that is?—I do; the other would be problematical.

3433. CHAIRMAN.—What is your union rating at present?—1s. 2d.; the standard rate is 10s. 6d.

3434. When you come and find people very much poorer paying twice and three times, and perhaps four times, as large parishes, don't you think it is fair for them to ask for some assistance?—For us to become charitable?

3435. I don't say charity at all, but some arrangement that will cause the rates to fall less severely on them?—If I was living in the poor districts, I would, but as I am, I would rather stop as I am.

3436. Mr. McFadden.—You are in favour of sending the pauper of Letterkenny to Milford and Stranclar?—Yes.

3437. You don't know anything about Milford Workhouse?—I never was in it.

3438. Were you ever in Stranclar?—No.

3439. You don't know the number of paupers in each at present?—No.

3440. You don't know that they are less than at Letterkenny?—I was one of the parties appointed at an inquiry in Donaghadee—I think the Chairman was there—and they were to do away with the Donaghadee Workhouse, and send paupers here to Letterkenny and portion to Milford, but the Milford Guardians were very kind; they were sending all the poor portions to Letterkenny.

3441. You would not take it then?—No.

3442. Would you not think it would be as convenient for the Milford paupers to come to Letterkenny as for the Letterkenny paupers to go to Milford?—I have given the reasons to the Chairman why I would consider this place as the proper place for a county infirmary.

3443. Have you considered the question of an auxiliary asylum?—I have, more or less.

3444. Would you be in favour of that?—No.

3445. Why?—Because I think it would increase the taxation.

3446. Would you be in favour of all the harmless idiots in the county being taken here?—No.

3447. Mr. Mealey.—Don't you find that insanity is very much on the increase in the County Donegal?—Unfortunately, it is.

3448. And sooner or later a very large addition must be made to the present asylum?—They are putting an addition to it at the present time.

Sept. 25, 1893.
Mr Philip
Carroll.

3440. I mean a further addition?—That is only an-
telpectation.

3450. But it is certainly congested at present?—It is
stated so.

Mr Hugh
McGiverty.

3452. Mr. McFadden.—You are Chairman of the
Board of Guardians and also a member of the County
Council?—Yes.

3453. CHAIRMAN.—You are against breaking up the
Letterkenny Union?—No, sir. I did not consider
what unions in the county should be broken up. I
have not thought of that aspect of the question, but I
am in favour of amalgamation.

3454. In favour of amalgamation generally?—Yes.

3455. You are a Guardian of Letterkenny Union?—

Yes, sir.

3456. Are you in favour of breaking up the Letter-
kenny Union?—I have not thought of that. I have
not considered the geography of the county sufficiently
to say which union should be broken up in order to
consider the accommodation of the sick poor hereafter
transferred from one union to another.

3457. But as regards your own union here, what
would your view be. Would you like to see it broken
up and divided, say, between Millford and Strabane,
as Mr. Carroll suggested?—No, beyond this, that if
you consider the question of an auxiliary asylum or
county infirmary, I would say there is no other work-
house in the county more suitable or central than Letter-
kenny would be for either purpose; but as regards
any other aspect of the question, I think, unless it was
going to be converted into an auxiliary asylum or
county infirmary, there is no other union workhouse
in the county that gives better accommodation to the
sick poor; and they are better treated than in any other
workhouse, because I see the cost of maintaining a
pauper in the workhouse at the present time is more
than in any other workhouse, consequently I come to
the conclusion that they are better treated. It is
5s. 6d. in the body of the house, and 3s. 6d. in the in-
firmary. I believe it is 3s. 7d. on the average, and I
believe that is higher than in any other workhouse
in the county.

3458. So far as food goes?—I have asked for that,
and I got no answer as to whether it was for the best
of food or not. The dietary scale has been largely im-
proved.

Mr. S. R. Watkiss.—Food and clothing.

3459. Mr. McFadden.—That accounts for the increase
in rates from the standard year?—Yes; it is much
higher than when I first became a Guardian. I re-
member when the cost of maintenance was only 8s. 4d.
in the body of the house, and 2s. 6d. in the infirmary.

3460. CHAIRMAN.—You would not be in favour of
breaking up the Letterkenny Union unless you were
first satisfied that the premises could be used either as
a county infirmary or an auxiliary lunatic asylum?—
Individually, I have not considered the matter, but on
a general principle, I believe it is one of the most
central unions in the county, and unless it was going
to be converted into either of those, it would be a mis-
take to break up Letterkenny Union.

3461. But if it were used for either of those purposes
it would first have to be broken up?—Yes; I should
say it should be broken up.

3462. If you could use it for either of those pur-
poses?—I would.

3463. Supposing it was broken up and converted into
an auxiliary asylum or county infirmary, how would
you divide Letterkenny Union among the surrounding
unions?—I have not thought of that aspect.

3464. But this addition, I suppose, will remedy that
congestion?—It is to be hoped there will be no more
additions required.

CHAIRMAN.—Have you any witnesses for the union?
Mr. McFadden.—The Chairman is here.

Mr. HUGH McCHARTER examined.

3465. You know, of course, the geography of the
union?—I know some divisions would be very con-
venient to Millford, Ballymacool, Castleway—

3466. Letterkenny itself?

Mr. Mackay.—And Gortaveen?—Certainly; the
other portions certainly would be more convenient to
Stranoclar.

3467. CHAIRMAN.—Anything on the far side of the
hill, say south of Letterkenny, Glenties?—Yes, por-
tions such as Sencor and Kinsraig.

3468. Mr. McFadden.—What would you do with
your own division?—Dunfarnaghy would be the most
convenient for Garra, Churchill, and Templegladagh.

3469. CHAIRMAN.—But if Dunfarnaghy were to be
closed, where would you send them?—I think there is
very little likelihood of both Letterkenny and Dun-
farnaghy being both closed.

3470. Mr. McFadden.—I suppose you would bring
them to Letterkenny?—I could not say where they
would be brought until we hear which are going to be
disclosed. I think Letterkenny Workhouse would be
most convenient for the paupers of Dunfarnaghy.

3471. You would send Tory Island to Sligo?—I don't
think Tory Island sends many paupers to any work-
house.

3472. CHAIRMAN.—Is there anything more you would
like to say?—With regard to tramps, I consider they
are a great burden on the various unions, but on Letter-
kenny in particular, because I believe it is a very
central place here, and more tramps come along to this
union perhaps than to any other union in the county;
and at the time of the training of the Militia, there
is a special reason why so many of them come here.
These men are not in the receipt of any pay when they
come here; eventually they are, and I think it is a
great hardship on the ratepayers of this union that
they have to support militia tramps for two or three
nights.

3473. I suppose the town would rather have them
and give them the two or three night's accommodation
than lose them altogether?—Portion of the town-
people, but not all.

3474. Mr. McFadden.—The Guardians made a re-
commendation that the Government should pay for the
maintenance of all paupers over sixty?—Yes.

3475. An old-age pension?—Yes.

3476. The present infirmary at Millford is rather in-
convenient for patients from Millford, Letterkenny,
and Dunfarnaghy?—Any institution at one side of the
county must necessarily be inconvenient.

3477. With the new railway service it is very con-
venient for patients from Dunfarnaghy and Millford to
come here?—Yes.

CHAIRMAN.—I see they send patients from Dun-
farnaghy by train through Letterkenny.

Mr. McFadden.—Yes, fever patients.

CHAIRMAN.—It is not a usual thing to send the sick
by train?

Mr. McFadden.—No. These are the only Letter-
kenny witnesses present.

Mr. JOHN MALLIN.—Would you mind taking my
evidence about the hospital in Ramoth?

Mr. JOHN MALLIN examined.

3478. CHAIRMAN.—Are you acting professionally?—
No, I am one of the governors. I sent you in a state-
ment.

3479. Will you kindly give the statement in evi-
dence?—With regard to the foundation of the hos-
pital—scene, of course, of this evidence, sir, is by re-
pute.

3480. This is what you believe to be the case?—Yes,
and what I ascertained by inquiry. It was erected by
the Grand Jury out of the county cess, and it has been

erected somewhere about 1830. A house was granted
of the site of it by Sir James Stewart, provided it was
used as a hospital. And somewhere about 1830 a
wing was added on account of an epidemic of cholera
that broke out at the time. It was out of the county
cess it was erected. The Grand Jury paid in their
cess a proportion according as the amount was at
times—they paid a proportionate part—for every 20
collected they paid 2s, but if there was no collection
at that time, we got no grant at all from the Grand

Mr. John
Mallin.

Sept. 26, 1871.

Mr. John Mallins.

Jury. Now under the Local Government Act all that the County Council is responsible for is all that was granted in the standard year.

3490. Dr. BROWN.—How much is that?—At this present moment—I asked that—the Secretary of the County Council may be able to tell me.

3491. CHAIRMAN.—Can you tell me whether the amount you receive from the county and from subscriptions, whether that fairly meets your expenditure?—Oh, it does.

3492. You are not struggling on in debt?—No.

3493. It meets your expenditure one year with another?—It is not in debt, and in my recollection it has not been in debt. I will give you the expense of the maintenance.

3494. First you might tell us what class of patients are treated there?—They are of a class that you would not call them absolutely destitute. Some of them are destitute. They are poor; some of them are able to pay.

3495. Suffering from what kind of ailments?—Generally, Dr. Paterson informs me, they consist of fever, pneumonia, inflammation of the lungs, and bronchitis. There are a great many operations performed. Of surgical operations, in 1861-62 there were nine operations and two fever cases.

3496. Is there an operating room there?—Not exactly made for the purpose. There are no instruments supplied to the hospital. He has to use his own.

3497. Has the doctor classified the operations for you?—No. In 1862-63 there were 11; in 1863-64 there were 1; in 1864-65 there were 6; in 1865-66 there were 4; in 1866-67 there were 6; in 1867-68 there were 2; in 1868-69 there were 3; in 1869-70 there were 5; in 1870-71 there were 3; in 1871-72 there were 2, and in 1872-73 there were 3. There have been fever cases; typhoid, measles, and scarlatina have been there in 1869, and in 1870, and in 1871.

3498. Dr. BROWN.—Are the other cases removed when you have scarlatina?—There are different wings; I am quite sure they are separated.

3499. Separate nursing?—The doctor gets £25, and the nurse something between £15 and £20.

3500. CHAIRMAN.—How many nurses?—One at present, but she has been trained under Dr. Paterson.

3501. Can you tell me how many patients there are at the present moment?—The number of patients in 1872-73 is three.

3502. What are they suffering from?—Scarlatina one was; I don't know what the other two are suffering from.

3503. Can you tell me from your personal experience about how many people are in that hospital as a general rule?—The average during the year would come to about six in all these years I have mentioned.

3504. Dr. BROWN.—The average number in the hospital of all kinds?—I think about that. There were seven one year. These operations would be a short time in.

3505. CHAIRMAN.—You take the names of patients, and you take your average of the number of names?—Yes.

3506. You don't take into question the duration of their stay in any of your statistics?—No. I will give you the expense of the patients in 1869.

3507. Each patient costs about?—£9 7s. 4d.; that is the average cost.

3508. But you don't say how long is the average duration of their stay?—No. In 1869, it was 29 10s. 10d.; in 1870, 65 7s.; in 1871, £12 10s., and in 1872, 28 11s. 3d.

CHAIRMAN.—I think we will ask the doctor, or whoever acts as registrar, to give us further particulars.

3509. Mr. HAYES.—Would you ask do any of these people pay in that hospital?—I don't think they do, as a rule; some of them may. I know one man who came in. He was an engineer on board a vessel that arrived there, and the owners of the vessel gave a subscription of five guineas to the hospital.

3510. CHAIRMAN.—The feeling of Ranelagh is strongly in favour of the maintenance of the hospital?—Yes, and the people of the district won't come to the workhouse; they prefer going to the hospital.

3511. What surprises me is that it is so little taken advantage of?—That speaks well for the health of the district. We have supplied new beds to the place ourselves by subscription, and got new mattresses and a new style of bed. Its position is very good, for there are no private dwelling-houses near it. Mr. Mackay is a good distance from it. There is only one house near it. It is in a very good position.

Mr. Mackay.—I don't object to it in the least; it is a very excellent institution.

Witness.—Ranelagh is a very large district. There were 3,625 in the last Census for the dispensary district.

3512. CHAIRMAN.—Do the people from the Millford Union use it?—They do. We have had Her Majesty's ships coming in there and sending men up.

3513. Is it no question of a union hospital at all; it is a county hospital?—Yes; it is not supported in any way by the parishes.

3514. Mr. Mackay.—If it be discontinued, I would suggest the propriety of having a better class of nurses, namely, trained nurses; not a girl that had to be educated. We had one before—a most excellent nurse—that saved my life in typhoid fever. I mean a trained nurse; not educated by the local district?—The expenses are very small of the staff—only £600 a year altogether, the nurses and doctor's fees. It is not equal to about the salary of the nurse in the Millford Workhouse. It includes medical attendance and medical comforts supplied, as well as good nursing. In 1868, it was £121 16s.; in 1869, £124 12s. 6d.; in 1870, £118 10s. 4d.; in 1871, £122 10s. 3d.; and in 1872, £128 2s. 9d.

3515. Mr. MURPHY.—There is a county contribution of £2 for every £1 collected?—It comes technically out of the county-at-large rate, and it can be divided now, as decided by the Chief Baron. I wish to impress on you that we have trained a number of nurses in that hospital.

3516. CHAIRMAN.—That I am sorry to hear?—I don't know what your reason is.

3517. You could not efficiently train nurses with an average attendance of from three to six people?—They go on.

Mr. Mackay.—When they go away from there and have gone to larger hospitals, they become great successes.

3518. Dr. BROWN.—You mean to say you give them a taste for it there?—Yes; we prefer doing that to taking in a paid one.

Mr. Mackay.—I am against the idea of operating upon an untrained fever patient.

CHAIRMAN.—Having unskilled nurses?

Mr. Mackay.—Yes.

CHAIRMAN.—I think you will find little difference of opinion on that.

Witness.—Where the means of the hospital cannot afford it. Under Dr. Paterson they turn out exceedingly well.

Mr. Mackay.—Yes, I agree, it is a great success.

Witness.—All the governors of the hospital are in favour of the being kept as a hospital, on account of its position and the objection of the poor people going to the infirmary.

Dr. CURRI examined.

3519. Dr. BROWN.—You are the Medical Officer of the fever hospital here?—Yes, sir.

3520. Mr. Mallins gave us some idea about this other hospital when it was erected. Do you know when it was erected?—It was before 1837.

3521. Was it before 1830?—It was originally a dispensary.

CHAIRMAN.—You may take it as the same time as Ranelagh.

3522. Dr. BROWN.—It was started out of the county one?—Yes.

3523. Or partly started?—Partly started; they gave twice as much as we collected.

3524. Then it was exactly on the same system as the Ranelagh hospital?—Yes.

3525. How is it supported at present?—We collect the subscriptions as before, but I believe the County Council give a fixed sum, calculated from the first year of the Local Government Act.

3526. Could you tell what the amount is?

Mr. R. S. WATERS.—£114 14s. 6d. per annum.

3527. You don't know how much they collect?

Mr. Waters.—Somewhere about an average of £49 a year. Last year it was £36 18s. 2d., and received

Dr. CURRI

SECT. 25, 1833.
Dr. Carr.

215 12s. 6d. from paying patients, and 25 contribution from the Royal Irish Constabulary sports, and 24 for interest—about 2175 altogether.

3518. You take nothing in but fever?—(Hfims).—Nothing but infectious cases, but occasionally a case has been admitted—an observation case. If there is nobody there we have had a few cases of the Constabulary that come in, on the clear understanding that they would turn out if any infectious case came in. They were just a few cases, very few indeed.

3519. How much do you charge the Constabulary?—13s. a day.

3520. CHAIRMAN.—Is it to people here?—Yes.

3521. Does that pay for them?—No, it does not. We have occasionally had cases from the Militia staff—infectious cases—and they paid more.

3522. Dr. BROWN.—Was 215 that you received last year covers all that?—No; that would be from the union here.

Mr. Walters.—215 covers everything received from paying patients, paupers, and others.

3523. Dr. BROWN.—How many patients had you last year?—In 1833 we had seventeen cases.

3524. Where were they from?—Principally from all over the union.

3525. Do you get any fewer cases from beyond the union?—No, they don't admit them.

3526. Although it is a county charge?—I should not say we don't admit them, but I don't think they have ever applied to be admitted. No case has ever been refused, but I don't think we have ever had a case outside the union.

3527. Do you think it should be a county charge when there is no benefit received by the county?—I think every case would be admitted. I am quite sure it would. I have no orders on the subject at all.

3528. Mr. Mackay.—It is looked upon by the county people as the union hospital?—No, I don't think it is looked at as connected with the workhouse.

3529. Dr. BROWN.—How do you get your cases brought in?—There is the ambulance.

3530. Who works the ambulance?—The Guardians hire it and pay for it; it is their ambulance.

3531. That does not come out of your funds?—No.

3532. CHAIRMAN.—They pay it a day for the patients and bring them in to the addition?—Yes.

3533. Dr. BROWN.—About your staff—you have a nurse and attendants?—Yes.

3534. And if you have many cases, you get another nurse?—Yes.

3535. A trained nurse?—Yes; always trained nurses.

3536. People have no objection to go into the fever hospital?—No, I think not, particularly under the present name; she is very popular with the people.

3537. Do the people of the district go into it freely, when suffering from infectious disease?—Yes, as freely as they will leave their own houses, and they are never willing to do that; but it is much better of late years. They are going in more freely than they used to do.

3538. If your ambulance were good, could you bring your cases from beyond the union?—Certainly, the ambulance is at present very good.

3539. CHAIRMAN.—Four-wheeled?—No, two-wheeled; but there is a very good new stretcher alongside the bed, which is a great improvement. The ambulance itself is not very satisfactory.

3540. Dr. BROWN.—You never get cases from Danefaghly Union?—We had a soldier from Danefaghly, but I don't ever recollect getting cases from Danefaghly.

3541. That was in 1837 or 1838, when the troops were stationed there?—Yes.

3542. Mr. MURKIN.—Any patient in the institution now?—No patients.

3543. What is the average attendance for the year?—Seventeen last year. The average for the last five years was about eleven cases.

3544. Did they all come from the Union of Letterkenny?—I think so; in fact I am pretty sure they did all come.

3545. Dr. BROWN.—You have been a long time practicing in this district?—Yes, thirty years nearly.

3546. Have you found much objection among the patients to going into the workhouse hospital?—Yes, a good deal; there is a difficulty in getting them to go.

3547. They go much more freely to the fever hospital?—I think they do.

3548. What is the reason of that?—I suppose it is the name of going into a workhouse—pauperism.

3549. You think that if there was a hospital separate from the workhouse, they would go in much more freely?—I am quite sure they would.

3550. Therefore the usefulness would be a good deal extended?—Yes.

3551. CHAIRMAN.—In your practice, no doubt, you have met a great many cases of phthisis?—Yes.

3552. There is no provision at all for the treatment of such cases in any part of the county?—Except in the county infirmary.

3553. That is at Lifford?—Yes.

3554. Then, of course, they are rather close to the other patients?—Yes, I think there is no isolation.

3555. Is there much consumption on this side of Danefaghly?—No; there is not in my district, certainly.

3556. In the records of deaths that you keep, are the number of deaths from consumption considerable?—No, I don't think they are. I have very few cases myself, perhaps one or two a year.

3557. You don't meet with many cases in your ordinary practice?—I do not. There are a great many cases which I don't think are at all. Any wasting disease they put down at once a consumption among themselves. I have very few cases that I could certify.

3558. And that were certified by medical men as consumption?—Yes; there were a good many in the asylum, but it has diminished recently.

3559. Where would these people come from?—From the county-at-large.

3560. Do you know any other district outside the union?—Yes; I practised at Rossmore.

3561. Of recent years can you tell us anything about the extent to which consumption prevails?—I am afraid I could not.

3562. We have received very startling evidence in a great many parts of the country, such as Millfield?—I did practice in that district and Bellaghy, but I don't remember a great many cases.

3563. Well, it is really startling the enormous number of cases dealt with, and the great number of deaths registered, certified by medical men.

Mr. Mackay.—I think, if I might mention, you will find it in the other side of the county—Killybegs, Ardara, and Glenties.

3564. Here you have not got much consumption?—No.

3565. And, as far as you are aware, there is not much of it in Millfield or Danefaghly?—No; my registry reports would be rather complicated by the asylum, but since we got the new heating apparatus in the asylum, there has been a marked diminution.

3566. Are they isolated there, the consumptive patients?—As far as possible they are.

3567. Dr. BROWN.—Could you let us know whether the asylum is much overcrowded or not?—It is; I could not give you the figures.

3568. CHAIRMAN.—Is it having regard to the extra space attached according to the regulation for each individual. That is the test, of course, of overcrowding?—Yes.

3569. Are the beds very close together?—Yes, and beds where they should not be at all—in the corridor.

3570. Dr. BROWN.—Are they building, or going to build?—They are building at present in their own grounds, I think, for 200 more patients.

3571. Will that relieve the overcrowding?—It will.

3572. Will it leave any space for future requirements?—Not very much, I am afraid, but just meet the present emergency.

3573. What is your idea of converting the workhouse into an auxiliary asylum?

CHAIRMAN.—Perhaps you would rather not say?—Well, I would not.

3574. You are in the position of being the visiting doctor?—Yes, and I have not considered it sufficient to give an opinion.

3575. Your committee has not expressed an opinion on the matter?—They have not. I don't think it has been a success where it has been tried.

CHAIRMAN.—It has only been tried in one place, and it has only been just started.

3576. Mr. MURKIN.—As a medical man, do you think the county suffers owing to the county infirmary being situated at the extreme end of the county?—I think it does.

3577. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think it would be better if it was in the centre?—I do; it is a very long way for people to go, and there is no way of providing them with means of travelling; there is no money allowed for it, and no ambulance.

3575 They have to come themselves?—Yes, and pay their own expenses.

3576 Dr. BIGGER.—Notwithstanding its inconvenience, is it not well availed of?—I think so, and it is a very nice order.

3577 Most it is not doing a considerable amount of good?—It is; there is no doubt about it. A few months ago Dr. Boyd could not take in some cases I wanted to send.

3578 Instead of removing the county infirmary you want another infirmary?—Yes.

CHAIRMAN.—We saw it yesterday, and were very much pleased with it. There were a great many patients in it.

3579 Dr. BIGGER.—If you had a small infirmary here, would it meet the wants of the district?—It would be a great help, certainly.

Mr. MACKAY.—It is like the county workhouse—it is one-sided—at the other side of the county.

CHAIRMAN.—I was going to say that when there are no cases in the hospital, the nurses is available for private or district nursing; helps with cases in the locality.

Mr. SAMUEL WATERS examined.

3580 Mr. MACKAY.—You are the Clerk of the Milford Union?—Yes.

3581 And you are also, of course, Clerk of the District Council?—Yes.

3582 I believe, on receipt of this letter of the 17th of July, 1903, containing the queries, it was placed before the District Council at their meeting in July?—Yes; at the quarterly meeting in July.

3583 Was that a largely attended meeting?—Yes, it was pretty large.

3584 At what stage of the meeting was this letter and the queries submitted?—The business was partly finished at the time, at least the quarterly business.

3585 Certain replies were given to these queries?—Yes.

3586 Those replies, generally speaking, were in favour of closing Milford?—Yes.

3587 I see they answered these queries not only as far as their own workhouse was concerned, but they generally answered for the whole County Down?—That was.

3588 Queries 1 and 2 seem to be answered together, and the answer was this:—"That Drommaghy, Stranabally, and Milford Workhouses should be closed as such, and the paupers transferred to Letterkenny, and that either of the closed workhouses should be made an auxiliary asylum for the treatment and care of idiots and harmless lunatics. That Ballyshannon and Glenfinn be closed, and paupers transferred to Donagh. That Inishowen be left open, and the paupers of Derry No. 2 be transferred there. Generally, that the paupers of Stranabally No. 2 and Stranabally might be disposed of between Letterkenny and Donagh." They answered all the queries in regard to the County Down, and have taken away your prerogative.

CHAIRMAN.—They committed suicide, I see; it is unusual.

Mr. MACKAY.—Perhaps it was to save themselves from slaughter. Then you have No. 3; they answered that—"That while this Council strongly advise and recommend the amalgamation of workhouses, and are altogether opposed to the amalgamation of unions, and they are of opinion that the controlled workhouses should be managed by a committee constituted in proportion to the cost of paupers incurred from each union. That the Boards of Guardians, as at present constituted, should administer in each rural district the Poor Relief Acts so far as medical charities and outdoor relief are concerned. That any portion of a union forming a rural district, but attached to another county as part of a Poor Law Union, should be constituted a separate Poor Law Union for above purposes, or attached to one in the county. That all aid be thrown on the rates for relief, who generally form the tramp, and casual class, should, if possible, be maintained out of workhouses, and educated and taught trades, which would enable them to be self-supporting in after life?"—Yes.

3589 "4.—That this Council unanimously resolved that in view of the abuses which have crept into the granting of outdoor relief since the passing of the Local Government Act, when this relief became a small-charge change, that the chargeability of outdoor relief should revert to an electoral-division change?"—Yes.

3590 CHAIRMAN.—She never stays out at night?—She does, sometimes.

3591 Dr. BIGGER.—But she would come in immediately if she knew of a case coming in?—Oh, of course. It is altogether under my directions.

3592 CHAIRMAN.—Are her earnings put to the credit of the hospital?—Her earnings go to the hospital, but they are very small. A good many people cannot pay anything.

3593 Dr. BIGGER.—But you believe in the nurses being occupied?—Yes.

Mr. MACKAY.—The same applies to Ramelton, for the nurse there attended upon me.

Witness.—We always get a second nurse from Omagh, or somewhere. We had a case this year.

3597 Mr. MURPHY.—Do you find they send you good nurses from Omagh?—Yes, very superior.

3598 Dr. Thompson is skilled in his education?—His training of nurses is first rate. I think Miss Hayes is above the average in that work.

CHAIRMAN.—Now, Mr. Mackay, is there any witness you would like?

3599 CHAIRMAN.—Can you tell us what the total expenditure on outdoor relief was in 1897?—I know hardly it has increased very considerably.

3600 How much is it at present?—There are about sixty at present on outdoor relief, and there were only six or seven on an average. It is ten times, and over that.

3601 And to what do you attribute that increase?—It just appears to be the same class of people, and I cannot tell you; owing to its being a union change the Guardians don't take the same interest in it.

3602 Mr. MURPHY.—Has the increase in outdoor relief lessened the number of inmates in the union?—Not in the least; it is just the same. The parties getting outdoor relief would not come into the workhouse.

3603 Do you think people get it that are not entitled?—No, they are all pretty deserving people; old people, as a rule, over sixty-five.

3604 CHAIRMAN.—Cases of poverty more than destitution?—Yes.

3605 Mr. MURPHY.—Then the new bodies give more care to the destitute poor outside than the old?—They do, sir.

3606 Mr. MACKAY.—And that is regardless of religious denominations altogether?—Oh, yes, they never take that into consideration.

CHAIRMAN.—I should not have dreamt of thinking of such a thing. New No. 3.

3607 Mr. MACKAY.—They answered that—"This Council is of opinion that the workhouses, infirmaries, and fever hospitals should be maintained, and that the general hospital accommodation at such workhouse should be enlarged and improved, and put upon such a footing that they would be recognised as district hospitals suitable for the reception and treatment of any case of accident or common temporary ailments, as well as infectious diseases."

3608 CHAIRMAN.—That would mean a considerable expenditure?—Of course it would.

3609 And the proposal really comes to this, that the workhouse as such should be abolished?

Mr. MACKAY.—This is the District Council's answer.

CHAIRMAN.—It is the Guardians, of course?

Mr. MACKAY.—In a moment you will see how the Guardians answered.

3610 CHAIRMAN.—Oh, they differ?—Yes, they differ.

CHAIRMAN.—They are the same body?

Mr. MACKAY.—They are the same body, but they seem to differ. One meeting was held in the boardroom and the other in the Town Hall of Milford, and it makes all the difference in the world where they meet. They answered No. 6:—"That the establishing of one or two of the closed workhouses as asylums for the reception of idiots and harmless lunatics already maintained in the workhouse, would not only ensure economy in administration, but would relieve to a great extent the congestion in the county asylums by the transferral from those of such cases, and as prevent the necessity for the enlargements of that institution, so often called for in recent years, entailing heavy expenditure and increased rates." No. 7:—"That the Council is of opinion that the Guar-

No. 4. 28. 1903.

Dr. Carr.

Mr. Samuel Waters.

Sept. 21, 1900
Mr. Samuel
Watkins

dians should have power to fix a scale of payments for the treatment of sick and insane in hospitals, according to the means of the person or relatives of the person so treated." No. 8:—"That the amalgamation of workhouses will tend greatly to settle the tramp or casual question, upon the supposition that no part of the closed workhouses shall be used for any purpose except as hospitals, or any other useful or public purpose, as may be settled by the Commissioners. That the managing body of the centralized workhouse, or their executive officer, should have power to commit to jail any person refusing to carry out any task allotted to him or her in consideration of the temporary relief afforded to them." Then it was resolved, on the motion of Mr. A. Gallagher, seconded by Mr. McDermott, that Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Hayes be appointed to give evidence on behalf of the District Council at the forthcoming Poor Law Inquiry. The Guardians have made a different case, and appointed three of their body to appear.

CHAIRMAN.—Are you appearing for both?
Mr. Mosley.—No. Mr. McFadden is solicitor for the District Council and also for the Guardians, and I am also for the Guardians.

CHAIRMAN.—There be exercised a wise discretion in running away before trying to reconcile the answers.

3611. Mr. Mosley.—I think he would have led upon a line by which we could see daylight, but he had to go to the Revision Sessions. I have got a map prepared. (Proceeds.) There are thirteen electoral divisions, and this gives you the number of miles from the different places. (To Witness).—You have been Clerk of this union for how long?—Seventeen or eighteen years.

3612. CHAIRMAN.—These are from central points in the electoral divisions?—I took the extreme end, I think.

3613. Mr. Mosley.—Before you were clerk of the union, I think you were assistant to the late clerk, Mr. William Reid?—Yes.

3614. Had you not had some years ago a rather large outbreak of fever in the Farned district?—Yes, a few years ago, at Ballymahoney.

3615. And I believe you had considerable difficulty in coping with it?—Yes.

3616. And I believe a number of patients died before they were brought to the hospital?—Several died.

3617. And a number who were brought to the hospital died?—Yes.

3618. CHAIRMAN.—Were nurses sent to their homes?—No.

3619. Dr. Rogers.—Did any die in the ambulance?—No; they did not remove them unless the doctor certified they were able to be removed.

3620. CHAIRMAN.—If you don't think it would cause any inconvenience, I would like to ask Mr. Watkins the point of difference of opinion between the Rural District Council and the Guardians in answering these queries?—The members who answered both are here, and I think I could hardly tell you.

Mr. THOMAS HAYES, J.P., continued.

Mr. Thomas
Hayes

3622. Mr. Mosley.—You are Chairman of the Milford District Council?—Yes.

3623. And also a member of the County Council?—Yes.

3624. CHAIRMAN.—And, of course, of the Board of Guardians?—Yes.

3625. Mr. Mosley.—You know the Union of Milford very well indeed?—I do. I drafted the answer to the queries for the District Council, and I may say it is a matter of very great surprise to me now that there have been different answers given by the Guardians.

3626. You were not present when they were given?—No; and there was a distinct understanding when those answers were drawn that the union answers should be the same.

3627. That is by those who were present?—Yes.

3628. How many members are there on the District Council?—Fifty-one.

3629. I think I am right in saying they are the same men who form the Board of Guardians?—Yes.

3630. CHAIRMAN.—There is no urban district in the union?—No.

3631. Mr. Mosley.—How many were present when you gave the answers to the queries?—About fourteen. There was, of course, a summons issued for the day.

3632. Mr. MURKIN.—What is about the average weekly attendance of the Council?—I would say about fifteen on a day that there is a meeting summoned.

3633. There is a distinct difference?—Yes, quite a difference altogether.

Mr. Mosley.—One section wants the workhouse maintained as it is while in favour of amalgamation. They admit amalgamation should take place in other districts, but they say, having regard to the location of Milford, it ought to remain as it is if not enlarged.

CHAIRMAN.—And the District Council would by break it up and deal with it as may be found best.

3634. Mr. Mosley.—Exactly, subject to the evidence that is brought before you. There are no tram facilities—I think I am right in saying, with the exception of Tarnam—for the purpose of bringing patients to Letterkenny?—The nearest tram station is Tarnam, the upper end of our union.

Mr. Mosley.—And having regard to the way Donegal has been opened up with railways by the State, I don't think there is much chance of any other railway.

CHAIRMAN.—You have some motor service?

Mr. Mosley.—They are off to-morrow, at a dead loss to the guardians who started them.

CHAIRMAN (to Witness).—The Commission will sit you later on to give them some statistics.

Mr. Mosley.—I got him to make out the general expenditure for some years.

3635. Mr. MURKIN.—What is the number in the institution at the present time?—Seventy-four.

3636. Of the seventy-four, how many in the infirmary?—The average is twenty to twenty-five; sometimes something less.

3637. Many are bodied in the hospital?—No, they are practically none, unless those who are doing a bit of work in the way of attending the sick; they are kept very busy.

3638. CHAIRMAN.—You have a very good fever hospital?—Yes; accommodation for sixty in it.

3639. Mr. MURKIN.—Any in it at present?—I think there is one case at present.

3640. What would be the average annually?—The average is pretty small. Sometimes there would be six or seven, and there might be a month, or two or three months, with none at all.

3641. CHAIRMAN.—In the Farned outbreak you had a large number, and then for months there would be none?—Yes.

3642. Mr. MURKIN.—What staff have you?—A trained nurse and wardmaid. The trained nurse acts as night nurse in the infirmary when there are no patients. When patients come in we send for a trained nurse from Dublin or Belfast. We have a trained nurse at present doing night duty in the infirmary, and another nurse as well.

3643. Dr. BIGGER.—You cannot get a trained nurse nearer than Belfast?—No, we had to wire to Dublin and Belfast. We had a great deal of trouble getting the present nurse. We have tried O'neill and Derry, and could not get them.

3644. Mr. Mosley.—It has been mentioned to me that this was brought up at the end of your quarterly meeting at the District Council, which was held in the Town Hall, Milford?—Yes.

3645. CHAIRMAN.—Some of those who had been present, I believe, had gone home?—Oh, certainly.

3646. There were fourteen present at the time?—Twelve or fourteen.

3647. Mr. Mosley.—Then it was agreed by those who were present that the answers which the Board, as a Board of Guardians would give, should be the same?—Yes; the Chairman of the Board of Guardians was present at the time, and agreed that the answers given by the Guardians should be the same.

3648. Of course, if in the meantime they heard any thing, there was no agreement that they should not change their minds?—I think it is really a matter that won't bear discussion; it is better to pass over it.

3649. You have heard these answers read out. They represent your own opinion and of those who met there?—Certainly.

3650. CHAIRMAN.—And you are still of that opinion?—I am; I go further. My own personal opinion is even more in advance of the answers to the queries as to the amalgamation of the workhouses.

3651. Mr. MURKIN.—Was the Council even that this question would be considered at the meeting?—Certainly, on special notice.

3651. CHAIRMAN.—How far does your opinion go?—That there should be one workhouse for the county. There are eight workhouses, and I would clear out the body of the house in seven of those eight, and fix one of the workhouses of the county as a central institution for the reception of such able-bodied males and females.

3652. What workhouse would you select as the central workhouse?—Stranorlar is the most central in the county.

3653. And you would send to that the healthy and infirm?—None of them.

3654. I am not talking of the sick, but the healthy aged and infirm. Would you send all of them from the other workhouses to Stranorlar?—That would be a question as to their fitness for removal; if fitted to be removed, yes.

3655. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Your idea of a central workhouse is more for able-bodied people?—Able-bodied people and children.

3656. Not for people over sixty-five years of age, infirm?—Most of those are on the books of the present infirmaries.

3657. CHAIRMAN.—You would find a very large proportion that are not. Now, for instance, in Ballyshannon there are 67 aged and infirm; in Donegal, 19; Dromahaire, 21; in Inishowen, 31; in Letterkenny, 40; Milford, 21; and Stranorlar, 11, who are not in the infirmary, and who are classed as aged and infirm in the body of the house; that would make up a big institution. You would send that class, as well as the able-bodied, say women with children. You would send all those to the central workhouse?—I would.

3658. Do you see any objection to doing so?—Only that the numbers would overcrowd it.

3659. Assuming the numbers would not, as I do not suppose they would, assuming that the numbers would not overcrowd Stranorlar Workhouse, you would be in favour of sending them there?—I would; I don't see any objection.

3660. Do you think many of these people would be visited by their relatives and friends?—No.

3661. People who are aged and infirm, and very old, you don't think it would be cutting them off?—Once they go to the workhouse they are left alone; there are very few visits paid to them.

3662. And, therefore, there would be no very great hardship in sending them off?—No.

3663. Are many of them buried as workhouse inmates, or are they in the end taken out?—My recollection is that they are almost all buried in the workhouse premises.

3664. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—If this idea of yours was carried out, that is to take into the central institution people that are not actually infirm and sick, do you not think that in the course of a very short time those aged people would become infirm and ill and have to be shifted about. There would be a good deal of expense in the changing?—Yes, there is something in that.

3665. You did not take that into consideration?—No; but if my idea was carried out, and the body of the house cleared out, then I say there is plenty of room to treat these old healthy people as occasion would arise.

3666. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Marnaghan's point, of course, is very serious. Assuming you send 500 people to Stranorlar, and some of them get ill, where are you going to treat them?—My idea was to keep the infirm in the workhouse infirmary.

3667. Then you would have very few to go to the central workhouse?—I make out from the statistics I got, through the kindness and courtesy of the clerk at Milford, that there would be twenty able-bodied males.

3668. Did you include the aged and infirm in that?—Mr. S. Watters.—Yes.

Witness.—In Ballyshannon there is one, in Donegal three, of Class 1.

Mr. S. Watters.—I took them from the classification in the admission and discharge book.

3669. CHAIRMAN.—Have you the answers from Letterkenny?—I have. On Saturday, August 1st, in classification 1, two.

3670. And those are tramps only—able-bodied tramps—practically not inmates at all. What were the headings you sent out asking for those returns? (Witness produces document).

Mr. S. Watters.—I adopted the admission and discharge book classification for the purpose of giving the clerk of the union as little trouble as possible.

3671. CHAIRMAN.—I am afraid that return does not give anything we could build on. The sick are very large, and the aged and infirm, and you have very few

of any other class?—I have 479 aged and infirm and adults of either sex above fifteen years of age not working in the eight workhouses in the county.

3672. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Do you not think it would be an unsuitable arrangement to have the children in such close proximity to the able-bodied persons?—I do. I think the children, once they are taken into a central institution, ought to be left there, and the workhouse converted into an industrial school, where they would be taught trades, and any other occupations suited for them in after life.

3673. I understood your idea was to have one workhouse in the county, and have it utilised for able-bodied persons and children. Do you think it would be a proper thing to put children in such close proximity to these able-bodied persons?—I think, if discipline was maintained in the house, there should be no contact with them at all. I don't see why there should not be as perfect separation as there is between males and females.

3674. Do you not approve of the system of boarding out children?—I do not.

3675. Have you ever tried it?—We have one case in Milford. It is only the very poorest of the poor who would take children, and I don't see, in my experience of life, that they are fit people to bring them up or educate them.

3676. Are you aware it has been tried in neighbouring institutions similar to your own, and it has been found very successful, and there is no difficulty whatever in getting suitable foster parents. We have tried it in Omagh, and all the children that the law will permit us to board out are boarded out. We find it not only economical but very beneficial as regards the children?

Mr. B. S. Watters.—And it has worked very well in Letterkenny.

3677. CHAIRMAN.—Your idea was to have another closed workhouse as an industrial school?—Yes.

Mr. Marnaghan.—It so happens that labour is difficult to get, and small farmers will be glad to get a grown-up boy or girl on reasonable terms.

Witness.—That can only be applied to a limited class of children—orphans.

CHAIRMAN.—It comes to a large number when you set them up all over the country, orphan and deserted. I think, Mr. Hayes, when you go back, after hearing what Mr. Murnaghan and Mr. Watters have said, you will look into it.

3678. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—How many children have you in your house?

CHAIRMAN.—The total in the workhouse on the day we took it, in midsummer, was seventy-five altogether. There were six children over two years of age.

3679. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Have you a schoolmaster?—We have.

3680. If these children were boarded out you could get rid of that official?—Yes.

3681. CHAIRMAN.—You don't pay her much!—According to the cards that I sent out, the workhouse accommodation of the county is 4,450, exclusive of the fever hospital, and on that particular day there were only 665 persons in the workhouses. I think that makes a very good case for dissolution.

3682. It does, but that old standard of accommodation—I don't know how it was made up, but it is not according to present notions at all—allowing proper space for beds, or floor space as distinguished from cubic space, we could not get anything like that number of people into the workhouse, and then it is subdivided for classification. In some classes you will have it pretty full; for infirm and sick there is not enough room. In other classes there is room after room vacant and empty. You would find it hard to transfer the infirm and sick to the garrets and other portions of the house?—I think something should be done towards improving the hospital accommodation.

3683. Have the Guardians taken any steps in that direction themselves?—They have improved the infirmary sheds, which used to be disgraceful, and they are made fairly comfortable now.

3684. You mean the back wings that stretch out from the kitchen?—Yes; and they are awaiting the result of the Commission to make further improvements.

3685. If they survive?—Yes; but they think some economy should be made in order to enable them to do so without increasing the expenses to the ratepayers.

3686. Have you any idea on that subject?—The idea is to close the body of the house and get rid of the salary of the officials. Of course, I don't come here

Sept. 20, 1903.
Mr. Thomas
Hayes.

with the view that one of the witnesses had this morning, that the officials receive £4 to £5, because in Milford it is quite the other way. The persons cost £374, as against £421 for the officials yearly.

3687. Mr. MURPHY.—Is the expenditure on your union only £3,000?—That is all on salaries, rations, food, and clothing.

3688. CHAIRMAN.—I don't know whether you have gone into that very strictly or not?—That is exclusively for the house.

3689. You took in the clerk of the union?—I did, but not the relieving officer.

3690. Did you put down the whole of the clerk's salary, although he has other duties to discharge?—I did.

3691. You might even diminish it lower?—I might. 3692. Well, according to your idea, you would save a great deal in salaries if you could close the body of the house and dispense with certain officers?—Yes, and I think we would get more efficiency as well.

3693. It would be all one class in the institution, and supervised by nurses and a matron?—A nurse matron. I read Dr. Warrack's evidence at Derry on the fever-nursing question, and, as representing the Milford Council, I wish to endorse in the strongest manner the suggestions he made.

3694. What did you take his suggestions to be?—That the fever nurses of the county should be put under the management of the county infirmary, or a central committee, in order to avoid the expense of bringing down assistant nurses from Dublin when they were required, and at the same time replace six out of

eight head nurses in the county having nothing to do. I think it was a very valuable suggestion. I think it is quite safe to say these nurses have nothing to do nine months of the year.

3695. In your hospital you have got them helping in the infirmary?—Yes, for extra pay—£22 a year extra. Unfortunately, when the fever nurse was appointed, there was no attempt to get an agreement with her that she should do night work, or do work in the infirmary.

3696. Did you try out your power with her. You seem to have given in rather early?—Once she was appointed, we thought we could not do so.

3697. Dr. BARNES.—What was her salary?—£23 on the day of her appointment.

3698. That is supposed to include rations?—£26 and 420 for rations.

3699. What does she get now?

Mr. S. WATERS.—She was appointed at £20, and £15 for rations. They give her 10s. a week while she is doing night nursing.

Witness.—It was a question whether we could compel her or not. There is one other point that I wish to draw the attention of the Commission to, although I don't know that it is within the province or scope of the Inquiry—I think it is a very great anomaly—and that is the salaries that are paid medical officers in congested districts.

3700. CHAIRMAN.—Do you mean in workhouses?—No.

CHAIRMAN.—Well, we don't deal with dispensaries.

3701. Mr. MURPHY.—You have no trouble with your medical officers in this county?—None whatever.

Mr. Hugh
O'Donnell.

Mr. Hugh O'Donnell resumed.

3702. Mr. Mackay.—You are Chairman of the Milford Board of Guardians?—I am.

3703. Were you present at the meeting of the District Council at which these queries were answered?—I was.

3704. Mr. Hayes has stated that there was an agreement with those present that the same answers were to be given?

CHAIRMAN.—He said he thought it better not to go into that.

3705. Mr. Mackay.—Afterwards did you preside at a meeting of the Board of Guardians?—No, sir; not at the meeting at which these replies were adopted.

3706. Were you present at a meeting of the Guardians at which answers were given to the queries?—No.

3707. Do you know what answers were given by the Guardians?—I assume they were much the same as the ones given by the District Council.

CHAIRMAN.—Perhaps Mr. O'Donnell is not the witness you want on this point.

3708. Mr. Mackay.—"Resolved that we appoint Mr. Mackay and Mr. McFadden to attend the sitting of the Reform Commission."—Hugh O'Donnell, Chairman." And there is a postscript: "The Guardians are strongly in favour of this workhouse being retained."—Oh, I beg your pardon; I was at that meeting.

3709. Am I right in saying that at that meeting the members present were in favour of Milford being retained?—Yes, sir.

3710. And you were chairman of that meeting?—Yes.

3711. That may not have been your own individual opinion?—They seem to be unanimous.

3712. Did you, as a matter of fact, agree with those present or with Mr. Hayes?—I agree with the Guardians for this reason; of course, I agreed with Mr. Hayes in the first instance, but when I considered the matter further I should prefer to have the Milford Workhouse retained.

3713. The Commission would like to hear your reasons.—Of course it is far removed from any railway communication, and the distances to the further points of the union are very far; I would say eighteen miles, so that if the workhouse was closed it would be very difficult to bring patients to central workhouses or hospitals as the case may be, and besides, the population of the union is something about

20,000, I should say. Now, of that population very nearly half are occupiers under £4 valuation, 7,814, between £4 and £10 valuation the population is 5,879, so that nearly 14,000 of the 20,000, or about 70 per cent., are under £10 valuation. The valuation shows the unprofitable state of the land, because the valuation is £30,398; then the area is 111,354 acres, so that great parts of the union are completely unproductive, and if a bad year came, and crops failed entirely, all these small land-holders possibly might become paupers, and it would be well to have the workhouse converted instead of having to go away somewhere else. Besides, Milford is fairly central, considering the surrounding unions, and I think it should be retained for these reasons at least. I would agree with some of the previous speakers as to having central hospitals; say, if Letterkenny was converted into a hospital that the idiots and epileptics and harmless lunatics were taken from the different workhouses of the county, and even taken from the asylum as well, and put into an institution by themselves.

3714. Mr. Mackay.—You mean Letterkenny should be used as an auxiliary asylum, or feeling that, it should be used as a hospital?—I considered Letterkenny was the most central place, and, besides, being so close to the asylum, you could make it an auxiliary asylum.

3715. Do you think Milford, as a union, is capable, in the event of that taking place, of having a slice of Letterkenny added to it, and also a slice of Duffagh if they should be done away with?—Yes; the workhouse is capable of accommodating twice the number we have.

3716. CHAIRMAN.—You know the union very well, of course?—Yes; I do.

3717. You thought a great many of those people with very small valuations might become subjects for relief in bad years?—Yes.

3718. Now, workhouses are these centres of population of these very small holdings?—Paradise, the extreme north of the union; Ballywhoriskey, and Rosgill.

3719. Do you happen to know how much the people earned in Rosgill and Ballywhoriskey last year?—No, sir.

3720. Would you be surprised to know it was less than thousands—four or five times the rental. Nearly every family in Rosgill has a man at the fishing, and, similarly, Ballywhoriskey?—Well, I would not know from Mulroy to Tarnah.

3721. What is the population of Tarnant?—1,324; that is a large area. From that then to Malroy is congested; then Glencella and Kasekalla.

3722. It is all very thickly populated?—The bulk of the population will be in Fasad and Rosgull and

Glen; all these agricultural districts are poor of course, and, besides, they have not the facilities that you mention of fishing.

3723. Mr. Mackay.—They are less than £1 per man valuation?—Yes.

Nov 29 1903

No 1646
O'Donnell

Mr. JAMES A. DRUMMOND, J.P., examined.

Mr James A.
Drummond.

I am the oldest Guardian of the Milford Board of Guardians. I have been twenty-nine years there in my capacity as Guardian. I want to explain this supposed friction.

3724. CHAIRMAN.—I think we might shade over that after what Mr. Hayes has said; we will take it for granted that there has been a difference of opinion?—No, there was no difference at all; it was not on the agenda paper at all. No man living has a grudge against Mr. Hayes' accuracy than I have, but the notice did not appear on the agenda paper at all, and it was sprung at the tail end of that meeting. I was at the greater part of that meeting, and had gone; there was a funeral in the locality and the majority of the Guardians had to leave. That accounts for it.

3725. The subsequent opinion we may take?—The subsequent opinion was when they were properly represented and had time to consider it.

3726. Your opinion then is in favour of what was stated by the Guardians as distinguished from the District Council?—Most decidedly; I would consider it a great misfortune to disturb—

3727. You would like the existing state of things continued?—Certainly.

3728. Mr. Mackay.—Or enlarged?—Or enlarged.

3729. CHAIRMAN.—How would you enlarge?—Take part of Dunfinaghy, Cresslogh, and Arla.

3730. Mr. MURKHAM.—And part of Letterkenney?—And part of Letterkenney; but I would think it a most imprudent thing to disturb or interfere with Milford.

3731. CHAIRMAN.—You don't think it would do to bring people from Rosgull or Fasad here?—I would think it a very inhuman thing ever to bring them here or to Stranorlar or Dunfinaghy—it is a distance of eighteen miles. You should know the locality; and during my twenty-nine years as a Guardian of the Milford Union we have had several epidemics of fever in Fasad, and I have been in close touch with the doctor, and he accounts for the prevalence of fever by the refuse of fish, and the throwing of the refuse into the middens, which are in close proximity to the houses; that was his idea. We have had three very severe epidemics there; the last, in fact, lasted for months, and gave the authorities all they could do, and took them all their time, and the greatest energy was used in coping with it.

3732. If there was a cottage hospital, or district hospital, or some building sufficient for the requirements of the union, Dr. Rigger is anxious to know whether you would still have the same feeling about the able-bodied or infirm and aged?—I would still have the same feeling about the people you call able-bodied.

3733. I don't call them able-bodied, meaning that they are able-bodied, but they are classed as such?—I would still have the same feeling. There is one thing I would set myself totally against; it is out-door relief. Now with the new Board, which Mr. MURKHAM says speaks well for, they have encouraged that sort of thing and I disapprove of it. The cause of their encouraging it is because it is union raising; these people have their own pet favourites, and they recommended them to get out-door relief, and you are perhaps scratched by the party applying for out-door relief, or his relatives in the district; you button-hole me, and I button-hole the next man.

3734. A friendly feeling all round?—A friendly feeling all round, the thing has become a downright fraud.

3735. Mr. MURKHAM.—Do you think people are getting out-door relief who are not destitute?—I don't think it, but I am sure of it, and it is growing, and will grow, as long as union raising is in existence.

3736. Mr. Mackay.—Don't you admit that under the old regime there were some people who would not go into the workhouse, and who were deserving, get nothing, and now those people are training add?—How did these people subsist under the old system of doing things? I think the old bodies were as fit to care them as these new lights

3737. There is no doubt there are some people who are receiving out-door relief now who would have died had it not been for the kindness of their neighbours—I don't know how they pulled through in the old times.

3738. I know. I paid one old woman 2s. a week, and I believe she is receiving 1s. 6d. now or 2s. 1—There is another thing. With regard to the fever hospital, Ramelton, I was surprised to find two respectable professional men like Mr. Mallins and Mr. Mackay coming here to vindicate the character and uprightness of this institution. I know it for the last forty years, and you made a great mistake in intimating that you would drop in to see it. If you looked into it suddenly you would see it in its real state.

3739. CHAIRMAN.—You think there will be a good deal of polishing going on?—Yes; and these operations you heard of were principally tooth extractions.

3740. Mr. Mackay.—Were you ever in the hospital?—I never was, thank God, and I hope I never will; but I would think it a great waste of public money when there is a splendid hospital, with a trained nurse, within three miles of it at Milford.

3741. It is a proper workhouse?—A proper workhouse! What is Ramelton? All the patients I know to come into it were some waifs or strays that there was nobody to look after.

3742. You cannot say that; we had obsequies in it—I would be delicate in interfering with Dr. Patterson.

3743. We had national school teachers in it?—I would not like to interfere with Dr. Patterson's little emoluments; these Ramelton people are very clannish—one supports another in what will bring ruin to their mill. I would chuck out Ramelton Hospital, and I would do away, comparatively speaking, with out-door relief, unless in some deserving cases. And the tramp nuisance—they are going about making the workhouse hotels—I would have an inquiry about everyone.

3744. What would you do with them?—I would give them imprisonment—everyone,—a fortnight or a month, and let that get publicity, and at the end of three months they would make themselves scarce in that locality, and pass over.

3745. They might give you a look in in passing?—No, they would not come to the locality at all.

3746. You would not be afraid of their being a little troublesome?—No; they would not come through the country at all only for the accommodation.

3747. Mr. Mackay.—You read in the papers about a man refused admission in Stranorlar who proceeded to come to Conroy and went into Mr. Wier's fax mill and burned it down?—That was only a speculation; if he had not been in some workhouse he might before he would not be in the locality at all. One union should write to the other, and have means of communication, and give a description of these people, because they don't use their own names; they give fictitious names. We started giving them employment in Milford, and got hammers to break stones, and the first thing they broke was the shafts of the hammers; then we got iron handles and they did nothing at all; they were as long as one stone as you would be going from here to Milford and back again. I would think it a terrible undertaking to interfere or disturb the Milford Union as it exists at present.

3748. CHAIRMAN.—And you would like to go back to divisional rating?—Certainly. Milford is a coarse barren district; you are mistaken in supposing that the people in Rosgull are living in a second Klondike; there are 100 Scotch boats there and every one named with Scotchmen.

3749. Do you know how many boats there are there from the parish of Carrigrohilly and Ballybucklisky?—I have an idea of what the local people can do there.

Sep. 25, 1862.
Mr. James A.
Diamond.

3750. Mr. Mosley.—They have six boats altogether; boats that cost £120?—The curries are all Scotchmen.

3751. CHAIRMAN.—Any people in the locality can get as much work as they can do?—They are not skilled workmen.

3752. I beg your pardon, they are; it is because they cannot get them from the locality they import them?—

The only way they benefit the people of the locality is supplying them with food—butter, eggs, and bread.

3753. It is an enormous benefit?—I know it is; but it does not benefit the whole community.

3754. Mr. Mosley.—Along the shore it is a benefit, and also inland?—I would think it is a very inhuman thing to ask that a patient should be dragged away from

the bottom of Rosgull or any other portion round there to bring them beyond Millford; it is eighteen miles to Millford, and I think that is surely enough.

3755. CHAIRMAN.—There are only about ten people in the extreme end and about thirteen miles?—I find a lot of these men, that are agitating for breaking up unions, when it comes to the point they are all for preserving their own, and operating on other unions. I cannot see where it would be a saving to the rate, the hospitals should be maintained; and what would you do about the chaplains; they would derive nothing if the union was dissolved.

CHAIRMAN.—And you would be in favour of giving them something?

Mr. Matthew
Corey.

Mr. MATTHEW COREY examined.

3756. Mr. Mosley.—You are a member of the Millford Board of Guardians?—I am.

3757. And have been for a number of years past?—Twelve or fourteen years.

3758. You were present at the Board meeting at which these queries were answered?—I was present until about 8 o'clock in the evening, and I left then.

3759. That is the District Council you refer to?—Yes.

3760. But were you present at the meeting of the Board of Guardians at which the queries were submitted and answered?—I was.

3761. Do you approve of the queries as answered by the District Council, or as answered by the Board of Guardians?—I approve of the queries as answered by the Board of Guardians.

3762. Have you anything to add in addition to the queries?—On the hearing out of pauper children. I think it would be a great gain to board out pauper children; they become far better members of society afterwards; they are fit for hiring out when boarded out in respectable farmers' houses, and even in the small farmers' houses they get better training than in the workhouses; they will sooner get service out of a farmer's house than they would get out of a workhouse.

3763. CHAIRMAN.—Most likely kept on by the same man?—Yes, or even hired out by others, if the small farmers are not able to keep them, but they are very quickly picked up from a house in that way. We have often very great difficulty in getting a boy hired from the workhouse in Millford.

3764. Sometimes boys?—Yes; and people turn them back and say "We don't want them" when they know they are pauper boys.

3765. Mr. Mosley.—In addition to that point, is there anything else?—Well, I am in favour of amalgamation, but I am also in favour of keeping on the Board of Guardians in the district. I don't see how they could be represented. Supposing three or four unions were dissolved, and Stranorlar were kept on as a centre, I don't see how people from Farned could go there to represent the district, or even if Letterkenny was kept on they would not come to represent the people at Letterkenny; the whole system of representation would be better than having it from a centre.

3766. Do you mean to rule to the case of the election of a doctor?—I don't know how it could be managed otherwise.

3767. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think they would not go to the election?—On many occasions they would hardly go, from here—from the bottom of Farned—it is twenty-eight miles.

3768. I expect they would go further for an election, than for ordinary business?—They would not go at all.

Mr. Mosley.—If a man gets out of the way of going, even to his public worship, he thinks the distance a great deal longer than it is.

Mr. Diamond.—If the doctor was a member of the family they might go.

3769. Mr. Mosley.—Is there anything else?—The tramp nuisance is another thing I would like to refer to but I don't know how to get rid of them. In Millford there were 132 during the twelve months; they sometimes call there to pass on to a fair next day, or steal something next day. Half of the tramps going

about are regular thieves, and they are a very bad class of people; it is a pity the rates should be burdened with them at all; if there could be any means of dealing with them, when they appear in the street could not the police take notice of them.

3770. CHAIRMAN.—In the old times they used to be branded with a red-hot iron; that would be too severe?—Nothing could be too severe for a tramp. If they find a farm-house is deserted by the male, they make an assault on the females and demand drink or try to steal; they are the worst class of people I know.

3771. Mr. MURKIN.—Have you any idea of the cost of these tramps to that particular union in the year?—I cannot say.

3772. I suppose they would only stop a night?—Sometimes two nights.

3773. That would represent six months of an inmate; 150 or so?—About that.

3774. That would amount to £5 in the year?—It would be under that.

Mr. Diamond.—Some have nine in family.

3775. Mr. MURKIN.—It is not so much a question of money?—No; the bad example and the chance of doing harm in the country; they can start on a tramp from here to Cork, and they know they can be entertained at Omagh and Enniskillen, and so on.

3776. Unless you can extinguish them altogether don't you think it would be better to put them up for a night in the workhouse than to leave them in the locality at large?—If they are to be in existence at all I don't see any other way than of keeping them in the workhouse.

3777. CHAIRMAN.—The bidwell was suggested by one?—If they could be kept there I think they would be under stricter supervision.

3778. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you not think that if the Guardians had the power to keep them for a couple of days and work them pretty hard?—They have tried it at Millford and they would not work.

3779. Do you think there would be accommodation enough at Millford for some more inmates than there are at present?—There is a considerable accommodation at Millford; it would accommodate 500, and stay in the hospital; and there is only, at the present time, about an average of seventy-four in the workhouse—I think yesterday in the body of the house only sixty-two.

3780. Mr. Mosley.—It would accommodate 420?—It would.

3781. And, of course, then the inmates could be cheaper being a larger number?—Supposing Dunfaghy and Letterkenny were dissolved or used for any other purpose, Millford would be the best centre in my opinion. Letterkenny might be used for an auxiliary asylum or any other institution, whereas if Millford were shut up it would be a waste and work, used for nothing.

3782. CHAIRMAN.—Even if Millford were closed would something in the way of hospital accommodation be necessary at Millford?—I believe it would; from the outbreaks of fever we have sometimes in the northwest of the union I think it would be unwise to shut up the hospital.

3783. Mr. Mosley.—Either that, or enlarge Roseliff?—Yes; it is useful as far as it goes, but it does not go far. The chaplain's salary is a very heavy item in our union; there is £125 paid for seventy patients.

3784. Mr. DIAMOND.—Do you think they are drawing money under false pretences?—No; but it is one of the heavy items in our union; it amounts to about £1 13s. a head on the inmates in the union.

Mr. MURKIN.—If you had the place enlarged, and neighbouring divisions taken in, it would be a great saving that way.

3785. CHAIRMAN.—The chaplains would ask for an increase in their salary?—I don't think they would; they are fairly well paid; they are not unreasonable; they will take what they get; you cannot offer them much less than they have; they have to attend for a single inmate and at the same time they could do the same service for 500.

3786. Mr. MACKAY.—And we know it is as easy preaching and praying to a large audience as to a small one?—It is. There are a great many small holdings in the union under £4 valuation, and there is a big chance of a big number of the poor classes being brought to hospital for fever. It always breaks out among the poor class, and to take them to the hospital at a distance would be very inconvenient. I think myself Medical hospital would be necessary in any case.

Mr. THOMAS HAYES, J.P., further examined.

One of the points I wish to speak on was about outdoor relief. The District Council recommended we should go back to the electoral division rating, but I would say it ought to become a national one; and I also wish to impress upon the Commission the desirability of keeping the present Poor Law Administration areas intact, because I don't see how, if, say, Letterkenney, Dunsaghy, and Milford are amalgamated, I don't see which would be the closed workhouse of the three. I fail to see what sort of a Board of Guardians would assemble in any place for the election of a doctor; there would be about ninety members, and I am afraid the Medical Charities Act would not be properly administered under these circumstances. And there is another point with regard to the excessive rate upon poor electoral divisions which you touched on yourself, and, I think, a case of that kind is a proper case where the Government ought to come to the aid of the county and subsidise the rates in a poor electoral division.

3790. CHAIRMAN.—Don't you think it is a case where a lavishly rated division should come to the aid of its neighbours?—I don't know that it is the duty so much of these divisions as of the Government; these divisions are not so much responsible for the congestion in the poorer districts, but I am afraid the Government is.

3791. A good deal might be said from a great many points of view on that question?—It may be a burning question.

3792. At all events you think there would be no harm in getting some money from the Government, if you could, under that head?—To aid a poor electoral division, or a poor part of the county.

3793. And your grounds for doing so would be that the Government was responsible for the poverty?—No; for the congestion.

3794. For the excessive population?—For the excessive population.

3795. How do you make that out?—That is just where it comes to be partly a political question or a question of Government in the past; you might have to go a long way back to get at the root of it.

3796. To the Plantation of Ulster?—Yes; I think that is the cause of the congestion; and I would say the Government ought to come to the relief of the poor districts.

3797. Mr. MURKIN.—Is there any part of the country that is over-populated at all? I thought the whole cry was that the population was too small everywhere?—I don't know what would be the criterion of over-population; I would say that a country was over-populated where it had a population with a valuation of, say, 10s. per head, as against a country with a valuation of £5 per head.

3798. Then you go on the question of valuation, not of humanity?—On the fitness of the land to support the population.

3799. Mr. MURKIN.—Any means of over-population?—None but an ambulance.

3800. Mr. MACKAY.—You would almost agree with me that your sanitary officers don't carry out the Act in the way it ought to be carried out.

CHAIRMAN.—We have nothing to do with sanitary matters.

Witness.—Another thing I would be in favour of is divisional rating, in this way, that if anything turned up in any district or yours you would be more apt to attend to it and see that there was no waste of money, but if it was on the whole union you would say it is coming off broad shoulders and you don't care to interfere; you let it pass.

3801. Mr. MURKIN.—Well, saying is a very great virtue, but is there not something better than saying; might not that not detrimentally to the destitute poor, men in outside divisions might not wish to give the help to the divisions that they are not in, and a poor person might be denied the necessary assistance?—That is the drawback, I admit; but I am talking of the saving of the rates.

Mr. MACKAY.—That is all, sir, for Milford.

Sept. 28, 1903

Mr. Matthew Curry.

Mr. Thomas Hayes

3802. CHAIRMAN.—That is taking the land as the sole source of support?—Yes.

3803. Which is not the fact; it is only a supposition which may be convenient for arguments?—As a matter of fact the land is not the sole source of support in Meerragh.

3804. Therefore it is no use to take the valuation of land as a test of sufficiency of population?—Without outside aid, it must be.

3805. If people make a lot of money from labour elsewhere and from fishing and other matters?—That was not done without aid from Government and from the Congested Districts Board.

3806. You won't find any district where the valuation is very low per head where there are not very large means much in excess of the value of the land for the support of the population. Take the Rosser, Gweedagh, Cloughanagh, and you will find they have means of support other than the land?—I don't know what they are about Falcarragh.

3807. Of course you know they go away to earn money elsewhere and their children are hired out?—I know that, but then I think this country ought to be self-supporting.

3808. Mr. MACKAY.—They could not exist there unless they did earn elsewhere?—Yes.

3809. CHAIRMAN.—At any rate that is your view; that the Government ought to give assistance, and the Congested Districts Board?—There is the payment of the rates and the maintenance of the poor.

3810. Can you suggest how they could do it?—By increasing the Agricultural Grant.

3811. Or re-appropriating the Agricultural Grant. I don't say the Agricultural Grant but rather re-appropriating the Parliamentary Grants?—I would say it would be fairer to increase the Agricultural Grant.

3812. That is a fixed sum for a definite purpose?—Quite so; and Mr. Balfour decided that fixed sum upon a basis of expenditure that was in existence at the time the grant was given; that expenditure has increased since through no fault of the people.

3813. It has increased all over, but not relatively or particularly in the congested districts?—If it is admitted it has increased since then I would say it would be fair that the grant should be increased, and to go to the poorer parts of the country.

3814. Supposing that could not be done, and there are other grounds in proportion; suppose a union in Meath that strikes a rate of 4d. in the £ for Poor Law purposes, when compared with an area in West Donegal that strikes 4s. in the £, and suppose that union in Meath gets an enormous proportion of the Government grant, those that are very rich get most and those that are very poor get least, would you say that it would be only a fair thing to re-appportion that grant so that the man in Meath should get less and the man in the West of Ireland with small means

Sept. 20, 1903.
Mr. Thomas Hayes.

should get more than his present share; in fact that the present arrangement should not be the basis for apportionment, but necessity—I certainly think it would be fair; that is if the proportion of county expenditure was less in Meath than it is in Donegal.

3012. The amount spent on the workhouse would practically be the same in each place. There is not any very alarming divergence in the cost of workhouse inmates in one part of Ireland from that in another, but the men in Meath gets many times the amount of the Parliamentary grant that the men in West Donegal gets; that is that the rich men gets many times the amount the poor men gets. Do you think that fair?—I am afraid I would not think it fair. If he has a high valuation, and the workhouse cost is practically the same, he pays in proportion to it.

3013. Who pays in proportion?—The Meath man.

3014. You think it right that the Meath man should

get many times as much as the Donegal man?—I think it only fair.

3015. Although his rates are only 6d. in the £1. Still he has got a valuation that will bring it up far beyond the West Donegal man's rate, in proportion.

3016. Oh, his rates will be over so much lower. So away from the holding for a moment. The amount paid to the highly valued unions in Meath will be many times as large as the amount paid to Dursanagh or Glenties?—That is in consequence of its circumstances.

3017. The result of the present system is that the rich unions get the most and the poor unions get the least. Do you think that fair?—On the face of it, I would not think it fair.

3018. As you suggested Government assistance, I wanted to point out to you that there is another aspect of that question—the re-apportionment of existing grants?—It would be all right for the poor county, but I am afraid the rich one would growl.

Fr. William Delahy.

MR. WILLIAM DORRITY, J.P., CHAIRMAN.

3019. CHAIRMAN.—You are here for the County Council. We have had the benefit of hearing a good deal of your views in Derry. Since then, have you or the County Council come to any opinion what unions should be best broken up?—In Derry it was generally on the boundaries question. The opinion of the County Council was that they would break up four.

3020. Which were the four?—In our opinion we should retain Stranorlar, Donegal, Milford, Inishowen. They are those that are nearest to the fair division of the county, and in the centre of the county.

3021. You would keep up Inishowen?—Yes; but it is not because I live in Inishowen. Inishowen would include Derry No. 2; next would be Stranorlar, which would include Strabane No. 2, and would also take the greater part of Glenties. Milford would take the whole of Letterkenny and Derrybeg Union.

3022. Mr. MURPHY.—Would not that be a large stretch?—It would, but very little over a fourth of the county.

3023. CHAIRMAN.—Kilmacrennan would be the most central point, of course?—Yes, but Milford, the lowest being there already.

3024. How far is it from Kilmacrennan to Milford?—Five miles. Donegal would take Ballyshannon and Killybegs, Dungloe going to Stranorlar, and Glenties going to Donegal. I would not cut out many of the present boundaries of the union.

3025. What would you do with Ballyshannon?—It would go to Donegal, the portion of the County Donegal. I would say that the other counties should not allow any of their county to be in another county.

3026. Mr. MURPHY.—You adopt the principle that the county should be the unit?—Yes; and if we, as County Councils, are Councils of the county, we should be Councils of the whole, not part. We find it very odd to say we are losing a fourth of the county to Derry and Tyrone.

3027. CHAIRMAN.—You would put in part of the Glenties Union west of Killybegs into Donegal, and you would put into Stranorlar the Rosses, and Dungloe, and Annagh. Have you considered that there are two very large centres of population, Glenties and Killybegs, on the one point, and the Rosses on the other. Would you oblige these people to travel the great distances from their present habitations to Donegal, on the one hand, and to Stranorlar, on the other, for hospital and other relief?—Yes, I would.

3028. You would not propose to ease the situation by having cottage hospitals in these places?—Certainly, I would go in for that in all cases. I would have this workhouse for the old and infirm alone.

3029. Dr. BROOKER.—What would you do with all the sick?—I would then have cottage hospitals in every parish.

3030. Even where there is a workhouse?—Even where there is a workhouse.

3031. What would you do with the present workhouse infirmaries?—Turn them to something else.

3032. CHAIRMAN.—Take your own union, Ballyshannon, and tell me what hospital accommodation you would recommend for it, supposing it remains as a separate union?—I would have a small cottage hospital in every parish—Merrill, Malin, Clooney, Colah, and Bunnewa.

3033. Dr. BROOKER.—And Carrindagh?—And Carrindagh.

3034. CHAIRMAN.—Did you look into the cost of that?—I would not have at a costly hospital, but a place where a district nurse would live, with about two rooms additional.

3035. How many beds would you want for males and females?—I did not go into the number of beds.

3036. I am afraid you must go into the number of beds to make a calculation?—I would say two rooms, and three or four beds.

3037. I am afraid that would go nowhere. Say for the sick of Bunnewa?—I would allow that these district nurses who had charge of these hospitals, should for the most part attend to the wants of the sick at their own dwelling-houses.

3038. She never could leave her hospital?—When there would be no person in it.

3039. You never would have that state of things?—If there were more attendants required, I would then call upon the nurse who had not so much to do in other parts of the union.

3040. You know the population and the number of families. Then all the doctors, and people who are used to having anything to do with hospitals, will tell you that one bed is necessary for so many people of the ordinary population—that is the average in towns and country districts, and so on. They will tell you what proportion the hospital accommodation ought to have to the population, having regard to the healthiness of the district. You would want more beds in a Lanesboro factory district than in a West Donegal village, but they can give you a fair idea of the average number of beds required. You have provided for a doctor?—We have already the dispensary doctor.

3041. You would have to provide a salary for him?—He would be doing the same business as he is doing now.

3042. You would be covering it at one centre instead of sending him out for patients?—There are not many hospital beds in the workhouse infirmaries at all, and if they were scattered over six other places—

3043. Then you might certainly rely on having more people for treatment. People will come to a dispensary hospital who would not go into the workhouse hospital?—Most people would prefer being attended in their own homes by a district nurse.

3044. And if the homes were suitable, it would be very good?—If these homes were not suitable, make them suitable under the Sanitary Acts. Certainly, there is a great want of proper homes for the people.

3045. One has to consider that, and the question of taking care of the sick in their own homes?—Well, have a parish cottage hospital for such persons; but the majority of people would prefer being attended by a good nurse in their own homes.

3046. I am sure a great deal could be done in that way?—And that nurse would be required at any time. There is no district but requires a nurse at the present day. I think there should be one everywhere.

3047. That is a very big scheme. If you put in every union a cottage hospital for each portion of it, it may be a great benefit to the sick people, but I am afraid it won't work out on the lines of economy?—I don't think there would be much business for them more than there is at present. Very few people go to the hospital at the union workhouse.

3048. I have the exact figures here. There is a substantial number of them, and one might reasonably suppose the total number for the county would be

larger if you provide a cottage hospital for each parish?—The cost is as large I think as it would be under the new scheme. These would not be very large buildings, but with comfortable rooms.

3840. A building you would put up for £5000—Far less than that. However, we need not talk much about money. Labourers' cottages are built at £300 now that an ordinary man would like to build for £100.

3850. Then you think you could put up the building for £300?—Yes; I think there would be no call for a cottage hospital costing more than £300. I don't mean to say it would be half the time in use, and if there was a rash came on, apply to another parish for an additional nurse.

3851. I differ from you as to the amount of its usefulness. I think people would avoid the one in their own parish?—Most of them would prefer being attended in their own homes if they were satisfied. As to the fever hospitals, I should say there should be four in the County Donegal—one in each of the districts who are speaking of here—and attached to the workhouse, but in some central place.

3852. You would not oblige a fever patient to be taken from Glenties to the one at Donegal?—There is no mean, I think, that forty miles from out to out in any part, and if you put the hospital in the middle, the most extreme travel would be twenty miles.

3853. You would make new hospitals?—Certainly. I would not have it in any case connected with the workhouse, and the nurses of these hospitals should be a county charge, and go where wanted, and perhaps two of these hospitals might be vacant or have no call for them for half a year.

3854. They would go to headquarters and be sent somewhere else?—Be called to wherever they were most required.

3855. Go where the occasion required. You would like to take the county as a unit?—In the matter of fever hospitals, but in the case of the ordinary sick, I would have the cottage hospitals supported by the district—by the union—but the fever hospital should be a county charge, and the nurses servants of the County Council, and paid by the County Council.

3856. Why would you make the difference between fever and non-infectious diseases?—They would have to go from districts to districts.

3857. The same thing is true of non-infectious diseases?—From parish to parish of their own unions.

3858. Supposing you have a training infirmary at Letterkenney or Lifford, then you would have the whole county served by the staff of nurses trained there?—I would say even the nurses of the district should be trained at the county institution.

3859. Would it not also be for the interests of economy that they should be transferable everywhere in the county where their services are required?—If they were in each parish. There are seven or eight parishes in every rural district now. I think that would be a large enough area for chargeability.

3860. I was not thinking so much of chargeability as economy of administration. If you had a staff of nurses that could be sent by the central authority to any place in the county, you would require fewer nurses than under the scheme you sketch out?—Then it would be a county-at-large charge; otherwise there would be great confusion.

3861. Would you object to the county-at-large charge?—I don't see that it would make much difference. I always go for the principle that the richer portions are to go for the relief of the poorer portions of the county.

3862. You made that point very strongly in Derry?—I think that was the initial foundation of the Poor Law Act, if it has any meaning at all.

3863. Taking up what I said just now to Mr. Hayes about the way the Parliamentary grants are distributed, would you think it right to re-apportion the grants and prevent the rich unions in the eastern parts of Ireland, where the rich grazing lands are, and where the rates are very low, would you think it right to re-apportion these grants so that the poorer people should get relief?—Do you mean the Agricultural Grant?

3864. Parliamentary grants, not the Agricultural grant?—I don't see why a Parliamentary grant for the relief of the poor should go to such a place as Meath.

3865. On account of their richness you would say?—You can support your own people very well, and the whole of the grant should go to the poor people?—They get grants on those large farms that they should not.

3866. It is because they are paid according to the present basis? I don't think it should go there at all.

3867. The Secretary of the County Council could show you how much a union like Dromahaire, for instance, would get as compared with a union like Glenties. There are a great number of Parliamentary grants in aid of local taxation—I think there should be more of them going to the place that requires them the most. I should say there should be no children allowed in the workhouse—they should be all boarded out—and as for tramps, I think they should go wherever they deserve to go, according to their deserts. If they deserved the jail, they should go to jail; if they are fit subjects for the workhouse, they should go there.

3868. Who is to decide?—I think it should be left to the master of the workhouse. There are some tramps, I think, that should be admitted into the workhouse, but a great many should not.

3869. It is putting a heavy responsibility on the master?—I would let the tramps go like other lodgers, and get their lodgings wherever they went; and if they don't get good lodgings, they are not likely to come back.

3870. We had a little discussion on the subject this morning. There were a great many representations that seemed to be reasonable, that tramps, if treated in that rigorous way, would be apt to retaliate on society, and make themselves disagreeable to landlords and house-keepers?—If they get such treatment by the public they are not likely to come back; when they are too well treated they come back again.

3871. Mr. McFadden?—We have had inquiries in other places in regard to this tramp question, and up to the present we have not found it looked up very large. In the question of expense we find it hardly comes in at all?—It is not the question of expense I look upon in the case of tramps, but it is the encouragement given to refuse to assist the country, and remain in it, that should not be given.

3872. Are you not aware that in every civilised land some little shelter has to be provided for the outcast and homeless?—That is why I say there should be power given to the master of the workhouse to take in tramps, where they would be proper cases for a workhouse.

3873. Do you not think that if the Guardians had the power now of keeping in the workhouse for a couple of days these tramps, and making them work during those two days, don't you think that would be deterrent?—It would certainly serve the purpose very much if you could possibly keep them at work.

3874. Even the effect of the confinement?—I would not think it something?—Certainly; if they have to come, I should certainly say they ought to be confined at the will of the master.

3875. You would approve of something of the kind?—I would not cast them off completely; there should be a certain latitude given to the master of the workhouse.

3876. We were told here to-day that some tramp had applied for admission to a workhouse in this county, and he was refused entrance, and that same night he lay in a shed and set fire to the place?—Something like that might happen. If he went out and hanged himself, that would be worse.

3877. CHAIRMAN.—In Kesh, I remember, a man went to sleep on the edge of a brook and fell into it?—Yes; we must look to the tramps' safety just as if they were good people.

3878. You approve of boarding out children?—Yes; they do not make good members of society when reared in the workhouse.

3879. And when you recommended the doing away with four workhouses, do you speak the voice of the County Council of Donegal?—Yes, I speak the voice of the County Council in that; at least that was the result of the meeting we had. I will not bind the County Council to everything I say.

3880. The Council were a bit shy about indicating the unions to be broken up?—Yes; and I have given my own opinion as to the particular unions. I was asked that in Derry, and I could not answer it; I had not studied the matter; but since I have gone to cut up the county in four portions, and I have given Inishowen the least. The total valuation of the county is £200,000, and much of these would be about £70,000, and with Derry No. 2 our valuation is about £74,000.

3881. Mr. McFadden.—If you don't get Derry No. 2?—I would retire from office.

3882. Supposing Derry and Strabane are kept as they are, how would your divisions work out then?—We would give Inishowen to you at Letterkenney, if

Sept. 26, 1903.

Mr. William Doberty.

Sept. 29, 1892.
Mr. William
Doherty.

you like; but I would say if we kept Inishoven even, we could take a slice off Letterkenny and a slice off Millford.

3833. What part of Letterkenny?—Macrossanagh, I suppose.

3834. That would be only one electoral division?—That would do us; we are not greedy in Inishoven.

3835. Greedy about pieces?—Those who are greedy about pieces are the Stranorlar people, and they would get a lot of pieces by this arrangement.

3836. You are giving a sop to the vice-chairman, who lives in Stranorlar?—In answer to that, I say I never spoke to him on it. If there is a better division to be made—but the County Council says there are to be only four workhouses, and if anyone can make a better division, let them do it.

3837. You would kick up Cain and Abel about Ballyshannon and Donagall. You say the valuations are equal?—The valuations are about equal.

3838. You should have Stranorlar made a cathedral town?—We are not on ecclesiastical matters now. I would give very much for having the parishes chargeable, instead of the electoral divisions or rural districts.

3839. Chairman.—It is a bill that does not exist at present. It never was as a civil division?—I think it is the best division for chargeability that has been made yet, and all demarcations are very nearly on the same boundaries—have the same limits for parishes.

3840. Mr. McFadden.—Is it not a pretty long journey from Dungloe to Stranorlar?—There is a railway there that we use for everything.

3841. Chairman.—You could not take the risk?—If a friend of mine had to go to the infirmary, I would as soon put him on a train as put him on a car. I think the train should be used in all cases except for contagious diseases.

3842. I don't think you would get the medical men to agree to send some sick people, such as cases of pneumonia, or a broken leg; what use is the train for that?—I think it would be as easy as a car.

3843. No; put them in a four-wheeled ambulance?—At any rate, they have, according to my arrangement, not to come there at all, but to go to their parish hospital.

3844. I think that is good. The only thing is I am sorry you have not worked out the expenses?—It would take a good deal of work, but I am not afraid of expenses. I think it would be even cheaper than at present.

3845. Mr. McFadden.—How much would you pay these nurses a year?—Not more than they are paid in the present infirmaries of the workhouses.

3846. How much would that work out in the pound in Inishoven?—I think it would be cheaper than what we are doing. There are two nurses in the workhouse at present, and nothing for them to do scarcely.

3847. Chairman.—Oh, that is not so?—Sometimes.

3848. They are very hard worked?—I know the nurse of the fever hospital below is only an odd time engaged.

3849. We are talking about infirmary nurses. They are very hard worked, and find it difficult to match time for necessary services?—I am sure; it is periodically, but not constantly.

3850. They have constant sick there, and the smaller the number of nurses the greater the labour, because they have no relief?—I think they would be better treated in their parish hospital.

3851. I quite agree with you, but I am afraid of the expense on such a large scale as you suggest. My question was only about two or three districts—Gweedore, Voe Rouse, or Glenties—where they are very remote from any hospital, and you went further and said you approved of a hospital in every parish?—Yes; but it would not be a great hospital that would cost £200 or £300, but an ordinary dwelling-house that a nurse could live in, and have a couple of spare rooms with two or three beds—a clean, healthy place; not an alms-house hospital.

Chairman.—I would recommend you to confer with a couple of doctors as to how that would work out.

3852. Mr. Diamond.—How many parishes in your district?—Six.

3853. How many nurses would that entail?—Six nurses. At the present time there is almost a nurse in every parish. There is one of the Jubilee nurses in Buncrana, and we would secure do without a doctor there without her; she is good to the poor.

Mr. McFadden.—And she costs nothing.

3854. Dr. Brown.—How much does she cost?—It is by local subscriptions. I think it is £20 a year.

3855. The committee paying the rent of the house?—Yes; but if the house I speak of were built, we would have no rent to pay; it would be her residence.

3856. Chairman.—She could not act as district nurse and also as hospital nurse?—I think she could.

3857. Dr. Brown.—Would you be in favour of having the district a little larger and having two nurses?—I am only suggesting improvements; have one hospital in every two parishes, but take them away from the workhouse.

3858. Chairman.—For the four workhouses you suggest you would keep in them only the nurses and aged?—Yes.

3859. They should be treated with kindness and consideration. You would class them as deserving poor?—Certainly.

3860. Old married couples, you would not separate them?—No.

3861. And ultimately you would hope that even these workhouses would disappear, and parish houses take their place?—Yes; but that won't be likely in any of our times.

3862. You think the representation, you say, is equitable?—Yes, I think the representation is not equitable; that is to say, two Guardians from each electoral division in the union. There is no equality in it, for some of these electoral divisions are sparsely of population and sparse of valuation. I have an instance here: there is a valuation of £200 represented by two members, and in the same rural district there is a valuation of £5,000 that has but two members, so that the £200 has the same representation as the £5,000, and a population correspondingly large. I think this is most inequitable.

3863. How do you propose to even it up. Do you think the present Boards of Guardians are too large?—The forty-four Guardians that we have in Inishoven is quite too large for one room.

3864. They have 100 or ninety-eight in Tralee. Do you think that is too large?—Certainly; I think the place would be better represented by twelve or fourteen. I would allow one member for each electoral division, but there would be any place misrepresented, and if the divisions grew up to £2,000, I would put on a second member; if it was £5,000 valuation, these members, and £4,000 should be the maximum, four. So if an electoral division had £10,000 I would only have four representatives, and if only £25, I would have one representative. But although I make valuation the basis, I would have population the controlling power. Where the additional Guardian is to be for £1,000 valuation, it would be only provided he represented 400 people, not less.

3865. There would have to be certain conditions of population as well as valuation?—Yes; I would have valuation and population going hand-in-hand with representation.

3866. Do you think there would be really any objection to that among the Guardians, as far as you know them?—I think not.

3867. A large number would have to go out of office at the next election?—After some time it will be very difficult to get District Councillors to come into office.

3868. The thing has not occurred yet; the supply has been equal to the demand up to this?—I have heard plenty of District Councillors say it is their last year, and County Councillors say the same. There are abuses in everything, and in the representation, and in many other places, the road contractors have risen as well as the representatives. I was working out that scheme in Inishoven, and we have, I think, forty-four members. They would be reduced to thirty-three by the scheme that I have proposed—one for each electoral division.

3869. That does not go down as far as you thought desirable?—I think thirty-three would be as many as any of the unions would think desirable.

3870. You would prefer a smaller number?—Yes, we would select.

3871. Mr. MURPHY.—While your proposal might work all right in your union, it might have a different effect in Sligo?—I am acquainted with Derry No. 3, and went into it on the same scale. I find there are only eighteen members at present for the nine electoral divisions. The valuation is £25,000, and in Inishoven we have forty-four members for £40,000.

3872. If your scheme was put into effect, and your boundaries are given to you over the Derry men?—Then I would increase the representation of Derry No. 3 from eighteen to twenty-two members by the scale. The valuation would increase it to twenty-four.

but that must be controlled by the population; the population is not so large. To check it by population each member must represent not less than 400 people.

3925. CHAIRMAN.—What is your view as regards electoral divisional rating as against union rating. You say you would be in favour of reversion to the electoral division?—Yes, I would much rather have it.

3926. You say: "Assess in outdoor relief would be very much modified by reversion to electoral divisional rating." . . . I would prefer rural district rating for all purposes. And then you refer to a question with which we have nothing to do, that is sanitary expenses?—When I say rating for all purposes, if it were rural district rating for everything, from county roads to supporting the poor, I would go in for it, for it is more broad-minded than the other. That was, I think, the Local Government Act, but it has been destroyed since.

3925. There are special ratings for this, for instance, Runcorne and Mordale?—You will have one place pay

for all its own, and pay its proportion for everyone else.

3926. I don't think it is paying its proportion for everyone else. It is lot of some things?—What I would go in for is parish rating, and that would be much the same as dispensary ratings, because the dispensaries are nearly coterminous with the parishes.

3927. But both parishes and dispensaries are generally determined by natural boundaries—moorlands, and such like?—I would go in for parish rating in preference to either electoral division or district rating.

3928. You would go in for parished rating and parochial hospitals. There are a number of other things you mention here that don't come under our inquiry—labourers' cottages, revision, demand notices, and Presentment Sessions?—I find a great grievance about Presentment Sessions. There is no healthy competition with road contractors. They are trying to keep them from sweeping the whole county, but it is very difficult to do it.

Mr. MICHAEL McNEIL examined.

Mr. Michael McNeil.

3929. CHAIRMAN.—Are the Glenties Board of Guardians in favour of the amalgamation of unions?—Yes.

3930. What unions do they suggest should be broken up?—They are indifferent as to what unions should be broken up, so long as it would be advantageous to the ratepayers of their own locality, and carried out without inflicting undue hardship and inconvenience to the sick poor in need of relief.

3931. What do they think about the Glenties Union?—They are under the impression, from the geographical situation of Glenties, and the way it is indented by the sea, and the distance from the various points to the railway stations, it seems almost impossible to amalgamate Glenties with other unions, but it would be possible to amalgamate other unions with Glenties. The greater part of Donegal Union, the dispensary district of Murchistera, the most remote part of it, is only eleven miles from Glenties, and Dunkineely is only about nine miles from Glenties, and the sick poor of that locality would not suffer in any way by amalgamation.

3932. They have now to go a slightly shorter distance and a better road?—It is about the same distance by road from the most remote part of Dunkineely Dispensary District to Glenties as it is to Donegal.

3933. How would the Dunkineely people go to Glenties?—They come across at Orough school-house to Roger Maguire's at the top of the hill, and then you cross by Binkane school-house.

3934. Do they take the road by Brackliff?—No, that would be very much longer; they would have to pass through Ardara going that way.

3935. What other parts would you take in—Finter?—Yes; portion of it is at present in Glenties Union.

3936. Breelan Bridge?—Yes; the people of that locality would not suffer by being annexed to Glenties, as there is railway communication through the most populous parts of that district.

3937. You don't want any of Donaghry, I suppose?—Except the distance; if the distance would not be considered too far they would not object to relieving them.

3938. Is not Annagry considered a long way from Glenties?—It is considered very far.

3939. Would you go beyond that?—I don't think so.

3940. You have sent in a statement here of your own; is this your own view or is it the view of the Glenties?—My own view.

3941. You have thought it out very carefully, certainly; a small cottage hospital you suggest on Annamore Island?—Yes.

3942. The population there is pretty large?—A little over 1,600.

3943. You don't approve of keeping up the fever hospital at Ramelton?—That was merely a suggestion that the county funds allocated to the fever hospital might go to Annamore, inasmuch as it does not seem to be required.

Mr. Mackay.—If you take the stones of the Ramelton Hospital away I will give you £200.

3944. CHAIRMAN.—A certain part of the workhouse hospital ought to be reserved for those who are able

to contribute; have you many of those people in the Glenties Union?—No; very few.

3945. Is your hospital sufficiently empty to say that you could spare separate rooms?—No.

3946. So it would really mean building?—It would, to provide the accommodation.

3947. Mr. MICHAEL.—How many are there in the hospital at present?—About forty-three; that is about the average.

3948. How many in the other portions of the houses?—Usually about sixty; 130 is the total. On the 1st of August there were 132 relieved indoor, and 208 relieved out of door, making a total of 340.

3949. CHAIRMAN.—In Glenties the people are so very poor that you don't approve for the Glenties Union of out-door relief?—No; it has a bad effect.

3950. As a matter of fact you give very little out-door relief there at present?—If we began and did not put on some restrictions on it you could not stop it at all; it is a sort of poison on these people to remain in houses unfit for human habitation.

3951. What do you think about the tramps?—I suggest that a fixed scale of dietary should be prescribed for able-bodied tramps, male and female, and they should be detained in the casual wards for at least one week, and that it be compulsory upon them to perform a prescribed amount of manual labour in accordance with their class. Children dependent upon the vagrant poor or tramp class should be retained by the Guardians of the union which they enter and committed by them to some central institution as a country-of-large charge where they should be reared and maintained. The great nuisance is the brooding up of tramps. This might be made applicable to those who were in the habit of going about as tramps from one workhouse to another, and that it could be proven to the satisfaction of Justices at Petty Sessions that such was correct.

3952. It is a bit dangerous, is it not, taking their children from them; it may encourage some people to go on tramp?—It might have that effect, but still it would be no harm to adopt it as a trial.

3953. You think the Casual Poor Act, England, should be adopted to give the Guardians power to retain these people legally?—Yes.

3954. You don't approve of cottage hospitals?—The experience in Glenties is that they have not been availed of.

3955. Do you refer to Innishree Hospital?—Yes; the nurse has been discharged; there was £20 a year given by the Guardians, and £60 by private subscriptions, to retain her services, and she remained for one year in the Dungloe dispensary district, and during that period she attended only one case.

3956. CHAIRMAN.—The selection of a site for this hospital was on an island in the sea; it was uninhabited or inhabited only by coastguards. You say it occurs to you that the richer parts of the county would be justly entitled to contribute to the maintenance of the poorer parts?—Yes; we don't get a fair proportion of the Parliamentary Grant, and in addition we think it just and reasonable that the richer parts of a county should contribute towards the wants of the poorer parts.

Sept. 29, 1905.
—
Mr. Michael
McHale.

3555. As long as you get some help you don't care whether it comes from the rich part or elsewhere?—We don't get our fair proportion of Parliamentary grants under the existing procedure. It occurs to me that the Agricultural Grant is apportioned in all of the entire levy of the County Donegal as a county-at-large charge in the first instance.

3557. You won't be able to touch the Agricultural Grant?—The Parliamentary Grant, I should say. On account of the low valuation of the Glenties Union we get a small proportion of the Parliamentary Grant. This, we consider, unfair as we have a larger population than others, and the majority of them are extremely poor.

Mr. C. Boyle.

Mr. C. Boyle examined.

3558. CHAIRMAN.—What part of the union do you represent?—The Dungloe Division of Glenties.

3559. What is your view on the amalgamation question?—The Glenties Board is in favour of amalgamation.

3560. But against the breaking up of their own union?—Yes; we are in favour of having two workhouses in the whole county.

3561. Where would you put them?—At Glenties and Letterkenny.

3562. How would you divide the other unions?—I would put Ballyshannon into Donegal, and Stranorlar into Glenties and the remainder into Letterkenny.

3563. How does that work out as regards valuation?—I would have it a county charge.

3564. And two Boards of Guardians meeting at Glenties and Letterkenny; then you would have no workhouse in Stranorlar, Donegal, or Ballyshannon?—None.

3565. What hospital accommodation would you have in the new Glenties Union?—I would retain the present hospital, or substitute others for them.

3566. You would abolish the Boards of Guardians but retain the hospitals?—Yes.

3567. What class would you admit at the hospital at Ballyshannon; only the sick?—Yes.

3568. What about the very old and infirm who are on their feet?—Send them by railway from these other places to Glenties.

3569. How would you send them to Glenties?—There is a line in course of construction between Ballyshannon and Donegal; all the unions in the county

are connected by rail with both these centres except Milford. These lines are being built by the aid of the Government and I think they should give free passage.

3570. Is there anything else?—I am in favour of a county charge.

3571. That would be very simple; you would have two Boards of Guardians and leave the hospital accommodation as it is; that, of course, would reduce the rates?—I think it would.

3572. There would be a good deal of saving in the establishment charges?—We are 2s. in the £ higher than the other districts in the county, on an average.

3573. Mr. MURPHY.—What is the rating in Glenties?—The average has been 7s. 5d. for the last five years on house property, and 4s. 7d. on land.

3574. CHAIRMAN.—What was it in the standard year?—Even higher; and the average rate for the last five years on the rest of the county has been 2s. 11d. on land, and 4s. 6d. on houses.

3575. Is there anything more you would like to mention?—As regards hospital accommodation; I would be in favour of a hospital at Arranmore.

3576. You would not give an extra hospital to the Rosse or Glencolumbkille?—I would not; the number of cases admitted to hospitals in the past three years is only thirty-three—that is fewer hospitals. I am speaking of the ordinary sick; I would not increase it.

3577. They have far to go?—Yes; but the number of cases is not great.

Mr. Charles
Kennedy

Mr. CHARLES KENNEDY examined.

3578. CHAIRMAN.—What division do you represent?—Arranmore.

3579. What is your view about amalgamation?—Our Board think there should be amalgamation, but they think there should be five unions in the county.

3580. What five do you think ought to be in existence?—I would say Glenties, Milford, Donegal, Stranorlar, and Inishowen.

3581. Then you break up Donaghadee and Letterkenny?—Yes, and Ballyshannon.

3582. On what principle did you make this division?—The convenience of the sick poor. I think we could not very well ask the people of remote parts of our union to be taken to any other to start with, and I think, in Inishowen, it would be very inconvenient to take them into any other; it is the outside part of the county, and I think one would be necessary at Milford; at that end of it you take in Donaghadee and part of Letterkenny.

3583. How far would people from north of Greendale, say Bloody Foreland, have to go for hospital accommodation; they would have to go either to Milford or Glenties?—Yes.

3584. Would that be an unreasonable distance, do you think?—I am not sure of the distance from there to Milford.

3585. There is not much difference in the two, but it is a tremendous distance?—There would be very little difference between going to Glenties and going to Milford.

3586. Do you think forty miles a reasonable distance to ask people to go?—I would be in favour of having cottage hospitals in some of these places.

3587. Where would you put them?—One in Arranmore, one in Glencolumbkille, and if there was part of Donaghadee added to Glenties there should be one at Croilly Bridge to serve that end of the Rosse.

3588. Is there any other suggestion?—No. With regard to the children; we board them out, and I think it is the proper thing to do.

3589. There is rather a difference of opinion I think in Glenties on the subject?—There is not; we are perfectly unanimous on it.

3590. Mr. Mackay.—And is it satisfactory?—It is, and it is both cheaper and better for the children.

3591. CHAIRMAN.—Would you be in favour of having the classification extended so that you could send out of the workhouse more children than you are able to send under the existing law?—We could send out any amount of children.

3592. You can only send out orphans and deserted as present; you cannot send out illegitimate children whose mothers are in the workhouse?—We would not send them out in any case, because if we sent them out the mothers would go out and come in with more.

3593. It operates badly on the poor children?—It does, but there is scarcely any help for it that I can see.

3594. You would not be in favour of any scheme by which a woman, after her first lapse, would go, not to the workhouse, but to some religious penitentiary conducted either by some religious organisation or whatever religious body the woman belonged to?—I would certainly be in favour of that as against the workhouse.

3595. That the rates should pay for that woman some moderate cost; what it would cost in the workhouse, we will say?—Yes; if it did not cost more.

3596. Towards the maintenance of this woman; and this religious organisation might give her a fresh start, and then you would agree to board out the child?—I would, certainly.

3597. That was the evidence given by witnesses in other parts of the country and it rather seemed to have a certain amount of practical good in it?—Yes; if the mother could be disposed of.

3598. And put in the way of making a fresh start on good lines?—Yes; I would be in favour of taking charge of the child and sending it out.

3599. About the tramps, what do you think?—I think it is very hard to deal with them; I think for

all they cost, anything done by the Guardians to try and get any work out of them for their maintenance would be dearly bought.

4000. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Might it not have the effect of lessening their number; of doing away with the class altogether?—I don't think so.

4001. An occupation that is not attractive does not find many followers, and if the law could be changed and a little positive treatment given to those people it might have the effect of doing away with them little

by little until they become extinct altogether?—It would be a long time to look forward to; my own experience is that the tramp nuisance is getting worse from year to year. Sept. 22, 1902.
Mr. Charles Kennedy.

4002. CHAIRMAN.—Then it would be better to make things a little more unpleasant for them?—Yes; if it could be done.

4003. You don't see yourself how it could be done?—No, I do not.

Mr. HUGH O'DONNELL examined.

Mr. Hugh O'Donnell.

4004. CHAIRMAN.—What division do you represent?—Glencolumbkille.

4005. Do you reside there?—I reside in the division of Glencolumbkille, near Carrick, in Meath.

4006. What is your view on this question?—I am in favour of amalgamation.

4007. What would you do with Glenties?—I would retain it in the interests of the sick poor.

4008. Owing to the long distances they would have to go?—Exactly.

4009. Would you add anything to it?—I would add part of Donegal to it, Mounicheries, and Dunkineely.

4010. That is what Mr. McNelis mentioned; would you take part of any other union?—I would take part of Sligo in case it was dissolved.

4011. But you are not very pressing for it?—No.

4012. Where does the boundary come?—The bridge near the late Mr. May's house; this side of it.

4013. How far would you go from the house of Mr. May?—Really I don't know the place very well.

4014. Would you go on to Brockagh?—Yes; it is not far from May's to Brockagh.

4015. Is there anything you would like to say as regards the re-apportionment of areas?—I don't think so.

4016. What other point would you like to touch on; you have heard the evidence that has been given by your fellow Guardians; is there anything you would wish to express dissent from?—There is nothing, unless I would prefer a county charge to a district charge; I think it is right that the richer part should bear their share with the poorer.

Mr. C. BOYLE further examined.

Mr. C. Boyle.

There is one point as regards outdoor relief; I would not be in favour altogether of abolishing it in the Glenties Union; it is very small, and great care is required.

4022. CHAIRMAN.—I am aware that there is very little given in Glenties; they always felt the difficulty?—I know the great assistance it is to some poor struggling people.

4023. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—It keeps them from actual starvation?—Yes; they prefer living at home sooner than face the workhouse.

CHAIRMAN.—I am aware there is very little given in Glenties; they could not give it with their rates.

Mr. BERNARD M'FARLAND examined.

Mr. Bernard M'Farland.

Mr. Mallin asked me to give you the amount contributed to the Hamilton Fever Hospital. The amount contributed to the Letterkenney Fever Hospital is £114 14s. 6d.; it practically never varies. One of two amounts may be contributed; the amount contributed in the standard year by the grand jury was double the amount of the private subscriptions.

4034. CHAIRMAN.—They may pay on two scales, but they generally pay on the higher?—They pay always on the higher. In March, 1903, the amount con-

tributed that year for Hamilton was £85 12s. 6d., whereas last March it was only £69 9s.; but we paid on the high scale.

4035. Dr. BROOKS.—Did you pay on whichever was higher?—Yes; if twice the amount of the private subscriptions is the higher we pay on it, and if the standard year is the higher we pay on it.

4036. And if they were to make alterations and get in subscriptions you would pay on that?—We would; but I have practically no connection with the unions beyond collecting the rates.

The SAVING terminated.

Oct. 1, 1903.

NINTH PUBLIC SITTING.—THURSDAY, OCTOBER 1st, 1903

At the Workhouse, Dunfarnaghy.

Present:—Mr. MICKS, (Chairman), Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. COREY BIDDER.

Mr. MICHAEL COLGAN, Chairman, Dunfarnaghy Union, examined.

Mr. Michael Colgan.

4037. CHAIRMAN.—Had you the question under consideration here as to whether it would be wise to amalgamate this or any of the unions in the County Downall?—Yes.

4038. What was the view of the Board of Guardians here?—In favour of amalgamation.

4039. What exactly did they think would be the best way of carrying out that opinion?—By getting amalgamated with Letterkenny.

4040. That is that the whole of this union should go to Letterkenny?—Yes.

4041. You did not consider the question of any of it going to Glenties—the Gweedore part?—No; we would not be in favour of that.

4042. Or any to Millford?—No.

4043. The whole of the union, you think, should go to Letterkenny?—Yes.

4044. Is that owing to the railway communication?—Yes; the railway line runs right through the centre of the union.

4045. Was that the main reason which decided your thinking it ought to go to Letterkenny?—Yes.

4046. Was there any other reason as regards the cost of maintenance; any question of the amount of the rates?—We considered that by getting amalgamated with Letterkenny it would lessen the rates considerably.

4047. Did you think you would have less rates to pay if you were joined to Letterkenny than to Millford or Glenties?—We considered Letterkenny would be the best.

4048. Did you think that if the workhouse were closed up it would be necessary to keep any hospital for ordinary medical cases or fever?—We were in favour of retaining our fever hospital.

4049. What classes of cases would you treat in that?—Infectious cases only.

4050. Would you propose that all the sick and aged and infirm should go from here to Letterkenny?—Yes.

4051. Was there any difference of opinion about that at all at the Board of Guardians?—None.

4052. Dr. BIDDER.—How far would it be from the remotest part of your union to Letterkenny?

CHAIRMAN.—Take the Bloody Foreland?—About forty miles. From Cully, which is the extreme western end of this union, to Letterkenny, is about thirty-nine miles.

4053. To Gortshork?—Cashelmore would be the station for Gortshork.

4054. I see it is nine Irish miles from Bloody Foreland to Cashelmore?—The railway runs from Cully Bridge, which is the most distant.

4055. There are some sick that cannot be removed by railway?—That is very true.

4056. How would you propose they should deal with bed accidents or cases of pneumonia?—As far as I am concerned my idea is there should be a central hospital in some central part of the county, where all non-infectious cases should be treated.

4057. Dr. BIDDER.—Would Letterkenny serve the purpose?—Yes.

4058. CHAIRMAN.—What we are thinking of here is not a central hospital, but for people who cannot be removed forty miles or anything like that?—If they could not be removed the only way would be to treat them at their own homes.

4059. By a district nurse, do you mean?—Yes, if necessary, under the supervision of the medical officer of the district.

4060. That would be practically taking away from these people hospital accommodation?—Of course; I understand there is some suggestion about cottage hospitals, but I would not be in favour of cottage hospitals.

4061. Dr. BIDDER.—Why?—Because certain people would just make a nuisance of them.

4062. CHAIRMAN.—They would be discharged as soon as they were no longer subjects?—That is true.

4063. Do you think they would cost too much?—I believe they would.

4064. How far is Cully Bridge from here?—It is about sixteen Irish miles.

Mr. Kelly, Solicitor.—It is nineteen miles.

4065. CHAIRMAN.—Do many people come here to be treated from that district?—Gweedore and Maghera-alough?—There have been a couple of people treated in the infirmary here for the last couple of years.

4066. I suppose even that distance makes people rather slow to come?—Yes, it does.

4067. What would you propose to do with all these buildings here if the workhouse was broken up?—It has been suggested it should be turned into a technical school.

4068. And supported by the Agricultural Department?—Yes.

4069. And County Council schemes?—Yes.

4070. There is no other purpose that you think of?—Well, sir, it could be let for factory purposes.

4071. The amount of labour here is very small?—Very small.

4072. They would not be likely to support a factory here; they would not have hands for it?—There are plenty of hands; the young people of the county have to go to other districts to seek employment.

4073. I mean from a distance of three miles round you would not have hands?—You would not.

4074. So that it would not be a possible site for a factory?—It would not be very good.

4075. As regards the children; you have not many in this workhouse?—Only one; it is boarded out; there are two or three in the workhouse at present, but they are under age—infants.

4076. Supposing this union to be amalgamated with Letterkenny; what is the average rate, do you say, for the last few years for Poor Law purposes?—The average rate in this union is about 2s. 7d.

4077. That includes a great many other things?—It includes everything.

4078. That includes roads?—No; it is only poor relief.

4079. Does it cover dispensaries?—I believe it does.

4080. And public health?—Well, really, sir, I am not very satisfied.

4081. CHAIRMAN.—Did you make out, Mr. Boyle, what the rate per £ would be for Poor Law purposes only—maintenance of the poor alone?

Mr. Boyle.—No, sir, I did not; I think it would be 1s. 9d.

4082. I will send you a schedule to give you some statistics about that which is the only part of the rate that we have any power to deal with; we don't touch dispensaries or public health administration. (To Witness).—If the unions were amalgamated do you think the rate ought to be on the whole new Letterkenny Union?—Yes, except for out-door relief purposes.

4083. You would not like to share the Letterkenny responsibility?—No; I would go in for electoral division rating for that purpose.

Oct. 1, 1903.

Mr. Michael Colgan.

4084. Practically you have no out-door relief in Dundahilly?—We have, and it has increased for the last five years.

Mr. Boyle.—It is 8d. in the £, or £200 a year.

CHAIRMAN.—Does 1d. in the £ only produce £50? Mr. Boyle.—That is all; the valuation is £22,000.

4085. CHAIRMAN.—So if you increase a doctor's salary £50, it means 1d. in the £. You think there is at present enough of hospital accommodation, and really there would be no necessity for cottage hospitals if the amalgamation took place?—That is my opinion.

Mr. Kelly.—The Clerk says 1s. 8d. is the poor rate.

4086. CHAIRMAN.—How much of your own salary did you get in?

Mr. Boyle.—£30 as clerk of the union, that is all.

4087. CHAIRMAN.—You did not put in as executive sanitary officer.

Mr. Boyle.—No.

4088. CHAIRMAN.—Would you make any other change except that of going back to the old electoral division rating for out-door relief; would you make any change at all in the way of charging rates?—None.

4089. Or in administration; you would leave it to the Board of Guardians at Letterkenny as before?—Yes.

4090. If you thought you would get your rates reduced would you be ready to make any other suggestion?—I would prefer we were not amalgamated with Letterkenny; I would suggest, in case Milford was dissolved, we got nine divisions from Milford and one from Letterkenny as an alternative; I should say Mulroy Bay should be the boundary.

4091. Keenot at the head of Mulroy Bay?—I would take in Milford, Ballyvary, Loughkeel, Farnon, Kilmurran, and Garrahan.

4092. You would have union-at-large rating?—Yes.

4093. Did you ever consider the question of county rating for part of your expenditure?—I never considered that.

4094. Of course you would like that?—I am sure it would be very good.

4095. You would not like the high valuation of East Dundahilly to help you up there?—Certainly; that was one reason why we would wish to be amalgamated with Letterkenny.

4096. Supposing you were left as you are and had your rate brought as low as Letterkenny, or perhaps lower, by means of a county rate, what would your rate be?—We would be in favour of a county rate.

4097. As against amalgamation?—Yes.

4098. I suppose you have very few people who pay in this hospital?—Very few.

4099. Are there any people who would not pay say 1s. a week?—Yes, there are.

4100. Would you be in favour of having a discretionary power vested in the Guardians, enabling them to charge whatever would be fair, according to the earnings of the people?—Yes, I would like that.

4101. Do you think that would be good for the people themselves?—I do.

4102. You have not many tramps?—We have a fair average of tramps; in the summer time they come and leave there.

4103. For the sea air?—Yes.

4104. Have you a hearty welcome for them?—We have not. I certainly would deal with them under the vagrancy laws, and my opinion is that professional tramps should not be received in the workhouse. There should be a home for them; they should be arrested under the vagrancy laws, and remanded and brought before the magistrate at Petty Sessions. I would give them from six months to two years, and compel them, if they had a trade, to work in this home; and this home would be self-supporting if properly conducted.

4105. It might be a little awkward if these people have no place to stay. They sometimes make themselves objectionable outside?—I find it is nearly always the case class of people who come here for relief, and make it a regular point to come here time after time.

4106. Mr. MURPHY.—In your last suggestion you said your Board was in favour of amalgamating this union with Letterkenny?—Yes.

4107. And you also said that you would not require any accommodation for the sick here, outside the fever hospital?—None.

4108. Does it not occur to you that by that suggestion you would be depriving yourself of the benefit of the Poor Law very much as regards this whole district?

—Taking into consideration that a central hospital would be erected at Letterkenny, it would be just as convenient to send patients to Letterkenny as here, provided the accommodation was here.

4109. Do you not think that there are some aged people, that would require some little care in the neighbourhood, that would not go long distances?—I have no doubt that is right, but I think the medical officers would be quite competent to look after cases of that description in their own homes.

4110. Your object then principally in amalgamating with Letterkenny would be the desire to cut down the rates?—Certainly.

4111. You say you have no children here but one?—I think there are three small children in the house, and one boarded out.

4112. How do you find the boarding-out system work?—It is doing very well; good reports coming in.

4113. The child has a good home?—Yes, a comfortable home; well looked after, and attends school regularly.

4114. Regular inspection by the relieving officer?—Yes.

4115. There was a suggestion at Letterkenny that the Letterkenny Union should be amalgamated with some neighbouring union, for instance, Milford and part of this. Did you think over that question?—It was only last night I saw that in the press.

4116. It was suggested that Letterkenny being a central point in the county, would be a suitable place for an infirmary, or some place for accommodating the whole county?—Yes; the Guardians here would be in favour of having a central hospital at Letterkenny.

4117. And you would be in favour of some kind of a general rate all over the county in place of a union rate?—Yes; if it tended to reduce the rates at present, I would be in favour of it.

4118. Dr. BOGGER.—Have you any knowledge of a cottage hospital?—I have not.

4119. Did you go into the subject at all?—We have been talking over it, but we came to the conclusion that it would be a very costly business.

4120. It was on the score of expense you thought you would be as well without it?—Yes.

4121. Do you know the population of the union from any twenty miles distant to Letterkenny?—The population of this union is nearly 15,000.

4122. How many of these would be beyond this distance from Letterkenny?

CHAIRMAN.—The greater part, 10,000, at all events, beyond twenty miles radius, Glenties and Gweedore?—Falcarragh is twenty-four miles from Letterkenny.

Mr. Boyle.—Falcarragh has 6,000 and Gweedore 5,000.

4123. Dr. BOGGER.—That would be a large population to have practically without a hospital?—But it would be as easy to bring a patient from Gweedore to Letterkenny.

4124. How would it be as easy?—There is railway accommodation.

4125. The railway does not run on Sundays, does it?—Yes, it does.

4126. CHAIRMAN.—Supposing there were cases that could not be removed by rail, how far would it be by Enniskill and Glenties to Letterkenny, and how far is it to Dundahilly in the usual way?—By road to Letterkenny would be thirty miles, English.

4127. And to Dundahilly?—About twenty miles. Then you see the convenience of going by railway is much quicker, if they could not be conveyed by rail they could not be conveyed by ambulance.

4128. Oh, yes; you can get a man in at his own door on a four-wheeled ambulance, and bring him a great distance?—A four-wheeled ambulance would not be suitable for this country.

4129. You may take my word that it would. I have driven these roads. If you could keep a cottage hospital say at some central place, Gweedore, or Gweedore, or O'Neill Bridge, wherever considered desirable, and if you had a county contribution under which your rating would not be increased, would you then have any objection to that?—Well, I believe there would be none.

4130. It is entirely on the ground of expense, and owing to the fact that you have such a small valuation, where 1d. in the £ only produces £50, that you cannot afford to increase your expenses?—Our expenses are up £300 for the last three years; our rates have increased 6d. in the £.

4131. Dr. BOGGER.—What is that owing to?—Increase in the staff, and repairs, and so forth.

4132. You had no epidemics?—None whatsoever.

Oct. 1, 1903.
Mr. Michael
Colgan.

4133. Mr. Mackey, Solicitor.—You said supporting Milford was discredited you would propose to add nine electoral divisions to this place?—Certainly.

4134. What would you do with the other ten?—That is for the people to consider themselves.

4135. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose they would have to go to Letterkenny?—Yes; my idea is that the peninsula of Fennel should go to Letterkenny—the district that lies between Malbeg and the Swilly.

4136. Would you take in Ballynure?—Yes.

4137. Mr. Mackey.—Is not that the kidney of Letterkenny. If you look at the map it would be a line ball, and you would like to have the advantage of it?—Yes.

4138. Mr. Kelly.—These districts of Bongsall and Carrigart that you propose to take in, you would have

seems as easily there as to Letterkenny. Terms is currently near?—Yes.

4139. The facilities for the poor are equal as regards Letterkenny on account of the railway?—Yes.

4140. You said the expense of this institution had increased £300?—Yes, for the last three years.

4141. You think there would be a saving of £400 by the amalgamation?—Yes, I have made that estimate.

4142. If this union is retained, do you know it is then a question that a large amount will have to be expended on the repairs?—Certainly.

4143. Will it be required immediately?—Yes, it is well as coming down over our heads.

4144. And there is some question of the sewerage?—Yes.

4145. Would you retain the fever hospital here and transfer one of the nurses?—Yes.

Mr. John
Irvine.

Mr. JOHN IARVIE examined.

4146. CHAIRMAN.—You have heard the evidence that the chairman of the union gave. On the whole, do you agree with him?—I do.

4147. Is there any point on which you decidedly differ from him?—No.

4148. Is there anything you would like to add to what he has said?—I don't think I could add very much, his evidence was so exhaustive.

4149. He really has expressed your views and that of the Guardians?—Yes. With regard to the establishment of cottage hospitals, it just occurred to me, when he was giving his evidence, that should such a thing be decided on, I don't think this locality here would be the best centre for one.

4150. You would have the fever hospital here?—Yes.

4151. And you would have the cottage hospital at?—Some place at Cloughaneely or Gweedore.

4152. Or supposing you had it at Grally Bridge, and get the two unions to support it?—Yes; we have a very thickly populated district near there.

4153. Annagry; and you would have the two unions served by hospitals of that sort?—Yes; although I don't approve of them generally.

4154. Is that because you have not seen any of them working?—No.

4155. Is it because you don't like the idea of the expense?—It is not. My idea is that an isolated hospital like that is away from supervision, with only a nurse, and assistant nurse, and a dispensary doctor.

4156. The utility depends very much on the character of the nurse—whether she is an attentive, nice person?—I don't think they would be as well looked after as in a place where there was a large staff.

4157. Mr. MURKIN.—And one official to watch another?—Yes; one head.

4158. CHAIRMAN.—Of course, you would have the clergy of the district looking in. They would be looking after the welfare of the people?—I don't want to go into details.

4159. But they would as regards supervision?—Certainly.

4160. But what you say is, especially if there was any risk to do, there is a certain temptation to be lax and careless?—That is one of the ideas that would make me not be in favour of these hospitals.

4161. They have been tried elsewhere, and what you say has been observed, but the general opinion about these hospitals is that they are greatly liked by the people of the locality having a hospital in their

midst?—Another notion I have is that in the unpopulated district, or poor district, as to Gweedore, and round the whole West, I think that in those communities where the great army of labour comes from, and they send out their own people all over the country to the best districts for labour, when they get worn out from old age and debility, or accident, it is too bad that they should be thrown back on the poor community from which they sprang.

4162. These poor people naturally go home again?—Yes; and they are apt to be sent into the workhouse.

4163. Would not a rate over the whole county or country in aid of these poor districts meet your objection?—Yes, but I was thinking there should be a Government subsidy. I think the whole country is served by this class of people going to Scotland and England, and expending their lives and energies there.

4164. Therefore you would suggest that the county at large should contribute?—Should contribute more or less. When the rate is over 1s. in the £ on those poor people for permanent purposes, it is too much.

4165. Mr. Kelly.—At present here you not a striking instance of what you are talking about. Is there not a pauper here at present who was forty years in Scotland?—Yes; he was sent back to us; in fact he was so long away that the Guardians of the neighbourhood he said he belonged to could not remember him at all. They argued at first that no such man came from the place, but after a while he proved who he was.

4166. Since he turned up he was able to punish them?—Yes.

4167. Dr. BIRNIE.—How long is that ago?—Two months ago.

4168. He was forty years in Scotland?—Yes.

4169. Mr. MURKIN.—Had he not acquired a settlement?—It appears not; they sent one or two down Scotland.

4170. Mr. Kelly.—Is not the railway four or five miles from Duffanagh?—It is 4½ Irish miles.

4171. Would you, as regards facilities, consider it as cheap to bring paupers to Letterkenny as to Duffanagh?—It would be cheaper to bring them to Letterkenny.

4172. And if you had a cottage hospital about Gweedore, you think the wants of the infirm and sick would be attended to?—I think they would be very well.

4173. Do you know the capacity of this house for holding paupers?—Yes.

CHAIRMAN.—You need not go into that.

Mr. Kelly.—The chairman of the District Council, and Mr. Murphy, intended to come here, but have been prevented, but they are unanimous in your resolution.

Mr. James
Boyle.

Mr. JAMES BOYLE examined.

4174. CHAIRMAN.—I intend to send a return to Mr. Boyle to get some statistics. The Guardians passed a resolution unanimously in favour of the amalgamation of this union with Letterkenny?—They did; preferably, Letterkenny.

4175. Was that unanimous?—It was; there was a special meeting summoned.

4176. Mr. Kelly.—The question was mooted six or seven months ago in the neighbourhood. Was there a public meeting?—Yes; it is about twelve months ago since it was started.

4177. Was there not a resolution three or four years ago?—Three years ago a similar resolution was passed. It was started twelve years ago.

4178. Mr. MURKIN.—How many Guardians were present on the session of the meeting?—Seven.

4179. What is the composition of the body; how many members?—Twenty-three.

4180. CHAIRMAN.—Was there any movement outside as far as you are aware, showing there was any difference of opinion on the part of the people of the district?—No.

4181. They seemed to agree with the seven who passed that resolution unanimously?—The general popular opinion is for amalgamation, except in the vicinity of Duffanagh.

4182. The trades, I suppose?—Yes.

4183. Mr. MURKIN.—The ground principally, I suppose, was economy?—Yes; it was estimated it would reduce the rates by 6d. in the £.

4184. So the universal opinion almost is that this institution should be amalgamated with a neighbouring one?—Yes.

4185. CHAIRMAN.—Did the Guardians in the Dunfally Electoral Division dissent from that?—They did not; it was passed unanimously.

4186. Were the Guardians of Dunfally present?—Mr. Murphy and Mr. Irvine, there were only five present.

4187. Mr. MURKIN.—Out of a body of twenty-three?—Yes.

4188. Dr. BUCHAN.—Did they get notice of it?—Yes, the meeting was specially summoned.

4189. Mr. Kelly.—What was the time?—Six of August.

4190. Were they busy at the harvest, when the few weather was coming in?

Mr. KELLY.—I think it was in 1889 or 1890. There was a full Board here, and a resolution was passed in favour of amalgamation.

Dr. J. J. MACGRATH EXAMINED.

4191. CHAIRMAN.—Did you happen to be present when the chairman was giving his evidence?—I was not.

4192. The question has arisen, supposing this workhouse was broken up, whether any hardship would result to the sick of the union by the closing of the hospital for the ordinary medical and surgical cases, as distinguished from the fever cases. Do you think any hardship would result in the union if the workhouse infirmary were closed, and no other general hospital opened in Dunfally Union for the sick?—I would say that if there were a small hospital it would be very advantageous to the people about, and it would certainly result, to some extent, in a hardship to the people, in this way, that they would have to be removed altogether from their own people.

4193. Is it your experience that their friends come in frequently to see them, or do you find that they do not?—They come in very frequently; too frequently sometimes.

4194. Even from a distance like Greendale or Cloughanally?—They come in to see their friends.

4195. Would any hardship result to the sick from the closing of the hospital beyond what you might call the sentimental, or separation from friends?—There are some of these districts it would be very difficult to get people from to railway stations. The station is five miles from the village.

4196. Take the further districts, Coosroads, and beyond it?—From Coosroads they could be conveyed, if not immediately, by railway. There are just as good facilities to remove them to Letterkenny and other places as to here, having regard to distance.

4197. There would be a large proportion of medical and surgical cases that could not be carried by railway?—Many of them.

4198. How would it work out as regards those?—I would say that there should still be some sort of small hospital in the union for those.

4199. What would you think would be a good site or place for the erection of such a hospital?—Of course I would say, as you have one here, to have it here. Then it would be a question also, perhaps, to have another one in another district—another cottage hospital.

4200. At where?—I am not sufficiently acquainted with the districts.

4201. You would be guided by the extent of the population?—Something like that. I would say there ought to be one or two hospitals, perhaps.

4202. You would not keep up this building here as a hospital?—It is a small hospital, and it could be made a very effective and good hospital.

4203. You are now speaking from a medical point of view; but if you were considering it from a ratepayer's point of view, would you see any economy in breaking up the union, and at the same time keeping up this large building as a hospital?—I certainly would, even as a ratepayer. I think the union ought to be broken up, though.

4204. Would it be on economical grounds?—On economical grounds.

CHAIRMAN.—I was at it, and there was an inquiry. Oct. 1, 1900.

4205. Mr. Kelly.—There was a public meeting held outside the Board; when was that?—There was no public meeting held since this Commission was appointed. Mr. Harkin addressed a meeting at Creenough.

Mr. KELLY.—He was chairman of the Guardians.

4206. CHAIRMAN.—Was he in favour of amalgamation?—Yes; he read a lot of statistics.

4207. Mr. MURKIN.—How many inmates in the house at present?—Forty.

4208. How many in the infirmary?—Eight.

4209. And the body of the house?—Thirty-two.

4210. Mr. Kelly.—What is the average cost of a patient?—About 3s. 7d.; that is for food and clothing only.

4211. It would cost about £25 entirely, the maintenance?—About that; it costs £1,000 to keep the union going.

CHAIRMAN.—Do you propose to examine the doctor?

Mr. KELLY.—I have examined all the witnesses I am instructed to examine.

Dr. J. J. MacGrath.

4212. You did not consider what the saving would be, if any, if you still keep on the fever hospital and infirmary. Would you have much saving?—Well, the fever hospital, if I understand, in the fever hospital and infirmary the patients cost £28 a year each, and the ordinary patients cost about £23. I apprehend if the ordinary patients in the hospital were taken and put out—I am speaking, of course, of this union—with their friends, to lodge, as it were, the saving would be considerable.

4213. Boarded out; that is the aged and infirm, who are not really acute cases?—Yes; I would suggest that, and even children.

4214. That they should be boarded out and the Guardians pay for them?—With their friends; and I apprehend they would board with their friends for some small thing.

4215. It would be a kind of out-door relief?—Yes; there are people that are at present in the workhouse who could more economically live outside, if their friends were given a small sum to keep them.

4216. Do you think that if the Guardians took the present number of infirm persons—say thirty—that there are in the workhouse, and if they were to put those out of the workhouse and send them back to the districts they came from, as boarded-out patients, do you think you would not be likely to have a very large number of applications from other people for similar privileges?—That would be the objection.

4217. How would you meet that?—I have not thought that out. I did not give that sufficient consideration. I was not prepared for examination here.

Mr. KELLY.—The doctor was not deputed to give evidence.

4218. CHAIRMAN.—I understand that. But that would be the difficulty—I know that would be the difficulty. I foresee that.

4219. Dr. BUCHAN.—Have you much consumption in this union?—There is a good deal.

4220. CHAIRMAN.—Whereabouts is it, chiefly?—I would say in the village of Dunfally, a great deal of it.

4221. Do they know anything about isolation?—It is very difficult, I find, to teach them isolation. For instance, I admitted a case last week so extremely bad that really, although she was in the village of Dunfally, I rather feared she would die on roads, although it is only a very short distance; but she is living still, and there are at present in Dunfally several cases of phthisis.

4222. Living in small houses?—Yes; and there is no doubt they will contaminate a great deal more.

4223. CHAIRMAN.—Is it spreading?—It is spreading.

4224. Do you think there is anything in the conditions of life here, or in the situation, that predisposes this place to be liable to consumption?—No, I don't think so, not more than other places. I was sometimes in Coosroads, and I believe there was more consumption there; and I was also in County Waterford for some time, and I believe even there, though it is rather a rich country, there is more consumption; but there are a few places about here that are very bad for consumption. The village of Dunfally is really bad.

On 1, 1900.

Dr. J. J.
MacGeach.

I apprehend a good deal of it is want of proper sewerage; also from the conditions of life under which they live, so that they merely exist, and they are then liable to all sorts of diseases.

4222. Is there anything in this place that would make it a bad site. This workhouse, if the workhouse were closed, would there be anything against making this, after making due structural changes, making this a sanatorium for the county, or for the adjacent counties, for consumption cases?—I believe it would be a very good site; the site of this workhouse and hospital is an excellent site.

4223. Do you know anything against it; you have the railway, too, within four miles?—We have.

4224. So that you would get patients brought within four miles of the workhouse, and then ambulated over?—Certainly; in nearly all cases of consumption, except in a case such as I spoke of, where the patient was very far gone.

4225. You think it would be a good plan?—I do.

4226. What ground have you there?—I don't know how many acres.

Mr. Boyle.—There are about four acres.

4227. CHAIRMAN.—You would have exercise ground?—Yes.

4228. I suppose that idea did not occur to the Guardians?—I dare say it did occur, but perhaps they did not care for it.

4229. If they were not paying for it, perhaps they would not mind?—No; I think they would be rather pleased. There was a consumptive patient sent here from Lifford because this was his native place, but I had no ward for consumptive patients.

4230. Was it an advanced case?—It was, but he was able to go about; it was in the third stage. I applied to the Guardians, and they sent him on to Lifford. I don't know what arrangement the Guardians made. But this last case was so far advanced I was obliged to admit him, and I have him here in an isolation ward, but I have no hope of arresting the disease.

4231. Dr. BOGGER.—Do you know anything of a fever case being sent from this union to Derry?—I know only what I have seen in the public papers; that is all.

4232. There was some mention of the fever hospital not having been used for three years?—That is quite untrue.

4233. CHAIRMAN.—You contradicted it, I think, in this morning's papers?—I did. It must have been an understatement, because the people with whom the case occurred are well aware that some of their own people were treated in the fever hospital recently.

4234. It was not thought that that was a fever case when it was started?—I am not aware of that. I heard there was a telegram sent to Derry to prepare a bed for a fever case.

4235. At all events the patient was not received into the Foyls Hill Hospital?—So I am informed.

4236. Mr. MASSEY.—Is it recently that consumption has developed in Derryferry?—As far as I know, it is of long standing. My predecessor found it also; it is the village doctor.

4237. Mr. IRVINE.—How many houses in the village have families suffering from that disease?—I did not come here prepared—well, say four houses.

4238. Dr. BOGGER.—In the four houses, do the patients sleep with any person else?—I have tried to keep them from it, but I have found it very difficult.

4239. You think they do sleep with others?—Certainly.

4240. And take no precautions otherwise as to expectation?—I don't think it would be well to say that, because I am trying to alter it.

4241. CHAIRMAN.—Are you apprehensive that they don't?—I am apprehensive that they cannot, even if they did try, that they cannot sufficiently keep away.

4242. Dr. BOGGER.—But do they carry it on to some extent?—Some of them are very intelligent people, and I must say some of them realise the danger.

4243. Mr. KELLY.—Those people would go into a sanatorium much sooner than into the infirmary of a workhouse?—Decidedly. I have tried, as a matter of fact, to get some of them into a sanatorium, but unfortunately, cannot, as there are no vacancies at present.

4244. So that the infirmary is practically a dead letter as regards giving any benefit to those people?—It is.

4245. Dr. BOGGER.—Do you get any paying patients in the infirmary?—Not in my experience.

4246. If there was a cottage hospital, would they go in and pay?—I am sure you would have a very large number of people coming in if there were a cottage hospital independently. They have an objection to coming here because it is a fever hospital.

4247. Mr. KELLY.—Are you aware that many of the patients are paying in the infirmary for the last six or three years?—I am only here for eighteen months, and I have no knowledge.

4248. Have you had many patients in the infirmary during that time?—I did not calculate, but I shall find out.

CHAIRMAN.—We are sending a circular for statistics on that point.

4249. Mr. KELLY.—Roughly, would there be five admissions in the year?—A great deal more.

4250. In recent years the fact that they were building a railway here caused the number of admissions to the infirmary to increase?—I have heard that.

4251. Accidents came here?—Oh, yes.

Mr. Michael
Colgan.

Mr. MICHAEL COLGAN recalled.

4252. CHAIRMAN.—Up to the present, have you got much from paying patients, except from the police?—For the last five years there were only two police constables treated; all the others were civilians—four or five accidents on the railway, and three others from the neighbourhood.

Mr. James
Sweeney.

Mr. JAMES SWEENEY examined.

I was not present at Letterkenny, but I have been told what Mr. DUNNELL said with regard to the Ramelton Fever Hospital. I am one of the governors of the Hospital, and I give the statement I have heard; he made use of a most unqualified contradiction, as to the way the Hospital was conducted.

4253. CHAIRMAN.—He had not a very high opinion of it?—He has never been there to form an opinion.

4254. You think Ramelton Hospital is useful to the locality?—Most useful.

4255. And it has relieved serious cases of illness?—Most undoubtedly. I know quite a number of poor people who have been brought there who were well, and would die on the roadside sooner than go to Millford Hospital. They go most willingly and cheerfully to Ramelton Hospital. There have been quite a number of difficult operations performed there, as can easily be proved from the books.

4256. And it is managed at a very low cost?—Yes, at a very low cost. The cost of supporting the nurses in Ramelton Fever Hospital, and also the payment of the

doctor, is much less than the payment of one nurse at the Millford Hospital, owing to the action of a number of stipendiaries. That is my experience. I don't feel at all sure, and I will prove it beyond the shadow of a doubt. The medical officer in attendance is a credit to his profession, and the nurses that have been trained under the charge of the hospital have become most devoted and successful when they have been appointed to other institutions.

CHAIRMAN.—We saw the hospital yesterday morning.

4257. Dr. BOGGER.—Do many people go long distances to Ramelton Fever Hospital?—Oh, yes, they come from a considerable distance away; even quite a number come from His Majesty's army.

4258. CHAIRMAN.—From Rathfriland?—Yes.

Mr. MASSEY.—They come from Knockalla.

Witness.—They come seven or eight miles, probably ten.

4259. Dr. BOGGER.—From Rathfriland?—Yes.

4260. Mr. MURPHY.—The number of patients there seemed to be very few?—They are not many.

4254. Dr. BROSSE.—Would you take them from any portion?

CHAIRMAN.—The doctor has the power of admitting?—Yes, and also on the recommendation of a governor.

4255. Does he refuse admissions, as far as you are aware, in many cases?—Very few are refused.

Dr. BROSSE.—Not only does he not refuse, but do the people, beyond a certain limit, know they can get in?—The people do not know any definite limits.

Mr. MACKAY.—They think it belongs to Ramelton.

4256. CHAIRMAN.—Do they come from Kilmacrennan?—Not generally. They are under the impression it belongs to the Ramelton dispensary district.

4257. Dr. BROSSE.—Where do you raise your subscriptions from. Is it altogether from Ramelton?—Chiefly, and also from a few miles outside the town; we rarely go over it.

4258. And I suppose you think you have a right to admit those people?—We don't go quite on that ground.

Mr. MACKAY.—I have been receiving this in my mind. I know one case that came from Milford. It

was the doctor there sent it on, because he had not the means of operating.

4259. Mr. MURKIN.—How do the contributions compare at the present time with the contributions of six or eight years ago?—I was not a governor six or eight years ago.

4260. And the County Council contribute in proportion?—Yes; in proportion to the amount we contribute privately.

4261. You are satisfied the hospital there does a lot of good?—Quite satisfied.

4262. And it would be a great mistake to have it removed?—Certainly.

4263. Mr. KELLY.—A man who was in the hospital last year made a bequest when he was dying?—Yes.

4264. CHAIRMAN.—Are there any other witnesses?

Witness.—Seeing that Mr. Diamond is now present, I would be very glad to repeat my evidence in his presence.

CHAIRMAN.—This witness, Mr. Diamond, who has gone down, holds a diametrically opposite opinion to yours on the subject of the Ramelton Hospital.

Oct. 1, 1902.

Mr. James
Sweeney

Mr. JAMES A. DIAMOND examined.

I anticipated as much.

4273. CHAIRMAN.—And you are both free to express your opinions.

Witness.—The chairman has been there and saw it, but he did not see it in its deshabitilla.

Mr. Sweeney.—Neither have you; you have never been there in your life.

Witness.—I walked round it.

Mr. James A.
Diamond.

Mr. E. WATERS examined.

4278. CHAIRMAN.—Was there anything that you wish, on behalf of the Milford Board of Guardians, to say?—No.

CHAIRMAN.—Because we have finished the evidence as far as the Dunsfonghy Union is concerned. They are in favour of amalgamating with Letterkenny instead of any other union.

Mr. Diamond.—If they conduct themselves properly, we have no objection to their going to Milford.

CHAIRMAN.—They don't want Milford, but if Milford is to go, they would take half of it.

Mr. Diamond.—There is just one thing I would like to refer to. You heard Mr. Hayes say the people lost all affection for their pauper friends when they went into the workhouse. He also followed up that remark by saying that the people, as a rule, were all buried in the union grounds. I yesterday called upon the clerk, and out of fifteen deaths in Milford for the past twelve months, three were buried in the workhouse, who were troops.—Here is the list:—Wm. Rodden, Kilmacrennan; Mudge M. Fadden, Rathfriland; Wm. Wason, Kilmacrennan; Wm. Callaghan, Masserunt; James McLaughlin, Tully; Catherine M'Atter, Masserunt; Ellen Wharekey, Killygarra. All the deaths during last year ending 31st March, 1903, interred out. None buried in the workhouse. Wm. Ward, buried in Milford graveyard; Mary McGeoghan, in workhouse; Patrick McGettigan, Meavegh; John Gallagher, Meavegh; Patrick M'Atter, Masserunt; James O'Shaughnessy, Meavegh; Bolla Byrne, workhouse; Sarah McBrick, Killygarra. Half-year ended 30th September, 1903. During the past year ended September, fifteen deaths—twelve buried out, and three in the workhouse.

4279. CHAIRMAN.—Yes, fifteen deaths, and twelve were taken out by relatives?—Yes; I have been a witness to it when going to my place of worship on a Sunday.

4280. I must say I heard it with great surprise.—Yes; he was speaking from reconciliation when he said so. I have watched with pleasure the relatives and friends of paupers coming there on a Sunday.

4279. I see two of these are from Mr. Hayes' own district?—Yes; they are buried in Meavegh.

4280. That is a very long way to take them?—Yes; their friends came for them.

4281. What about the bodies from their friends?—They all generally come to see them.

4282. And they are not deserted?—Nothing of the sort. It would be a terrible impression to leave on you to say that they were altogether neglected as soon as they went into a workhouse. Nothing of the kind is the fact.

4283. Mr. MURKIN.—Then your idea would be to retain in the localities some institution or other for the accommodation of the infirm and aged?—Decidedly; it would be a very inhuman thing to have these poor creatures removed a distance of eighteen miles to Milford, and then to Letterkenny; and Dunsfonghy is out of the question altogether.

4284. You would not believe in a central county institution for such a class?—Not for that class, but I would say the county infirmary is altogether in the wrong location when it is located at Milford. If we had a county hospital at Letterkenny it would be a central place.

4285. Mr. KELLY.—Or Ramelton?—Ramelton is very well supplied with the hospital it has if it is continued. I hope Mr. Sweeney has treated you to a detailed account of the operations that I described as tooth extractions the day before yesterday.

CHAIRMAN.—You were wrong in that.

Mr. Sweeney.—He is often wrong.

Witness.—Leave that for the gentlemen just to find out.

4286. Mr. MURKIN.—You are not specially interested in the Dunsfonghy Union being amalgamated or otherwise?—No; they are able to take care of themselves.

Dr. McGraff.—You might perhaps consider that phthisis was only in Dunsfonghy village. I forgot to say there is a great deal in the upper end, Cresslonga direction.

Mr. E.
Waters.

The sitting was adjourned.

TENTH PUBLIC SITTING.—TUESDAY, OCTOBER 13TH, 1903.

At the Workhouse, Ballyshannon.

Present:—Mr. MILES (Chairman), Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. CONY BROGER.

CHAIRMAN.—Gentlemen, this is an adjournment of the Letterberry Inquiry, and I would like to know who are the legal gentlemen present?

Mr. Philip Law Smith, M.P.—I appear, instructed by Mr. Reid, for the Ballyshannon Rural District No. 1, for the Urban Council of Ballyshannon, and for the Board of Guardians of Ballyshannon.

CHAIRMAN.—Are the other two counties represented, Leitrim and Fermanagh?

Mr. Smith.—We will produce evidence before you, sir. They are not separately represented, except as part of the Board of Guardians.

CHAIRMAN.—Is there any division of opinion?

Mr. Smith.—I think not; there have been resolutions passed. I will tell you shortly the position that the bodies I represent take up. As you are aware, sir, the valuation of the entire of Donegal is about £306,000, and the valuation of the Union of Ballyshannon amounts to £22,290, that is more than one-sixth of the entire county of Donegal. There are 122,328 acres in this union, and it is divided between three counties—41,570 for Donegal, 52,386 for Fermanagh, and 28,452 for the County Leitrim. There are five dispensary districts in this union—Ballintra, Ballyshannon, Belleek, Charahill, and Keshbeg—and I think, from your experience, having been here before, you have some idea of the way in which this workhouse has been done. I think it is one of the few workhouses in Ireland at which there has never been an inquiry, or in reference to which any complaint made. It has been singularly efficient in the management of its business, and the way the paupers are looked after. The body I represent are in favour of amalgamation. There are at present eight unions in Donegal.

CHAIRMAN.—Before you pass away from that, have you got the valuations of the three rural divisions?

Mr. Smith.—I can hand them in to you in a moment; Mr. CHURCH will give it to you. What we are in favour of doing is this. There are eight unions in the County Donegal. What we suggest is that four should remain, and the four we suggest should remain are, Ballyshannon, Glenties, either Letterberry or Milford, and Inishowen. We say the other four—Donegal, Dunfemphry, Stranorlar, and either Milford or Letterberry—should be abolished. If you look at the formation of this union on the map, Ballyshannon is the largest town coming through Donegal to Londonderry from Sligo. It has this large workhouse in close proximity to Banagher, and you know the Flaxer camp is there. We suggest that we should take in position of the County Fermanagh. I understand, by a resolution passed by the Fermanagh County Council, they are in favour of amalgamation, and only want one union for the County Fermanagh.

CHAIRMAN.—Taking your part?

Mr. Smith.—No; they have us over and will give us a portion of Inishowen. We are prepared to take up Brookhill and Roskeshober; that will extend down to the village of Pettigo. Mr. West, the Secretary of the Fermanagh County Council, has been kind enough to give me the resolution passed by a Committee of the County Council of Fermanagh, consisting of the Earl of Erne, Earl of Belmore, Mr. Jordan, M.P., and Mr. Cranley. We have the assistance and support of the Fermanagh County Council. They don't want any portion of our union, and I understand they are willing to give us Brookhill and Roskeshober. The town of Donegal is about half the size of the town of Ballyshannon. At present our union boundary runs up to the middle of the village of Ballintra, and we suggest we should get all Killybeg.

CHAIRMAN.—You would take the town of Donegal?

Mr. Smith.—We would take the entire of Inishowen—we have half of that already—and also Templemore.

CHAIRMAN.—How far would you go—up to Lough Beg?

Mr. Smith.—Up to Lough Beg.

Mr. Maguire.—Up to the top of the hills.

CHAIRMAN.—The sky line.

Mr. Smith.—As far as Letterberry is concerned, we are prepared to take in the entire parish of Ballyshannon and Killybeg. Although Ballyshannon is at the extreme end of Donegal, you will see from its position, and the class of roads, and the facilities, between towns and roads, of getting into Ballyshannon, that it is the most suitable place in the whole of Donegal for carrying on a large union. Ballyshannon is here (on map), and it extends to Pettigo on the other side, and the result of all this will be a great economy by abolishing some of the other unions. You have good train service, and the people of Donegal won't have as far to go to Glenties on that side. The answers that were given by the Board of Guardians to the queries that you submitted to them are:—"The Board of Guardians of Ballyshannon Union are in favour of reducing the number of union workhouses; that such reduction can be brought about by amalgamation. The facilities for the conveyance of the destitute to the workhouse by railways, and otherwise, are vastly improved in recent years. The Board of Guardians of Ballyshannon are of opinion that all workhouses having an average number of inmates of 100 or over, should be retained; and those workhouses having a low average of inmates might with advantage be discontinued." The number in the workhouse of Ballyshannon is 127—that is an average; in Donegal, 50; Dunfemphry, 43; Glenties, 19; Inishowen, 123; Letterberry, 27; Milford, 72; and Stranorlar, 55, and we suggest that the unions with over 100 inmates should be retained. "We do not approve of auxiliary inmate asylums; such institutions would make county management too expensive. The present system of having inmates at one centre is a better arrangement. Workhouses with a small average number of inmates, if financed, might, with advantage to their surrounding localities, be utilized as technical schools, or converted into houses of industry, according to the respective requirements of the districts. We do not approve of the maintenance of any class or class of paupers in the workhouse of another union when there is amalgamation in the case of the two most affected thereby, and we disapprove of the boarding of inmates. Amalgamation or no amalgamation of unions, combination or no combination, or whether any changes as to administration are made, we are in favour of opinion there should be a change in the mode of granting outdoor relief. We think outdoor relief should only be granted by the Board of Guardians on the production of a certificate from a dispensary medical officer, or on the joint recommendation of the Guardians representing the electoral division in which the applicant resides. We consider outdoor relief for support to the former system of divisional rating. We consider that no additional accommodation for the treatment of the sick poor is required in Ballyshannon Union. The good reputation of the Ballyshannon workhouse and hospital is sufficient to show that the treatment of the poor inmates has always been excellent, and we have never yet heard any complaint on the ground of want of, or of bad, treatment. We consider wherever a patient is able, he should contribute. More vigilance is necessary on the part of the Guardians in enforcing the provisions of the Vagrancy Act, and the improvement not to be less than two months." The Town Commissioners of Ballyshannon have given the following reply:—"That we, the Town Commissioners of Ballyshannon, in full meeting assembled, unanimously resolve that in consequence of the central position occupied by the Ballyshannon workhouse and fever hospital, their convenience in respect of the districts which they serve, the splendid accommodation which they can afford, their proximity to the large towns of Ballyshannon and Buncrana, and the

Oct. 16, 1906.

smaller ones of Ballintra, Belleek, Kilmough, Garrison, and Tullaghan, we are strongly of opinion that no change can be effected whereby the interests of the sick and destitute poor could be so well safeguarded. We also respectfully urge that before deciding on their report dealing with the Ballyshannon Union, the Poor Law Reform Commissioners should consider the good management that prevails in the union and at the workhouse, the good condition of the union parishes, and the efficiency and harmony that exist among all the officials. Signed—Michael Maguire, solicitor,

Chairman; Edward Lynch, Town Clerk." The Fermanagh County Council are also in favour of amalgamation. The number of people that were admitted to the Ballyshannon Workhouse during the year 1902 amounts in all to the number of 920—that is, 704 were admitted during the year, three were born in the house, and the number that were in the house at the beginning of the year, making in all 920 persons. I now call Mr. Chas. who will give you the details of these figures.

Mr. J. B. CHAS. EXAMINED.

Mr. J. B. Chas.

4287. Mr. Smith.—You were formerly Clerk of the Poor Law Board here?—Yes.

4288. And you now occupy the corresponding position with the Rural District Council?—That is so.

4289. For how many years have you occupied these positions?—Nearly thirty-four years.

4290. During that time, as far as you know, have the workhouse buildings and the staff of the Union at Ballyshannon been kept in efficient working order?—They have, particularly since the Chairman of this Commission inaugurated a new system of running.

4291. Can you give the date of that?—I think it was about 1885.

CHAIRMAN.—1886 or 1891.

4292. Mr. Smith.—That system was adopted then?—It was. We were the first union, I think, in the North of Ireland.

4293. And with satisfactory results to the sick poor?—Most satisfactory.

4294. I see you have adopted the scale of dietary, and everything else recommended by the Local Government Board?—We improved the dietary.

4295. Have you carried out, as far as possible, the different recommendations of the Local Government Board as regards the workhouse?—We have.

4296. CHAIRMAN.—Except as to the flags in the workhouse?—We are advancing; we will do that in time, too.

4297. Mr. Smith.—The union, as at present constituted, is made up of three counties?—Yes. The valuation is £25,475 in Donegal, £17,049 in Fermanagh, and £9,796 in Leitrim, making £52,320 in round numbers.

4298. Am I right in saying that Ballyshannon is the largest town in Donegal, and the largest town on the way from Derry to Sligo?—Oh, certainly.

4299. Much larger than the town of Donegal?—Oh, yes; much larger.

4300. CHAIRMAN.—You would not go through Strabane or Omeath that way?—No.

4301. Mr. Smith.—Am I right in saying that there is a railway in course of construction between Donegal and Ballyshannon?—Yes; I expect it will be open in a year.

4302. And that will carry you into Donegal?—Yes.

4303. You have the answers which I read, which were given by your Board. Was that adopted after due notice to all the members of the Board?—It was.

4304. CHAIRMAN.—Was it after the decision of the Donegal County Council?—It was passed and approved of on the 10th of the month, that is last Saturday. I sent an advance copy to you.

4305. Mr. Smith.—That was the result, after full notice to every member representing those counties?—Yes, sir.

4306. With reference to the districts, take it that there is amalgamation in the County Fermanagh, and Limavady Union is abolished. That would leave you the districts of Breckhill and Rossharbour?—Yes, that would go close to Pettigo.

4307. Can those districts be conveniently and suitably served from Ballyshannon?—Certainly. They are quite as near as a great many of our districts already. They are nearer than Cheshill.

4308. Now take it on the Donegal side. The Union at present goes up to the middle of the town of Belleek?—Runs to the police barracks.

4309. That is the parish of Drumahaire. Take it now that Donegal is abolished. Could that district be conveniently served by Ballyshannon?—I believe so, because there would be railway communication the whole way. It is not further away from us than Church Hill in Tullaghan.

4310. At any rate, the other half of the street cannot be inconvenient?—No.

4311. CHAIRMAN.—Is it proposed to take in the town of Donegal?—Well, as far as the parish of Killybeg Drumahaire goes very close to it.

4312. Laghey is in Drumahaire, and I think Donegal too?—I would not be surprised. Templemore runs towards Pettigo.

4313. Mr. Smith.—Is Templemore down near Pettigo?—It is.

4314. And that, you say, should also be taken into Ballyshannon?—Yes, we have the railway from Pettigo to Ballyshannon.

4315. On the Leitrim side, have we at present any portion of the parish of Ballyshannon?—It is the parish of Rosinver. All our Leitrim divisions are in Rosinver.

4316. Should the entire of Rosinver be brought into the union?—I believe we could do with it.

4317. Killybeg?—We run on the very edge of it at the present time.

4318. CHAIRMAN.—Is it in Mohill or Manorbennet?—Manorbennet. At Leitrim, we are further away than Killybeg.

4319. Mr. Smith.—The number of paupers relieved in the house was 127. How many more people could the building accommodate. Would there be sufficient to take in the ordinary requirements of these districts?—I have no doubt of it whatever. Of course the workhouse will not accommodate now the numbers put on them at the start, on account of the changes—the cable space, &c.—but I believe we could do up to 250 or 300, although the workhouse was intended at first for double that number.

4320. Now will you tell the Commission the number of people that were actually admitted to the workhouse during the year 1902. How many had you at the beginning of the year ending March, 1902. The number of persons who were in the workhouse at the beginning of the year was 125, and there were three born. There were actually admitted to the workhouse during the year 794, making in all 920 persons?—Yes, that is copied from my book.

CHAIRMAN.—One aspect of the question you have not gone into, the fact that the County Council of Donegal contend that all the unions should be within the county, and they propose to sacrifice Ballyshannon for that reason. Will you have any further rebutting evidence; some County Councillor from this neighbourhood?

Mr. Smith.—Certainly; Mr. Maguire. But I wanted to get from Mr. Chas. what owing to the position of the place, and the number of people who were actually relieved, being an enormous number in this district, that it would be a fatal mistake in the interests of the poor to abolish this union, notwithstanding the opinion of the County Council. We are strongly of opinion that owing to the condemnation of the district round, Ballyshannon is the natural selection for a workhouse union.

Mr. MURPHY.—Then we are to understand that the bodies you represent adopt a different view to the view taken by the County Council of Donegal?

Mr. Smith.—Yes. We don't bind ourselves to county divisions. You are sent out to see whether there is to be economy or not, amalgamation or not. That must necessarily bring increased distance, and the county divisions are not mandatory upon you, or upon us, to meet the exigencies of a particular case. We say Ballyshannon is a special case with three counties round it. Take the Fermanagh people—they would have to go to Belleek, the Leitrim people would have to go to Manorbennet or Sligo, and the people of Ballyshannon, where 920 people are relieved, would have to go to Donegal or Glenties.

Mr. MURPHY.—Then your position is identical with that of Derry city. They have taken up the position that owing to the facilities afforded by the Derry

Oct. 12, 1892.

Mr. J. B.
Union.

Union, it would be an injury to concede to the demands of the Donegal County Council that the county should be self-contained for all purposes.

Mr. Smith.—They can carry that theory of self-contained counties too far. We can show you that, by limiting it to the County Donegal, you would be putting extreme hardship not only on the poor and sick, but also upon any representatives that have to go there, and we will show that the desire of this district and of the three counties, as voiced by their representatives, is

that this union should not only be preserved, but should be extended.

4321. CHAIRMAN.—Is this the market town for the union including the Leitrim and Fermanagh parts? It is, sir. It is the only market town in it, too. Ballyshannon has no market at all. This is the market town for the whole union.

4322. Mr. Smith.—And for the outside districts even, that we seek to take in?—Drumshelm people come here, too.

Mr. Michael
Maguire.

Mr. MICHAEL MAGUIRE, Solicitor, examined.

4323. Mr. Smith.—You are the Chairman of the Town Commissioners?—Yes.

4324. And you are also Chairman of the District Council?—Yes.

4325. And you are also a County Councillor?—Yes.

4326. CHAIRMAN.—Were you present at the County Council meeting?—I was present at a few meetings when the matter was discussed, but the situation of Ballyshannon never was considered fully there; in fact it was hardly mentioned. The urgent discussion at the County Council was with regard to the districts near Derry and Strabane, in the County Donegal, that formed portion of the unions of Derry and Strabane. Ballyshannon never was considered. I was not at the last meeting, where something occurred about it, and I don't know what it was. I was present at those meetings where the Derry Union and Strabane Union were considered, and I voted on the subject that those portions should be taken away from Derry and from Strabane, for the reason that those are rich portions of the County Donegal, and that they should be thrown in with the unions of the County Donegal for rating purposes, and the relief of the rates all over those districts now in the Strabane and Letterkenny Unions.

4327. Mr. Smith.—You say the case of Ballyshannon is different?—Entirely different, for the reasons, partly, that I have mentioned, that those districts there are rich districts, and would be useful to the unions of Strabane, Letterkenny, and Limavady. Here the districts which we seek to retain from Fermanagh and Leitrim are not rich districts, not near so rich as the Ballyshannon rural district itself, which forms portion of the union, and the districts which we would seek to have added on are also districts poorer than we have here in the Ballyshannon rural district in this county.

4328. Your Board, both the District Council and the Town Commissioners, unanimously adopted the answer that I have read?—Yes. The Ballyshannon Town Commissioners have unanimously adopted the resolution you read, and I understand a similar resolution was passed by the Board of Guardians. I was not present.

4329. You have been living for some time in and about the town of Ballyshannon?—Yes, sixteen years.

4330. Ballyshannon is the market town and the business centre for the entire union?—Yes, the entire union, and for very large districts outside the union boundaries. For instance, Ballyshannon is the market town as far as Orange, County Sligo, and people in the County Fermanagh and in the County Leitrim who are not at present in this union, come here for their markets; also people in the parish of Drumshelm, who are in the Donegal Union, do their marketing at Ballyshannon.

4331. And do you state to the Commission that the sick and poor of the added districts that I have mentioned can be adequately served from Ballyshannon?—Yes, I make that statement.

4332. And the buildings here would be sufficient to accommodate the increased number that might reasonably be expected to be brought from the added area?—The buildings are ample for the purpose.

4333. You know the buildings in Donegal?—Not very well. The Chairman here knows the buildings all over the district.

4334. I think I am right in saying that the buildings here are much larger than the buildings in Donegal?—

CHAIRMAN.—They are large enough in each place for all possible requirements.

4335. Mr. Smith.—You think that these districts can be adequately served?—Yes, that is my opinion.

4336. With reference to this boundary question, do you know of any desire of the people of the County Donegal to limit the unions to the County Donegal?—No, I know of no such desire here.

4337. Or any desire on the part of the people of Fermanagh?—No, there is no such desire.

4338. Or Leitrim?—I don't know of any.

4339. CHAIRMAN.—The Guardians are unanimous?—Yes.

4340. Mr. Smith.—There is a unanimity of opinion in favour of preserving this union, which seems to have worked satisfactorily, and of extending it?—Yes.

4341. Mr. MAGUIRE.—It seems that the bodies with which you are connected disapprove of making asylums?—They do, sir, on the ground that it would make the management very expensive. You would require an entirely new set of officials for each sanitary asylum. The officials that you have at the workhouses, in the event of any workhouses being discontinued, would not be suitable officials for the management of an asylum.

4342. Are you aware that the asylums in this country are conducted on an economic line as the workhouses?—I don't know the management.

4343. It is principally on the ground of expense that you would object?—On the ground of expense.

4344. If you could be satisfied that sanitary asylums could be conducted as economically and at as little cost to the ratepayers as the existing institutions, the system involving better treatment, would your objection then disappear?—It would not. I would prefer to see lunatics at one centre for the county. I think the management and supervision is much better than it could be if you had a number of asylums.

4345. Do you think it is well for a great aggregation of people to be in one particular place such as would be absolutely necessary if all the insane of the county are kept in one district?—That would be a question for an expert on insanity; he would be better able to answer than I would.

4346. It seems you disapprove of the boarding-out of children?—No, sir; we disapprove of the boarding-out of inmates; we mean adults.

4347. Not of children?—No; personally, I am in favour of the boarding-out of children.

4348. Still this institution acts on that principle, because they do not board out any here?—They do board out some.

4349. You have three boarded out and twenty-two in the house?—That is so. Since I became connected with the Board, there was no great desire on the part of the Guardians to board out, and no person moved in the system. That is the explanation.

4350. The question of able-bodied paupers does not seem to arise much in this institution?—We have not got any; as soon as it is ascertained that there is an able-bodied pauper here he is turned out.

4351. So that is not a question really that troubles this Board very much?—No, sir, it does not.

4352. You have no voice upon what should be done with regard to vagrants?—I thank the answer to the queries given by the Guardians and Town Commissioners would go a good way in meeting the case. If the police were more vigilant, when they found these people wandering about, they should call upon them to give an account of themselves, and they should put the vagrancy laws in force, and the period of imprisonment which the magistrates might impose should be two months at least. That was the opinion of the Board here. I think if they got two months' hard labour they would be slow to trouble the same locality again.

4353. Mr. Smith.—In some other counties they get to employ them at useful manual labour in the workhouses?—Yes.

4354. With reference to this outdoor relief, you say:—"We consider among rating far superior to the former system of divisional rating." Will you explain that?—The explanation of that is this, that while there is union rating, every member of the Board is equally interested, whereas if it were divisional rating with regard to outdoor relief, you might have

all the Guardians in favour of relief in a particular electoral division save the Guardians representing that electoral division, and the two Guardians representing a particular electoral division might be over-ruled in the case of their own division.

4353. Your Board suggested that there should be a change in the mode of granting outdoor relief?—Yes, I think that there should be more evidence given in some form when an applicant comes for outdoor relief. There should be the evidence of the doctor that he is a fit subject, or the Guardians representing the electoral division in which the applicant resides should be unanimous in their view that it is a fit case for outdoor relief.

4354. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you think it would be a proper thing that the Guardians of the division should have a deciding vote in what the whole union would have to pay?—No, I do not, but I think on their representation, if they were unanimous, the Board would not refuse.

4355. Still they would be dealing with money contributed by other divisions?—No, that would come before the full Board.

4356. You would not allow the full Board any voice?—I would on the recommendation.

4357. CHAIRMAN.—You would not allow the case to come before the full Board unless it had the urgent recommendation of the two Councils?—Yes, representing the division in which the applicant resides.

4358. Mr. MURKIN.—Is the outdoor relief question a big one here? Do you give much outdoor relief?—It is fairly large. We give to all deserving cases.

4359. CHAIRMAN.—Has it increased very much within the last five or six years?—I am informed that it has not increased within the last five or ten years.

Mr. CHILDS.—It has not. It was £503 a year. Since the new system came into force it has not increased. The new Board merely carried forward the practice which was on outdoor relief under the old system.

4360. Mr. Smith.—You get a legacy from the old Board?—That is it.

MR. ROBERT SWEENEY EXAMINED.

4361. Mr. Smith.—Are you a Guardian?—Yes.

4362. And you are a Town Commissioner?—Yes.

4363. You know Ballyshannon and the requirements of it for some time?—Yes.

4364. With reference to this resolution of the Donegal County Council as to limiting the unions within the boundaries of the county, do you approve of that?—No, I do not. I think there is a great deal of sentiment in that, and I think making the unions county units would be very inconvenient for the destitute poor and the poor generally.

4365. And especially now, will you deal for a moment with the particular requirements of Ballyshannon, and saying that county law to Ballyshannon would be injurious to the sick poor?—I think it would be very injurious.

4366. You have been connected in business for some time with Ballyshannon?—Yes.

4367. Do you agree with the other witnesses that it is the central market town for the entire union?—It is; and for districts outside the union.

4368. With reference to the added areas that we suggest, can they all be as conveniently worked from Ballyshannon?—Well, taking the divisions already in Ballyshannon from the neighbouring counties, those divisions appear in some cases to be more convenient than those already attached to the union.

4369. Is it the feeling of the entire of the Guardians that the present state of things as to the union should continue?—As far as I know.

4370. And to take in the other portions?—It is.

4371. Mr. MURKIN.—Of course, you are aware that this is the only section of this county that takes the position that Donegal should not be self-contained as regards the union and county purposes?—Yes, sir.

4372. I suppose it is in the interests of self-preservation that Ballyshannon does that?—I think the interests of the poor were what were considered when the present boundaries of the union were defined.

4373. Supposing an arrangement could be made whereby the neighbouring unions could send to an institution such as Ballyshannon all the paupers of the adjoining unions, would not that meet your view as well?—I don't think it would. I think there should be a representation of the union that the paupers came

4353. CHAIRMAN.—You approve, of course, of people paying coming into the hospital?—Yes; I think that is the arrangement at present.

4354. You would like to make it discretionary with the Guardians what sum people should pay according to their means?—Yes, the Guardians have better means of ascertaining the ability of the person to pay.

4355. Mr. MURKIN.—In regard to outdoor relief, is not the custom at present that the Guardians representing the divisions in question give recommendations?—No, sir; the relieving officer may come forward before the Board and say there is a case in a particular electoral division that is fit for outdoor relief, and the Guardians representing that division may not be present at all at the Board, and the outdoor relief would be granted. Of course, the relieving officer is sifted in every case; he is examined by the Guardians to know is it a proper case to give relief in.

4356. In some unions the custom is that when an application comes before the Board the matter is referred to the relieving officer to report on a stated day in the month—for instance the second meeting in the month—and then he makes his report, and it is open to all the Guardians to decide as to whether the relief should be given or not?—That is very much the case here; the relieving officer is examined, and if he does not know the person, and the Guardians representing the district are not present, the matter is held over for further inquiry.

4357. So there is nothing in the way of extravagance in this union as regards outdoor relief?—Not that I am aware of. I know the union for a long time, and I know other unions, and I think a better-managed union than the Ballyshannon Union could hardly be found. There is the greatest humanity among all the officials; no friction of any sort, and the Guardians never hear any complaints, either from inmates or ratepayers, so far as I know, as to the management of the affairs of the union.

from in the house they went to. I think if the paupers from a neighbouring union came in here it would not be a fair thing, and I think it would create a system that would be very difficult to work out satisfactorily.

4360. CHAIRMAN.—I take Mr. MURKIN to mean that if No. 2 and No. 3 Districts should be added to the Fermanagh and Leitrim Unions, and if it were thought that the distance that the sick poor would have to be sent would be rather too much, would you see any objection to their being sent as board-out from the Fermanagh or Leitrim Union to Ballyshannon, paying so much a head, in the same way as you send patients to be treated in Dublin and other hospitals?—I don't think that would work well.

4361. What drawback would you see to that, where they gave, say 7s. 6d., or whatever it would be, a week, and you fed, supported, and looked after the patient, what objection would you see to that?—I would say that it would disarrange the system that is so well-known to the people, and I don't know how it would work within the workhouse; these are the outsiders.

4362. The relieving officer, or medical officer, in No. 2 or No. 3 Districts would give an order for admission here, and under that order the Guardians of the Fermanagh or Leitrim Union would have to pay for the patients so sent?—That class of pauper, I think, would not be received so well, or, at least, looked upon as a union pauper in the same way they now are; he is an outsider brought in. Supposing you made it a county boundary the feeling would be "You had better go to your own county."

4363. You would be glad to get anything that would relieve your rates?—I don't know that it would relieve our rates.

4364. He would pay a full share of the establishment and other charges, 10s., or whatever it would be; that would include all these things, and the pauper would be paying his full share?—I cannot see that that is a course likely to work out well.

4365. Your receipts would be practically the same for Poor Law purposes; you now get so much poundage rate for Poor Law purposes the difference would be that you would get per capita payments for the number of sick that came in. Do you think there would be any

Oct. 18, 1908.

Mr. Michael Maguire.

Mr. Robert Sweeney

Oct. 15, 1903
Mr. Robert
Sweeney.

difference in the amount of your receipts?—Well, I don't suppose there would be. How would we do in connection with outdoor relief?

CHAIRMAN.—That would be for the other unions.

4387. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—The proposal I make would be only to get rid of the travelling difficulty.—You mean to avoid long distances. I think whenever unions are retained they really should comprise the representatives and the poor of that union, and it would not be advisable to send outside paupers to a union they are not connected with.

Mr. Patrick
Trevelin.

4390. Mr. Smith.—You are a Rural District Councillor, and live in the County Donegal?—Yes.

4392. You and Mr. Daly were appointed on behalf of the Board to give evidence here?—Yes.

4393. Do you agree with Mr. Sweeney and Mr. Maguire with reference to the suitability of Ballyshannon Union for the purpose for which it was intended?—Yes; I agree that there could be no more suitable place.

4394. And you think it should be preserved?—Yes.

4395. And the added area can be worked with convenience to the poor?—I think so.

4396. Yes, as a Donegal man, know the resolution of the Donegal County Council with regard to this boundary question; do you think that as applied to Ballyshannon would be a mistake?—I think the case altogether different in Ballyshannon. My idea about the matter is this: that poor and rich areas should be grouped together irrespective of boundaries, so as to equalise as far as possible the taxation.

4397. CHAIRMAN.—Throughout the whole country?—Yes.

4398. Mr. Smith.—The old county divisions were created for a purpose that is now obsolete; you think the other districts can be served just as well?—Yes.

4399. How long have you been a District Councillor?—I was an old Guardian.

4400. During your time there have been no complaints with reference to the administration of the Poor Law by the Board?—No; never heard any. I would further suggest that in case of amalgamation this matter of grouping poor parts of the country with rich parts should be very seriously considered. I would also suggest to the Commission that the valuation and population of the different centres where workhouses are to be retained should be considered.

4401. That is irrespective of the county boundaries?—Yes. Also the number of inmates in the houses at present, the number of inmates the house can accommodate, and the management of the workhouse and the care and treatment of the inmates; also the facilities for moving the poor to the workhouse.

4402. CHAIRMAN.—Had you any particular idea how you would equalise the rates: did you think of any particular districts that you would, if you were dealing with the matter yourself, join together for the purpose of equalising rates?—It would suggest itself to me that the congested districts should be joined with richer parts of the country if possible.

4403. It would be places like Glenties and Derryfaherty?—Yes; and even here.

4404. How would you help Glenties and Derryfaherty?—They are practically all congested—very poor, low valuation. How would you help them?—I don't know how I could help them if there were no rich areas to which I could add them.

4405. There are no rich areas there; is there any other way you think?—Except by a loan or grant.

4406. How would you manage that grant?

Mr. Smith.—Would you go on the valuation list or the population test?

CHAIRMAN.—Or the poverty test—the relation between poverty and valuation?—I think I would go on all three.

4407. So that if Government grants, say half a million, for the sake of argument, all over Ireland, you would not be in favour of giving that chiefly to the wealthy and thinly populated districts in Meath and Westmeath?—Oh, no.

4408. Are you aware that these districts get the most grants at present?—That is on the valuation, I suppose. I would not be in favour of that.

4388. Well, the thing prevails already; you send people to different institutions?—We send them to the asylum.

4389. And the dumb and dumb institutions and places for the blind?—Yes. You see, these institutions are only few in number compared with workhouses.

4390. Institutions of the kind might not be very numerous. I just put the question in order to get your view. The matter is worth considering; it is a not beneficial it should not be adopted?—I think it would work up friction; I don't think it would work satisfactorily.

Mr. PATRICK BREKIN assumed.

4409. There are some unions with a valuation of nearly one and a quarter million sterling; that, of course, gets four times the amount of Donegal?—That is not fair.

4410. Would you be strongly in favour of redistributing the grants on the basis of poverty?—I would; if a grant is given for the purpose of relieving those that are overtaxed I think it should be used for that purpose.

4411. A grant is given for a great many purposes—it is given for medical purposes, part of the salaries of officers, school teachers, and other purposes like that, and it is distributed according to the valuation. You would not do that?—No.

4412. You prefer seeing it distributed in some other way, by which the poorer districts ought to get what would be really a fair share?—Yes; that those who were most in need of it should get most of it.

4413. You would take population and poverty largely into consideration?—Yes.

4414. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—You say you think it would be right that the richer portions of the district should contribute to the help of the poorer portions in the assistance of the poor of the whole area?—Yes, sir.

4415. Did you ever consider the question of county rating for Poor Law as well as for other purposes. You would meet your view, for instance, if instead of having union rating for the County Donegal there would be a county rating for Poor Law purposes; then do you not think that this question of boundaries or opposition to it would disappear if the whole County of Donegal were to contribute, proportionately, its share to the upkeep of the poor?—The divisions of other counties that we propose to take in or keep are all poor portions.

4416. You say that you do not think that it is right that a poor locality should have to support its poor alone without outside assistance; you think their rich neighbours should contribute to that support?—Yes; I think in any case of amalgamation that should be considered.

4417. Suppose some kind of county rating was proposed that would take in the rich and poor portions together, and then the Union would be spread equally all over the area, would that meet with your sympathy?—No doubt the rates would be very high in a county rating.

4418. They would not be high in the poor districts; they would be low in the poor districts, and they would be added to a little in the richer districts?—I don't think the local Guardians would take the same interest in keeping down the rates if it was county rating.

4419. CHAIRMAN.—Would you meet Mr. MURKAGHAN's suggestion half way, and, say, suppose there was a quarter of the expenditure a county rate when you come to a rate in aid of the poor districts, or under a particular head, supposing the expenditure on the sick—at present it is almost impossible to remove county hospitals to keep the sick as they should be kept, it is the 6 won't produce 650 altogether—would you propose that some particular head, such as expenditure on the sick, might be made a county charge, or even a county charge?—I don't think I know sufficient of the subject to answer that.

4420. Your idea was that you would like to see the poor people aided in their hard task of paying their way?—Yes; I had it in my mind that some of the unions of Donegal were very poor, and if they could be added to the rich ones I think it would be better for them.

4421. Mr. Smith.—But having thought over the question seriously, you are of opinion that Ballyshannon is a centre that ought to be preserved for a union?—Oh, yes.

Mr. JOHN DALY examined.

Oct 18, 1906

4422. Mr. Smith.—You are a District Councillor also in Donegal?—Yes, sir.

4423. And you were appointed, along with Mr. Desha, to give evidence here?—Yes.

4424. You agree, I need scarcely say, with the terms of this report that I have read?—Certainly.

4425. And you are of opinion that Ballyshannon should be preserved?—Yes.

4426. And that the other districts that have been mentioned can be, usefully to the poor, added to it?—Yes; and for the benefit of the sick.

4427. They can get here conveniently by train?—Very conveniently.

Mr. HENRY STUBBS examined.

Mr. Henry Stubbs.

4431. Mr. Smith.—You are a member of the Town Commissioners of Ballyshannon?—Yes.

4432. And you approve of the resolution that was passed, and which I read?—Yes.

4433. Were the Commissioners unanimous in favour of maintaining the present state of things?—Yes.

4434. From what you know of the district here, from your experience, are you convinced that Ballyshannon should be preserved as a union for the benefit of the poor of the district around?—Yes; I think it should. Ballyshannon is the centre of a very important district in the county; it is the largest town in the county, and in addition to that there is the rising town of Bandon, rapidly increasing, within three miles. It serves a large district with a number of small towns—Tullaghan, Garrison, Belleek, and Ballintra. Ballyshannon is practically the centre market town for them, and the workhouse here has always had a large average of inmates.

4435. CHAIRMAN.—A large average from the town?—Oh, yes; and from the districts around.

4436. About what is the population of the town, taking in Bandon?—Ballyshannon itself is 5,000.

4437. I suppose it would come to 4,000 people now, including Bandon?—I think it would be quite that. Of course, in summer there are much more.

4438. That furnishes a good many sick and infirm inmates to the house?—Yes.

Mr. JAMES TIMONEY, J.P., examined.

Mr. James Timoney.

4440. Mr. Smith.—You are a Justice of the Peace?—Yes.

4441. And are you also Chairman of the Belleek District Council?—Yes.

4442. That is in the County Fermanagh?—Yes.

4443. Where do the council assemble?—Here, for auxiliary purposes.

4444. As regards that district, what are your views with reference to maintaining as you are, attached to the Ballyshannon Union?—We would be strongly in favour of retaining.

4445. CHAIRMAN.—Is that the unanimous opinion of your council?—As far as I have been able to ascertain.

4446. Mr. Smith.—Mr. Stubbs has stated that for that district around, Ballyshannon is the real market town and business centre?—Yes; we regard it as the centre of the district; it is the banking centre and everything.

4447. As far as you know, to abolish this Ballyshannon Union, as it stands at present, would that inflict serious injury on the sick and poor of the district here?—We think it would be very inconvenient for the poor; there is no union nearer than Enniskillen.

4448. The resolution I have read, passed by the Fermanagh County Council, says they are in favour of amalgamation and only one union. I presume that would be Enniskillen. Assuming Enniskillen was gone, what workhouse or hospital accommodation would be available for the poor of your district?—If cut off from here, Enniskillen would be the nearest.

4449. On your side of the lake is there any railway?—No railway.

4450. How would you get to Enniskillen?—We would have to go by road.

4451. What distance?—Twenty-one or twenty-two Irish miles.

4452. CHAIRMAN.—How far are you beyond Belleek?—Five miles; I live in Church Hill.

4428. Have you heard of any desire on the part of the people of this district to be limited to the county boundary as suggested?—I never heard any.

4429. And do you think it would be to their advantage to have it so limited?—I think it would be an advantage to let it remain as it is—a great advantage to the poor people.

4430. Mr. MURKIN.—In regard now to the infirmaries, don't you have to send cases as far as Lifford?—I never knew of any case from here to go to Lifford; we have the Shiel Hospital.

Mr. SMITH.—A certain class of cases can only be treated in the Shiel Hospital.

4439. The Ballyshannon and Bandon people send a great many inmates here?—Yes; unfortunately.

4440. If Ballyshannon were closed what would be your nearest workhouse?—Donegal; that is eleven Irish miles.

4441. You would have a great number of people to send that distance if the workhouse here were closed?—Oh, yes; a great number of cases would have to go to some other place.

4442. Mr. Smith.—And the number in Donegal, as at present constituted, is only 50. You know the resolution about the county boundaries of the Donegal County Council; do you think in reference to this union that the county boundary should be preserved?—No; I think it should not; decidedly the portions of Fermanagh and Leitrim that are in the Ballyshannon Union; they, practically, although not in the County Donegal, belong to this district; all by Garrison and up there, in fact all this side of the Derry range, belongs to this district.

4443. Is in the natural conformation?—Yes; as far as Sligo, including Tullaghan.

4444. Do you know the districts we have suggested should be added in portion of Enniskillen; that can be as conveniently served now as Church Hill?—I cannot speak for that; I only know the circumstances about here.

4445. And the Town Commissioners unanimously adopted that resolution?—Yes.

4450. Mr. Smith.—You know the district we suggest—Brookhill and Rensborough—do you think they could be conveniently served from Ballyshannon?—I don't see any inconvenience from Church Hill, and they are nearer than Church Hill.

4451. And they have a railway the entire way?—Which we have not.

4452. With regard to the Donegal boundaries, the sentimental question, when it comes to a question of taxation and the relief of the poor, does not affect the question of your district?—Oh, no. I think it is largely a question of sentiment. If the workhouse were to be built now it might be another thing, but as we have them standing—

4453. You are in favour of preserving Ballyshannon, and extending it by taking in portion of Fermanagh?—Yes.

4454. CHAIRMAN.—You know the County Councils for your district?—I do.

4455. What do they think about this question?—There are some of them here to-day.

4456. Mr. MURKIN.—Your evidence is based on the supposition that the view of the Fermanagh County Council would be carried out, that there would be only one workhouse in Fermanagh; supposing that view would not be carried out at all, supposing there could be an institution fairly convenient to your district, would you not prefer to be inside your own county?—As a matter of sentiment, we might.

4457. Lines have to be drawn somewhere, and what better lines can be drawn than such ancient landmarks as county boundaries?—I think twenty-two Irish miles too far away.

4458. I quite agree with you, but suppose there was some institution convenient, not very far from your locality, would you not rather remain in your own county than come here?—Yes; if it were more convenient.

Oct. 18, 1905.
Mr. James
Timoney.

4458. We are not bound to any hard and fast line, and what we want to get at is what would be the best way of reforming the present system by giving facilities to every county in the most suitable places.

Mr. Smith.—The difficulty about Fermanagh is the lake.

Witness.—Unless there would be new premises built altogether.

Mr. MURPHY.—That might be possibly the best thing to do—to build new premises and not keep up these old barnacles.

4459. Dr. HUGHES.—All premises have you, as a District Council, to go to some other centre for certain duties?—No. In connection with roads we sit in Belleek.

4460. Does it mean that you have to attend more frequently—that is between the two places—that you would if you sat in one place?—Oh, no.

4461. CHAIRMAN.—You come for sanitary business on the same day that you come for Poor Law?—Yes; it is market day.

4462. Dr. HUGHES.—Then the other days that you sit at Belleek are extra days?—Yes.

4463. CHAIRMAN.—Partly for the convenience of the contractors, I suppose?—Yes.

Mr. CHURCH.—Night meetings in the year.

4464. Dr. HUGHES.—Have you any idea of the rates on the adjoining districts how they compare with the rate for your district?—I cannot say since it was union

rating, but in the neighbouring districts to Enniskillen, when it was divisional rating, it was something lower than ours.

4465. At present do you not know?—I am not sure at present.

4466. When the rating question did not affect you in coming to your decision?—We considered the disadvantages and the inconvenience more than anything else; it would be inconvenient for the poor and for the Guardians if they had to go to Enniskillen.

4467. Mr. MURPHY.—Fermanagh is a county of such notoriously economical management that I don't suppose it would be possible to reduce the rates any more there.

Mr. Smith.—Some of the figures are very peculiar; it costs £5,000; it comes to about £35 a head for a pauper.

Mr. MURPHY.—Would not that be including the repayment of loans?

Witness.—They spent a considerable sum of money in putting up a heating apparatus, which I heard has been a failure.

Mr. MURPHY.—You may take it from me that in an asylum, for instance, Omagh Asylum, the average cost per inmate does not exceed £35 a head, and in your workhouse I find it comes to £13 or £13 10s., and remember the per capita contribution is £10. I think there is a wrong view over the country with regard to the extravagance of asylum management.

Mr. John
Duffy.

Mr. JOHN DUFFY examined.

4468. Mr. SMITH.—You are a District Councillor?—Yes.

4469. And you are also the representative of the District Council on the County Council of Fermanagh?—Yes.

4470. You know the requirements of the people of your district?—Yes.

4471. And knowing their requirements and from your own knowledge, are you of opinion that Ballyshannon serves your district properly?—I think you could not serve it so well under any other arrangement.

4472. What is the name of the division you represent?—Belisk Electoral Division.

4473. And you think it can be best served from Ballyshannon?—It can.

4474. And it would be an injury to the poor and sick of your district in the surrounding districts to remove the workhouse of the union from Ballyshannon?—It would; the distance would be very great that they would have to go to Enniskillen in case of emergency was dissolved.

4475. You have no objection on this county business to having the locus of the union in the County Dungal?—None.

4476. You think the natural formation of the county shows it is an entire district that ought to be served by one union?—If the workhouse was confined to Dungal county it would cut off the Fermanagh portion, and it would have to be annexed to Enniskillen.

4477. How would the poor of your district get across the lake?—There are two roads that would lead from

Enniskillen—one on each side of the lake—to Belleek. The one on my side of the lake is considerably longer than the other side. The one on the north side is twenty miles, and on the north side of the lake it would be twenty-eight miles from Enniskillen to Belleek.

4478. And there is no connection between the two roads?—No; no bridge across.

4479. So that from your knowledge of the district, and of what the people require, is it your evidence that the Ballyshannon Union is necessary for the relief of the poor?—That is so.

4480. CHAIRMAN.—Have you heard the question raised at the County Council of Fermanagh about how the county might be made the unit for Poor Law administration?—I have not.

4481. There has been no expression of that county similar to what we have had in Donegal?—No.

4482. The resolution you put forward is rather against that count?—Oh; the chief clerk of the Fermanagh County Council is present.

4483. I did not mean so much a resolution as a discussion on the subject?—I did not hear any discussion. 4484. Were you on the committee of the County Council?—I was on the committee, but could not attend, but from the report Mr. West has they appear to be in favour of amalgamation.

4485. Leaving your position, as it is, free?—Yes.

4486. Mr. Smith.—Do you know whether they expressed any opinion about giving us any portion of Irvinestown if it was abolished?—I think they are in favour of giving a portion, as far as Pettigo.

Mr. W. H.
West.

Mr. W. H. WEST examined.

4477. Mr. SMITH.—You are the Secretary of the County Council of Fermanagh?—Assistant Secretary.

4488. Do you produce the resolutions of the committee, consisting of the Earl of Erne, the Earl of Belmore, Mr. Jordan, and Mr. Cranley?—Yes; those were all that were present at the meeting; there were three or four more on the committee, but they did not attend. The County Council deputed this committee to deal with the whole question.

4489. Mr. MURPHY.—You had no special meeting about it?—No.

4490. No public discussion on the matter?—No public discussion.

4491. No question as to the boundaries of the county?—Yes; that was discussed at this meeting of the committee. They expressed themselves in favour of a county workhouse in case Ballyshannon was abolished here, but should Ballyshannon workhouse be kept where it is they would not interfere with it, because they believed it would be unreasonable to ask such a thing, and their opinion also was that the increase of

the sick poor would be better served by having a workhouse here.

4492. They went on the view that there would be only one institution?—And the distance being so great on account of the lake dividing our county.

4493. They never took into consideration the probability of auxiliary institutions?—No.

4494. Built on a small scale to accommodate different classes?—No; they never did; their opinion was against that. They thought the bigger the institution it would be the cheaper. The one ought to do the whole county with the exception of the two ends towards Clones and Donagh.

4495. They were moved principally by matters of money?—No; the interests of the sick poor were considered, too, as much as anything else.

4496. CHAIRMAN.—They showed their interest in the sick poor by not claiming that those distant parts of the union should be annexed to them?—Yes; they said in the case of Belleek, which is within three or four miles of Ballyshannon, it would be unreasonable to ask those people to go to Enniskillen.

4507. They have a large slice of Cavan, and they propose it should go to Cavan?—The opinion was it should not be retained.

4508. Perhaps they did not see any monetary advantage in retaining the portion of the county that is in the Ballyshannon Union?—The Belleek Rural District comes within three miles of this workhouse, and it is twenty-five miles from Belleek to Enniskillen, and they thought it would be much better to have the workhouse.

4509. Mr. Smith.—Your answers are?—1st, Considering the number of paupers in this county and the facilities for locomotion, we think amalgamation would be very desirable if all the interests concerned could be satisfied. 2, We are unable to answer this question at present; ultimately the County Council may be able to advise them for some useful purpose. 3, With reference to class arrangement, it would not, in our opinion, be desirable to board out aged and infirm paupers and hospital patients; it would be desirable to make new arrangements in relation to families, and to improve the treatment of the aged and infirm. 4, We are of opinion the section of the Local Government Act which abolishes dispositive committees should be repealed; we also think the name "workhouse" should be changed. 5, There is sufficient hospital accommodation in the county, the only difficulty would be with fever patients.

6, It is possible, with amalgamation, one half of the present officials would be sufficient, thereby effecting a very considerable economy. 7, It would be desirable to introduce a system of payments and cost of treatment for this class. 8, We recommend all tramps should be detained at least three days and employed at some manual labour. All members of committees wish to be examined generally in relation to the whole question.

4510. You have stated now the views of the County Council as far as you have been able to gather them in reference to this, and you are expounding the opinion you gathered from them that Ballyshannon should be preserved in the interests of economy and of the poor?—The opinion was that it would be better to preserve it.

4511. With reference to the divisions, I have mentioned the names of two districts—Brookhill and Roseharbour, down to Pettigo—from what you know of the opinions of the County Council of Fermanagh, would there be any objection to giving those two districts that I have mentioned and adding them to Ballyshannon Union?—I have never heard any opinion on the subject.

4512. Are they inconvenient at present, supposing Irvinestown is abolished?—It would be far more convenient to Enniskillen.

Mr. HOSE M'GOWAN examined.

4513. Mr. Smith.—You are a District Councillor from the County Leitrim?—Yes.

4514. Am I right in saying that the district you represent is down near Lake Melvin?—Yes; along the side of it.

4515. Is it the opinion of the people of your district and your own opinion that Ballyshannon Union should be preserved, and that it is the most suitable and central place?—Yes; it is. The division I represent is in favour of retaining Ballyshannon.

4516. Is it the market town for the people of your district?—Yes; it is the only market town; all the people come there.

Oct 18, 1903.

Mr. W. H. Wash.

Mr. Hugh M'Gowan.

4517. You know from your own knowledge that it would be the place for them to come to?—Yes.

4518. Any sick from your district, have they to come here to the infirmary?—Yes.

4519. And you have no objection on the question of county boundaries to having the workhouse here in Ballyshannon?—No; no objection.

4520. CHAIRMAN.—Has there been any resolution of the Leitrim County Council on this question of union boundaries and county boundaries?—Not any that I am aware of. There are three Leitrim County Councillors adjoining this union.

Mr. THOMAS MAGUIRE examined.

Mr. Thomas Maguire.

4521. Mr. Smith.—You are also a District Councillor?—Yes.

4522. Where is your district?—Tullaghan.

4523. Is it in the Sligo direction?—Yes.

CHAIRMAN.—A couple of miles beyond Bundoran.

4524. Mr. Smith.—Are the people of your district and are you yourself in favour of preserving the Ballyshannon Union?—Yes.

4525. Is it your market town?—Yes.

4526. And do the sick and paupers come to this union?—Yes.

4527. And you are in favour of preserving it?—Yes.

4528. Take it that Ballyshannon was abolished, and you had a county workhouse in Leitrim, how far would it be from Macerhamilton?—Eighteen miles.

Mr. BERNARD CONNOLLY examined.

Mr. Bernard Connolly.

I happen to be appointed by the Kesh District Council to come here.

4529. CHAIRMAN.—What is the view of the Council?—That they are in favour of amalgamation with Macerhamilton. I don't speak personally; I speak for the council.

4530. Are you a Guardian here?—Yes.

4531. When the question was discussed here were you present?—I understand there was a question sent down by you gentlemen, and I think with such a very important question coming before this Board that there should be cards sent round to the Councillors or Guardians. I happened to be the only man from Leitrim who was there that day, and Fermanagh had only one representative; there were five or six from Ballyshannon, and I think that cannot be taken as the voice of the Guardians of the Ballyshannon Union. And I came here from the Kesh District Council, authorised by that council, to speak in favour of joining the Macerhamilton Union.

4532. Mr. Smith.—Was there a special meeting called for this purpose by the Kesh District Council?—Yes; it was at this meeting I was appointed; there was no special meeting.

4533. And how far from Carrish-on-Shannon?—About three times as much.

4534. And you would never get to Mohill?—There is no railway running to it.

4535. So as far as the people of Leitrim are concerned, you say this theory of counties is a mistake?—It would not be right for our portion of Leitrim.

4536. The sentimental business of the various counties being self-contained will have to be regulated by the immediate requirements of the poor of your district?—Yes.

4537. And you say that is best done by preserving this workhouse in Ballyshannon?—I think so.

4538. Mr. MICHAEL.—Do you know has the question been considered by your County Council?—I don't think so.

4539. Mr. MICHAEL.—Do you come authoritatively to speak for the council?—For the council.

4540. And the expression of your council is?—And it is the expression of the people.

4541. That you would prefer to join with an institution in your own county rather than go to an adjoining county for Poor Law purposes?—Yes.

4542. Mr. Smith.—You thought it was necessary in a matter so important as that that cards should be sent out; did you not get one of those yourself (produced), look at the date of it?—Yes; but the answering of the questions.

4543. Here it is—"September 12th, 1903.—A special meeting of the council will be held on the 26th inst. to appoint two members of the council to give evidence before the Poor Law Reform Commission." On the 12th of September—"The following business will be transacted at the Guardians' meeting on the 19th:—Consent of Guardians to give evidence before the Poor Law Reform Commission." Have you any further complaints to make against Mr. Chinn?—I made no complaints against Mr. Chinn, but I say it was on last Saturday that this report was signed.

4544. Were you there?—I was.

Y

Oct. 15, 1861.

Mr. Bernard
Connolly.

4544. Did you object?—I did not object.

4545. You were the representative of the people there, and do you consider it your duty, when acting as representative, not to object?—There was no other man from Leitrim, only one, and there was no use in my objecting.

4547. Are you a miller, that when a resolution was passed that you did not approve of that you did not dissent?—It was handed to the chairman.

4548. Have you not ears, and did you not hear it?—I did not object.

4549. Do you come here with a pocket resolution to object to this?—No; but I come here as a representative of the Keshmonee Council to represent their views.

4550. Keep quiet, sir, you are not at a meeting of the Guardians now! You could not stand up to object when the time was, when the resolution of the Ballyshannon Board was passed, when you were sent there and supposed to do your duty; if you had any objection to it why did you not make it then; were you afraid or ashamed? I give you my choice!

CHAIRMAN.—Or did you know the views of your constituents until you got back again?—I knew them three years ago. Even then went through the country to ascertain the views of the people, who were in favour of Manohamilton, and who were in favour of Ballyshannon, and 60 per cent. signed the papers in favour of Manohamilton.

4561. Dr. ROONEY.—How many signatures might there be?—I could not say; there are seven electoral divisions.

4562. Was it largely signed?—It was.

4563. Mr. MURPHY.—Well, we are to take it that Leitrim, as a whole, is not in favour of remaining in Ballyshannon?—Leitrim, as a whole, is in favour of Manohamilton.

4564. Mr. Smith.—Are you a co-opted, not an elected, District Councillor; are you elected?—I am co-opted.

4565. So the voice of Leitrim is expressed not by its elected representative but by the co-opted of Keshmonee?—I don't want to give my own opinions, but the opinions of my council, and I appeal to you, Mr. Chairman, for protection.

4566. Was there, or was there not, a special meeting called to ascertain the views of Keshmonee?—There was not.

4567. Show me out of the books any authority given to this co-opted Mr. Connolly to appear before this Board to give evidence.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—Oh, yes; Messrs. Bernard Connolly and Roger Rooney were appointed to give evidence.

Mr. Smith.—Were any special instructions given to them?

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—That was all! It was at the meeting of the 25th of August on his own motion.

WITNESS.—I was appointed on the motion of the chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—Messrs. Bernard Connolly and Roger Rooney were appointed to give evidence on behalf of the council before the Poor Law Reform Commission."

4568. Mr. Smith.—Now show me any authority or statement from the Board telling you what their opinions were—have you any?—I have ascertained the views of the council.

4569. How many members are there on the Keshmonee District Council?—Seventeen.

4570. How many did you discuss this matter with?—Six, I think.

4571. Of course, you had a strong view on this point?—Yes.

4572. And you went to the men that you thought had the same views as yourself?—No. It has been publicly known that I was in favour of the Keshmonee District Council forming part of the Manohamilton Union, and it was on that understanding that I was appointed.

4573. Mr. MURPHY.—You give expression to these views?—Yes.

4574. Mr. Smith.—Who nominated you?—The chairman of the Keshmonee District Council.

4575. Is Mr. Roger Rooney here?—He is. There is a quarterly meeting of the Keshmonee District Council this day, and it prevented people coming.

Mr. Smith.—And they sent the two men they could best spare.

4576. Mr. MURPHY.—How far is your division from this town of Ballyshannon?—About twelve miles.

4577. CHAIRMAN.—How far from Keshmonee?—I live four miles from it, and the electoral division I represent is still further away; one part adjoins Manohamilton, seven miles away.

4578. How far from Keshmonee?

4579. Mr. MURPHY.—How many miles from Ballyshannon?—I could not say; it is ten from my house to Ballyshannon.

4580. On the question of convenience and names, Manohamilton is nearer?—Yes.

4581. Mr. Smith.—How would you get to Manohamilton from your place?—The same as from Ballyshannon—by car.

4582. Do you come through Keshmonee?—Yes.

4583. And is not Ballyshannon nearer than Manohamilton?—It is a bit nearer from where I live, but not from the division I represent.

4584. CHAIRMAN.—There seems to be not much difference in the question of distances. Did you go to any of the Guardians of Keshmonee and Tullaghan?—Yes.

4585. Are they in favour of going to Manohamilton?—I was speaking to the Keshmonee Guardians—one of them—that day—the chairman of the Keshmonee District Council—who sent me here, and they are in favour of amalgamation with Manohamilton.

4586. Would they, right down the whole way from Keshmonee to Tullaghan, be in favour of amalgamation?—I could not say that.

4587. Mr. MURPHY.—I suppose you will take steps to ascertain the views of your county before we go to Leitrim?—If there is a sitting of this Commission in Leitrim we will attend and give the voice of the people there.

CHAIRMAN.—There will be.

Mr. Roger
Rooney.

Mr. ROGER ROONEY EXAMINED.

4598. CHAIRMAN.—What are the views of the Keshmonee Council, as far as you know them?—I have not their views; I did not get their views at the meeting.

4599. Did the council come to any decision, as a whole, as to whether they would like to be cut off from Ballyshannon and added to Manohamilton, or not?—Not that I know of.

4600. There has been no meeting to consider that question?—Not that I know of.

4601. What is your personal view; where do you live?—Three miles from Keshmonee, the Glenside way.

4602. How far are you from Manohamilton?—Eleven miles. Manohamilton, as far as I see, is more the

market town for the Glenside people than Ballyshannon, and I think it would be more convenient.

4603. Mr. MURPHY.—Then, you would be in favour of disincorporating?—I have no authority to speak for anybody, except I speak to a few of the councilors.—Here.

4604. CHAIRMAN.—Of your own neighbourhood?—The councilors for Glenside, and they did not give me any views. I wanted them to tell me what their view was, and they did not give me any views, one way or another. I told them that I had got a card that the Commission would be here in Ballyshannon.

4605. You will have a meeting before we go to Leitrim?—Very likely.

Mr. Thomas
Ferguson.

Mr. THOMAS FERGUSON EXAMINED.

4606. Mr. Smith.—Are you a County Councillor from Fermanagh?—Yes.

4607. What division do you represent?—Inishmacsaint and Church Hill.

4608. Were you appointed to give evidence here?—Yes; by the County Council.

4609. What is your view with reference to preserving the divisions of Fermanagh as they are at present in the Ballyshannon Union?—I would be for it.

4610. That is your evidence here; you are in favour of preserving these divisions in Ballyshannon Union?—Certainly.

4611. Do you know the requirements of the people of your district?—Yes.

4612. Is this your market town?—It is, principally; there are smaller places.

4613. Of course, they go into Belleek?—Yes; and Killybegs.

4594. And this is their principal business town?—

Yes.

4595. Do you think it would be a serious loss to the poor and sick of the district if this union were abolished?—I do.

4596. Or if the people of your district were cut off from Ballyshannon?—They would not like it at all.

4597. They have no objection to having a central place here in Ballyshannon, although they are Fermanagh men?—On the contrary, they like it.

4598. Mr. MURKIN.—Was this matter discussed at a meeting of the County Council?—Not in my hearing.

4599. You were not present?—I was not; but I was at most of the meetings; they would leave the people

to their own free will; they would leave the decisions that came to Ballyshannon to their own free will to come to Ballyshannon as usual.

4600. Mr. Smith.—They don't want to take them all into Fermanagh?—They do not.

4601. Mr. MURKIN.—Was there any notice of motion that the question would be discussed at the County Council?—Not in my presence; it might be in committee; it was a long meeting the last one, and I was not at the end.

Mr. Smith.—They appointed a committee to draw up resolutions, and you will see it was a representative board—two Ealas, a Member of Parliament, and the chairman of the Town Commissioners.

Mr. W. H. WHEAT further examined.

4602. Mr. Smith.—Have you the resolution appointing the committee to draw up the answers to the questions?

CHAIRMAN.—Or authorising these gentlemen to come here.

Witness.—That was the meeting on Friday; there was a letter from your Commission read, stating that you would sit here to-day, and they deputed Mr. Duffy, Mr. Ferguson, and myself to come here to answer any questions.

4603. Dr. BROWN.—Did they give you any instructions?—No; but to answer any question put to them. At first when that memorandum came out we put it on the agenda paper and discussed it at the County Council meeting, and there was a committee appointed to deal

with the subject and answer the questions, and they sent the answers on to your secretary, and the committee expressed their opinion that each member should give evidence as he thought and express his own views.

4604. Mr. Smith.—That is the joint result of their opinions?—Yes; after two or three hours' deliberation.

4605. Mr. MURKIN.—At the last meeting what occurred?—I read your letter, and the chairman said it would be better for somebody to come and be present at this inquiry, and they deputed these two gentlemen and myself to come; they both live in the Belleek Rural District.

Mr. Smith.—The County Council nominated the men from the district who would know most about it to come here and give their views to you.

Mr. EDWARD STEPHENS examined.

4606. Mr. Smith.—You are a Town Commissioner here?—Yes.

4607. Were you present when this resolution was drawn up and passed that has been read here?—Yes; it was passed unanimously.

4608. And is that, as far as you have been able to gather, the opinion of the entire town of Ballyshannon?—It is, certainly.

4609. Do you know the districts?—I was bred and born in the town, and know all the people.

4610. You know the districts outside the County Donegal—the Leitrim and Fermanagh portions?—I don't know much about those districts.

Dr. R. H. CHAMBERLAIN examined.

4611. Dr. BROWN.—Are you one of the officials attached to the Shell Hospital?—Yes.

4612. Have you any other position?—Well, I am medical officer to the soldiers and police; I have no Poor Law appointment.

4613. Do you know anything about the workhouse hospital?—I have assisted a few times at operations in it; I have never acted as locum tenens for the workhouse; I have once or twice acted as locum tenens for a dispensary district.

4614. Can you tell the Commission the conditions of the trust established for this hospital?—I have lately read Dr. Shell's will; Dr. Shell left, practically, all his money to the hospital, but part of it was left as a life interest, I think you would call it, to his widow and his sister, so that the hospital is now receiving approximately half of what it will have.

4615. What is it at present?—I have no official knowledge, but I believe about £750. The Shell Hospital was built rather larger than that was fit to keep going, so as a result at present we can only take in acute cases or cases requiring operations; we have had to refuse cases of chronic bronchial trouble and inoperable cancer. As regards that rule it is only temporary, and on any time be changed by the governors, as you will find if you refer to the last rule on the list. You must not take me as being in favour of admitting all chronic cases, for I am not.

4616. Mr. Smith.—That scheme had to be approved of by the Lord Chancellor, and these rules were drawn up with the sanction of the Chancery Division, so it cannot be altered as easily as you think?—I think if you read the last one;—but, as a matter of fact, they

were altered in the beginning of last November. At present in the Shell Hospital we have been asked not to take in more than twenty patients at a time on account of the want of money—that is twelve free and eight paying. We have once or twice exceeded the number of free patients under special circumstances. In the will itself there is nothing forbidden.

4617. Dr. BROWN.—Therefore it runs with the trustees, with the sanction of the Lord Chancellor, to alter the rules or make new ones?—One of the governors is present here to-day, Canon McKenna, of Bundoran.

4618. Mr. Smith.—I see it is limited to twelve people free?—Generally altogether it is all we have got accommodation for at present, but, of course, there are several empty wards, unfurnished.

4619. Take it then you get the entire amount of the charity, that the other £750 comes in?—I cannot give you definitely, but I am of opinion that there is nothing like £750 more, and I do not think if the rest fell in you would be able to keep forty beds going; but, of course, I have not got that absolutely definite.

4620. You think you have about £750 at present?—About.

4621. That supplies twelve free patients and eight paying patients, who are self-supporting?—Not necessarily because they pay from 7s. a week up, but some do not.

4622. You could not keep twenty free patients at present?—We could not; but, if I might qualify one thing, that seems an enormous price per bed, but the explanation is that we have not a full equipment of instruments, and every year something extra is being got. For example, at the last board meeting they

Oct. 16, 1905.

Mr. TERENCE FERGUSON.

Mr. W. H. WHEAT.

Mr. Edward Stephens.

Dr. R. H. Chamberlain.

Oct. 18, 1903.
Dr. R. H.
Creighton.

ordered a new sterilizer, and they laid out the grounds last autumn, an £750 divided by twenty would not represent, it would exceed, the actual cost of the bed.

4625. You don't think there will be anything like that coming in in the future?—I think not.

4626. And an £750 won't support twenty on your own showing you could not possibly keep more than twenty-five free patients?—As far as my knowledge goes, I think not, unless the amount is increased.

4627. Had you not to close recently for want of means?—No, we have not been closed for that reason; we have had patients from as far as Dublin.

4628. Dr. Brown.—What other income have you?—None; except, of course, from paying patients.

4629. How much do you think you get annually from paying patients?—I could not hazard a guess.

4630. You have no subscriptions from the district?—No.

4631. Could you tell me what area is served by the hospital?—I had myself a patient who came down from Dublin for an operation; as a matter of fact, we have patients from Kilbeggan. I had a letter the other day from a patient at Belmullet who wanted to come here, and I have had patients from Macmahonstown.

4632. Do the governors allow patients to come from any length?—They do.

4633. Therefore it could act as a county hospital?—There is no reason why it should not.

4634. Or for a large district; there is nothing in the will to limit it to this district?—No; I think that is specially objected to; it is laid down—

Mr. Smith.—It would be better that you should have a copy of the will.

4635. Dr. Brown.—If a patient applies for admission?—They go to the doctor—any doctor they like—and he gives them a certificate that they are fit for admission; that certificate is then taken to one of the governors, and he issues a ticket, and on that he either marks "free" or the amount per week that they are to pay. Then the case comes before Dr. Condon or myself, whatever admission day it happens to be, and we decide whether the case is a suitable one for admission or not; that, of course, is to exclude infectious diseases.

4636. Cases that would require operations or urgent cases, how would they be admitted?—In practice, Dr. Condon and I admit on our own responsibility, and go as soon as possible to a governor.

4637. Have you any means of conveying a patient to the hospital?—None; the union ambulance has been used once or twice.

4638. How long is the hospital closed in the year?—It was closed this year for six weeks, and during that time a lot of painting had to be done, and the operation room and wards were painted and the floors stained.

4639. How long was it closed before that; for twelve months?—It was; but I would rather not go into the circumstances under which it was closed; it would not be advisable to publish them.

4640. These last six weeks, was it closed principally on account of cleaning up and painting?—I have been on two different accounts of that.

4641. One said it was an account of want of money?—I don't know.

4642. What about the medical staff?—It consists of two visiting surgeons, Dr. Condon and myself, on equal terms, each with an equal number of beds. There is also an anaesthetist appointed, and three consulting surgeons, so that if we want further advice on any one we can call in one of those at the hospital expense; they are Dr. Thompson, Oungah; Dr. Wernock, Dergal; and Dr. Byrne, Derry; we can call in the one we think best suited for the case.

4643. And they get a fixed fee?—£25; that is fixed, it is an honorarium rather than a fee.

4644. Are you appointed honorary?—No; salary; we have £30 a year each for constant attendance during the year, and in addition to that we have the right to charge paying patients. In the case of a patient of my own I can charge any fee I like, but if the patient is one that comes accidentally under me the governors have a right of veto if they think the fee too high, but that question has never arisen.

4645. What are the charges for admission?—Fees, and from 7s. a week up to £3 a week, according to what the governor who admits may think.

4646. That is for the cost of nursing and maintenance; that has nothing to do with your fee?—No; there are one or two extras. For instance, in the administration of chloroform or in an operation, the patient would pay that.

4647. What is the average number of inmates in the year?—Last year about 150; I am speaking from memory. We have to refuse many deserving cases; we have to carry out strictly that rule. My colleague, Dr. Condon, is here now.

Dr. Condon.

Dr. Condon examined.

4648. Dr. Brown.—Do you agree with the evidence given by your colleagues as far as the Shell Hospital is concerned?—Yes.

4649. CHAIRMAN.—Is there anything you wish to add; you are not a dispensary doctor?—No. With reference to the workhouse children, I think it would be a good plan that children up to six years old should be boarded out under strict supervision, and after that put into some industrial school.

4650. You think their health is not good here?—Their health is very good, but I don't think it is just beneficial to their morals, and that a training outside after six years would be better for them.

4651. You would board them out at what age?—I would board them out from between five and six.

4652. From what age would you put them out of the workhouse; two or three?—I would put them out, if anyone would take them, as soon as they are infants.

4653. Dr. Brown.—At what age?—From a year up.

4654. Have you much consumption in the district?—There is a great deal of consumption scattered about.

4655. Have you any means of treating them in the workhouse?—None.

4656. What would you propose?—To build an isolation ward for them.

4657. In the workhouse?—Outside it.

4658. Would you not attach it to the Shell Hospital?—I don't think so.

4659. Is there anything else you wish to say?—That is all, except that it would be wise to have all lunatics removed from the workhouse.

4660. Mr. MURKIN.—I suppose you are aware that the Guardians are not in favour of an asylum system; they have expressed themselves so?—I am not aware of it.

4661. Dr. Brown.—You mean patients should go from this to the asylum proper?—I mean that all these harmless lunatics should be removed out of the workhouse.

4662. Mr. MURKIN.—Where do you suggest they should go?—I think the place where lunatics are treated is the proper place for lunatics; not to be mixing up with others in the workhouse.

4663. Do you think that some of the institutions could be used properly for that purpose?—I think so; I think some of the institutions could be set aside for these harmless lunatics; it would be a great saving to the workhouse in looking after them, and so forth; of course, the majority of them are harmless; any that got outrageous here to be sent away, but the others would be much better in an institution by themselves.

4664. You say this professionally, as a medical man of experience?—Quite so.

4665. Dr. Brown.—At present do you ever send any of the cases from the workhouse to the Shell Hospital for operations?—Very few come here; any that do come are sent over.

CHAIRMAN.—My colleagues and I wish to express my admiration of the business-like way the evidence has been put before us.

Mr. F. Lewis Smith.—On behalf of the Board I represent, we thank you for the great care and attention you have displayed in conducting this inquiry.

The sitting terminated.

Oct. 14, 1903.

ELEVENTH PUBLIC SITTING.—WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 14TH, 1903.

At the Courthouse, Donegal.

Present:—Mr. MICKS, (Chairman), Mr. MURNAHAN, and Dr. COREY BOGGER.

Mr. J. DUNLOP.—I represent the Donegal Board, and the Stranorlar Board is also represented by Mr. Boyle, solicitor. We think it would facilitate the Stranorlar men if we let them get on first; it would let them catch their train.

CHAIRMAN.—If you like to arrange that, it is all the same to us. Then, Mr. Boyle, are you ready with the Stranorlar evidence?

Mr. Boyle.—We have only two witnesses.

Mr. YEAGUE MOYEN.—We cannot get away until half-past six in any case.

Mr. D. C. FRANKON, Clerk of the Donegal Union, examined.

Mr. D. C. Frankon.

4666. Mr. DUNLOP.—How long are you Clerk of the Union?—Over thirty years.

4667. Have you looked into this matter of amalgamation of unions?—I have.

4668. And you have made out statistics?—I have made out answers to the queries.

4669. Take No. 1 query?—In my opinion, having regard to the fact that the population of the County Donegal is little more than half what it was when the present union boundaries were settled, and that the proportion of the remaining population at all likely to require workhouse relief under any circumstances is still more reduced, and that the facilities for transport and for communication are vastly better, I am of opinion that it would tend to economy and efficiency to amalgamate some of the unions. But it is idle to suppose that this can be done on the basis of any workhouse accommodating the number of inmates for which it was originally intended, as modern ideas and requirements would render such huddling together impossible.

4670. Now take No. 2 query?—I agree with the opinion expressed by the Board of Guardians that, with the exception of Letterkenny, no workhouse in this county could, with advantage, be utilised as an auxiliary lunatic asylum. If you had to provide an entirely separate staff to supervise it it would not tend to economy.

4671. No. 3?—I do not think that any of the suggestions in this query would tend to economy, except in so far as (a) and (b) would be carried out under complete amalgamation. Clause (c) I would consider absolutely unworkable and likely to make the position of the paupers so boarded out very much worse than under existing circumstances. Any classification of workhouses for the maintenance of different classes of paupers would, in my opinion, tend to greatly increase the cost without any compensating advantage.

4672. CHAIRMAN.—What do you take to be the meaning of sub-head (d)?—I assumed boarding them in external hospitals, as we do now.

4673. Do you think that might not be advantageous in some cases?—I think that if you retain the staff of the workhouse that it would not tend to economy.

4674. I can understand it not being of much importance in this union, but where you have portions of a union up close to another workhouse it may conceivably be of advantage for the people in a district remote from their own workhouse to be boarded out in the nearest workhouse to them. Did you think of it in that point of view?—I did, but my opinion is it is hardly likely any workhouse would arrange for boarding out in another workhouse the class of persons that they had accommodated for themselves.

4675. I am dealing with the sick altogether?—Well, of course, in acute cases, as a general rule in workhouses there are not a large percentage of acute cases, it is only chronic cases.

4676. But still there is a percentage?—There is a percentage, of course, and it would tend to relieve suffering if the person was brought to the nearest hospital,

but it would be a very small percentage of the cases arising in any union that would be so dealt with.

4677. I suppose you think amalgamation could be carried out on a large scale if it were not for acute and fever cases; if people were able to travel you could have very much fewer workhouses, but the difficult question is how to provide for the acute sick?—There are only two cases in this county where it occurs to me that anything like that would be likely to arise—the extreme end of Glenties, Glencolumbkille, and the Lower Rosses. I think in any other part of the county, with any probable amalgamation, they would still be within a nearer distance of an infirmary than the remote parts of Glenties Union are now.

4678. Oh, yes; they are practically cut off from hospital accommodation?—They are; Glencolumbkille is much nearer to Donegal than it is to Glenties.

4679. Mr. DUNLOP.—What answer would you give to No. 4?—I think considerable changes would be necessary or desirable. For instance, the present boards are too large, and if two or more were added together they would be quite unworkable, if not unworkable, and the present system of representation, whether looked at from the basis of taxation or population, is indefensible. For instance, taking Donegal Union as an example, and there are far worse cases, one electoral division has about one-seventh of the population, one-seventh of the voting power, about one-fifth of the valuation, and contributes one-fourth of the present rate, but its representation is one-eighth.

4680. CHAIRMAN.—That is where we are sitting now?—That is where you sit now. Again, six divisions have more than half the voting power, more than half the valuation, contribute more than half the rates, and are represented by twelve Guardians, while the other twelve divisions, less important in every way, have a representation of twenty-four Guardians.

4681. Then you think the system of representation is utterly unjust?—I think it cannot be defended from any point of view.

4682. Mr. MURNAHAN.—The money point of view?—No; not the population; there are a larger proportion of destitute round the towns and villages than are in rural districts.

4683. Is it not a fact that in the poorer districts there are a larger number of destitute people than in the richer?—So far as this union is concerned, there is hardly a single electoral division that has not some poor and some good land. Nearly all the divisions run from the sea to the mountains, and I think there is no division that has a larger proportion of poor in that respect than Donegal; I am looking at it entirely from a domestic point of view.

4684. From a money point of view it might be so, but there is something more important even than money—that is the care of the destitute. If your suggestion was given effect to would it not have an injurious effect on the poor people of these districts that you say have a preponderance of voting power at the present time?—I don't think so at all; as a matter of fact

Oct. 14, 1903.
No. D. C.
Dublin.

these smaller divisions, when we had electoral division rating, most of them never had a pauper in the workhouse. My opinion is that there is more poverty in what you would call the richer divisions. Before they think of coming to the workhouse they migrate towards the towns.

4665. CHAIRMAN.—Had you any idea what you would suggest as an alternative representative plan?

Mr. DUNDY.—Do you know how the present representation was fixed?—The basis on which the present representation was fixed was the old idea of having double representation, an ex-officio and an elected Guardian for every electoral division.

4666. CHAIRMAN.—And the electoral divisions were founded largely on the boundaries of owners' properties?—Yes; under the old scheme sometimes two or more divisions were grouped together for the purpose of election, but under the Local Government Act those have been doubled, and even tripled, by separating them, and in Ballymahon they have only in one division a valuation of £150 for two Guardians, and in another division a valuation of £1,500.

4667. You wish to point out that there are great inequalities that should be remedied some way?—Yes.

4668. You don't suggest how?—It could be done by grouping the smaller divisions, and some of the larger ones would require to be divided into wards.

4669. That would tend to keep up a large number of representatives?—I am strongly of opinion that single constituencies are better than double ones.

4670. Single constituencies and fewer of them?—Exactly. There is another result that I am sure no one having any experience in carrying out the district council part of the work can have failed to notice, and that is that the towns and villages suffer now by the over-representation of the rural districts.

4671. Under the Public Health Act?—And under the ordinary road expenditure; the rural districts grudge any expenditure on the towns or villages.

4672. What is outside our scope, but I see the point of what you say?—On that question I also agree with the reply given by the Guardians—that in the case of amalgamation something should be done to protect the unions at present moderately well served being handicapped by having a highly-rated district added on.

4673. Does that affect this union?—I have not the most remote idea whether it is to survive and have another added on to it, or whether it is to be added on to another, but I think the interests of existing ratepayers should in some way be protected.

4674. That is, you would like not to have any raising of taxation on one part by having another poorer part added on to it?—As far as possible, but I would not at all say that a small thing should stand in the way of a great good.

4675. If you got Glencolumbkille in?—There are parts of Glenties Union that I would be much more unwilling to take in than Glencolumbkille itself.

4676. Mr. DUNDY.—Coming to query No. 3, what answer would you give?—I have already given an answer to questions that apply to that. I think that the remote districts of Glencolumbkille and the Rosses could be provided with small hospitals to which cases unable to be removed to the workhouse hospital could be admitted, but, with these exceptions, I imagine that all parts of the county would be within reasonable reach of a hospital, even after amalgamation, considering the present facilities for communication and transit. In the past communicating with the centre was as slow as peevish as sending out and getting a person in; but now, considering that motor cars will bring any part of the county into communication with another where an ambulance is required, I think that the added facilities for transit being the remote parts much nearer than they were when the present boundaries were fixed.

4677. CHAIRMAN.—The sick were not much considered when the present boundaries were fixed; it was entirely meant for able-bodied people?—Of course it was. To No. 4, my reply is that I do not think any change except amalgamation would be likely to tend to economise.

4678. Do you approve of keeping the insane in the workhouse?—I do not.

4679. You would send all the insane away to the bead institutions?—I would; in Donegal we have done that for many years.

4680. You don't board out children at all in this union?—We have not had for years what I would think a suitable case for boarding out. We have had some

few, a very few, illegitimate and deserted children. For a long time back I can only recall one case, and that a good many years ago.

4681. Therefore that really is not a practical question here?—No. I am quite satisfied that the Board of Guardians are practically unanimous in favour of it as a suitable case arose. I would like to say in respect of that, that notwithstanding the way the workhouses are abused as homes for children we have had some very marked successes; more than I have ever known a case boarded out.

4682. But you have not had boarded-out cases?—No, I had some years ago, but my experience of the boarded-out cases was that they certainly never rose above the level of the people with whom they were boarded out.

4683. You did not get them back again?—No; I don't think we did.

4684. Mr. DUNDY.—Query 7?—I think that with the present facilities for getting away to general hospitals it is neither necessary nor desirable to go further than the present law admits of to meet this class of case. A considerable expenditure would be required to enable Guardians to enter for them, and even if this was done I imagine persons able to pay a reasonable sum would prefer going to a city or county hospital.

4685. CHAIRMAN.—But suppose they could pay very little, 5s. or 7s. a week?—At present the law enables us to deal with these cases, and we do; we have quite a number of cases always on the separate register.

4686. Paying from how much?—We have one case as low as 1s. a week, and with one notable exception, it is the highest; we have had them up as high as 12s. The Guardians use a discretion as to the means of the person; if it is a person who is very poor, but at the same time wishes to avoid the heat of pauperism, we would admit him at a small sum; we admitted one last evening case at 1s.

4687. Mr. MUNNAGHAN.—Except in the matter of amalgamation, you don't see any way of economising on the present system; did you say that?—I did.

4688. Have you any suggestion to make as to who would be a suitable amalgamation for Donegal?—I prefer not suggesting.

4689. You say that old chronic cases supply the did number in the institutions?—They do.

4690. Do you see any difficulty in removing these chronic cases to some central position?—I don't think so.

4691. You don't think there would be much hardship?—I don't think there would be.

4692. And you see no difficulty in regard to the children being boarded out or sent to some industrial institution?—No, I do not.

4693. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think if they were sent to a distance from their friends, for instance to the Letterkenny Asylum, do you think they would feel out of their friends?—I don't think so.

4694. You think the visits are not frequent or regular?—They are not frequent with chronic cases; with a case comes in first for the first few weeks they are visited.

4695. I suppose the people coming in are mostly people whose friends are few outside?—Yes.

4696. Mr. MUNNAGHAN.—And they remain in the institutions?—Yes; as a general rule it is a hospital in the dying; they remain in there until they die.

4697. How many have you in hospital at present?—There are thirty-eight in the infirmary and five in the fever hospital; forty-two in all.

4698. Dr. BURNES.—That is twenty-six in the body of the house?—Thirty-four; eight of those are children.

4699. Mr. MUNNAGHAN.—Does the tramp question figure any in your union?—Not at all largely; we have practically solved the question.

4700. CHAIRMAN.—How did you solve it?—We simply don't admit them; if it is a wet day and my hardship would occur we do admit; if there is a woman and children we always admit; but able-bodied tramps we do not admit.

4701. Mr. DUNDY.—On what grounds?—I don't think the Poor Law, the letter of it may be, but I don't think the spirit of it was intended to meet cases going from one union to another for the purpose of getting a night's lodging. I think it was for the purpose of relieving distress arising in the union; they were never intended to be tramp hotels.

4702. CHAIRMAN.—If the people are not destitute you have discretion to refuse admission, and you do so?—There is evidently a tendency among them that comes

the news, and they don't come to us, and after the first year of taking a firm stand against admitting them they have ceased to come.

4733. You would be aware whether there were any complaints from the farmers about these people quartering themselves in their homes or haggards?—I have not heard any appreciable complaint. I have heard a great many complaints about their going into country houses and demanding food and money, and intimidating women and children if they were there, but I have not heard complaints.

4734. As to night lodging?—No, I have not.

4735. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—How long have you been experimenting on that matter?—For more than twelve years.

4736. And you have no tramps at all now?—Oh, we have.

4737. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose you will have some to-morrow for the reason?—I don't think that class are likely to get in.

4738. Mr. DUNLOP.—Is there anything else you would like to add?—That is the only thing.

4739. CHAIRMAN.—We won't press you on the question of amalgamation?—I don't think it would be right for me to say what workhouses should be continued or discontinued.

4740. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—But on the broad question you think something should be done?—I think it is almost to maintain institutions intended for eight millions for four millions now.

4741. CHAIRMAN.—Then they were founded on the idea of having a large house for the maintenance and support of starving adult people; that has ceased altogether, and they have become rural hospitals?—They have practically.

4742. So the matter would be to see what number of hospitals are necessary?—Exactly; if you were beginning again I would say that there ought to be a cottage hospital for nearly every two dispensary districts.

4743. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Suppose we did begin again, what would you suggest?—I believe myself it might in the long run be cheaper to begin again. I am strongly of opinion that it would be desirable to have a hospital there with accommodation for a few of the other classes as well as the acute sick, and you would serve very big districts all round.

4744. Chronic sick?—Yes, and even the old infirm. I think that you cannot economically work a workhouse on any other basis than the present, because if you have all the sick in one you must pay for every particle of labour done in it. I don't at all approve of pauper nursing, but there is a great deal of work that paupers able to work can do that will reduce the expenditure of the establishment. On the other hand, if you crowd all the able-bodied into one workhouse you leave them without help in the other; so I think the present system is the most economical.

4745. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—What do you mean by able-bodied; as far as we have gone in this county we have not found able-bodied paupers?—Well, there are able-bodied women with children, and they do a great deal of work, and there are men who are able to work, but, of course, no one would dream of employing them as able-bodied men; we have only two at present—one is a big strong man, who, though not classed as infirm, is a man of weak mind; the other is a man with one leg and a large family.

4746. Are the family in the institution?—Five of eight children are in the institution; they are not permanent cases; they generally come in the winter.

4747. The poor man is not able in the good time to make enough to support him in the winter?—I don't think he is willing if he were able. He has been a vagrant all his life; he is a native of the moon.

4748. CHAIRMAN.—Then, really, you think all Donegal instead of being divided into eight unions might be divided into sixteen or twenty hospital districts?—If it could be done, and there was money for it, I think the sick poor would be infinitely better served by an arrangement of that sort. As to the rating, I have seen that a number of suggestions have been made that you should revert to electoral division rating; I think that would be, certainly, a very retrograde step. I admit you cannot control outdoor relief otherwise except by rating it practically altogether; you must either give outdoor relief unaltered.

4749. For general expenditure, you would keep the union as large, and as regards outdoor relief you think it would be more economical to have electoral division

rating?—If you give it at all; we don't give outdoor relief except on the certificate of the medical officer or provisional relief by the relieving officer. The Guardians do not put any chronic cases on the relief list.

4750. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Do you not think that that injuriously affects some very deserving people?—I don't think so; my experience of over thirty years is that nine-tenths of the applicants for outdoor relief are simply cases of contributing the rent for parties who otherwise maintain themselves begging, and they would be much more comfortable in the workhouse.

4751. Are you not aware that it is the most economical way of furnishing relief to the destitute if properly given?—I am not, and don't believe it. If you can restrict it, but with union rating you certainly cannot. If a case is given outdoor relief in one district, the Guardians of another district, knowing that they won't have any extra charge on their own immediate neighbours, will say, "Well, there is a very old woman of mine just as bad as that one," and in any union I am acquainted with, and I am acquainted with a great many, the cases are so numerous it would entail a very large expenditure. My experience is that where outdoor relief is pretty generally given there the rates are high, and where it is not given except in cases that cannot be removed to the workhouse, the rates are low.

4752. Don't you know that there is amongst the poor a feeling of dislike to come into the workhouse?—I found that some years ago there was an intense feeling, and it exists in isolated cases to this day, but the proportion compared with what it was before is very small, and as regards the sick it is very nearly gone.

4753. But still it might happen that some family might unexpectedly meet with reverse and be left in a destitute condition, and be unwilling to come into the workhouse; don't you think such a case should be assisted?—There are so many cases nearly on the level; it is opening a gate that it will be hard to close.

4754. But once a person enters the workhouse, do you not think the dislike to go there has removed, and it is an attraction to them afterwards?—I don't think so. I know of cases saved in the workhouse, and although of kindly disposition and liking to see their old acquaintances, they would shun it as they would a plague, and some have risen to great eminence.

4755. We have had evidence before us where the Guardians refused outdoor relief in every case except on a certificate, and the Guardians themselves, out of pure charity, had contributed to keep these people from starving; do you think it is right that deserving people should be treated like that?—You cannot make any general rule that will apply to every case, there will be occasional exceptions, but there will be no exception to the fact that if you give outdoor relief to that class of person you will have other classes that are not so deserving getting it, and you cannot avoid it.

4756. But still if the relieving officer had placed upon himself the responsibility of deciding as to the merits of the claim for outdoor relief, and he felt that responsibility would be closely investigated and inquired into by the auditor, do you not think that outdoor relief judiciously administered would be very economical?—I have never known the Guardians even reflect upon the relieving officer for giving provisional relief; my remarks refer not to the cases of emergency but to chronic cases.

4757. I would just like to get your opinion, because you seem to be a very level-headed man, and have had many years' experience?—I have had a good many years' experience.

4758. CHAIRMAN.—Do all the cases come up on the application of the relieving officer?—If he finds it necessary during the week.

4759. But I mean you have no such thing as chronic cases?—Yes, we have.

4760. Are they brought forward by Guardians?—The only chronic cases we have on the books are cases we carried forward from the old Board of Guardians. Immediately after the Local Government Act was passed the new board passed a resolution handing themselves that except in cases relieved by the relieving officer, and cases given on the certificate of the doctor, they would not add to the list, but allow the old list to die out.

4761. Do you think if the relieving officer were made the person responsible for outdoor relief in all cases, and if he could be pulled up by the Guardians and auditor of the Local Government Board, do you think abuses would be likely to arise then?—I think just as

Oct. 14, 1905.

Mr. D. C. Pearson.

Oct. 14, 1905.

Mr. D. C.
Pearson.

likely; it would require to be a very firm relieving officer that would resist the appeals of local Guardians.

4753. Do you think the first aid might not suffer him?—I think he could do a great deal quite within the law that no auditor could touch.

4754. If the law were tightened?—I hardly know how you could tighten it more than describing the class, for no law will classify the cases, though the present law does classify them as well as can possibly be done.

4755. You don't see any advantage in putting the responsibility, as in the case of provincial relief, on the relieving officer instead of the Guardians?—I do not think so; I think a body like the Board of Guardians are more likely to deal impartially than a relieving officer, who, perhaps, by refusing a particular case, would make enemies.

4756. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—I suppose you see the point I am trying to get at; it is this, that in giving outdoor relief, if judiciously and properly given, the recipient receives the whole benefit of the grant; none of it goes to officers or establishment charges; what we would like to arrive at would be to find a method of giving the poor the best possible relief.—I do not think it would be possible to discriminate as wisely as you suggest. I think not only Boards of Guardians but all charitable institu-

tions have found that they were constantly imposed on. I have before my mind a case something like you refer to, where the Guardians put their hands in their pockets and contributed in that form to poor persons who were not eligible within the law. It was distinctly proved to the Guardians that they managed to convert the relief given into whiskey, and the Guardians themselves contributed to purchase clothing and blankets for them. And I am personally certain that in outdoor relief the small sums that would be likely to be given would simply go to pay the house rent for parties who live by common begging, and certainly my experience is that the parties who apply for outdoor relief are not the class of persons who would die rather than come into the workhouse; you will get an exceptional case now and again; parties are much more likely to die from starvation without their poverty being known than parties who would take outdoor relief are to do because they would not come into the workhouse.

4757. How are the people who are very poor who do not beg?—We always do that; the law provides for that; when a person in the County Donegal dies his relatives will apply to the relieving officer for a coffin and a shroud, and a deputation will go round the town and beg the means of providing a cat.

Mr. Connell,
M. Ward.

Mr. CONNELL, M.

WARD examined.

4757. Mr. Dawley.—You are the Chairman of the Donegal Board of Guardians?—Yes, sir.

4758. And have been for some years?—Yes.

4759. You and the Guardians stand in answers to all the queries?—Yes.

4760. Is there anything you would wish to add to the answers you have given to those queries?—No; there is nothing I would wish to add; anything I would be inclined to add has been added by Mr. Pearson, and I entirely concur in everything he has said on the matter. Those answers are somewhat similar to the answers he gave, and they were the answers we arrived at after considering the matter as seriously as we could, and the Board were all unanimous that those answers were the best answers we could give to the several questions, and any additional information that Mr. Pearson has given I fully concur with him.

4761. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—The clerk has told us that your board, immediately after the entrance on their duties, came to the decision that they would give no outdoor relief?—We did.

4762. Would you give the Commission the reasons which influenced the members?—Yes; we all believed that it would be wiser to do so for the simple reason that if a person got outdoor relief in a certain district that a Guardian in another district would say to himself, "My neighbour requires outdoor relief too," and he would use all the influence he could to get outdoor relief for this person, and the thing would go from one district to another, so that it would become too general; people would be asking for outdoor relief that could do without it; it would demoralise the people to a certain extent; it would become very general, and be an expensive item on the rates.

4763. Since you came to that resolution has it affected the number in the house in any way; did more come in?—No; I don't believe it did affect it appreciably at all; those that were getting outdoor relief when our board came into existence we continued outdoor relief to them, and any provisional relief the relieving officer gives we give him liberty to use his discretion. We passed a resolution that without a doctor's certificate that the persons were not fit to be admitted to the house we would give no outdoor relief.

4764. You make all the destitute who are able to be removed come into the workhouse?—Yes.

4765. Has any case of hardship come under your notice?—Well, no; the only case of hardship that came under my notice was the case alluded to by Mr. Pearson, where the Guardians made a subscription themselves and bought clothing for the parties, and gave them provisional relief in that way; some of these people came to the workhouse afterwards and died there.

4766. Does the feeling exist among the people outside, living in the country, of a desire to come into the workhouse?—Well, no; when the people become destitute I don't think the feeling is much against coming into the workhouse now; they believe they get very

good treatment, and all that. There are some people who may have a feeling.

4767. CHAIRMAN.—Among the very old people—Old people come in; they have no remorse, I believe.

4768. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Have you many laborers in your union?—No; they are nearly all small farmers.

4769. Then the question is not so strong in your union as in some others?—I think not; they are nearly all small farmers, with the exception of an odd person about the town; but in the country they are all small farmers.

4770. What is your view as regards emigration; do you think the number of workhouses in this county is too great?—I think there are too many, certainly; if it would reduce the rates I believe they should be reduced.

4771. Have you any suggestions to make?—I have not. I mentioned before, I believe, that from the decrease of the population and that sort of thing, and the facilities for transit and going from one place to another, that certainly less workhouses would do now than formerly. When the union boundaries were first fixed communication was very poor, but now there are good facilities for travelling.

4772. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think this union could be abolished?—No; I think this union should be retained.

4773. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—If Donegal were to be preserved in all its glory and increased you think some of the other unions could be done away with?—I think so.

4774. CHAIRMAN.—Supposing this union were broken up, have you any idea how it could be dealt with?—I would be of opinion that there should be a workhouse in every parliamentary division of the county, and I think the workhouse should be in the most central part of the division. I think then that Donegal should stand for South Donegal.

4775. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—You have the credit of bringing forward a new proposal as regards parliamentary areas?—I think it would be wise to have one in every parliamentary division of the county, and I think Donegal would be the most central place for South Donegal.

4776. You have heard Mr. Pearson say that a good number of the inmates of the house are chronic cases, and he has also said he does not think there would be any hardship in reserving those inmates to some central position; do you agree with that?—I think that the facilities for travelling now that there would not be; of course, there are some exceptional cases in which there would be hardship, but, on the whole, there would not.

4777. Have you many children?—There are not many children.

4778. CHAIRMAN.—Right?—Sometimes there does not be that many even.

4779. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Has the question of boarding out ever come before the board?—We never had many children at a time. I believe it would be advisable in a great many cases to board out. I know some cases myself before I became acquainted with the workhouse that were boarded out, and they did very well;

the people that had them in charge sent them to school, and they became quiet, industrious boys afterwards.

4789. And never sought the house again?—No, they never did; and, in fact, the people who had them in charge would keep them for ever, as fond as of their own children—some of them. I believe the system of boarding out, if it was seen that they were properly conducted and sent to school, is a system I would approve of.

4790. Would you think there would be any difficulty in getting suitable homes?—I think not if there was a fair fee given to the parties; the fee might not be so large, but if there was a pretty good fee given there would be no reluctance on the part of some farmers taking them in; then, of course, the Guardians in the neighbourhood should see that these were properly sent to school and conducted; if not they should be taken from them.

4791. CHAIRMAN.—You would not be afraid of any personal cruelty towards the children?—I would not be a bit afraid of any personal cruelty to the children.

4792. Mr. MURKIN.—Your general experience is that persons boarded out receive fairly good treatment from their foster parents?—They do.

4793. CHAIRMAN.—The only danger would be not sending them to school, but taking as much work out of them as possible?—That could be seen to by the Guardians of the district; but I believe there would be no danger of that.

4794. Dr. BAKER.—In your evidence you mentioned something about the county infirmary at Lefford?—Yes; I believe the infirmary at Lefford would be quite sufficient for the wants of the sick poor in a considerable area round about, and the Small Hospital at Dallyshannon could give accommodation to some of the people about Ballyshannon.

4795. CHAIRMAN.—And you would be willing to pay for patients going from here to the Small Hospital?—Some of them would be willing to pay for themselves.

4796. But the Guardians?

4797. Mr. MURKIN.—They would cost no more than the present cost?—No.

4798. The Guardians would be willing to give as much assistance as they could?—They would, I believe.

4799. Supposing Donegal was preserved, have you in your mind's eye any of the unions that could be done

without in Donegal. We must begin with some unions, and we would like to get the opinion of a sensible gentleman, like you?—I would have Donegal in South Donegal, but it is a question I would not like to answer.

4800. CHAIRMAN.—Are you afraid of Mr. Boyle?—No, I am not, nor of Mr. Magee either. I should say Glenties should be retained for West Donegal and Milford for East Donegal, and Lishaven for Lishaven; and I would say, of course, the reason I would pass over Letterkenny is that I believe it could be added to the present asylum, not as an auxiliary requiring an extra staff, but as part of the present building, because it is sufficiently near the present building to be managed by the staff with some extra assistance.

4801. What would you do for Stranorlar?—I would turn it into a large establishment for the whole county.

4802. For what class?—If children would not be boarded out it would be a grand place in which to train the children of the county, learn them trades, and turn them out good members of society; either that or to turn it into a technical school or agricultural school. I believe that any of these workhouses that could be dispensed with should be turned into technical or agricultural schools.

4803. Mr. MURKIN.—What about Ballyshannon?—Ballyshannon could be turned into something of the kind too.

4804. Mr. DUFFY.—Would you sell it to the War Office for barracks?—We could do that; I am sure they would be very glad to buy it.

4805. Mr. Boyle.—Is there any railway into Milford; is it a very accessible place?—It is not a very accessible place, but it is not very far away from the railway.

4806. Is it not at the very end of North Donegal and within one mile of West Donegal?—Well, I am not quite sure.

4807. Would it not be about the most inaccessible workhouse that you could have for East Donegal?—Of course I admit Stranorlar is the most accessible.

4808. Is not that a point in its favour. You have promulgated the novel idea that there should be a workhouse in each parliamentary division, but if a redistribution of seats came, and there were perhaps only two parliamentary divisions in Donegal, would you have the workhouses then reduced?—The number of parliamentary divisions will last for some time.

Mr. CHARLES CAMPBELL, EXAMINED.

4798. Mr. DUFFY.—You are a member of the District Board of Guardians and District Council?—Yes.

4800. And have been since the passing of the Local Government Act?—Yes.

4801. You sent in your answer already to the Commission to these queries?—Yes, sir.

4802. Have you anything that you would wish to add now to the answers that have been sent in; did you hear the evidence of Mr. Ward?—Yes; I did.

4803. Do you agree with it?—Yes.

4804. CHAIRMAN.—Do you agree with him as regards the unions that ought to be closed up?—Yes.

4805. You would close up Dallyshannon, Stranorlar, Ballyshannon, and Letterkenny?—Yes.

4806. Mr. MURKIN.—Was that matter considered by your County Council—District Council?

Mr. PEARSON.—We have only the one district council in the one union; it is exactly the same body.

4807. CHAIRMAN.—You have no urban district?—No.

4808. Mr. DUFFY.—Was it considered by the district council what unions should remain and what should be closed?—Yes, sir.

4809. Mr. MURKIN.—A special meeting summoned for the purpose was there?—Yes, sir.

4810. And the decision was?—Unanimous.

4811. You think Ballyshannon is an situated and the town is of such importance that it is necessary the institution should be retained there?—It is made up of three unions.

4812. I should have said Donegal?—Yes; I think it is in a central position.

4813. CHAIRMAN.—Then you would take the Donegal part of Ballyshannon?—Yes.

4814. Mr. MURKIN.—Would there be any difficulty in doing that as regards the transfer of people to this house?—No difficulty whatever; in a short time we will have a railway from Ballyshannon into this

town, the line is being constructed; I think there will be no difficulty at all.

4815. Donegal is situated in a fairly central position?—The most central I am aware of.

4816. Because there was a suggestion yesterday at Ballyshannon that Donegal could be done without, and I would like to know from you something on the other side?—I don't see how it could be easily done without, because it is in my opinion, and has been the opinion of all the counsel who met at the deposition summoned, that Donegal was the most central place for South Donegal, and I believe it too.

4817. CHAIRMAN.—It was pointed out in Ballyshannon that they had more than twice as many inmates as you have here, that there are more people seeking relief in the infirmary and workhouse than here, and then consideration ought to be given to them as the more important centre of population?—Ballyshannon is on the seaward skirts of Donegal altogether.

4818. They were pointing out that the railway would be made, and it would be very handy for bringing your people into them?—The Small Hospital is in Dallyshannon, and for the sick and infirm I think it would be quite sufficient to accommodate the Ballyshannon section, and by conveying persons from Kilgobbin to Ballyshannon would be a distance of thirty-six miles, while the distance from Ballyshannon to Donegal would be only about thirteen miles, and it would meet the Glenties section of this part.

4819. Do you agree with Mr. Pearson in thinking that no matter how the matter was settled some small local hospital would be necessary about Carrick or Glenties?—Yes, I do; it is a very far distance from Glenties to any workhouse, but you Donegal, owing to the railway facilities from Killybegs, would be as convenient, and more convenient for bringing them than any other workhouse I am aware of.

4820. For the people who could be removed?—For the people who could be removed.

Oct. 14, 1902

Mr. Campbell,
H. Ward.

Mr. Charles
Campbell.

Oct. 14, 1898.

Mr. Charles
Gawdy.

4821. But the people who could not be removed would require some small hospital in economical lines?—Yes; I agree with that.

4822. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—There was a suggestion also made yesterday that Ballyshannon Union could accommodate a number of outlying divisions in other counties, such as Fermanagh and Leitrim; did that question ever come up before your council to consider?—No, sir.

4823. But what you think is that if this union were retained that it would be in a suitable position to accommodate any person living inside the boundary of Donagall as it exists at present?—Yes, I do.

4824. You think it would be a very suitable place?—The most suitable I know.

4825. And the doing away with it would be an injury to the poor?—I believe that; and it would be very inconvenient.

4826. Mr. Doolery.—Would not Irvinestown workhouse be sufficient to look after the Fermanagh portion of the Ballyshannon Union?—Yes; and it would be nearer than Ballyshannon.

4827. And Manchesterhamilton Union for the Leitrim portion?—Yes.

4828. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—I understood your board does not give any outdoor relief except in provisional cases and under the certificate of the doctor?—No, sir.

4829. Could you tell the Commission what was the reason for that; did you find it was abused?—We met, we passed a resolution, according to the law, and we are of opinion still it is the best plan we could adopt, because in a great many cases the people who would receive outdoor relief, what they got would not be far outdoor relief, but it might be converted, and the poor are far better provided, I am of opinion, and know it, within the workhouse here at present than they could be outside.

4830. As far as food and clothing, perhaps, they are better provided, but they have not the freedom that human nature seeks; the confinement is very cruel under this; if there was a careful system adopted of outdoor relief that would give only to those that would be fully entitled to it, do you not think that would relieve the institution of a great many inmates and bring comfort to the destitute?—I don't see how the poor who would receive outdoor relief could be as comfortable as they would be within the walls of the workhouse, nor as well cared and looked after.

4831. Supposing there was 2s. a week or so given to the destitute person, could they not subsist on that by earning 2s. or 3s. more, and living more comfortably and be happier than in the barracks here?—There are very few of them that apply for outdoor relief that are able to work.

4832. For instance, people living in the towns and getting little jobs, do you think it is right that those people should be allowed to starve or go to the workhouse?—The only case that I know that that applied to was subscribed for.

4833. I may tell you it does happen in other cases. It is the only case since I became a member of the board.

4834. You don't think any better system of outdoor relief could be devised than the present system?—I believe they could not be better accommodated, and I have known cases that it was painful to see them living there until they were removed to the house, and they were not within the walls of the houses when I want to see them in a short time, and they would not leave on any consideration; parties that I visited from my own division.

4835. Did you not think you were doing an injury to the union by bringing these people into such comfortable quarters instead of giving them assistance outside temporarily?—I do not believe it; I believe I was doing justice to them.

4836. CHAIRMAN.—You would not do anything that you thought would produce real hardship to the people outside?—No, sir.

4837. Have you heard any complaint at all about hardship arising to your refusing to give outdoor relief, or have you known any case of hardship resulting?—No, sir.

4838. What is your own division?—Innymore.

4839. I suppose people occasionally from time to time have mentioned outdoor relief as a possibility to you?—No.

4840. Since you became a member they don't look for it in your division?—No. Within the division I represent no person has applied to me or spoken to me.

Mr. Doolery.—That is the evidence I produce on behalf of the Donagall Board.

CHAIRMAN.—The doctor is here; we might hear him.

Dr. WARNOCK examined.

4841. Dr. BUCHAN.—Do you wish to supplement the evidence you have already given?—I don't know that I have anything to add to the evidence I gave at Derry, except upon the subject of amalgamation. I think there are too many workhouses in the county, and a good many of them could be done away with. In the first instance, the population is not anything like it was when they were first instituted, and in the second place, there are not the same number of people, according to the population, requiring support in workhouses. I think, of course, that the question of workhouses and hospitals should be kept entirely distinct, and when the subject of removing them from one place to another is discussed that that should be kept in mind. To remove the residents in a workhouse from one place to another would, in my mind, entail no hardship at all when you have railway accommodation; they are supposed to be healthy inmates—some are children, some are old and infirm, but they are capable of removal. Those who are incapable of removal are, of course, confined to the hospital.

4842. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think the question of removing these people from their friends is a practical question; do you think they would feel being removed from a distance, say from Ballyshannon to Donagall?—I think in some cases they would, but for those resident in the body of the house it would not apply in the same way as it does in the case of those in the hospital.

4843. You don't think that would prevail to any extent, that would be a bar to an economical arrangement for the good of the community?—No, I don't think it would to any very great extent. I think in the case of old people resident in the house, in families, that a better arrangement should be made. I think in the case of an old couple in the house, that have lived together all their lives, they should not be separated when coming into the house; some arrangement should be

made by which they would continue to live together, either in small rooms by themselves, or outside.

4844. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—You said you think there would be no hardship in changing cases of removal. The persons who are resident in the body of the house are not patients; they are not invalids, as a general rule; there are some of them invalids, but those who are invalids and infirm are treated in the hospital when the hospital can accommodate them; that is why I say I don't think the question of hardship, with regard to removal, or degree of removal, where there is railway accommodation, can come in. For instance, take Ballyshannon, Donagall, Stranorlar, and Glenties, in my mind one workhouse would accommodate all the able-bodied and all outside the hospitals, and I think it is immaterial which workhouses they are accommodated in, because you have at present railway communication between Stranorlar and Glenties and between Donagall and Stranorlar, and in a year or two we will have communication with Ballyshannon.

4845. Then as regards temporary cases, cases that might not be permanent—destitute for the moment—and still would like to keep out of the house?—In that case it would just mean the railway fare from one place to another.

4846. CHAIRMAN.—What would you do as regards the sick?—I would maintain all the present hospitals and improve them; I would separate them entirely from the body of the house and convert them into a block by themselves, and, as I stated in Derry, place them under an infirmary board on the same level and footing as the county infirmary, and under the management of the same board, with, perhaps, in the district hospitals, the addition of a few local men added on to the committee.

4847. Would you hope to have economy?—Certainly.

Oct. 14, 1903.
Dr. Warrack.

4853. Mr. MURRAY.—Do you find the elected representatives are extravagant?—I don't find they are extravagant at all; the reason I mentioned that in Derry is I think it would work for economy to have them all under one head, chiefly with regard to the nursing; the same staff of nurses, particularly the fever nurses, could be changed from one hospital to another as required.

4854. You say you would have a nominated board instead of a representative?—No; I said the present infirmary board—the County Council—and, as a matter of supervision, that question was raised in Derry by some one; the County Council could nominate or elect, whichever you choose.

4855. CHAIRMAN.—The same as they do on the asylum committee?—Exactly; a few local representatives in each district; the same thing applies to the county infirmary; it is from the point of view of economy I mention this. It is not that there is any fault to be found with the present boards, but I think it would be much better, particularly with regard to nursing, to have the whole thing under one control. As I pointed out in Derry, there are times when there is a demand for more than one nurse in a fever hospital, then you could transfer the nurses from another hospital which was not required for the time being, and the vice versa as well.

4856. So that having the nurses under one control you could move them about according to the exigencies of the case?—Exactly.

4857. And in this way arrive at an economical arrangement?—Certainly.

4858. Dr. BROWN.—Is it your opinion that very few of the old and infirm have friends, or, if they have friends, do they often go to see them?—That is why I said it would not apply so much in the body of the house as in the infirmary; they do not have the same number of visitors going to see them.

4859. Very often their friends are dead?—Sometimes they are, but, as a rule, people do not come into the body of the house if they have friends who can support them. Their friends don't allow them to come in; they are generally people who have not many friends or relatives outside.

4860. That is different from the sick?—Yes; because they come in as a matter of necessity and for treatment.

4861. Have you anything to say with regard to the location or consequences?—With regard to the consequences I can only repeat what I said in Derry, that I think there should be a special institution for them that would serve a number of counties, not one county at all, because there are not a sufficient number in one county to make it economical to provide an institution for them. One institution would be quite sufficient to accommodate all the consumptives in two or three, or perhaps more, counties.

4862. But then the difficulty would be that their friends would not allow them to go long distances?—That is not my experience; of course, it is not much good sending them at all unless you send them in the early stage, and my experience is that in the early stage they will consent to their going any distance; in a later stage, when you cannot tell them there is much hope it is then that they don't like to let them go; they want to have them die at home. With regard to the question of location, we all know that increased accommodation is necessary, and I think when it can be at all arranged that the workhouse, I mean now the body of the house—I am not talking of the infirmary, because I think the infirmaries, except in towns where there are county infirmaries, I think the workhouse infirmaries will all be required—but I think the body of the house should be converted into an auxiliary asylum in addition to the asylum, and, again, for economic reasons, because it would be there under the immediate

control of the staff of the asylum, and it would not require so many additional attendants, because the cases put into an auxiliary asylum are not the acute cases that require special supervision.

4863. Mr. MURRAY.—That could only be done in your county at Letterkenney?—That could only be done at Letterkenney.

4864. The asylum, I understand, is overcrowded, and they are building additional wings?—Yes; and the workhouse, with some improvements, would be capable of accommodating harmless lunatics with a certain number of epileptics.

4865. You think an institution of that kind would be a better home for these afflicted people than a workhouse?—Unquestionably, because they would be under a trained staff.

4866. And it would be better for the harmless lunatics already in the asylum to be away from the noisy people?—Unquestionably.

4867. Dr. BROWN.—With regard to the fever hospitals, should they be decreased or increased?—They could not possibly be reduced with safety to the public, and I think in certain localities small hospitals should be established that could be used either as fever hospitals or as district hospitals, as occasion required. I mentioned in Derry the two localities that I think require such accommodation.

4868. One hospital that might be used for either purpose?—According to emergency cases.

4869. CHAIRMAN.—You don't think it would be possible to have a cottage hospital common to both infectious and non-infectious diseases?—You could not possibly, where you had fever, admit other cases.

4870. But suppose you were a long time without fever, suppose, as often happens, for six months or a year?—I think that in the interval a case might be admitted.

4871. The awkwardness would occur if you had half a dozen ordinary, serious, medical, or surgical cases in this hospital; then, if a fever case came, you would have to send it somewhere else?—You would have to have a small isolated block so arranged that you could isolate it completely; that would be required even in surgical cases, because a case of erysipelas might arise, which you should isolate.

4872. Dr. BROWN.—If they had two wards that would give them time to have the other patient removed?—Yes; but it is only in case of emergency.

4873. CHAIRMAN.—I think the districts you referred to were Glencolumbkille and the Rosses?—Yes; there may be others in the northern end of the county that I cannot speak of.

4874. You might fix a site that would accommodate both at Greencastle?—Yes; now, particularly that you have a railway there, I don't mean that fever patients should be conveyed by railway, but many others could be.

4875. Mr. MURRAY.—Have you any suggestion about the island of Arranmore?—I think there should be a small cottage hospital that would be used entirely in the case of an outbreak of fever, and an arrangement should be made to send fever cases there when required. The people won't consent to go to hospital until the disease is advanced, and then there is a difficulty about getting them on to the mainland, and there is a danger as well in removing them; I mean danger to themselves in removing them when the disease arrives at that stage.

4876. Is there any diseased institution in that locality that could be turned into such a hospital?—I have not been on the island lately, but I have heard there is; I don't know anything about it of my own knowledge at present. Of course, if there was a permanent cottage hospital established for the accommodation of the Rosses people this small hospital on Arranmore could be worked in connection with it as required.

Mr. GEORGE McLAUGHLIN, Clerk

4877. Mr. ROYLE.—Have you sent a reply to the queries?—Yes.

4878. It is before the Commissioners; have you anything to add to that?—Yes; there are some general statements I wish to add.

4879. On the question of outdoor relief, would you say anything as far as your board is concerned?—Our board is rather reluctant to give outdoor relief, but in case of temporary distress or where there are two or

of Stranraer Union, examined.

three in the household they would be in favour of granting it, but taking it as a whole the majority of the Guardians think that granting 2s. or 3s. a week as outdoor relief is not to be advocated, for they think that if the workhouse is not a suitable place for treating such cases it ought to be brought up to the standard to meet such cases. From a sanitary point of view and other reasons they would be much better treated in the workhouse than in their own buildings, but where

Mr. George McLaughlin.

Oct. 14, 1902,

Mr. George
H. Langhills.

urgent cases are brought up and advocated by the Guardians of the district the board are in favour of granting them.

4389. Is it only in case of exceptional years they have given outdoor relief?—Our outdoor relief is only £1 13s. 6d. a week; we are really a poor district. In Strabane No. 2 they are giving £9 a week in outdoor relief; we are the poorer part of the county, and are paupers supporting paupers.

4390. How much is the standard rate in Stranorlar?—Our standard rate was the lowest in the county, except Londonderry No. 2. Ballyshannon was 1s. 1d.; Donagall, 10d.; Milford, 1s. 9d.; Glenties, 2s. 8d.; Inishowen, 1s. 4d.; Letterkenny, 10d.; Londonderry, 1d.; Derry, 10d.; of course we suffer by that now. I sent in a statement to the Commission, but I find that what I sent in to the Commission was only the rates levied on "the other hereditaments." Ballyshannon, to be deducted in respect of agricultural grants for county charges, 55s.; to be levied off other hereditaments, 185s.; union charges, 127s.; sums deducted in respect of agricultural grant, 64s. 6d. In Donagall the union charges to be levied off agricultural land are 72s.; deducted in respect of agricultural grant, 81s.; other hereditaments, 184s. 6d. Derry, 10d.; deducted in respect of agricultural grant, 10s. 11d.; to be levied off other hereditaments, 70s. 6d. Glenties, union charges, 146s.; sums to be deducted in respect of agricultural grant, 104s.; to be levied off other hereditaments, 122s. 6d. Londonderry No. 2, union charges on land, 74s.; agricultural grant, 55s.; to be levied off other hereditaments, 154s. Letterkenny, union charges, 70s.; sums to be deducted in respect of agricultural grant, 81s.; to be levied off other hereditaments, 122s. 6d. Londonderry No. 2, union charges on land, 34s.; to be deducted in respect of agricultural grant, 34s.; to be levied off other hereditaments, 72s. 6d. In Milford, union charges, 74s.; to be deducted in respect of agricultural grant, 72s.; to be levied off other hereditaments, 157s. Strabane No. 2, union charges, 146s.; sums to be deducted in respect of agricultural grant, 55s.; on other hereditaments, 20s. In Stranorlar, union charges, 84s.; to be deducted in respect of agricultural grant, 87s.; to be levied off other hereditaments, 158s. 6d.

4392. How much was Strabane No. 2?—The rate this year in Strabane No. 2 to be levied off agricultural land, 144s.; the grant, 55s.; and to be levied off other hereditaments, 20s.

4393. Mr. MURKHAM.—That is 1s. 8d.; what is it in Stranorlar?—13s. 6d.

4394. I suppose there is exceptional reason this year for the high rate in Strabane?—Yes; apparently.

Mr. MURKHAM.—We understand that in the County Tyrone the reason was there was an under calculation.

4395. Mr. Boyle.—Have you any observations to make about the representation of the electoral division?—Yes; we have one electoral division with a valuation of £200, and they send forward two representatives, and we have another division with a valuation of over £6,000, and they only send forward two representatives as well.

4396. Mr. MURKHAM.—What is the number of people in the house at present?—There are thirty-five in the infirmary and three in the fever hospital.

4397. Mr. Boyle.—How is Stranorlar situated for the purpose of transit and railway facilities?—It is the centre of the railway system of the Donegal railways; all the other railways radiate from Stranorlar towards Donegal.

4398. CHAIRMAN.—That is the southern branch; the ones radiating from Letterkenny have no connection with you?—No, sir; but Strabane No. 2 and Glenties.

4399. Mr. MURKHAM.—Suppose in the case of amalgamation the union of Stranorlar was abolished, would it cause any inconvenience to the poor of that locality?—I would be in favour of retaining all the infirmaries attached to the various workhouses. Taking our own union, if cases of illness occur on the mountain portion, sixteen or seventeen miles away, or fever or sudden accidents, it would be cruel to remove the cases from those parts to any other workhouse. I think the same argument applies to all the unions situated in the county.

4400. Is there any neighbouring union that Stranorlar, owing to its situation, could serve in the case of amalgamation?—There is railway communication to Strabane, Donagall, and Glenties, but none towards Letterkenny.

4391. Is Stranorlar so situated that it is in the central portion of the county?—I believe it is.

4402. What is the valuation of the union?—£21,000.

4403. What is the annual outlay?—The demand is £2,500.

4404. CHAIRMAN.—For what purpose?—All purposes—medical charges.

4405. Have you the demand for Poor Law purposes only; could you tell the amount, excluding the Public Health and medical charges?—The expenditure for inmates, including clothing, is about £200 a year.

4406. That does not cover the establishment?—No, sir; it does not.

4407. Have you got what would have been the old poor rate?—The average for the last five years in the old poor rate was 10s. 6d.

4408. What services did you do out of that?—All the services in connection with the Poor Law medical charges, registration, establishment, maintenance of paupers.

4409. Public Health?—Yes.

4410. Can you tell me for Poor Law purposes only what would be the present rate?

Mr. Pearson.—It was £1,611 last year.

4411. CHAIRMAN.—Out of £2,500?

Mr. Pearson.—Yes.

4412. Mr. MURKHAM.—I notice that the rate in the standard year was not as high as it is at present. No, sir, it was not; but we had to expend between 1890 and 1900 since the Act came into operation in making improvements in the workhouse and on the additional nursing staff.

4413. How were they paid for; by means of a loan?—£200 was by means of a loan.

4414. Has the other £200 been paid out of the fund?

—Yes; the ordinary funds of the union.

4415. You say there is an inequality in some of the electoral divisions owing to the low rate?—Yes, sir.

4416. You mention one case in which the valuation is £250 and another case where the valuation is over £6,000?—Yes.

4417. You think it is hardly fair to the high rated division that it should only have the same representation as a low-rated one?—Yes, I think so.

4418. Have you any suggestion to make to relieve that inequality?—Personally, I think an electoral division under £2,000 valuation should have only one representative.

4419. Then you would create a representation according to the valuation?—Yes; I think it is a very high estimate to have one. And as regards outdoor relief chargeability, I would be in favour of making it a divisional rating.

4420. Simply on economical grounds?—Yes.

4421. And the reason is to put on every electoral division the cost of its own district?—Yes; besides I think when a district councillor advocates Poor Law relief for a pauper in his district, he should be responsible for that, knowing that his division has to bear its expense.

4422. You can look at that from another point of view. Of course, on the ground of economy and keeping down the rates, that would be very right, but you must take into consideration that a poor electoral division might have a considerable number of poor and a rich electoral division might have very few poor, but you would be putting the whole burden of keeping up the poor on the poor electoral division; how would it affect you if the rating system was changed from a case rating to a county rating, such as a compounding charge; do you think that would be a better distribution?—I don't know. I would be inclined to believe that the district councillors and Guardians would be rather inclined to put more cases on outdoor relief in their respective divisions; I think if it was made a divisional charge and brought more home to them they would do that the cases were proper cases.

4423. CHAIRMAN.—If you put outdoor relief out of the question?—Leaving outdoor relief out of the question, I think it should be county rating.

Mr. MURKHAM.—What is the area of the Strabane Union?

Mr. Boyle.—The next witness will tell you that.

4424. Mr. MURKHAM.—How many children have you put in the house?—Ten.

4425. Are your Guardians in favour of the system of boarding out?—They would be in favour of boarding out, but there are only two children at present boarded out in the union; I think the consensus of opinion is that the boarding-out system is better. I would like

to hand in a dietary scale, showing the liberal treatment of the paupers and inmates in Stranorlar Workhouse: the class that uses tobacco get an ounce and a half weekly, those who are not confined to bed; and one ounce those who are; and the doctor gets a great lot of snuff in the infirmary.

4016. How many people are there in the infirmary?—Twenty-five.

4017. And in the body of the house?—It takes up the balance.

4018. Have you any harmless inmates in the house?—Five.

4019. Did your Guardians ever express an opinion as regards the benefits of an auxiliary system?—They are of opinion that all these classes of inmates should be treated in a separate institution.

4020. Any trouble with the tramp question in your union?—Yes, sir.

4021. You don't adopt the treatment they adopt in Donegal?—No, sir. In wet weather it is very hard on the poor tramp who comes from Strabane or Donegal; it is a very difficult matter to refuse them admission, but I would be in favour in summer weather of absolutely refusing admission, but in the case of women and children I would always admit them.

4022. CHAIRMAN.—You were master in Stranorlar before you became clerk?—Yes.

4023. For a great number of years you had this discretion in your hands of admitting them or not admitting them, and that is the way you exercised it?—Yes.

4024. You were slow to refuse admission?—In winter weather.

4025. And the Guardians did not impose any extra order on you with regard to the regulations or rules?—They imposed that they should do a certain amount of work before leaving the house in the morning.

4026. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Are there any able-bodied inmates in the house?—There are two men and four women; there is one of the men who is a lunatic, so, practically, there is only one.

4027. How many could the house accommodate in addition to what you have?—The accommodation is 592 under the old conditions.

4028. That would be cut down very largely now, perhaps to nearly half the number, on account of the space that is considered desirable?—It would be reduced; a half would be rather a big estimate.

4029. Do you think Stranorlar would be a central point?—Yes. And in recent years we are trying to bring it up to the standard, and the vacant portion is perfectly in repair. We are at present spending £140 in sewerage improvements; on the introduction of water-closets it was necessary to provide new sewerage.

4030. The Guardians make no objection to provide these necessary things?—No; they are in favour of bringing the house up to as modern a standard as possible. There is one thing I would like to add: the farm at Stranorlar Workhouse is a source of great revenue; I hand in the auditor's statement for the last half-year.

4031. CHAIRMAN.—Have you the farm account?—I have not the farm account with me. For the last six years the average profit on the farm is £169 11s. 9d.

4032. If you had the farm account I would ask you a few questions on it. You charge labour against the farm account?—Yes.

4033. What do you charge for labour?—Nothing for the inmates.

4034. So that the inmates give their work for nothing and that does not go into the account as an outgoing?—It does not.

4035. Then as regards what you produce on the farm—milk and potatoes—how much do you sell the milk for to the Guardians?—3d. a quart.

4036. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—What is the contract price?—At present I am paying 3d. a quart in Stranorlar.

4037. CHAIRMAN.—How much do you charge for potatoes?—The potatoes are at the current price of the market.

4038. I am afraid these farm accounts don't impress me very much; I have had a good deal of experience of them; I am never impressed with farm accounts until I have examined them?—It is at the current price, and we think the milk is very good value.

4039. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—How many cows have you got?—Four at present.

4040. Do they furnish a sufficient supply?—They do.

Mr. THOMAS MAGUIRE, J.P., examined.

4041. Mr. Boyle.—Are you a member of the Stranorlar Board of Guardians?—Yes.

4042. You are also a member of the County Council for the Stranorlar district and a member of the asylum committee, and of the County Infirmary?—Yes.

4043. You have sent forward replies to the Commission, but in addition to that have you any evidence to offer. Are you in favour of a decrease in the workhouses in Donegal?—I am, on account of the decrease in the population.

4044. I believe since 1841 the population of the county has decreased by 123,000 odd?—Yes.

4045. In connection with the question of amalgamation, you are in favour of the amalgamation of some of the workhouses?—I am.

4046. As to the individual workhouses, would you express an opinion?—I would not; I think it is for the Commission.

4047. CHAIRMAN.—Would you go so far as to say whether in your opinion Stranorlar should be kept on?—The Guardians are unanimous that Stranorlar should be retained, and have passed a resolution to that effect; that is my own opinion too.

4048. Mr. Boyle.—Why is it your opinion?—It is the centre of the county, and connected in every way with railway communication; they have the railway to Strabane, Dungannon, and Killybegs, and in a short time we will have one to Ballyshannon and Glenties.

4049. CHAIRMAN.—There is none projected to Letterkenny yet?—A guarantee has passed the County Council for a railway from Strabane to Omagh and then to Letterkenny.

4050. But not direct to Stranorlar?—No.

4051. Mr. Boyle.—How far in the Letterkenny direction does the Stranorlar Union extend?—It goes within four miles of Letterkenny, and some parts less, at Magua McFadden's.

4052. I suppose in your opinion the management and equipment of this institution and its geographical situation should be an important element for the consideration of this Commission?—I consider so; I think the

Stranorlar Guardians have spared nothing in the way of making the place comfortable for the poor.

4053. Since 1869 how much have they expended on improvements in the place?—£225.

4054. And I believe that Strabane No. 2 adjoins Stranorlar?—It does; they have removed all the beds from the infirmary and got four beds and mattresses.

4055. They will see that when they go there. I believe Strabane No. 2 adjoins Stranorlar; within how many miles is the nearest portion?—Two and a half or three miles from Stranorlar workhouse.

4056. How much is the population of Strabane No. 2, am I right in saying it is 10,463?—Yes; and the valuation £42,750.

4057. How much is the population of Stranorlar Union altogether?—43,792.

4058. How much is the valuation of that union?—£31,000.

4059. How much does the fever hospital in Letterkenny get from the county?—From the county-at-large £114 a year, and there is one at Ramoth that receives 25s.

4060. Would you be in favour of that going elsewhere?—I would be in favour of them being sent somewhere else; in the good old days they were planted one near the Letterkenny workhouse and the other three miles from Milford.

4061. CHAIRMAN.—They were built before the workhouse?—I have been fighting in the County Council to have those removed to some other parts of the county.

4062. Mr. Boyle.—As far as railway facilities are concerned Stranorlar is the most central part?—It is the most central part of the county.

4063. Is it not the headquarters of the light railway system?—It is.

4064. CHAIRMAN.—I think Letterkenny would have a somewhat different view to that?—No; I think, sir, at the time the system was built it was only carried by one line.

Oct. 14, 1903.

Mr. George McLaughlin.

Mr. Thomas Maguire.

Oct. 14, 1893.
 ———
 Mr. Tugue
 Magee.

4065. Mr. Boyle.—How much is the area of Strabane Union; is it 190,093 acres?—Yes, the whole union; Stranorlar is 121,151 acres, and there are six congested districts in Stranorlar Union and five non-congested.

4066. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—You are a member of the Donagall County Council?—Yes.

4067. Did the question of the amalgamation of workhouses come up before that body?—It did.

4068. What decision did they arrive at?—It was considered four would be sufficient, but it was a very small meeting.

4069. It was not summoned on notice?—It was summoned to answer the queries and something about the boundary question, but the claim of Stranorlar is interlocked with the boundary question, because we consider those portions of the union going into Strabane should go to Stranorlar; it should be county government.

4070. That is the claim of Stranorlar Union?—Yes.

4071. Is that the claim of the County Council?—That is the claim of the County Council, and they have passed several resolutions to that effect.

4072. CHAIRMAN.—They are quite willing to give up the Leitrim and Fermanagh portions of Ballyshannon?—They are.

4073. Because the question came up yesterday as regards the boundaries in another portion of the county, and we did not have the benefit of the opinion of the County Council of Donagall on the subject?—I must say that was not brought before the Council, but I know the opinion of the members, and they still think it should be county government. The chairman is here. They passed resolutions several times on the boundary question.

4074. Mr. Boyle.—Do you think the situation of Stranorlar is such that it could give accommodation to that portion of Donagall included at present in Strabane No. 2?—I do. There are about fifty inmates from Strabane No. 2 in Strabane Workhouse, and if you look at to-day's paper you will see the doctor's report on the congestion of the infirmary in Strabane; they have not room for them there. That congestion we can relieve without any expense, while they must spend £1,000 in Strabane in building an infirmary, and they must get officers and assistants to carry this on, while we have everything ready for them to come into.

4075. CHAIRMAN.—And welcome?—And welcome, and without any expense; we have an infirmary that can accommodate all that is in both unions, and well equipped; we have two nursing sisters.

4076. If you get Strabane No. 2 you would not be able to absorb Donagall as well?—I did not put forward anything about absorbing any union.

4077. You don't think that would be too big a mouthful with the other?—I think if we get Strabane No. 2 we would be pretty well off; we think we have a claim on Strabane No. 2 because for historical purposes it always comes to Stranorlar.

4078. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—You think the getting over of that portion of Donagall that is at present in Strabane Union would be a help to the ratepayers in the existing union of Stranorlar?—It would, and it would be no loss to the ratepayers going into Strabane, because our rates for five years are lower than Strabane; we have sixty-five or sixty-six in the house at present, and giving us these fifty we would have only 115; we could accommodate those well without any extension of premises.

4079. In regard to the tramp question, have you any trouble?—We have very little trouble; we make them do work up to the amount that they cut us nearly; we make them break stones, and don't let them out until they do that work; sometimes I myself have sent some of them further off if they are in any way troublesome.

Mr. Boyle.—If you please, Mr. Chairman, I have only a few words to say with regard to the amalgamation of workhouses, in so far as the workhouses of the County Donagall are concerned, but Stranorlar as at present under this Commission is labouring, and must labour, under a disadvantage, for the recent boundary inquiry that was held by you on the 15th and 16th of August must inevitably affect Stranorlar. I am not going to put forward any personal view of mine, I only put forward the view of the Stranorlar Union. We do not say that another union should cease to exist; we say that is essentially a question for the Commission, because they are an unbiased Commission as any Commission could possibly be; no member of this Commission is from the County Donagall, and if I produced 500 witnesses from Stranorlar to say that Stranorlar should be maintained, or there were 500 witnesses from Donagall to say that Donagall should be maintained, the Commission would still consider the question as a whole. But in so far as the amalgamation of Strabane No. 2 with Stranorlar is concerned I would humbly submit that is the only way to deal fairly with Stranorlar. You have heard the figures, you have heard that Strabane No. 2 in the County Donagall with a population of nearly 10,000 has a valuation of over £42,000, a valuation in excess of an existing union in the County Donagall, the union of Stranorlar, which has only a valuation of £31,000 odd; that is a fact that is before you, and it is one of the most important facts to be dealt with by the Commission, which has to decide on the amalgamation of unions without fear, favour, or affection, and with due regard to the economic administration of the Poor Laws for the poor and only for the poor.

2½: Sitting terminated.

TWELFTH PUBLIC SITTING—WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 28TH, 1903.

Oct. 28, 1903.

At the Courthouse, Omagh.

Present:—Mr. MICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. CONY BIGGERS.

Mr. John Muldoon, B.L. (instructed by Mr. F. J. O'Connor, solicitor), appeared for the Omagh Rural District Council.

CHAIRMAN.—Gentlemen, I suppose the object of our inquiry to-day is understood to be the question of how far, if at all, the administration of the Poor Law can be improved in the County Tyrone. Is there any appearance here for the County Council, any professional appearance? You appear, I suppose, Mr. Montgomery as one of the County Council?

Mr. Montgomery.—I was deputed to give evidence for the County Council; the County Council did not employ a professional man.

CHAIRMAN.—We generally take the County Council evidence first.

Mr. Montgomery.—I think Mr. Moore is the other witness appointed, and he is upstairs; there is some County Council business going on, and we could relieve each other.

CHAIRMAN.—Then if you would come first.

Mr. H. DE F. MONTGOMERY, D.L., examined.

MR. H. DE F. MONTGOMERY.

4030. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Montgomery, have the County Council considered definitely whether there ought to be any breaking up of unions in the county; are they in favour of it?—The committee that was appointed and authorised to deal with the point decided that there should be no amalgamation, though they considered that there may possibly be some alteration of boundaries and some readjustment of establishments and drains. I think possibly I had better put in the answers to your queries; they embody the different points that were agreed upon by the committee appointed by the County Council.

4031. That is this printed document?—That is that document.

The committee appointed by Tyrone County Council, with authority to deal with queries from Poor-Law Union Commissioners, met on July 24th, and agreed upon the following general answers to the queries:—

Query 1.—The ratepayers of the remote parts of the smaller unions in the county could not secure adequate representation at such distant centres as Omagh, Strabane, and Dungannon.

The administration of outdoor relief requires to be decentralised rather than further centralised, in order to secure that it should be carried out with due care and adequate local knowledge.

An infirmary for the sick poor and a refuge for destitute aged and infirm is required at a reasonable distance from the remote districts.

As it would not be expedient to reduce the numbers and increase the areas administered by Rural District Councils as road authorities, sanitary authorities, &c., the extra expense of maintaining those councils, as Boards of Guardians for their respective districts, will be inconsiderable.

Query 2.—No union should be dissolved.

Query 3.—The cost of maintenance of unnecessary buildings and an unnecessary staff in the smaller unions could be lessened, and the care of certain classes of paupers improved.

1. By lodging all the homeless lunatics and idiots in the county (or in the two Counties of Tyrone and Fermanagh) in the superfluous space existing in the workhouse of one of the smaller unions.

2. By providing for the mere epileptics in some central, national, or provincial institution.

3. By sending the children to an industrial school, possibly to one established in a disused workhouse.

4. By abolishing lodging accommodation for tramps or "casuals," in all but the three large workhouses in the county.

Query 4.—Provision would be required to adjust financial relations between the smaller unions, to be placed on a more economic basis, and larger unions,

relieving them of some of their liabilities as regards the entertainment of tramps, &c.

Some boundaries might advantageously be changed to meet new circumstances arising from the construction of railways and otherwise; also to lessen inequalities between areas.

Unions voting does not work well as regards the administration of out-door relief, medical charities, and sanitary matters.

Dispensary district voting would work better. The people of a dispensary district have some knowledge of the whole of such district, and have common local interests in the same market town, &c., which are not identical with those of other dispensary districts in the same union.

Query 5.—Improvement or enlargement, or both, are required in the infirmaries at Cookstown, Clogher, and Omeagher, which might be facilitated by the changes suggested in the answer to query 3.

Query 5—(a) See answer to query 5.

(b) See answer to query 3.

(c) See answer to query 3.

Query 7.—The district infirmaries should be made available to the surrounding ratepayers and, to some extent, remunerative, by the establishment of paying wards, at rates of pay graduated according to means or valuation, with some discretion to Boards of Guardians in applying the scale.

Query 8.—The number of workhouses at which accommodation for casuals is provided might, with advantage, be reduced to one half, strict measures being taken in the way of cleansing and medical control.

4032. Then the opinion of the County Council committee was that no union should be dissolved?—Yes.

4033. Has that view of the committee come before the County Council at any meeting specially summoned to consider it?—I was abroad at the last County Council meeting, and I am not sure whether it did come before it or not; possibly Mr. Moore will be able to tell you that.

4034. This document is the report of the committee; now would you tell briefly in your own words the views of the committee?—There was a very strong feeling that the unions were so situated that the remote parts of them would not be properly represented at board meetings at the centres of the larger unions.

4035. And if the smaller unions were broken up the ratepayers of such small unions would not be adequately represented at meetings?—Yes. Also that the sick poor could not be adequately dealt with, that the distances would be too great, not, of course, from the parts of the smaller unions nearest to the centre of the large unions, but that the portions of the unions most remote

On 24, 1905.
Mr. H. De P.
Montgomery.

from the centres of the large unions would be altogether too far off for dealing with cases of sickness and the aged and infirm.

4995. Did you consider the question whether it would be economical, if possible, to provide for the sick in such a case by the erection of cottage hospitals?—The idea is that there should be something, either that there should be a cottage hospital in lieu of the present workhouse, or that the workhouse, or some part of the workhouse, as might turn out desirable, should be made into a hospital, or the infirmary improved so that the hospital accommodation should be rather better, and that the unused places should be either used for a more useful purpose in some way or other, either used for infirmary purposes or for some other purpose altogether so as to leave the infirmary as the only thing to keep up in the smaller unions.

4997. Then they mention something about the Rural District Councils, but our function does not include such bodies or such districts at all, of course?—That was merely put in as another reason against the dissolving of the Boards of Guardians of the smaller unions that they would actually exist; the same bodies of men would necessarily go on existing for another purpose, and therefore you would not save much by abolishing them for one purpose when they would go on existing for another.

4998. And you so double the work on the representatives going to distant places for the Poor Law business and transacting the business of the Rural District Council in another place?—Precisely.

4999. Therefore you come to the conclusion that no union should be amalgamated?—There was also another point, we consider that the administration of outdoor relief suffers rather from the centralisation under the present Act, from the substitution of union voting for divisional rating, and if the outdoor relief would be virtually administered over the remote districts of these amalgamated unions it would be administered by people who knew nothing about the applicants; very likely the whole board would know nothing, because the attendance from these remote districts would be so very bad that it would be administered by people who knew nothing about the people concerned.

5000. That is under query 41—it is also mentioned in the answer to query 1.

5001. Then under query 31—That I think we are all agreed about; that the harmless lunatics and idiots should be lodged in some one place, and probably the harmless lunatics and idiots from two counties could very well be put in one place. I think the figures in your last report show that the total number of these lunatics is small in the county; I have not the figure with me.

5002. It is small?—Then, of course, the number of some epileptics is still smaller, and rather points to the view that one asylum for the whole country would be the proper arrangement for them.

5003. It is rather under 400 altogether. About the lunatics, did you consider whether it would be better to provide for the lunatics in an auxiliary asylum, such as a closed workhouse, or by an enlargement of the existing asylums?—We are anxious, of course, if possible, to utilise the present buildings, which at present are larger than are wanted, and, personally, my own first idea was, if it could be possible, to convert Omagh Workhouse, or part of it, into an auxiliary asylum. There it is, and it would be close to the asylum and under the same officers. But it appears in the Omagh Workhouse there are more able-bodied paupers, and it is more required for various purposes than the smaller workhouses, so that it might not be practicable, but whether by adding to the infirmary so as to enable the infirmary at Omagh to serve the purpose of a county infirmary and union infirmary, the body of the workhouse might be possibly vacated and made available for idiots, is a thing I have not been able to go into.

5004. You did not go into the figures whether it would be cheaper to keep all the lunatics in an enlarged asylum or whether it would be cheaper to send them to a distant workhouse?—No; I did not go into the figures.

5005. The capitulation grant would be less if you had an auxiliary asylum?—Yes.

5006. Half?—No I understand.

5007. You would get 2s. instead of 4s. 1s.—Yes. No, I am sorry to say, we did not go into that calculation, but I take it, whichever is the most economical plan

we should certainly approve, having been quite agreed that they should all go to some one place.

5008. If you had an auxiliary asylum you would require an extra medical staff and an extra trained supervising staff, whereas if you had your existing asylum increased?—The same staff would go further.

5009. The first paragraph of the answer to query 1 speaks of lessening the cost of the maintenance of unnecessary buildings?—Well, I sent up a more elaborate note of evidence with regard to Clagher, for which I am also deputed to give evidence, and possibly it might be better to take up that in connection with Clagher.

5010. Very well, we will pass over that for the present—I can only give that as an instance; I believe something similar would probably be the case in the other smaller unions.

5011. Then, with regard to the children?—The children are largely boarded out, and the more children are boarded out the more unsuitable in the workhouse for the remaining children as a place of education; therefore we recommend that those children that cannot be boarded out for various reasons should be sent to some sort of an industrial school.

5012. Under Poor Law management, or do you mean an ordinary industrial school? do you mean a Poor Law school as there is at Trim?—I don't think we run into that point; we were merely satisfied that these children should not be left in the workhouse; that would be one thing that would reduce the staff and the number of rooms wanted in these workhouses, and the children would be better in some form of well-conducted school.

5013. Cut away from workhouse associations?—Yes.

5014. Did you consider whether it would be possible to enlarge by legislation the powers of the Guardians so that they might board out a larger number, if not all the children?—I don't think that that was considered, but I have no hesitation in saying I think it would be approved.

5015. Children of women, for instance, who would have two or more illegitimate children?—Yes.

5016. Would you go as far as advocating that such a woman should be deprived of the custody of her children?—That must depend on the merits of the case; I should say in some cases it would be very desirable.

5017. The woman who has had two or three illegitimate children you cannot look on her in the same light as a woman who has had one illegitimate?—No; I think where the merits of the case clearly point to that then should be power to take them away.

5018. And as regards women who come into the workhouse to be confined of the first illegitimate child, would you still keep up the ward in every workhouse for the admission of such persons?—I don't think we went into that; that is a very difficult question I should not like to give an ill-considered answer on.

5019. Of course there are risks of increasing instead of diminishing immoral tendencies by kindly treatment?—As far as I can judge from experience, it would be rather difficult to abolish that refuge altogether.

5020. That ward in the workhouse infirmary. It was suggested to us by some of the witnesses that it might be possible that religious associations or religious communities of various sorts, as they have those refuges, that they, and not the workhouses, should be the people who would take charge of such cases, that those refuges should have a lying-in ward attached, and that the Guardians might pay, as they do now, for patients in extern hospitals; pay so much a head for women going there, and under religious influences it might be hoped that these women would be turned aside from their evil course after their first lapse and not fall again?—That would be probably very desirable where such places are accessible, but in those remote unions here I don't know that there are such places.

5021. I don't know whether you have any nearer than Belfast here?—No; I apprehend that would not meet the case.

5022. Then it would really come to a question whether if a county or two counties combined an institution might not arise which would be willing to take in such cases?—Yes; but then I imagine in many cases the women don't come in until too late to give time for removal for long distances.

5023. My own experience of inspection in workhouses is that you see these poor girls in, unfortunately, for a considerable length of time?—You probably have a much larger experience than I have.

5014. They seem to come in some months before, as soon as their condition makes them ashamed of remaining outside, and when they can no longer remain in a situation.—Then, if that is the case, I think your suggestion would be good.

5015. They would be under good influences for months before their confinement, and the child could be provided for some way.—That is only a suggestion; I think that would be very desirable indeed.

5016. That would remove a class from the workhouse that everyone is anxious to see removed.—Yes, and it would reduce the number of cases it would be necessary to take in very much; there is a practical difficulty about it, unfortunately, and that is that in some of the smaller unions, where we really have no able-bodied people, these unfortunate women are the only people that act as servants to do the work.

5017. That is so, but then it would be cheaper to pay servants.—I think to myself, but it would be a difficulty in the eyes of some Poor Law Guardians.

5018. Hardly, I think, if they considered that the salvation of the woman's future was put in one side of the scale.—Personally, I entirely take your view.

5019. Then, about tramps.—Clearly, the present system is all wrong, but I am sorry to say I have not found time to go into that matter thoroughly, and I should not like to offer an opinion as to the best mode of dealing with them. But with regard to the question of reducing the establishments of these small workhouses, it has occurred to me that whatever is done with tramps it will not be necessary to allow them so many places to sleep at. For instance, in Tyrone if the tramps were only received at one or two, or at the outside three workhouses, it would be enough, and the smaller workhouses might be relieved of having to provide a casual ward, and I suppose there would have to be some little financial arrangement between them and the larger.

5020. I don't think any financial arrangement would be necessary as regards the tramps.—I should hope not. I think if the tramps are put under a proper system there would be no such arrangement necessary.

5021. What would you do at Clogher, supposing you closed the casual ward there, what provision would you have, or would you have any provision at all there for wandering and destitute people?—My impression is that no provision would be necessary; after all, wandering, destitute people can generally get some sort of shelter; it is necessary there should be some sort of public shelter for them perhaps, but I think Enniskillen, Dungannon, and Omagh would be near enough to serve the Clogher district. I understand it is the opinion of the Guardians at Clogher that that is so, that that would not cause any serious hardship. Then we also think that the boundaries might advantageously be changed in some respects owing to the means of communication being entirely changed by the making of new railroads. However I will come back to that when I am dealing with Clogher.

5022. That would affect the attendance of Guardians at board meetings and the removal of able-bodied people, but not the removal of the sick?—To a certain extent it would; you could get a sick person at Glenties on the train to bring the person straight to Clogher, who has now either to be carried all the way across to Dungannon or sent round to Petterson.

5023. You don't have sick people removed by train to any of your workhouses?—I think to a certain extent.

5024. You might have a certain amount of sifting people, but you won't have people who are seriously ill?—Yes; but for the attendance of Guardians it would be a great convenience. Then the general opinion is that union rating does not work well as regards the administration of outdoor relief and medical charities and sanitary matters.

5025. What area would you think better?—The dispensary district has been suggested. I take it that the electoral division is too small an area, though most Guardians I know think that that was much better than union rating, but I believe the electoral division was really taken as a sort of neutral outlet when the thing was first started, and that, of course, is no longer any standard or does not affect the matter at all, but the dispensary district is a district where the people more or less know each other and where the outdoor relief would be controlled by people who know the applicants, and the dispensary district, generally, is a common centre to people having a common interest. Where I

have noticed the facts is this, supposing the people of some dispensary district want to build a dispensary house and a doctor's residence that the people of the other districts prevent their doing so, because it is made a union charge, and possibly there might be a little jealousy between the little market towns at the centre of the different dispensary districts, and they always consider that they have no right to pay for things that are only for the benefit of one district. And there are other things that turn up from time to time under the Poor Law as well as under the other Local Government branches in which I think that dispensary district rating would work very much better than union rating.

5026. Would you still keep union rating for indoor relief, establishment charges, salaries of officials, and all that?—I suppose there would be union rating for establishment charges; whether the charge for indoor paupers should be put on the dispensary district I don't know. I think, possibly, it would be better to have both on the same sort of rating so as to prevent people being sent into the house because it is a union charge, instead of giving them outdoor relief when they ought to get it, because it is a district charge. I think that possibly the rating for all the paupers supported should be on the same basis.

5027. Now, query 5 deals with certain contingencies in the event of Cholera, Cholera, and Cholera not being closed?—Yes; that certain parts of the house that are used now for other purposes might be used to improve the infirmaries, or if the building, which is largely unused, could be taken over for some other purpose, with some compensation to the union, that compensation might take the form of something that would build a cottage hospital or so improve the present infirmary as to make it a suitable infirmary. Then I think there is a general feeling that the district infirmaries should be rearranged so that respectable people would not be ashamed to go into them, and they should be made remunerative by arrangements being made that paying patients should go in.

5028. Graduated according to the discretion of the Guardians?—There should be some standard, and the Guardians should have some little discretion to vary it, but probably there ought to be some fixed sum for different classes—different wards—which the Guardians might have a discretion to vary in certain cases.

5029. You are a Governor of the Fermanagh Infirmary?—Yes.

5030. They have some such scale there; it is an absolutely discretionary scale?—Yes; they expect the person recommending the patient to say what he ought to pay, and I don't think that works very well.

5031. It would be merely an indication?—It would be merely an indication, but still it puts a job on the person recommending that is not always very convenient.

5032. The person recommending might mention what the man's circumstances are, that he is in receipt of 10s. or 20s. a week, or whatever it may be, and that he has a family of so many persons?—I think reference might be made to the person recommending, but in practice sometimes there is a case that is quite clearly a case to recommend to the infirmary but in which the person recommending does not know the man's whole circumstances, and has not time at the moment to investigate, and cannot keep his recommendation back while he investigates.

5033. He leaves that blank sheet?—He leaves that blank.

5034. And admission would not be refused?—If there was a standard according to valuation or wages, then the recommender might be referred to.

5035. You could hardly do that; that would be utterly knocked out if a man had a family of twelve children, for instance?—It would, but then you would have a reference. If the man said he could not pay according to the scale he came under because of some reason of this sort that would be a case to refer to the recommender, but you don't want to put more work on the recommender than you can help, and in the normal case the man might go under a scale, and then the recommender might be asked when he said he could not go under that scale for any reason.

5036. Query 7 you say the district infirmary, that is the old hospital or the cottage hospital in its place?—Yes.

5037. By what bodies should they be looked after?—Our idea is they should be put under a proper hospital staff—a head nurse and master—but I suppose they would remain under the management of the Boards of Guardians.

Oct. 28, 1890
Mr. R. De F.
Montgomery.

Oct. 26, 1925.
Mr. H. De F.
Montgomery.

5028. Not under the management of a committee such as is indicated in the Local Government Act, a committee comprised partly of the representatives of the Council and partly of resident in the locality appointed by the Guardians.—That might be a useful arrangement. I don't think we, any of us, went into that. We considered merely that the Guardians should still remain established, and should still remain, in the last resort at any rate, the governing body. I think committees of that sort would be useful for various purposes, because the weekly attendance of Guardians at some of these unions is exceedingly bad, and if there were certain committees appointed that would attend and let the Guardians only have to meet once a month—on the day that they meet as District Commissioners—I think the thing might work a great deal better than it does, but then you would have to find a committee that would attend; sometimes committees attend even more than the whole body.

5029. In the County Tyrone you ought to get such committees—I believe in meet once you could. If you leave the administration of these district hospitals in the hands of Guardians they are associated in the public mind altogether with the administration of the Poor Law, and they come to be looked upon as Poor Law hospitals, especially if parts of the old workhouse; if you got a committee that partly has no connection with the Poor Law it does put it on a somewhat better basis.

5030. It might help to put the thing on a right footing, but I think the Guardians would expect to have a predominant voice—it would be a committee constituted something like the Agricultural and Technical Instruction Committee of the County Council; it would be a committee appointed by the County Council consisting of members of its own body with certain other persons associated.

5031. Dr. Brown.—Would that meet with your approval?—I don't know; it is a question that did not occur to me before.

5032. If you had all the district hospitals in the county administered on the same basis?—You mean it would assimilate the board of management of the district hospitals to that of the county infirmary.

5033. Yes; to some extent it might, and also put all the district hospitals pretty much on the same basis, more uniformity in their administration than if they were separate boards?—Yes.

5034. And it might also to some extent assist in economy?—Yes.

5035. In the way of the nursing staff too, they might be changed perhaps from one place to another and utilized?—Yes; I think that the Guardians would like to maintain their authority independent of any central authority as far as possible, but that would not prevent a certain amount of uniformity and interchange of services being made available.

5036. Mr. MURKIN.—You have had considerable experience of the old Poor Law system, Mr. Montgomery?—Yes.

5037. Many years, I believe?—Well, I have been a Guardian for thirty years, I think.

5038. How does the management of the new system compare with that of the old; I mean from an economical and humanitarian point of view?—I don't see very much difference in my own union.

5039. Then you don't see any reason why the Guardians should not have the authority they at present possess; there is no lack of sympathy for the poor in the present administration?—I think not, more than under the old system; I don't see any difference in that respect.

5040. Do you see any advantage in introducing a non-representative person to do the work that a representative man has been doing up to the present?—If you give them a new work to do—the administration of a hospital that would not be a hospital for paupers only, for whose care they were primarily elected and that there are certain people who might be very proper people to be on a board of that sort, who for various reasons are not members of the Board of Guardians, it might be a great advantage for the conduct of the thing to have those people on. But they would be nominated, I understand, by the Board of Guardians, and not an outside body.

5041. In what way will the advantage come?—I think you will find gentlemen, and ladies, and clergymen, and other people living in the district who are the very people to manage a hospital well, who might very likely

not be members of the District Council or Board of Guardians, and I think if the District Councils and Board of Guardians could get their assistance in managing the hospital it would be a great advantage to them.

5042. Would not the present system that the Guardians have as regards children sent at nurse meet?—The system with us has been quite a new system, and it is partly that what I suggest, that is of appointing certain ladies in the district to look after the children, ladies who have no connection with the Board of Guardians. They find the inspection by the relieving officer is rather perfunctory, some other machinery is wanted; I believe the relieving officers do their duty according to their lights, but it is not considered with the idea that are now prevalent with regard to the way children should be looked after that that is sufficient.

5043. Have you many children in your workhouse?—No; I think there are only four or five.

5044. Have you tried the boarding-out system?—Yes; there are a large number boarded out; you have three figures.

5045. CHAIRMAN.—We have those figures?—All the children that can be boarded out are boarded out.

5046. Mr. MURKIN.—You have no difficulty in finding suitable homes for them?—No; the homes that have been found for them hitherto have not always been found suitable. I think under the new arrangement, when we have brought in these outside ladies who will be asked to report on the homes before a child is sent to it, that anything like what has happened in the past won't happen in the future.

5047. What is the customary amount you pay for the boarding out of children?—4s and clothes; there has been an addition made to the clothing lately, and the clothing has also been handed to this outside committee of ladies.

5048. You have had no complaints from any neighbours as to the treatment of these children in the homes that they are sent to?—Not that I remember.

5049. You think that they are fairly well treated?—I think so; as well as the people they are with are able to treat them, and where the children are not as well treated as they should be and as well kept it has been the fault of the Guardians for sending them to people without sufficient inquiry.

5050. I suppose you have no trouble with tramps down in Clapham?—Indeed we have plenty.

5051. I did not think they would ever go down there?—I am afraid we have been too good to them.

5052. Have you any suggestion to make with regard to them; what do you think of adopting the English system of compulsory detention for forty-eight hours?—Something of the kind is badly wanted, but it would be very difficult to do in a small workhouse with a small staff—a dozen side-bodied tramps might be too many for the master and the porter. One of our suggestions is that the tramps should not be taken in at those small workhouses, but at the large workhouse. I conceive some such arrangement as that might be made and carried out.

5053. You say you do not think amalgamation would be suitable in this county?—That is the conclusion we came to.

5054. Suppose, for instance, that a cottage hospital with some accommodation for the sick in those outlying districts, suppose some such institution as that was established, would it remove your objection to doing away with some of the workhouses of the county?—Doing away with workhouses is a different thing from amalgamating unions. In Clapham, for instance, if the whole workhouse could be taken over for an infirmity school or idiot asylum, or something of that sort, at a price, that the ratepayers of the union should get paid for it, at a price that would enable them to build a cottage hospital and board room, then in that case we would be glad to see the workhouse taken away. But that would not be amalgamation. We consider the under all circumstances we should have our Boards of Guardians these to administer outdoor relief, and the cottage hospital should be of such a nature as to accommodate a certain number of aged and infirm people who would not under the present system be actually in the infirmary.

5055. CHAIRMAN.—An almshouse?—Well, something of that kind; we don't think it would work well to remove the whole aged and infirm class to distant workhouses any more than it would the actually sick.

5056. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you not think the present system of having so many establishments is very expen-

what I think, as far as I have gone into the figures, I think there is an enormous delusion about that; I think by the time you had worked out your amalgamation you would find you would save little or nothing by it. You would have various disadvantages, which I have pointed out, and I believe the idea of saving by it is largely a delusion.

5067. For instance, if such a number of establishments could be reduced by half there would be a great saving, simply in the matter of coal and light.—That would come in under what we recommend; if we are able to reduce the number of wards we have to warm and light and reduce the number of officers we have to have, that would, I believe, secure all the economy that is possible, and if you went further than that and tried to amalgamate the unions I don't think the economy would be appreciable.

5068. I think what we would like to get at is an idea from a man of your experience and great knowledge of what suggestions you could give as that would direct us to a method of simplifying the present Poor Law system, to give as good treatment at less money?—You don't happen to have the copy of my evidence about Clougher that I sent in, because when I was looking for it I could only find a very uncorrected version of it.

5069. CHAIRMAN.—Here it is.—Can I put this in or run through it.

I think if you take Mr. Mangan's question first. 5070. Mr. MANGAN.—What I would like to know from you, because I know you have great knowledge and good judgment, if you could offer the Commission some suggestion that would help us to improve the system without adding any more cost to the ratepayers.—

CHAIRMAN.—You having expressed an opinion contrary to the breaking up of workhouses or Boards of Guardians?—Yes. Well, in this report, which was not absolutely adopted by the Guardians of Clougher, but it was submitted to them, and they knew that these were my views when they appointed me to give evidence for them. I think I had better state them: Clougher Workhouse was designed to accommodate 500 or 550 able-bodied and aged and infirm paupers, and 80 or 90 children; with an annex for 30 or 40 sick and injured persons, and 16 idiots and harmless lunatics. There are now usually 20 or 25 patients in the infirmary and 10 or 12 in the idiot ward. In the body of the house there are now no able-bodied paupers, except a few women with illegitimate children. There are from 20 to 30 aged and infirm men and women, and from 6 to 16 little children who attend school outside the house. From 8 to 10 lodgers per day are accommodated in the gate house. The body of the house consists of the central buildings and two wings. With regard to these figures I have not thought it necessary to go into them and arrange them; these are what I found on going round the house, roughly speaking. I know that you have all the actual figures at the Queen's House. The south-west wing contains 12 large rooms measuring 30 feet by 18 feet and 12 feet high. Nine of these rooms are occupied by from 12 to 20 aged and infirm men. Nine are vacant. The north-west wing contains 12 similar rooms. Two of these are occupied by from 6 to 12 old and infirm women. One as a day nursery for two or three infants in charge of their mothers, one (perhaps) as a sleeping room for two or three women with infants. Eight are vacant. In the centre of the house the boys' dormitory, capable of accommodating 20 or 40 inmates, is vacant. The boys' school-room, about 45 feet by 30 feet, is used as a day-room for three or four little boys and an infirm pauper attendant. The girls' dormitory (45 feet by 30 feet) is used as a bedroom for two or three little boys and the cook. The girls' school room (30 feet by 30 feet) had been divided by a partition into (1) a school room (now used as a day-room for two or three little girls and a pauper attendant), and (2) a Roman Catholic place of worship. Because we have done away with our workhouse school, we send our children to the National School, which is already a great improvement. The large dining-hall is now unused, a portion has been boarded off and converted into bedrooms for infirm women. The laundry arrangements are unsatisfactory and wasteful of fuel. The kitchen was recently supplied with a patent cooking range, which seems satisfactory. The scattering of small classes of aged and juvenile persons about these vast apartments involves an immense consumption of fuel which produces very little comfort. The upkeep of the workhouse, including staff, fuel, repairs, etc., costs the ratepayers a large

sum of money, for which they receive very poor value. So far we are with you, Mr. Mangan.

5071. Mr. MANGAN.—Then let us see how we get the value?—We say the complete abandonment of the workhouse and the amalgamation of Clougher Union with neighbouring unions cannot be recommended, as the geographical position of the Clougher Valley calls for a local infirmary for the sick and injured poor, and for a local asylum for a section of the aged and infirm poor. Many of the latter are now provided for by outdoor relief; there are, however, always a certain number of cases not suitable for outdoor relief, and a system of outdoor relief without the check of the house test has ultimately led, wherever tried, to a very heavy charge on the ratepayers, and other evils. Owing to the distance between most parts of Clougher Union and the centres of the unions with which it would have to be amalgamated, if amalgamation took place, and to the fact that the persons who enjoy the ratepayers' expenditure are busy men, to whom long drives to attend frequent board meetings would be impossible, the result of the amalgamation would be to deprive the ratepayers of effective representation on the boards by which their affairs would be managed. The Clougher Union is small and its resources limited. Three electoral divisions formerly belonging to it were transferred to Monaghan Union in 1892. The facilities of transit afforded by the Clougher Valley Railway make it desirable that the loss of the Monaghan divisions should be made up for by the transfer of the Clonmel electoral division (formerly part of Armagh Union) and the Rellymannan electoral division from Dungannon Union to Clougher Union. The loss to Dungannon Union might be made up by the transfer of a portion of Omagh Union, which is far too large, to Dungannon. In any case, however, some relief from the present improvable expenditure on the maintenance of Clougher Workhouse is urgently called for. The idiots and sane epileptics should be removed to some central institution where they could be better cared for than is possible at Clougher without disproportionate cost. The children should be sent to an industrial school under the provisions of the Pauper Children (Ireland) Act, 1888. That was the only thing that struck us at the time. If there is a better form of school than that so much the better. While it is necessary to provide some local refuge for the sick and injured, and aged and infirm poor of the district, no hardship would be involved in the abolition of the local accommodation for tramp lodgers, who could be sufficiently provided for at Baniskillen, Omagh, and Dungannon, where complete workhouses will probably, in any case, have to be maintained. But when they get there they should certainly be put under some more effective form of discipline, at least those that deserve it, than they are under now. The removal of the above-named classes from Clougher would enable a reduction to be made in the official staff. The offices of master and matron could be abolished and the aged and infirm, the kitchen, the laundry, etc., be placed under the care and control of the nursing staff, who would have the assistance of the porter if one of trouble. The present master who has served the Guardians for thirty years is prepared to retire at any time. The matron, who is an excellent officer, should be given an opportunity of qualifying as head nurse. It would be worth the Guardians while to defray her expenses while qualifying and pay a substitute during the needed time. These changes would, however, render the existing buildings still more out of proportion to the requirements than they now are. The ratepayers being as anxious for some reduction of local taxation as they are for better value for what they pay, would prefer some arrangement by which the main building would be taken off their hands altogether by some central body for conversion into an industrial school, an asylum for harmless lunatics, or for some other suitable purpose, on terms, as to rent or purchase, which would, at the same time, relieve the rates, and defray the expenses of some necessary addition to the accommodation for the sick, injured and infirm, in the portion of the buildings the Guardians wish to retain. Of course these general words I have put in, because as regards the Clougher Guardians they are willing to give over this house for any purpose. It is a healthy district and situation, and would be a suitable one for an asylum for idiotic children, or any other purpose. Then we come to the following improvements. The following improvements are absolutely necessary if the present infirmary is to be permanently retained for the present

Oct 28, 1903.

Mr. H. De P. Montgomery.

Oct. 25, 1908.
 Mr. H. De F.
 Montgomery.

purpose:—1. A new range of ranges, with boiler or boilers, in the kitchen or kitchens. Perhaps I need not go into these details as to what would be necessary in order to make the present infirmary suitable; in fact it is absolutely necessary; it has been put off from time to time in view of possible changes; these are the things the Local Government Inspector has been pressing on us for some time, and some of them we have complied with, but others we have put off in view of some possible changes which would render other arrangements necessary. We want isolated wards for cancer, consumption, skin diseases, and lying-in. There would be a new staircase wanted, because we cannot get had cases upstairs now, and closets, and so on. Should it prove impracticable to get rid of the main building on advantageous terms, the question will arise of making the best use of it, and it will probably be expedient to abandon the present infirmary, idiot wards, &c., and if they cannot be let or sold for any suitable purpose, to dispose of them as building material to be pulled down and carried away; and to re-arrange the main building to accommodate the sick and injured in one wing, the aged and infirm in the other (or in each part of it as will suffice for the purpose), and the nursing staff, surgery, &c., in the centre. In this case the following arrangements would be the most convenient:—South-east wing ground floor. Two front rooms; infirmary for women, private patients (if any), to occupy room next S.E. wall. Two back rooms; infirmary for men, private patients (if any) to occupy room next S.E. wall. First floor—two front rooms: lying-in ward, and ward for skin diseases and cancer (women)—the former next S.E. wall—

5072. CHAIRMAN.—As regards the separation of the sexes?—My first idea was to put the women in one wing and the men in the other, but they would have a great deal too much room on each side, and in consultation with some of the other Guardians, we devised a scheme by which men and women could be put in the same wing, but completely separated, so that officers and nurses would have access to both divisions, but there would be no communication, by the building up of certain doors and, I think, making another staircase. Two back rooms, rooms next S.E. wall, extra ward for men, the other for skin diseases and cancer (men). Second floor—Two front rooms; consumptive ward for women—day-room next S.E. wall. Two back rooms; consumptive ward for men—day-room to be next S.E. wall. Closets and bathrooms to be erected against S.E. wall for each floor—one set for men and one for women. It is a great pity to take up any part of the south-east aspect for that purpose, but to have a place of that sort separately accessible from both sides that is the only place we could put it. Centre of house—Divide boys' schoolroom (used as Protestant chapel) into two. The portion next master's quarters to be retained as chapel; the portion next new waste to be surgery. Divide boys' dormitory (back) into two bedrooms for nurses. Convert front room into sitting room for nurses. Construct small passage between front and back rooms. Convert schoolmaster's room into kitchen for nurses. (Part of these arrangements might be done without, if master's and matron's quarters become available for nursing staff). These arrangements were partly sketched with a view that the master and matron should remain as they are for the present, but the matron, of course, could get the quarters now occupied by the master and matron, and then some of these rooms might be used for other purposes, but the whole infirmary, with more rooms than there are in the present infirmary, would go into one of the end wings without occupying the whole of the wards. All pauper inmates not in the infirmary to be quartered in north-west wing. Two ground floor south-west rooms—aged and infirm women. Two ground floor north-east rooms—aged and infirm men. Second floor—Two rooms (north-west)—day and night nursery for mothers and infants. You suggest that we should get rid of these and that would give us more space. Build up all communications between men's apartments and women's apartments. Give men access to front yard, and women to back. The girls' dormitory may continue to be used as such till children are removed, and the schoolmaster's room and the one west of it as a boys' dormitory. These would then become spare rooms for future use, or store-rooms. Erect an apparatus for heating with hot water or hot air all the apartments in the main building included in above scheme, with connections to unused apartments, so that heating arrangements may be ex-

tended to them at any future time. Heating apparatus to be so constructed as to enable heat to be regulated in each apartment separately, and also to supply hot water for washing, and heat for drying room to the laundry, and hot water on each floor and in each apartment of an infirmary, for baths and other purposes. Where open fires are required, registered grates to be substituted for present fireplaces. Such an arrangement would have the advantage of leaving it open to the Guardians at any future time to further improve and enlarge the infirmary accommodation, by converting some of the spare space into paying wards, and making such other arrangements as would render the infirmary available to any ratepayer suffering from any illness or accident requiring more skilled nursing and better medical and surgical appliances than he can get in his own house. As no ratepayer is exempt from risk of serious illness or accident, all would get value for any money in the shape of rates devoted to this purpose, except the small minority who live in another house and can afford private skilled nursing. The fever hospital should, in any case, remain as it is, subject to such improvements as may from time to time be called for. There is a third alternative which would also meet the case, viz.:—That the whole of the present workhouse buildings should be taken off the hands of the Guardians at such terms as would enable them to build a cottage hospital with a boardroom and clerk's office, and at the same time lighten the burden on the rates.

5073. Mr. MURPHY.—From that scheme that you have delineated, which seems to me to have been well thought over, what saving do you estimate would there be to the Clogher Union?—It depends entirely upon what terms we get in the case of the houses being taken over and the present infirmary being improved, or the houses and the present infirmary being taken over and the cottage hospital being built; it would depend on the terms we should get for what we are giving up.

5074. CHAIRMAN.—Including that capital expenditure, what saving would you have annually?—We see the saving of the master and matron's salary and rations; I think we should have to keep a porter, and we should save a great deal of fuel; our present expense in fuel is something like £600 a year; we should save fully half of that, and we should save, I think, on the candles.

5075. Mr. MURPHY.—And the accommodation would be better than it is at present?—And the accommodation would be better than it is at present, and if the rates are taken up of dragging the hospital out of the slough of pauperism, I think it is properly managed, the improvements should pay for themselves, because people are gradually understanding and being told by their doctors that if they want to recover from illness, and so forth, and accidents, that they require a great many things they cannot possibly get in their own houses in the country, and if the kind of bed now was lifted from the workhouse hospital I believe people would come in and pay as a rate that would keep the thing going and pay for most of the improvements.

5076. Have you thought over the question of consumption?—For the present we have recommended that two of the vacant rooms—it is an inconvenient arrangement, but pending some reconstruction of the whole thing we have recommended that two of the vacant rooms in the body of the house on the first floor, with a good aspect, good airy rooms, should be arranged for the consumptive; of course it is inconvenient for the doctor to have them so far from the nurses, and so on, but as a makeshift we have done that. In the sketch of the conversion of the main building I think I pointed out that there would be two rooms quite by themselves upstairs with a good aspect that could be put aside for consumptives.

5077. CHAIRMAN.—The only reduction in establishment charges, in salary and rations, would be the abolition of the office of master and matron; you would still keep on the clerk?—Yes; I think we should have to keep on the clerk.

5078. Mr. MURPHY.—Perhaps have to increase the nursing staff?—We should have to increase the nursing staff, but then again I think the proper management of the hospital should help to pay for that.

5079. CHAIRMAN.—You look for payment from people who come in who could afford to make some payment?—Yes.

5080. Did you at all consider the question of whether aged and infirm persons could be boarded out at

whether such a system would lead to a great abuse?—I don't think we considered that; I think that would lead to abuse; I think the aged and infirm who are able to be boarded out are really the same persons who now get outdoor relief, and there are a certain class that are not suitable for outdoor relief, and I think you must have some refuge to bring them into. I don't see what class you could board out whose case you cannot meet by outdoor relief now.

5021. What do you think of a central county institution for the aged and infirm?—With a view of reducing the number of inmates, if you take away the women and the children, and if you also take away the aged and infirm, to a central place you would practically leave nothing to local administration except the hospital.

5022. The hospital and outdoor relief?—I think there are a certain number of aged and infirm people that come in and out of the house that I would not transfer to Omagh or Enniskillen. I think the numbers might be reduced to a certain extent, would be reduced by taking away the epileptics and so on, but I think there could perfectly well be a couple of wards for aged and infirm, with a nurse and a porter to look after them.

5023. What objection now would you see to removing them to the central institution?—I think it is too far for them to go—a certain class of poor creatures.

5024. Say up to twenty miles or twenty-five miles, do you think that would be too far?—I think so; there are old creatures there that are taken in by kind neighbours, and so on, and there are certain seasons of the year when for some reason or other that is not convenient, and they just go into the workhouse for a while, and I think, on the whole, they are cases that I don't think could go twenty miles, and I don't see why we should cart them twenty miles.

5025. Unless there were some great saving?—It would also tend to increase outdoor relief. There is a sort of case that is not quite deserving of outdoor relief, but at the same time you could not say to them: "You must go all the way to Omagh or Enniskillen," but if there is a workhouse near with an aged and infirm ward, we can say: "We won't give you outdoor relief, you must come into the house." But if it was a question between sending them to Omagh or giving outdoor relief there are cases in which outdoor relief would be given where it ought not to be.

5026. You spoke of two electoral divisions in the Unions of Dungannon and Armagh; were they both in the County Tyrone?—They are both situated in the County Tyrone, and both on the Clogher Valley Railway, and the Caledon people in 1846 were very anxious to come to us, but the people in the intervening district would not move in the matter.

5027. Are those the only divisions in that part of the country situated in the County Tyrone that belong to unions outside the county?—One of them was already in Dungannon, and that was the difficulty no doubt, and that intervened between us and one in Armagh Union that would have been transferred to us if it was contiguous, but the difficulty of taking the connecting link from Dungannon and giving it to us prevented the thing being done.

5028. Is your view about these divisions based on the idea of having the county self-contained for all purposes?—Certainly, and we acted on that principle, and we resigned the three divisions formerly belonging to Clogher that are in Monaghan; we acquiesced in their being included in the Monaghan Union, but we combated the time on getting two Tyrone divisions, but we did not get the compensation.

5029. Mr. MONTAGNAN.—You have told us now that you are decidedly of opinion that there should be no amalgamation of unions in this county, but you are of opinion that improvement in the Poor Law administration could be brought about in another way?—Yes.

5030. What is your great objection to amalgamation; is it that you would deprive the locality of the representatives they are entitled to?—That is one of the reasons, and the other reason is that the geographical position of the Clogher Valley calls for a local infirmary for the sick and injured poor, and I believe that may also be said of Castlederg and Cuckstown, and every local asylum for reception of the aged and infirm poor. Many of the latter are now provided for by outdoor relief, but there are always a certain number of cases not suitable for outdoor relief, and a system of outdoor relief without the check of the house test has ultimately led wherever tried to a very heavy charge on the rate-

payers and other evils. That there is the representation with regard to the outdoor relief being dealt with by a body of men who know nothing about the district with which they are dealing.

5031. But you are of opinion that without amalgamation considerable economy and improvement could be effected?—Certainly.

5032. And you think it is not through amalgamation this could be done, but in some other way?—Yes.

5033. CHAIRMAN.—There is one matter—you are not sure whether this report was considered by the County Council; might I suggest that the report should be brought before the County Council to see how far they endorse it, and that we should be informed of the result?—Certainly; you could not bring it before them to-day; our next meeting will be in December; I will certainly mention that. At the time the queries were before them it was supposed you were going to sit rather sooner than you actually did sit, and, therefore, they thought the best plan was to appoint a committee in whom they had confidence with authority to deal with the whole thing.

5034. Dr. RYDER.—Are you a member of the asylum committee?—No.

5035. Mr. MONTAGNAN.—He was for a great many years, and knows all about it?—I was a governor for a good many years, but I declined to be put in in the new system, because it is very troublesome for me to attend.

5036. Dr. BRUCE.—You don't know whether the asylum committee took any action with reference to the admission of inmates from the workhouse?—No; the only thing I know was we had a communication from them in Clogher the other day to say that if we sent inmates from the workhouse we should arrange that they should arrive before some hour in the evening.

5037. You did not go into the question of the relative cost of keeping inmates in the two institutions?—No.

5038. Are you a governor of the County Infirmary?—I am a governor, but not on the new governing board.

5039. Are there any restrictions about the admission of patients there?—I don't think there are.

5040. You think any person requiring infirmary treatment could get admission into the County Infirmary from the county?—As far as my experience goes, they can.

5041. Mr. MONTAGNAN.—Has the order for admission not to be obtained from one of the committees or of the governors?—Yes; but there are governors all over the county; I did not mean you to understand that anybody might go in without a recommendation, but there is no restriction; any deserving case can go in.

5042. CHAIRMAN.—The surgeon could admit an urgent case on his own responsibility?—Certainly.

5043. Dr. BRUCE.—Do many cases go from Clogher?—A good many.

5044. You have spoken about consumption, and providing wards in the contemplated new hospital; do you not think a separate institution would be better?—Very likely; that was not put before us.

5045. You don't know if there is much consumption in your district?—I don't know any statistics about it, but I hear of a good deal; we have had very few cases to deal with in the workhouse; we have no case now at the present moment, but I do hear a good deal about it in the country, and I have heard it said that lately there has been more of it.

5046. Do you not think that your not having cases in the workhouse is partly to be attributed to the fact that you have not good arrangements for them in the workhouse?—I think so; I think the doctors recommend the people to sleep out in the fresh air if they possibly can sooner than come into the workhouse.

5047. Mr. MULLEN.—I would like, on behalf of the Omagh Rural Council to ask Mr. Montgomery some questions. For a considerable time you have been chairman of the Clogher Union?—Yes.

5048. And the other member of the committee who answered these queries, Mr. Gunning Moore, is chairman of the Cuckstown Union?—Yes.

5049. I thought I knew your Roman hand. You don't claim for your evidence to-day that you express the views of the County Council of Tyrone?—I do; because they were drawn up at a meeting duly called of the committee of the council; the meeting to which these surveys were submitted had the authority of the County Council to deal with them.

5050. And you claim that the County Council will hereafter endorse the evidence you have given to-day on behalf, say, of the preservation of the Clogher Union?

Oct 26, 1902.

Mr. H. De F. Montgomery.

Mr. WILLIAM GARNER, Chairman, Castlederg Union, examined.

Oct. 21, 1906

Mr. William
Garner's

5138. CHAIRMAN.—Your Board of Guardians had the queries that were issued by our Commission?—Yes.

5139. What was their opinion on the various questions that were asked?—I think I sent you a resume of what evidence I have to give on this matter. We agree in the main with the answers given by the County Council, and, further, I have had a good long experience myself as these Boards of Guardians. I have been a Guardian there now for upwards of forty years, and I am intimately acquainted with Castlederg Union and administration, and I think that amalgamation would not serve us in any way, for this reason: first, we could have no representation, as hardly any Guardian would attend at Scrabane or Omagh.

5140. Mr. MURKIN.—You think one or other of these towns would be the natural place to go to?—That would be the natural place that the union, supposing it was likely to be amalgamated, would go to. There is a portion which lies in the immediate neighbourhood of Scrabane—not in the immediate neighbourhood, but contiguous to Scrabane—and there is another portion of it that might be amalgamated with Omagh in the case of amalgamation—that is the Drumcree district, within seven or eight miles from Omagh and seven or eight from Castlederg. Then we have another mountainous part that I don't know where it could be taken to, it is so far from either of these places, and the Guardians were quite unanimous in thinking that we might make some economy—in fact I was pleased with Mr. Montgomery's evidence. I think Castlederg comes nearly in the same category as Clough, we have but a very small number of people in it, principally old people, who come in here, in fact to die—come in for one portion of the year and perhaps go out again. We have no outdoor relief in the union. We have a splendid fever hospital, and for more than two years have not had a single case, and we have been thinking if we could get that improved for a cottage hospital.

5141. You were going to turn that into an infirmary?—Yes; the infirmary we have is not a good one; in any case we look upon it that we could not do without a local infirmary, and this fever hospital would make an excellent infirmary.

5142. Would you want the rest of the workhouse if you had the fever hospital done up as an infirmary?—If we keep the workhouse open as a place for administering relief we would want a portion of the workhouse.

5143. The fever hospital would not be big enough for all the inmates you have?—It would be quite big enough for the whole of them.

5144. So you could do without the workhouse?—I believe we could do without the workhouse at all, but at the same time there would be some requisite accommodation required for a kitchen and some cooking apparatus and outbuildings. The workhouse is mainly used by worn-out and infirm people from the district who come in there to die, and it would be inhuman to send them such long distances to crowded hospitals. In reference to query 3, what I have been saying would meet them; that is the change of the fever hospital to a district hospital, and besides that we mean to have one or two or three paying wards in it. We have no outdoor relief, nor, as a rule, do we appear of it except in extreme cases temporarily, and on the certificate of the doctor.

5145. To the effect that the person cannot be removed?—Quite so; we don't give any regular outdoor relief; we never did, except in extreme cases. I never remember it in my forty years' experience, except in a case of cancer that we gave 2s. a week for a very short time.

5146. Mr. MURKIN.—Have applications not been made to you for outdoor relief?—Well, there were some applications made, but the Guardians were all opposed to it, then in under the old regime, but since the new rules came in we have had no application at all for outdoor relief.

5147. Do you not think that such a rigid rule works some hardship in the locality; do you not think it might occur that some person would suddenly become without means and have no option but to come to the workhouse or die?—I have never been acquainted with any such case, and I have spent my lifetime in the country. And this way of giving outdoor relief is open to such abuse that really there are hardly any persons who would require relief but are accommodated by either their friends or neighbours, or otherwise if they are able to be removed to the workhouse they come in here.

5148. Have you many agricultural labourers in the union?—There are in the agricultural parts of it; in the mountainous parts there are not many.

5149. Suppose the head of the family was stricken with illness and the wife could not make any provision for the children, how is that man to provide for the family?—That might be a case for application, but we have never had any of those applications.

5150. I suppose you have some rule on the book that would not allow you to entertain it?—No; there is no hard and fast rule, only it was always a custom with that Board of Guardians since I became a member that there was no outdoor relief given except in extreme cases.

5151. Have there been any extreme cases lately?—No, not that I am aware of; I don't remember any, and I attend as regularly as any other member.

5152. CHAIRMAN.—At all events you have not paid a penny for outdoor relief since 1899?—We have not paid any relief since 1899, when it came under the new system.

5153. Mr. MURKIN.—Does it not occur to you that, for instance in the case of a man stricken with illness, it would be a proper thing to give that man some little help until he would get well?—It might be.

5154. And not compel him to go into the workhouse?—It might.

5155. Do you not think it would be economical?—It might be.

5156. Do you not think that by coming into the workhouse it takes away from a man that horror of the institution; he thinks it is not so bad a place after all, and he may come back again?—It occurs to me that there are a good many people would take outdoor relief if they got it and spend the money in drink.

5157. Well, not many will get it from the Castlederg Board of Guardians. What is the reason you disapprove of the amalgamation of workhouses when you are so economical in your tendencies otherwise?—I am not so much opposed to amalgamation, only for this reason that we would have no representation if we were amalgamated with either Scrabane or Omagh; the Guardians there are perhaps more liberal-minded than we are, and they would help on outdoor relief, because we would have no person there to represent us. We have never had a very high rate in our union; it never amounted to more than 1s. in the £1 on the valuation.

5158. Perhaps you had not many very poor in your union; perhaps they are all fairly well-circumstanced?—There are a great deal of poor farmers, but they are nearly all farmers—the great bulk of them—at least their hold land.

5159. Do you not think now if there was some institution there for the accommodation of the sick that it would be a feasible thing to confine to two or three workhouses in the county all the infirm and destitute?—It might be, but it would take wider bounds than mine to form out a plan to do this.

5160. You know the upkeep of the establishment is very costly?—It is; the fuel, if nothing else.

5161. And suppose some institution based on a more modest system was established, do you not think that you would give that a fair consideration if it could be shown to you that it would be a benefit to the locality, put no more rates on you and give better treatment to the sick?—I don't see that it would give any better treatment to them, when they would have to be removed in teams for great distances; these people are a homely, kindly people, and the greater part provide for their own poor, with the exception of some poor old men or women that their children have all scattered away from them, and they have no shelter to live in; the main thing that brings them into the workhouse with us is want of a shelter, want of a house, but there are no persons that I am acquainted with that are so necessitous that they require relief if they have a shelter and a bit of land and children to look after them.

5162. Do you not think it is very costly to have a doctor to look after thirty or forty people that you have there?

CHAIRMAN.—He is the dispensary doctor?—He is the doctor for the district as well.

5163. Mr. MURKIN.—But he has a salary for the workhouse?—Certainly; he gets £50 a year for the workhouse.

5164. Do you know the cost of the coal there by the year?—I do; it is about £120.

Oct. 26, 1902.
Mr. William
Gamble.

5155. Are there not other economies in that direction that might be effected?—I am not aware of any, only the expense of keeping up such a large house that is unoccupied; we have to pay for painting and repairs to the windows and doors and ceilings that get out of order, and the Inspector calls our attention to these, and we have to spend money on them.

5156. You have to have a matron, porter, clerk, ambulance driver, and a whole gallery of assistants?—I don't know how we could do without a clerk there; if you have a hospital I think you must have a clerk to look after the expenses.

5157. But he might have other occupations than that; you did not think over the question in that light?—No; I did not look at it in that way further than what I have stated that I believe that from the experience we have had and what I have heard about the amalgamation of Gortin that it never reduced the rates in Gortin.

5158. CHAIRMAN.—You say you have rarely a case of boarding out?—No; we don't approve of boarding out; we have sometimes boarded out deserted children; invariably we have boarded out deserted children.

5159. You have very few children at all in your workhouse?—There are only three or four; I think there are a few more at present; there is a delicate man with an orphan family of five or six—they came in a week ago.

5160. Mr. MURKHAM.—If you had given that man 3s. or 4s. a week he would have stayed out and kept his children out?—I don't know he came in; he appears to be one of those scheming fellows that has got it into his head that we should keep the children and let him go; he is a kind of preacher.

5161. CHAIRMAN.—Then what would you do with the tramp?—I think we should not admit them at all in the first place; I believe that these tramps are a public nuisance; they should first be sent to the sergeant of police to say whether or not they are a public nuisance, and then if they are strange tramps I would not think so much of them; we are not much troubled with them; we would not have on an average more than one or two in the week. Our workhouse is a little out of the line of tramps; it is not so much in the centre of the county as Strabane or Omagh, and we have only a few previous to the fair days of Castlederg or Drumahaire, and sometimes some of these travelling people demand lodging in the workhouse, but we have so staff there sufficient to manage them—only the master, who is rather a feeble old man, and the porter—and some of these people are too strong for them, and will do nothing for them, and they have to be taken in charge by the police. I would not admit them at all if I possibly could help it.

5172. What is your view about union ratings?—As far as the general relief is concerned we could not complain about union rating. There used to be a good deal of discussion at the board about the admission of a person when it was put on the electoral division; there was always a great discussion about what division they would be put on, but for all the people we have it does not matter very much.

5173. It economises conversation?—I don't, a great deal.

5174. But it has not increased your outdoor relief?—No.

Mr. Felix
Connolly.

5197. CHAIRMAN.—You have heard the evidence of your chairman?—I did, sir.

5198. Is there anything you would wish to add to that, or do you agree with him in his evidence?—Well, to a certain extent. The valuation is £26,526 12s. 6d. The absorption of Castlederg Union in any adjoining union is not desirable either in the interests of the poor or in the interests of the ratepayers; the comfort of the poor, especially of the old and infirm, is greater in a small house like Castlederg than it would likely be in a larger house, where a great many people would be buddled together. As regards Castlederg Workhouse, the poor there have some friends or acquaintances likely to pay them a visit occasionally; this would be quite impossible if these poor were transferred to either Strabane or Omagh; it would be an inconvenience to the old and infirm to have to go to Strabane or Omagh; as it is, parties of the Castlederg Union is about fourteen miles distant from Castlederg Workhouse. Some destitute people take refuge in the workhouse during the winter months and drift back again during the

5175. If Castlederg were broken up and the distinct divisions amalgamated with other unions, do you think any provision would be necessary for the sick locally?—Certainly; we cannot do without a local infirmary then.

5176. You would require some place for treating the sick?—Certainly; in fact they are nearly all sick that are in our workhouse.

5177. Mr. MURKHAM.—The fever hospital would be utilised for a purpose like that?—That is what we are proposing.

5178. Is it in a pretty good state of repair?—It is in a fairly good state of repair to be so long vacant; it has been vacant for a long time; it feels damp, and would require to be re-modelled a little.

5179. CHAIRMAN.—But it is built much more recently than the workhouse?—I believe it was; it was built fifty-one years ago or so.

5180. Mr. MURKHAM.—Then your objection to amalgamation is simply on the ground that you would not have any representation?—No representation.

5181. Mr. MURKHAM.—You think it would be a great hardship to come into Omagh?—I would not think a very great hardship if I had any business to do.

5182. If you had a Board of Guardians to attend would you think it a hardship to come in?—I would not; I would not take £10 and do it.

5183. How do you get here?—When I come I generally drive my own horse.

5184. Have you not a railway and team all the way?—We have, but that takes you round about, and you have to attend the particular hours of this railway and team, and here, coming up to the various different lines, if we come by the railway we would be too late for the opening in the morning, and we had to start at an earlier hour or run the chance of being fined.

5185. Is not the Union of Castlederg, the borders of it, within eight or nine miles of Omagh?—It is within thirteen miles of Omagh.

5186. You give no outdoor relief?—No; we had no applications for it.

5187. How many relieving officers have you?—One.

5188. What are his duties?—To give lines to them who need relief and to admit to the workhouse people with the doctor's recommendations.

5189. To offer the house to all applicants for outdoor relief?—No, I don't know that.

5190. You attend the Board meetings there pretty frequently?—I do.

5191. Within the last seven years did you have an application for outdoor relief at all?—Not that I remember.

5192. It is perfectly well known in the locality that no outdoor relief would be given?—I suppose so.

5193. And then no application comes; don't you think that works hardship in a number of cases?—I don't believe it does.

5194. It saves the rates! Have you built any labourers' cottages in your union?—Not yet.

5195. CHAIRMAN.—Have you heard of any case of alleged hardship to people by your not giving outdoor relief?—No, I have not heard of any.

5196. No allegation that it was cruel on the part of Guardians not to give in a certain particular case?—No.

Mr. FELIX CONNOLLY, Castlederg, examined.

spring and summer to their own neighbourhood, where they get some light employment sufficient to support them part of the year. These would not find their way back so readily to their own neighbourhood if they were in a workhouse at a long distance from their old homes. Very few of the Guardians in the Board of Guardians could attend meetings of the Board of Guardians either in Strabane or Omagh, so the greater part of Castlederg Union would be practically disinterested in the case of amalgamation. It is not evident that the absorption of Castlederg by any other union would in any way lessen the expense to the ratepayers of Castlederg Union. The lodging of tramps in the workhouse is the lot of two evils. What I want to point out, is I agree with Mr. Gamble, it is partly inevitable, that is, I agree with Mr. Gamble, it is partly inevitable, and there are not a great many tramps left. If they are refused they may go into cottages, where they stay, and perhaps set fire to the buildings, as the case may be, and I believe with the few tramps that attend it is the less of the evils. The workhouse is not a suitable place for the bringing up or training of children, then

association with the paupers in the body of the house is not conducive to their moral welfare; in opposition to the strict discipline of the teachers or master they invariably mingle with the adult inmates. I would suggest boarding out and education at the primary schools of the country or a central institution for the children of the different unions.

5209. Dr. FUSHER.—Do you know how many children you have?—We had eleven last Friday, but Mr. Gamble states there were five that came in recently, and two others, that their parents are in jail, and, of course, when the parents are liberated they will get out again. Then with reference to outdoor relief, there was some rule before my time—I am four and a half years a member there, and I am on the visiting committee since I was appointed there. They are all small farmers, but there might be an occasional deserving case, but there is some rule that has been severe to giving outdoor relief, and lately, I am afraid, there is another reason that in Parliamentary, it is a very close constituency between the different political parties. I knew an instance myself a year ago of an old man he was not of my own religion or principles politically; he told me he required relief; I told him: "I believe it is impossible; are you aware it may interfere with your vote." "Would it," said he, "then I won't look for it." I believe they go very closely in that respect, although there is practically not any distinction.

5210. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—What about the agricultural labourers who get out of employment, or who, through illness, cannot work?—I know their families get along during that time—I believe they help out with the neighbouring farmers, and the old people perhaps drift into the workhouse.

5211. When a man is ill and not getting any pay, what supports his children?—I am not aware of any case of hardship that I can recall.

5212. You say there is a rule on the book?—Well, at least there is some understanding. I was told always they never gave any Poor Law relief.

5213. And the threat of that terrible rule prevents any Guardian proposing to give relief?—It may have something to do with it.

5214. You made one remark that strikes me as having considerable force, you say if that union was abolished it would interfere in the case of temporary inmates?—Oh, it would.

5215. That is to say you have, of course, in the winter time a larger number of inmates than in the summer time?—There are.

5216. The number fluctuates considerably?—It does.

Mr. RICHARD BERRY, Castlederg, examined.

5217. CHAIRMAN.—You have heard the evidence of your colleagues?—Yes.

5218. Is there any point that you would wish to emphasize?—Yes, sir. There are some respects in which I don't altogether agree with them. I have heard the evidence of Mr. Montgomery, the first witness examined, in reference to Clagher, and to some extent it impressed me as something largely with what my own views would be with reference to Castlederg. It is the unanimous opinion of the Castlederg Guardians that amalgamation is undesirable for several reasons—one is geographical. Castlederg is very remote both from Strabane and Omagh. The town itself is twelve Irish miles from Strabane and fourteen Irish miles from Omagh, and some parts of the union beyond that would be twenty or thirty miles from Omagh or Strabane. Another reason is what you have heard so much about, representation; no Guardian could be got to go from Castlederg to either Strabane or Omagh.

5219. I think we understood all that, but if there is any point of divergence, where do you differ from them?—I think that unions are already too large; they ought to be smaller. I think three or four dispensary districts are large enough to form one union, and, so far as my knowledge of Castlederg Union is concerned, the inmates are composed of three classes—children, infirmity patients who are under the doctor's care, with whom I would include people who are very old, and there are a third class who are there from poverty or destitution, but who are not infirm. I think the children should be boarded out—that would remove No. 1 class—with foster parents. I think that the aged and infirm who are under the doctor's care should be provided for in a

5220. You think if there was a central institution for these people that they would have to stay there summer and winter?—Summer and winter. The general voice is for the union to remain as it is, and some of these people could drift back again in the summer-time to their friends.

5221. So that while some of the inmates only stay perhaps five or six months, by this change to a central institution these people would, you expect, stay as permanent?—Yes.

5222. CHAIRMAN.—Did you ever hear any allegation that paupers suffer owing to outdoor relief not having been given?—No, never; I never did.

5223. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Perhaps these political parties make up for the outdoor relief?—It may be.

5224. Are you good political fighters down there in Castlederg?—I believe so, but I don't know much about it myself. I am separated from politics.

5225. If some system could be devised that would provide for Castlederg suitable accommodation for the sick poor, do you think there would be any hardship in doing away with that institution in order to relieve the ratepayers?—I believe you would get no Guardians to undertake to be elected. I know an instance myself of one electoral unit where the two who were Guardians for the first three years would not at all allow themselves to be re-elected, also we could not get a single one, I mean politically, because politics were very high in the same district; in the same unit we could not get any others; consequently, then, if it was amalgamated with any other union there would be no Guardians, except a few, would attend either Strabane or Omagh.

5226. The difficulty then is rather as regards representation than accommodation for the sick?—Yes.

5227. CHAIRMAN.—Would you be afraid your rates would be increased if you went to Strabane or Omagh?—They are afraid so, because there is talk about Gurin when it was divided between Strabane and Omagh that the rates were higher for years, and it would be the same in Castlederg. They say the clerk would likely be clerk of the District Council, and would have to be retained; then the master. Of course there would be some superintendent; if there was a hospital or some other institution there would have to be some supervision to correspond with the present master of the workhouse.

5228. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—What is the number of inmates in your house now?—There were sixty-one on Friday; the average for each month was 54, 43, 41, 46, 53, 53, 44, 46, 51, 56, 61.

5229. Then the annual average is about fifty?—About fifty; it was built to accommodate up to 200.

5230. You don't see any objection to that?—None whatever. I think it is desirable to have one institution for all who could be transferred without any injury to their health.

5231. People who would be fit to be removed?—Yes; but for the infirm and aged and people dying of old age some sort of cheap institution or infirmary ought to be in every three or four dispensary districts, and that these three or four dispensary districts might form a union.

5232. That would mean increased expense having fresh institutions all over the country?—When I say three or four dispensary districts, Castlederg, for instance, has only three dispensary districts; it forms a union in itself.

5233. There are a great many places that have a great many more?—I am speaking largely from a Castlederg point of view.

5234. Take Omagh, with seven dispensary districts?—Omagh would naturally form—

5235. Two unions?—Even supposing it would, even if it was sufficiently central to bring all the infirm from seven districts, if the distance was not too far.

5236. You don't think additional buildings would be necessary?—No; for instance in Castlederg the fever hospital might form a cottage hospital and the other buildings might be disposed of.

Oct. 28, 1902.

Mr. Felix Connolly.

Mr. Richard Berry,

Oct. 28, 1902.

Mr. Richard
Barke.

5227. In what way?—A school for industrial or technical education, or even disposed of for commercial purposes.

5228. Mr. MURKIN.—Would not that be doing away with the workhouse?—It would not be amalgamation.

5229. Dr. BAKER.—It would be amalgamation for the purposes of your healthy class?—It would be amalgamation to a certain extent.

5230. CHAIRMAN.—Your Guardians would still deal with all the cases and give an order for admission of one of their own people to the central institution?—Yes; and they would still govern the infirmary and outdoor relief.

5231. If you had any; and still govern the children; in fact they would govern everything except the persons who are strong and healthy and who might be maintained in a central institution, such as an infirmary. Have you any views on the subject of outdoor relief?—I believe there are exceptional cases where it might be given, such as have been pointed out by Mr. MURKIN, where the head of the house is ill, but every case should be discussed on its own merits, and I believe to give outdoor relief broadcast would be a very undesirable thing.

5232. You have been a Guardian now for some years?—Three years.

5233. Have you ever heard of any application for outdoor relief being brought up at your board?—No; I have not.

5234. Or have you heard of any case of hardship?—I have never heard an allegation of hardship resulting from outdoor relief not being given; there are a great number of poor, but no subject poverty in the district.

5235. But still are you disposed to think there are some cases?—The case has been pointed out here, for instance, where a labouring man fell ill, and it would be highly desirable.

5236. And yet that application would not come before you?—I am not sure that any such case did occur, but if it did I would be in favour of giving it.

Mr. J. B. GUN-
NING-MOORE.

Mr. J. B. GUNNING-MOORE, B.L.,

5244. CHAIRMAN.—You are one of the committee of the County Council with Mr. Montgomery who furnished this report?—Well, I believe I was named on that committee, but I was not present when it was drawn up.

5245. You were not an acting member of it?—My Board of Guardians considered that report, and here, in the main, adopted it as the opinion of the board at Cockerstown. I was present when that was considered. It practically comes to the same thing.

5246. Apart from Cockerstown, is there anything you wish to add to the report of the committee of the County Council?—I have put in a paragraph—I do not know whether you have got the report of the Cockerstown committee. There are just two paragraphs at the end that we were instructed to add that it would be better to lodge harmless lunatics and idiots in Ouzagh, say in the workhouse or County Gaol.

5247. In the workhouse or gaol?—Yes. We thought they should be under the superintendence of the asylum authorities, and the board preferred a return to divisional rating, but in default of that we preferred dispensary district rating. We thought the union rating created more expense.

5248. Was that for all kinds of expenditure you preferred that rating?—That was for the absolute relief of the poor.

5249. For indoor as well as outdoor?—Yes; I think so. I do not think it is really so much with regard to indoor as outdoor; more with regard to outdoor. Outdoor relief has considerably increased with us since the union rating has come into effect, and somehow we do not appear to be able to check it, and yet we feel—there is a prevalent feeling—that it is unduly increasing.

5250. You did not nominate a committee to visit Cuckleding or such places?—No. I heard some of the Cuckleding evidence. About twenty-five years ago there was practically no outdoor relief given in our union. When I first joined the board that was the state of affairs. And it has risen up considerably now, and the tendency is to increase it.

5251. There is no hard and fast rule?—Not that I am aware of.

5252. If there were such a rule you are aware it would be illegal?—I am not aware it exists.

Mr. MURKIN.—The Guardians think any rule is binding until it is rescinded.

CHAIRMAN.—That would be utterly illegal as far as Mr. MURKIN is concerned.

Mr. MURKIN.—It is well there is an authoritative amendment on that point, for some of us Guardians in Ouzagh try to keep the rules very strict.

CHAIRMAN.—That would be a resolution not to carry out the provisions of an Act of Parliament.

5253. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you think that changes of a beneficial character could be made without amalgamation?—I think the unions might be maintained, and, if not reduced in size, at least not made larger, but there are changes that could be made for the benefit of the poor that would not disturb the present arrangements as regards representation. I think a central institution where people could be transferred without detriment to themselves might be maintained as a county institution, but that the unions should be preserved intact for their own aged infirm, and a hospital to which local people could go and even pay.

5254. There would be room for such people in the fever hospital?—I think so.

5255. CHAIRMAN.—You have not accommodation for pay wards there at present?—I think it could be made large enough if it were taken for that purpose.

5256. Mr. MURKIN.—You think this view you have given us here to-day are shared by many of your colleagues?—I am not aware of that; I know they are unanimously agreed upon not desiring amalgamation, but really that is the only question; they have not considered any alternative scheme; these are ideas that have occurred to myself without consultation with my colleagues.

5257. Do you think the people in Cuckleding, as long as their institution would be preserved under whatever name might be selected, would be satisfied provided it did beneficial work?—Provided they were not required to go outside to represent the union at a distance like Ouzagh or Strabane.

Chairman, Cockerstown Union, examined.

5251. What is the test for giving outdoor relief? There are certain classes only to whom it can be given, and what is your test?—When the relieving officer reports them destitute, that they require relief, and when they decline to go into the house.

5252. Do you satisfy yourself always as to the destitution, or do you think it is a cheritable conviction?—Not as a rule. We take the report, and we have to check the report of the relieving officer.

5253. That the people are destitute?—Yes.

5254. And have you any idea what meaning he attaches to the word "destitute"?—If he finds them without food in the house, and no means of getting it, he calls them destitute.

5255. Without means?—If he finds no food in the house, and can see that they have no means of getting it, he reports them destitute.

5256. That certainly means destitution. And you do not give outdoor relief in the Cockerstown Union as far as you know, unless there is evidence before you that destitution exists?—I do not think we do. Possibly speaking, I have very little to do with the putting on of a case for outdoor relief, but I know Guardians do come and say they are informed by their neighbours that such and such a one is in want of outdoor relief, and ought to get relief.

5257. They are reported to be destitute without food in the house or means of getting it?—The Guardians do not say that; then the case is put in the relieving officer's hands, and he visits them and reports.

5258. What is the average relief you would give, say for two people in the house?—They get from 3s. to 6s.

5259. As much as that?—Oh, yes. It depends very much whether they have any means of getting food and whether the neighbours will help them.

5260. The amount of relief given is not such as would support destitute people; it is supplementary to what they would get from other sources?—Sometimes, not always.

5261. Do you ever give weekly payments large enough to support?—I do not know what you consider large enough; if a person has a house they get half a crown a week sometimes.

5252. Do the people who get 2s. 6d. a week pay their own house rent?—They generally have a house free. There are plenty of cases of freedom.

5253. Are you aware of any case in which the outdoor relief goes to pay the rent of the house?—I am sure there are. We generally ask that question, is there any rent to pay, and the answer is "The landlord is not hard to satisfy" or that the house is free. We have a sort of understanding amongst ourselves that if a person is living alone with no one to look after them we are very shy of giving relief, but if, on the other hand, two persons are living together, say an old man and his wife, we do not want to part them, and we are willing to give in that case.

5254. Is it your opinion that destitution is the real ground on which it is given, or is it in the nature of a charitable addition to their resources?—I have no doubt that occasionally it is in the nature of a charitable donation.

5255. Now we have your paper here, the report of the Cookstown committee. We will take this down as it stands on the notes.

COOKSTOWN UNION.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AMALGAMATION.

Committee—consisting of Messrs J. B. Gunning Moore, D.L. (in the chair), Robert Howard, J.P., William H. Warrack, William Leeper, J.P., John Davis, John Quin, and James McKee—appointed to consider the question of giving evidence before the Visiting Commission on the question of Amalgamation of Unions and Workhouses, met on 1st August, 1903, and submit following report:—

The Board of Guardians of Cookstown Union having considered the report of the Committee of the Tyrone County Council upon the queries submitted by the Poor Law Reform Commission as follows:—

Query 1.—The ratepayers of the remoter parts of the smaller unions in the county could not secure adequate representation at such distant centres as Omagh, Strabane, and Dungannon.

The administration of outdoor relief requires to be decentralised rather than further centralised, in order to secure that it should be carried out with due care and adequate local knowledge.

An infirmary for the sick poor and a refuge for destitute aged and infirm is required at a reasonable distance from the remoter districts.

As it would not be expedient to reduce the numbers and increase the areas administered by rural district councils as road authorities, sanitary authorities, etc., the extra expense of maintaining those councils, as Boards of Guardians for their respective districts, will be inconsiderable.

Query 2.—No union should be dissolved.

Query 3.—The cost of maintenance of unnecessary buildings and an unnecessary staff in the smaller unions could be lessened, and the care of certain classes of paupers improved.

1. By lodging all the harmless lunatics and idiots in the county (or in the two counties of Tyrone and Fermanagh) in the superfluous space existing in the workhouses of one of the smaller unions.

2. By providing for the poor epileptics in some central, national, or provincial institution.

3. By sending the children to an industrial school, possibly to one established in a dissolved workhouse.

4. By abolishing lodging accommodation for tramps or "casuals," in all but the three larger workhouses in the county.

Query 4.—Provision would be required to adjust financial relations between the smaller unions, to be placed on a more economic basis and larger unions, relieving them of some of their liabilities as regards the maintenance of tramps, etc.

Some boundaries might advantageously be changed to meet new circumstances arising from the construction of railways and otherwise; also to lessen inequalities between areas.

Unions rating does not work well as regards the administration of outdoor relief, medical charities, and sanitary matters.

Dispersary district rating would work better. The people of a dispersary district have some knowledge of the whole of such district, and have common local interests in the same market town, etc., which are not identical with those of other dispersary districts in the same union.

Query 5.—Improvement or enlargement, or both, are required in the infirmaries at Cookstown, Clough, and Castlederg, which might be facilitated by the changes suggested in the answer to query 3.

Query 6.—(a.) See answer to query 5.

(b.) See answer to query 5.

(c.) See answer to query 5.

Query 7.—The district infirmaries should be made available to the surrounding ratepayers, and, to some extent, remunerative, by the establishment of paying wards, at rates of pay graduated according to means or valuation, with some discretion to Boards of Guardians in applying the scale.

Query 8.—The number of workhouses at which accommodation for casuals is provided might, with advantage, be reduced to one half, strict measures being taken in the way of cleansing and medical control.

Casuals therein, except in the following points:—

1. This board considers that it would be better to lodge harmless lunatics and idiots in Omagh, say in the workhouse or gaol there, than in any other place in the county, inasmuch as they might be there put under the charge of the asylum medical officers. (See reply query 3, clause 1.)

2. This board would much prefer a return to divisional rating; but, in default of that being granted, prefer dispersary district to union rating.

Messrs. Gunning-Moore and Leeper are appointed to give evidence on behalf of this board before the Commission.

H. ALFRED MOORE,

Clerk of the Union and Rural District Council.

5256. CHAIRMAN.—Is there anything you wish to call our special attention to? This is practically following the lines of the County Council committee, with the two additions you have pointed out to us.—We have considered more than once, several years ago, the question of amalgamation, and have come to the conclusion that they were against amalgamation. On this recent occasion they fully considered it, and they still are opposed to amalgamation. They always considered that if they were amalgamated at all it probably would be with Dungannon, and we did not think it would be any advantage to us at all.

5257. Your rates are higher than Dungannon?—I do not think the poor rate is.

5258. Taking last year, your rate was 10d. and Dungannon 8d. for Poor Law purposes solely?—They have not considered that we should gain by it. We thought, certainly, that there would be a very small attendance of our people even at as near a place as Dungannon, and it would be practically left in the hands of the local at Dungannon. It would not be local government. As far as we can understand, people attend the boards in their market town on their market days, and if you ask our people to go to Dungannon on a Dungannon market day they would not do it, because they would go to our town on their own market day.

5259. They could not afford the two days?—They could not afford the two days.

5260. Dr. Hume.—It might be on the same day?—They are not.

5261. CHAIRMAN.—If they thought they would get a reduction in their rates do you think they would be willing to let the question of representation slide to a certain extent and attend Dungannon, say only once a month?—I think they would be very sceptical as to getting a reduction of rates if they did not attend.

5262. They think that the attendance keeps it down?—They think they would not be cared for by the Dungannon people.

5263. It would be all the same management, the same union?—They would think that they might keep down the rates at the expense of their people whilst spending it on the Dungannon people. They could do that, or else even if we had it, and the Dungannon people were brought to us we might spend the money on our people.

5264. I do not see how you could do that?—We could give large outdoor relief in our own neighbourhood.

5265. Your outdoor relief is rather higher than theirs?—Yes; it is going up since we had union rating. I have no doubt ours was lower than theirs before. The larger the district the more the rate goes up.

5266. Are most of the people in your workhouse chronic cases?—I do not think many go out and in. There are a few. I think there used to be more than there are now.

Oct. 28, 1895.

Mr. J. B. Cunningham-Moore.

5297. Your figures look as if you had not many going in and out—I do not think there are. As to income, we are somewhat divided.

5298. You have not, however, many of them?—We have about ten a week, I think.

5299. Costing 2s. or 4s. a week?—Yes. My own opinion is that they would avoid Cookstown if Cookstown as a house for tempers was abolished. They are coming round the north side of the lake, and they would push on to Dungannon. However, some of my colleagues do not altogether agree with that.

5300. If the workhouse at Cookstown were closed as a union workhouse, what provision, in your opinion, would be necessary for the sick and aged and infirm?—I think there should certainly be an infirmary for the people who are directly under the doctor's charge.

5301. Ten require hospital treatment for the people at Cookstown?—Oh, yes. The district is large enough for that.

5302. As regards the aged and infirm?—I think it would be a pity to take them too far away from the neighbourhood of their friends.

5303. Do you think that class of people are much visited by their friends in the workhouse?—I cannot give you any information of any value as to that.

5304. We have heard evidence in both directions?—I cannot give you anything of any value upon that point.

5305. We were discussing earlier in the day the question of women going into workhouses to have illegitimate children. Have you some of that class in Cookstown?—Yes; we have lately had two sisters of the same family, and one of them has had two or three children.

5306. Do you think if some arrangement could be made by which girls in that position would go to a religious penitentiary, managed by religious people of the same denomination that the girls themselves belong to, do you think that would be an improvement on the present system—that the girls would go to a penitentiary, say in Omeagh or wherever it would be in the county, or for two or three counties, and the Guardians would pay for their maintenance there at practically the same rate that they would in the workhouse?—I do not think the Guardians would mind that, so far as I can see, but I have my doubts.

5307. Do you think it would tend towards the reclamation of some of those girls. You mentioned that girl who had two or three children, if she were taken with her first baby would there be a better chance of reclaiming her?—I have my doubts. I do not think so.

5308. Even under good religious influence, if she went in at a time that she would certainly be in a position to regret her lapse?—I doubt whether she would go.

5309. If she had no place else to go, if the workhouse was not open to her?—Do you mean she would have to go to Omeagh, fifteen or twenty miles from her own place.

5310. The local body or relieving officer would give her an order for admission to the institution, to the penitentiary instead of to the workhouse. These girls, as a rule, like to go as far away from home as they can. There are a great many workhouses where complaints are made that girls not belonging to the union at all go to the workhouse?—I can only speculate as to what they would do. It is possible that religious influence may have some effect upon her. I suppose it would have more effect than the workhouse. The chances are that it would. It is only a speculation on my part.

5311. She would go into a workhouse some month or two before her confinement, and she would meet with girls who had similarly fallen. That would have a bad influence?—It might.

5312. Perhaps fall in twice. If she goes into a penitentiary she would be guarded, and presumably everything that could be done would be done to influence her towards a better course in future?—Nobody can speculate about those chances.

5313. Would you be hopeful or would you be willing, as a practical man?—I should certainly not in any way oppose any change of the sort. It might be a little more hopeful than the workhouse.

5314. Of course nothing can be done except by some special personal influence that may happen or not, but nothing could be done in the workhouse towards reclamation?—I think, as far as I can see of the class that come into the workhouse for that purpose, all sort of chance is probably gone.

5315. You do not say it is gone when they come in first?—Well, as far as I have seen any of them when brought before the board, I would say it was.

5316. Even with the first?—Yes.

5317. They are not always paraded before the full board?—No. They are sometimes asked to come up when the relieving officer cannot get any information as to the percentage.

5318. It would be wiser to have a small committee to visit them than to have a girl brought before a large number of people?—She never seems a bit shy.

5319. Mr. Cunningham-Moore.—In reply to a question by the Chairman, you said that in some cases the granting of outdoor relief was in the nature of a charitable contribution. What do you mean by that?—I mean we know they were getting something from some other source.

5320. Still you are of opinion that unless they get something from the rates?—I—that they would be in a bad state.

5321. You never give it unless you believe they are in absolute need of it?—No.

5322. And you take every possible precaution to see that the granting of outdoor relief is not abused?—We take the report of our relieving officer. He is a man we trust, and, subject, of course, to the knowledge of the Guardians from the neighbourhood who hear of the individual, and very often know him.

5323. Have you any idea of the amount actually paid in the way of outdoor relief?—I am afraid I have not got the figures with me.

CHAIRMAN.—5324.

Witness.—It has been rising rapidly.

5325. Mr. Cunningham-Moore.—Still you do not think that there is any abuse of the outdoor relief system?—I think there is, in this way—I think it is given to as and so, because the previous case is very nearly the same, and if you give to one you have to give to the other, and probably if it stood alone you would not give it.

5326. Dungannon was compared with Cookstown in the matter of parading rate, and it seems that in Dungannon the rate is one penny or 1d. less than in Cookstown. Might there not be structural alterations or some exceptional improvements being made in Cookstown that would account for that?—I have heard figures with regard to amalgamation gone into, and it was rather the other way, that Dungannon was a little higher than Cookstown. These must be some recent figures.

5327. CHAIRMAN.—I am speaking of figures in the last report of the Local Government Board?—That was perhaps a year later than it was gone into with us.

5328. Not taking an average of years, as we would for this Commission, but as a basis to speak on; apparently last year it was 1d. less?—I think there must be something exceptional; either one outdoor relief has risen or there were some exceptional expenses.

5329. You take the entire expenditure of the Guardians?—I take poor rates—the figure of the poor rate.

5330. I take the expenditure for Poor Law purposes only, which, of course, is quite different to the poor rate?—We were judging by the poor rate.

5331. That enhances a great deal of expenditure with which we have nothing to do with here?—Expenses.

5332. Yes we have nothing to do with that; we simply take into consideration expenditures under the Poor Law—indoor and outdoor relief, and establishment charges.

5333. Mr. Cunningham-Moore.—You think if Cookstown were amalgamated with some other union that the poor of Cookstown would be at a disadvantage?—We think they would not have representation on the other board.

5334. And you think that Dungannon, or wherever would be the union to absorb you that they would have the benefit that yours would not have?—I think that if the district were not represented it would not have the claims of the poor advocated to the same extent as if the representatives of the district were present. It is the natural result. I do not think there is any wish on the part of those present to do wrong to those absent, but as the people any there would be nobody present to speak for them.

5335. Is there much fluctuation in the numbers in the house between summer and winter time?—I do not think there is.

5336. You think they are about a regular number?—I do not think there is much going in and out with us. 5337. Do you not think that if some arrangement was made by taking the destitute poor who are not sick to some central institution and leaving Cookstown as an infirmary that economy could be arrived at by that method?—Well, if it would not increase the outdoor

Oct. 28, 1902.

Mr. J. H. Gunning-Moore.

relief I think there might, but I think the danger would be that a person who would be willing to go three or four or five or six miles, if he had the workhouse at his hand, the workhouse that he has known all his life from passing it, and knowing the people who have to do with it, he might not be willing to go to a strange home. The consequence is that you would have to give outdoor relief, and what we find is that when you grant outdoor relief to a single person that person in the course of time becomes incapable of taking care of himself at all, and you have to employ nurses at 2s. to 2s. 6d. per week. We have frequently nurses employed among the poor, three or four at a time, by reason of outdoor relief. That tends very largely to increase our outdoor relief.

5327. You think it might have an opposite effect by taking away the workhouse from Cookstown of increasing the charges?—It would increase the charge by largely increasing the outdoor relief. I think it might. Of course that is only a guess. People may say "I know Cookstown Workhouse, I know the people, I know all about it; why should I go twelve or fifteen miles to a place I know nothing about?"

5328. Do you not think something might be done with the Cookstown Workhouse by lessening its size and the expenditure with regard to fuel and up-keep, and in that way arrive at some economy?—If you have a large house you have to keep two wings for male and female. If you had a smaller house you will have economy, but whether you will get any economy by cutting down a big house I do not know.

5329. It has been suggested by some of the witnesses that the institutions in some unions might be altered. In some of them the fever hospital might be used as an infirmary, and the body of the house sold or used for some other purpose, and in that case economy might be arrived at?—In a course the fever hospital is quite away apart from the workhouse. If you could get rid of any buildings it might be the fever hospital, but then you would be without any place to take infectious cases. That is where the difficulty seems to come in.

5330. You do not want such a large institution as the fever hospital for infectious patients?—It is too big. The fever hospital with us is often standing idle for six months in the year.

5331. Have you any infirmary in the neighbourhood?—We have only the workhouse infirmary.

5332. You have no fever hospital?—No.

5333. Dr. BROWN.—Have you a nurse continually in the fever hospital?—We either have one or are trying to get one.

5334. Is it a permanent appointment?—Yes. The last arrangement we had with the nurse was—she was the nurse in the fever hospital, and she was to give her assistance in the workhouse infirmary when there were no patients in the hospital.

5335. You still tie her to some extent in that way?—I get a return the other day from the clerk of ten years of the patients in the fever hospital. In 1890 there was only one patient in the whole year for eleven days. In 1891 there were three patients, altogether 140 days. In 1892 there was an outbreak of measles in the workhouse. In that year there were thirty-two patients, coming to 930 days. When there was an outbreak of fever along Lough Neagh in 1895 there were forty-eight patients, and their total days amounted to 1,420. One year we had only four patients, another year only six, another year ten, and another year sixteen.

5336. The average cost for each patient must have been very high?—I should think it was.

5337. That was the time you did not utilize the fever nurse for any other purpose?—I think the bargain has only been made with the recent appointment. In the old days they were appointed and left there, and very often they had nothing to do at all, but the recent appointment has been made with a stipulation that she is to assist in the infirmary when not required in the fever hospital.

5338. And when you want an extra nurse you have to requisition her from Belfast or Dublin?—Yes.

5339. And that is at a high rate?—It is a high rate, but it is for a short time only.

5340. At 2s. a week?—Yes, but for a very short time.

5341. If there were more county nurses available would it not have a tendency towards economy?—I suppose the charge would be a little less.

5342. Chargeable to the union, but the county would get whatever was received and pay the nurses' salary.

If they were attached to the county hospital, say in Omeagh, and you could requisition them at a fixed rate, would not that be much cheaper than requisitioning them from Dublin or Belfast?—I think the Local Government Board has prevented us requisitioning them from the county hospitals. They have refused to acknowledge that those nurses are qualified.

Dr. BROWN.—They are not qualified, perhaps, for fever nursing, but where qualified, and where available.

5343. CHAIRMAN.—We are not speaking of the place of training. We are speaking of duly trained nurses in the service of the county. You have six unions in the county. There might be fever in only one of them. At present you keep up six fever nurses when perhaps one would be enough for the whole county, or two would be enough—I think that would be a very good arrangement.

5344. Dr. BROWN.—So that if the county worked their own staff it would tend to economy?—Yes, I think it would.

5345. Mr. MURPHY.—You think that amalgamation is not the way to improve the service, but rather by some other method, such as turning the existing institutions into places for the sick, and improvements of that description?—Yes.

5346. Retaining the existing institutions, cutting away the surplus, anything which is unnecessary, utilizing everything that can be used to the best advantage—I mean to the institutions. For instance in Cookstown your institution is very large?—Yes; the workhouse is a considerable size.

5347. Could that fever hospital not be utilized to meet all the requirements of the locality for the sick or infirm, for the 227, or whatever number you have?—Oh, I think it would save us if we could do without a fever hospital, it would save us having to enlarge the infirmary. Our infirmary is attached to the workhouse, and you might have the two places together. The fever hospital in a distinct building. If you wanted to get rid of the workhouse and infirmary you would put the infirm patients in the fever hospital. What would you do then with the people who are simply there as a house of refuge? You would have to send them away to a distance.

5348. And you do not approve of that?—I do not think that that would work out economically. I think outdoor relief would increase more than you would save in the other way.

5349. But could you not lessen the staff by that method?—If you get rid of the tramps I think you can lessen the staff. If you retain the house only as a hospital and as a refuge for the infirm and old I do not think you would require a master. I think one person, a matron, would be sufficient at the head of that place.

5350. CHAIRMAN.—Or a head nurse?—Yes; if it could be done with one person. That would depend on the members there. I do not think you want a master unless you have a number of men who are likely to be unruly or to give trouble.

5351. Dr. BROWN.—Do you board out your children?—We do not board out any at present. A good many years ago there was a good deal of talk about boarding out, and I think we did have two or three boarded out at one time, but they are now all in the house. We clothe them so as not to distinguish them from the other children and send them out to schools in the town.

5352. Do you not think that boarding out would be an improvement?—I really cannot speak from experience. It depends very much whether the people are anxious to take them. We have rarely had applications to get children out except by friends of their own.

5353. In other unions in the county they board them out?—I do not say anything against it.

5354. And you are working on the same principle to a lesser extent by sending them out to the schools?—We send them out to the schools, no doubt.

5355. How many children are there in Cookstown?—I do not think there are very many. There are certainly not a dozen. This paper that the master furnished me with stated that there were seven boys and, I think, four or five girls.

5356. You have no knowledge whether they grow up and still make the house their home?—I do not think they do. The master says that very few come back, and he has known cases of some of them doing very well indeed.

5357. Do they go back to any other workhouse. You have no knowledge?—No.

5358. The county infirmary, how far is it situated from Cookstown?—It is in Omeagh here.

Oct. 28, 1903.

Mr. J. B. Gosling-Moore,

5349. How many miles is Cockstown by the direct road?—But nobody goes that way now.

5350. But for the sick?—About twenty or twenty-two Irish miles.

5351. Are there many patients who come from Cockstown to the county infirmary?—As far as my own recommendations go I have recommended more in the last year or eighteen months than I did for many years before.

5352. Is that since the new infirmary was built?—Yes.

5353. Better accommodation there?—Yes; I suppose there might be something in that.

5354. If your hospital in Cockstown were made a district hospital, that is a hospital for ordinary outpatients or poor outpatients who might take advantage of it, do you think that would increase its usefulness; would you be inclined to advocate it?—Certainly; a paying ward. We quite agree with that.

5355. Do you think there would be much money received from that source?—I cannot tell. The better class people would be a little shy at first.

5356. But even some of these go into the workhouse at present and pay nothing. If there was such a system of small charges according to their circumstances, do you not think they would be inclined to pay something, even some of those who pay nothing?—I think those who go in free at present are, as a rule, too poor to be asked to pay anything.

5357. You think they are too poor?—I think really they are.

5358. CHAIRMAN.—Would some of the people be depending on a man, say earning 15s. a week, or more?—I do not think there are very many of that sort go into the infirmary.

5359. Are they all absolutely destitute?—Oh, not absolutely destitute. They are people, or connected with people, who are earning from 5s. to 4s. or 10s. a week. There might be occasionally people earning 14s. or 15s. a week, and, of course, if it is the head of the family, the money is gone.

5360. Suppose it is someone depending on the head of the family, that person, if at home, would cost some few pence a week; don't you think it would be fair that even that contribution should be asked, and that the Guardians should have power to require payment at their own discretion if they thought it could be paid without hardship?—There would be no harm giving them the power.

5361. Something like that is done at the Fermanagh Infirmary that works very well. They have got quite a respectable sum in small sums?—When you were asking about the number of people going to the county infirmary it is almost in every case for an operation.

5362. Dr. BOAG.—(Not for any ordinary accident?—No.)

5363. It is too far?—Yes; it is too far.

5364. Therefore you require a hospital in the district?—Yes. A good deal depends on the reputation of the doctor. Our present doctor in the Ouzagh Infirmary has a high reputation.

5365. Of course there are some obscure medical cases that go to it?—Yes; when they try all the doctors round and get no benefit they are glad to come here.

5366. About consumption, you have not taken that into consideration?—We have not many cases; when we last talked about consumption there two or three cases seemed to be about the outside we ever had.

5367. That is in the institution?—Yes.

5368. But are there many cases in the district?—I think there are a good many.

5369. Would not it be a great advantage to have them isolated in the institution?—They go on with their work until they are no longer fit to work, then they come in, and you cannot take hold of them. They do it voluntarily.

5370. If there was an institution where they thought there would be a chance of being cured, would not they be more likely to go into it?—If you told a person who knew they were in decline that there was a chance of cure by going in there very likely they would. The desire for liberty and freedom is very strong with our people.

5371. Not where the prospect is death?—Oh, indeed, yes. Very often they think they get on better where they have their liberty than going into a place where they are shut up.

5372. Have you many lunatics in the workhouse?—Well, we have got rid of a good many lately. We had eight or nine, and got rid of five or six. We sent them to Ouzagh.

5373. They do not refuse any?—They have not refused the latest batch.

5374. Were they sent on the ordinary house farm?—I think so.

5375. Not by a magistrate's order?—The doctor got it done.

5376. So that now you are pretty free?—I think we are pretty free. We have one or two.

5377. It is a saving to the ratepayers in Cockstown?—Well, I do not know.

5378. It is not a saving?—I cannot give you an answer. I am not up enough in the figures. We did it under the advice of the Local Government Board.

5379. CHAIRMAN.—They were influenced by the double consideration of economy, most likely, and benefit to the inmates?—Possibly. It has never been any want of desire on the part of the Guardians to send them there. We have known cases when they could not take them in there.

5380. Dr. BOAG.—And now they are more inclined to take them in?—They always take them in when there is room. Ouzagh is generally filled up. I attended meetings of the Board of Governors and they always talk of more building.

5381. Mr. MURPHY.—Regarding the sanitary system, what do you think of a proposal of that kind; do you think it would be well to establish one in the county, or would it be better to enlarge the lunatic asylum?—I think if you had a spare building I think it would be better to use it as an auxiliary. To have one with a new staff, say in Cockstown, instead of our fever hospital, or in Dunganman, with an absolutely new staff, I think that would be more expensive than an addition to the present asylum.

5382. Considering that the Board of Guardians are beginning to see that there is something to be gained by sending out the epileptics and insane and lunatics to the lunatic asylum, do you not think that something would have to be done in the way of enlarging the existing institutions?—From what I have heard, when I attended the Board of Governors in the asylum, I think something will have to be done by way of enlarging.

5383. In Dunganman and your own union you have gone ahead of all the rest of the county by sending to the lunatic asylum your harmless lunatics; the people in Ouzagh and Strabane and other unions will be following your wise example; so then what is going to be done?—If the present asylum cannot take them in you will either have to build or find an auxiliary, but my opinion is that the auxiliary ought to be somewhere in the neighbourhood of the present one.

5384. Do you not think it would be better to enlarge the existing building, because by that you get a week contribution, whereas if you have an auxiliary asylum you will have only 2s. Did that occur to you?—No.

5385. CHAIRMAN.—Are you under the impression that the cost of maintaining an inmate in the workhouse is very much less than the cost of maintaining an inmate of the lunatic asylum on the rates?—I know there is an impression among the Guardians. It has never had any weight in my own mind as to whether it was 1s. or 2s., more or less, but there is a prevalent belief that it is more in the asylum than it is in the workhouse.

5386. I expect they would find it was a little the other way. In the statistics that are given for Poor Law maintenance you simply put in the cost of food and clothing, some places feed alone. You do not put in all their share of the establishment charges and other expenses that are included in the cost of an inmate in the lunatic asylum, so that if you put in everything that should be added to the workhouse inmate you will have him very near the same as a lunatic asylum inmate, and then you will have the 500 1s. contribution from the Government, bringing down the asylum expenditure very much below the workhouse. The establishment charges go on the same in short cost. What you have only to consider is the absolute cost of maintenance.

5387. In the case of the lunatic asylum they put in everything?—That is not a fair comparison.

5388. In the workhouse they simply take the cost of a man's food and clothing and ignore all the other things; therefore it looks as if a man in the workhouse is kept at a very low figure.

5389. Mr. MURPHY.—Do you think something will shortly have to be done in the way of providing new rooms for the lunatics of the county?—Are you asking me that as a member of the Board of Governors of the asylum.

5390. Yes, as a member of the board. You know the space is already nearly taken up!—That is my impression. It is filling up very rapidly.

5391. In fact there are only ten or fifteen spare beds. Something will have to be done in the asylum if the increase goes on as it has been going on in recent years. From your knowledge of the system in connection with the lunatic asylum which do you think will be better, that is to enlarge the present institution or to use one of the existing institutions provided some workhouse was closed?—I understand you get less grant from the Government. On the other hand you have an existing building almost ready for reception.

5392. CHAIRMAN.—Requiring a very large expenditure!—Then it is cheaper to build an annex and to get an extra grant from the Government. If there is no present building that can be made available as an auxiliary without considerable expense I think it is cheaper to the county to build fresh and to get a larger grant from the Government than to spend a large sum in altering an existing building as an auxiliary and getting a small grant.

5393. Mr. MURKHAM.—That is extend the existing system?—It seems to me to be so.

5394. Mr. Muldoon.—Is your chief objection to be amalgamated with Dungannon the fact of the representation?—The fact that our people would not attend. It would not be local government. You might nearly as well let the whole thing be done from Dublin.

5395. If they would not attend!—And they would not.

5396. Is the attendance of your Guardians good at Cookstown?—Yes; it is very good now.

5397. And from Cookstown to Dungannon you have the rail?—We have.

5398. How far is it?—Fourteen miles by rail.

5399. Do you think if there was such a business as an election of master or doctor at Dungannon that your Guardians could be got to go down?—Yes, for a special purpose for a day.

Major HOWARD, DUNGANNON, examined.

5400. CHAIRMAN.—You have considered the list of queries that were issued by the Commission?—The Council appointed a committee to do so, and we have practically to a great extent adopted the County Council answers with this exception, that we consider in reference to queries 1 and 2 that the workhouses of Dungannon, Omagh, and Strabane are sufficient for the able-bodied paupers of the county, and that the other workhouses could be utilised for district hospitals and for concentrating the treatment of lunatics and imbeciles in one or other of them.

5401. Chiefly for the local sick and also for any other object that could be found feasible?—And for utilizing one of these houses in the county for the sole treatment of, say, imbeciles or harmless lunatics, so that they could be specially treated under experts.

5402. Rather than put them into an asylum?—Rather than put them in. We did not consider it in the way it was put here to-day. Personally I would be in favour of concentrating the whole thing at the Omagh Asylum under one special staff, for at present there is not sufficient speciality given to any one class of patients.

5403. As you have a good asylum you would rather extend it than found a subordinate and inferior institution?—Certainly; the more you concentrate it, provided it would not get too large, the better government and the better treatment you get.

5404. That would be your own opinion, but until you come here you were rather disposed to advocate an auxiliary asylum?—Yes; it was because of concentrating the treatment, no matter where it was, either at the Omagh Asylum or in an auxiliary.

5405. But you yourself, after what you have heard to-day, would prefer having patients treated in the Omagh Asylum?—Yes.

5406. You think the three workhouses—Castlederg, Claghoe, and Cookstown—might be closed as such?—Oh, yes.

5407. You have had the advantage of hearing the views of the Guardians from those places; they are opposed to it?—The great thing that they seem all to be opposed to it for is the question of not having representation or not getting a fair share of the rates under

5408. Is it your evidence that they would be apprehensive that their rates would be raised if they would not attend?—Yes.

5409. Still they are the most economical Guardians in Tyrone after Castlederg?—I do not dispute that.

5410. Have you built any labourers' cottages?—We are in process of building.

5411. But you have not up to this?—We have not.

5412. You yourself have been Chairman of the Guardians for a number of years?—Yes.

5413. And you are a member of the County Council?—Yes; as Chairman of the District Council.

5414. And you come to the meetings of the County Council?—Sometimes; not everyone.

5415. Are you a member of the finance committee of the County Council?—Yes.

5416. And you come to Omagh for that?—Sometimes.

5417. And you are a member of the infirmary board?—Yes.

5418. And you come through Dungannon on all these occasions?—I do.

5419. You, at all events, would have no objection to go there?—I would not go every Thursday or Saturday.

5420. It was determined that monthly meetings were sufficient, and that the business was important, do you think there would be any objection to the Guardians going to Dungannon?—There would. They have to attend the Cookstown District Council, and they do that on the same day. They have it on the market day. To go to Dungannon, they would lose more days from their own labour. One day to Dungannon and another day to Cookstown for the District Council, and attend their markets as well.

5421. How many of the Guardians who attend Omagh have as far to go as your Guardians have to go to Dungannon?—I do not know about their circumstances.

5422. That is, at all events, your chief ground of objection?—It is the chief ground of my board and as an individual.

5423. CHAIRMAN.—Is there any other witness?—Mr. Leeper was to have been here; he is very sorry that he is unable to come.

the present system of union rating. That is the great evil all over, because everybody thinks he has not got a fair share of the rates unless he has got as much relief for his district as he can, because he is paying for one and all.

5424. And he thinks the more he can increase the general expenditure the better for his own locality?—Yes; whereas if it were divisional rating the local Guardians would be responsible for any relief they give, and they would not give relief in cases where they knew it was not necessary, because they would have to answer to their own constituents; now they have nobody to answer to. It is the same way in the rural councils on the roads; there is a maximum amount that can go to them, and, of course, every councillor, myself along with the rest, are all fighting who can get the most money for his own district, and it is a case of "The Devil take the hindmost"; there is no question of keeping it under the maximum; that is one reason why I advocate strongly divisional rating; that used to be the way in the old days; it was the Guardians of the district who regulated the relief.

5425. Then you think it is rather an advantage to the district to be without representatives to increase the expenditures?—There is no other Guardian would interfere with their district if it was a division rating.

5426. You think it would be prudent to go back to the smaller area for charging?—Certainly; because then the Guardians would be more careful and would inquire more particularly, because they would have to answer for it themselves.

5427. The idea of a great many people is that if everybody has to pay a proportional part of a single relief case that they all would be against it; is that your experience?—No; that is not my experience. My experience is more this way—supposing I get relief for a party, perhaps 3s. a week or 2s. 6d. a week, and some other neighbouring Guardian gets 2s., or has got 2s. a week for someone of his, he says, "Oh, you got 2s. 6d., I have as much right to 2s. 6d. as you have," or even it comes to be afterwards, if you get up and object to anything, "Oh, I did not say anything when

On 25, 1903
Mr. J. B. Guss-
ning-Mace,

Oct 26, 1902.

Major
Howard.

you got 2s. 6d.?" That is the way of it; whereas if it was divisional raising the Guardians who had to deal with it would be entirely different.

5438. It looks like a sort of jealousy?—It is jealousy, for fear one district would get more than another, and that is the great reason why that increase of outdoor relief goes on.

5439. It comes to about 2d. in the £ in your union; go on to query 37.—As regards the children, I would go in strongly for establishing an industrial school in the country.

5440. Do you prefer that to boarding out?—Certainly; because I think the children would be made more useful in after life, in this way that they could be educated in technical instruction, and learn trades and be sent out into the world.

5441. Did you ever know of any tradesman who received his instruction in an industrial school?—Oh, yes; that is quite common through England and Scotland.

5442. Trades unions don't object to it?—Oh, no.

5443. That is a recognized way of entering a trade?—Quite; some institutions are practically nearly self-supporting that way; after the boys have been a year or two at cabinet-making or bookbinding.

5444. Do you think the children reared in an institution become as good or better citizens than children who are absorbed into the ordinary home life of the country?—I would say they would become more useful citizens afterwards, because they would be better educated and better skilled.

5445. Would they be better versed in how to get on through the intelligence that comes from rubbing on in the world?—At their time of life I would think they would.

5446. Have you had experience of these children in industrial schools?—I have seen a good deal of them.

5447. Have you found them satisfactory as servants or trades-people; have you known them in any actual capacity?—Yes; I have known them in all these capacities.

5448. You have had, for instance, servants from an industrial school?—Yes; I have.

5449. Did you find them satisfactory?—Yes, very, exceptionally; intelligently trained in every way, civil and obliging always, particularly so. The boarding-out system is certainly—in the present way of doing it—the boarding-out system is certainly the best, because it takes away the stigma that seems to attach to a workhouse.

5450. To the institutions?—To the workhouse. An industrial school, such as would need to be established in connection with a thing of this sort, would not be in the position or in the relation of what one would call a reformatory, such as most industrial schools are.

5451. Or committed by a magistrate's warrant?—No; it would be purely a training school; there would be no stigma attached to it.

5452. Would you propose to educate these children, who are from the destitute classes of the community; would you propose to educate these and put them into a better position than the children of any small ratepayer could hope to get into?—It would eventually come to that. If the thing was properly carried out they would be turned out as tradesmen with trades at their fingers' ends; whether they would rise to anything after that I would always give them the means of doing so, and making better citizens of themselves.

5453. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you think it would be a proper thing to ask the poor ratepayers on the mountain slopes to provide such an education for these waifs that they are not able to give to their own children? I would not just exactly go that far, but the expense would be so greater; the thing can be done at the same cost or without any extra expense. I think at this time of day it is only right people should be pushed forward as far as they can be.

5454. Do you not think it would be better to put these children out to board and let them mingle with the ordinary population, such as they spring from, and grow up with the rural population instead of making them artisans and skilled labourers?—No; I don't think so at all; in the one case you would give them the opportunity of improving their position if they had the ability.

5455. But why should you reserve to them special privileges that you won't give to the children of the ordinary ratepayer?—Oh, well, of course—

5456. Would not that be creating a privilege?—It would not be creating a privilege in this way, that you

would be doing with the public funds the best you could at the same cost; as long as it did not mean any extra outlay, that is what I mean.

5457. CHAIRMAN.—But would not the cost be many times as great on maintaining a child in an industrial school as boarding out that child?—I don't think so.

5458. You heard Mr. Montgomery's evidence to-day that the cost of boarding out was 6s. a year and a suit of clothes?—In our case it is nearly 2s.

5459. Say 4s. or 4s. or 4s. or 4s.; you are nowhere near the average of the industrial school?

5460. Mr. MURKIN.—An industrial school would mean, at least, from 23s. to 23s. I think it is not a much as that.

Dr. BROWN.—About 21s.—In the one case, the 4s. is only the cost of very young children.

5461. Mr. MURKIN.—Those people that take the boarded-out children, as far as we have any experience, they won't give them up at all; they don't like to get rid of them; the bigger they grow they more they like them!—But in an industrial institution you would have them up to fifteen or sixteen or seventeen years.

5462. The chances are they would get on the Glengue boat and go over to Scotland and give Scotland the benefit of the teaching we have paid for?—No; there are too many of them already.

5463. CHAIRMAN.—Is there anything else you would like to point out in your evidence that you have not called attention to?—The inmates of the workhouse who have always borne—our board brought up that matter—the inmates of the workhouse who have always borne a good character should be kept separate from those who are more of a criminal character; there should be some provision made for that sort of thing.

5464. Some privilege words?—Some privilege words that they should not be mixed; there are justice I know myself who object to entering the house on account of the unpleasant people they have to mix with.

5465. Dr. BROWN.—Have you any means of spending them in Dugganstown?—Oh, yes.

5466. You have never tried it?—No; that is the unfortunate thing; we have a grand establishment, but can get very few to take the benefit of it; outdoor relief has grown to such an extent with us that we are keeping up a staff and a house for very few inmates; it has become a regular crying out cry.

5467. Mr. MURKIN.—What is the annual expenditure for out-door relief?

CHAIRMAN.—£860.

Witness.—It has increased very largely of recent years.

5468. CHAIRMAN.—1,400 in the house?—Yes.

5469. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you not think that outdoor relief when properly given and where need exists that it is an advantageous method of relief?—It is, but there is just where the difficulty comes in, "properly given"; there are a great lot of people who would be far better in the house—that is, I mean, elderly, infirm old people, who are not fit to look after themselves and refuse to come into the house—they get relief, and the next thing you have to do is to pay a man to look after them, and that is the way a great lot of the relief goes. What I object to in the outdoor relief is a great number of cases in where people are getting 2s. 6d. or 2s. outdoor relief, and they are paying 1s. a week and sometimes 1s. 3d. in rent.

5470. CHAIRMAN.—So that the outdoor relief must be only a contribution, not a maintenance?—It is only a contribution.

5471. It is a charitable contribution not supporting the destitute?—It does not support them. Very often then they fall into such bad health that the amount has to be increased and a nurse put on to attend them; that very often follows. When one gets outdoor relief a great number simply follow suit; they think if one gets it, "I have a right to get it." And one Guardian says, "You got outdoor relief for so and so; I have a much right to get outdoor relief for my district."

5472. Do you know of any cases of outdoor relief in your union in which relief goes into a house when members of the family are earning?—I have often seen that.

5473. And you are aware it is so?—Yes.

5474. Of course such relief is absolutely illegal?—There are many illegal things done in connection with that I am afraid. Of course, if we came to know any of the family was earning—

5475. I am speaking of substantial earnings; I am not speaking of chance pickings up?—Oh, in the case of substantial earnings—

Oct. 28, 1903.

Major
Howard.

5465. You don't know of any person, for instance, earning, we will say, in a mill, substantial earnings and the old people in the same household getting outdoor relief?—I know they get outdoor relief in that way, where perhaps the daughters would be earning 6s. or 7s.

5467. That is the kind of case I mean?—6s. or 7s. a week and perhaps two old people or a family besides, so that they could not possibly exist on it.

5468. Mr. MURKIN.—I don't think that would come within Mr. Miles' description?—No.

5469. Two old people and a family would hardly live on 6s. a week?—Oh, of course, not.

CHAIRMAN.—The question then is whether that is destitution; the law only permits relief to be given where there is destitution.

5470. Mr. MURKIN.—I suppose all precautions are taken to see that there is no abuse of outdoor relief?—We are very particular that way, and have got a very good relieving officer who is very conscientious and particular in making inquiries.

5471. CHAIRMAN.—But still you are not satisfied that it is not going ahead too much?—No; but there is a good deal of that sort of fault of the Guardians themselves and union relief; if it reverted back to divisional rating or dispensary rating it would be much more lenient.

5472. Mr. MURKIN.—But notwithstanding this great increase of outdoor relief, does not your rate compare favourably with the rate before the passing of the Local Government Act when you take into consideration the improvements demanded by the Local Government Board?—We, of course, were always a very up-to-date union; they could not make many improvements with us.

5473. CHAIRMAN.—I think your nursing was improved?—It was increased.

5474. Mr. MURKIN.—That means money. If you take into consideration all the changes that have been made in the dietary scale and improvement of nursing and other little things, do you think that would not raise the rate of 1897 up to what it is to-day?—No; I don't think so.

5475. You are treating the people better now than you used to?—They are said to be treated better, but it is a question.

5476. CHAIRMAN.—You are spending more money?—We are spending more money, but the money is not spent as the paupers; it is spent on the staff and the upkeep.

5477. Dr. BROWN.—Is not that a benefit to the paupers?—It is, but if the matter was concentrated more by amalgamation—if there was more amalgamation and less staff, then there could be more money spent on the paupers—the paupers would get the direct benefit of it; now they do not.

5478. Then you advocate amalgamation?—Oh, certainly.

5479. Mr. MURKIN.—But suppose without amalgamation you could derive economy—that is by changing some of the institutions into infirmaries and hospitals for the sick; allowing the same conditions of things to exist as at present as regards representation?—As long as you could reduce the expenditure on the staff and the upkeep of the large workhouses that are standing practically empty.

5480. Say reducing the staff one-third in some of these existing institutions and getting rid of the upkeep of the large buildings, besides other little economies that could be accomplished, how would that meet your view?—That would be so much towards it; there is so much duplication of staffs throughout the country that could be done away with.

5481. Now, suppose you absorbed Cocktown, would you have room for all the Cocktown people?—Oh, yes; and we could nearly take in Omagh too.

5482. When you got them there would you take care of them; we are very liberal with out-door relief?—I believe we would.

CHAIRMAN.—And is your rate for out-door relief and 2d. their's? £300 and £1,200.

5483. Mr. MURKIN.—We are giving £1,400, so that I am afraid the Omagh people would not like to go down to Dungannon?—If it was not for the Mid-Ulster Artillery in the summer our house would be very lonely.

5484. Mr. Miles.—I think you are stronger on the question of amalgamation than you are on any other Poor Law question?—I am strong on the concentrating of the thing.

5485. Dungannon would be willing to take in Cocktown and portion of Clogher at all events?—Yes.

5486. Leave Omagh out, for that raises other difficulties; have your board considered this question of amalgamation?—Yes.

5487. And passed any resolutions on the subject?—Yes.

5488. And they have been in favour of amalgamation, and leaving an existing unions?—Dungannon, Omagh, and Strahane.

5489. And your board think establishments ought not to be maintained in Castlelog, Clogher, and Cocktown for the number of paupers that are now relieved there?—No; they consider those places should be utilized as district hospitals.

5490. You heard the evidence of Mr. Gunning-Moore, the Chairman of the Cocktown Union; do you think there is any ground for his apprehension that the economical Guardians of Dungannon would impose burdens on Cocktown that they would not be willing to bear or share themselves?—I don't think there is any ground for anything of the kind, and if divisional rating was brought in it would remove all that, for the Dungannon Guardians would not interfere with the Cocktown Guardians; they would let them give their own relief.

5491. I would not press that too strongly, for it would rather bear him out in one aspect of it if the Cocktown Guardians did not go up to Dungannon?—They would not interfere with them.

5492. The representatives of Cocktown could get quite readily to Dungannon?—Oh, quite; it is only seven miles by road.

5493. And I suppose the Guardians at Dungannon have quite as strong a reputation for economy as those at Cocktown?—Quite.

5494. And you have been doing everything there to keep down the rates?—We have, so far.

5495. Have you built any labourers' cottages?—No.

5496. That is upon economic grounds?—Upon economic grounds.

5497. Mr. MURKIN.—Are you aware you could build cottages and bring advantages to the rates by doing so in the present position of the agricultural grant?—I quite understand that; but I may tell you that I don't think we ever were very much pressed to build cottages.

5498. No demand for them?—No demand for them; it is a district in which there is a particularly good supply of other dwellings all around there.

5499. Dr. BROWN.—You would not be averse to relieving the rates of the expense of building a few cottages when they would not cost you much?—Oh, no; there has been really no demand for them.

5500. What provisions have you in Dungannon for consumption?—We have no particular provisions; that is one thing I, personally, would be very strongly in favour of, the isolation of consumptives in a central institution.

5501. Have you thought that out at all?—I have never thought it out, particularly because I did not think there were as many consumptives in the wards of the county as would be sufficient to create a necessity.

5502. Not in the wards, but through the county?—I know it is through the county, and it is greatly on the increase there two or three years; I notice it myself even going through the country.

5503. So that there would be a double benefit in having an institution—the cure or relief of some of the cases, and at the same time preventing the spread of the disease. Has your board set apart any ward in your own infirmary?—No; we have no particular ward; we have only got distemper; that is all.

5504. Apart from isolation, it is not much use?—But it is what the Local Government Board suggest.

5505. The Local Government Board suggested separation and separate wards?—Then the Local Government Board have recommended us to build a smallpox hospital, and we have had two smallpox cases within the last twenty years, but I think consumption a much more pressing thing than anything like that.

CHAIRMAN.—Certainly. We hope to visit Dungannon hospital.

Oct. 28, 1862.

Mr. Isaac Kydd.

5506. CHAIRMAN.—You are a Guardian of the Dispensary Union?—I am.

5507. Are you in favour of amalgamation of some of the unions?—It has been discussed on several occasions before the board, and the board are unanimous that amalgamation in the end would be beneficial to the recipients.

5508. What unions do you think ought to be broken up?—I don't know; I think Clagher and Cookstown, and then I heard the evidence from Castlelog, and I think the witnesses gave very good evidence for a break up.

5509. How did you think the evidence was in favour of a break up?—I think they were not treating the poor fairly; I think they were not very charitable to the poor in giving outdoor relief.

5510. You know, of course, that charity is not one of the virtues that a Guardian is supposed to possess; he might find himself with a surcharge hanging over him if he was too charitable; if the Cookstown Guardians made a good case for not having their workhouse closed, and if they said they had room enough to take in Dungannon, do you think Dungannon ought to be put into Cookstown?—Well, I don't know; I would have no objection for my part, but we have room enough; the Dungannon house was built to accommo-

date 1,200. There have been questions asked about taking in some of the divisions of Armagh after the Local Government Act, and I never heard any complaints that they were unfairly treated. I think divisional rating would be better than union rating; I think it wrought better under the old system.

5511. Less charity?—Yes. Wherever there is a manufacturing locality, such as Dungannon, there is a good deal more poor there, and, of course, the locality is benefited by it, and there is Coleraine, also a manufacturing locality, and there is more poor in those two divisions than there is in all the rest of the union; there are some divisions that there is no poor from in the house at all, and very little outdoor relief, yet they have to pay their proportion of the rates on Dungannon and Coleraine.

5512. Dungannon is a little lower rated than it used to be, and the country electoral divisions have a higher rate?—Exactly.

5513. You would like to see every division pay its own way?—Exactly.

5514. Did you hear Captain Howard say he thought union-at-large rating made the people more extravagant?—Perhaps it makes the Guardians that they would uppe costs in their own divisions.

5515. So as to get their share?—Yes.

Mr. Peter Clarke.

Gentlemen, the Chairman, Mr. Humphreys, could not attend here to-day; he is a very old man.

CHAIRMAN.—We had the benefit of his evidence.

Witness.—I have one or two observations of my own to make. There is a little departure in my report from what I have been listening to all day. Strabane Workhouse was built to accommodate 250; there is a spacious infirmary, and I have ascertained it is capable—

5516. Over-crowded?—Capable of accommodating 100 more.

5517. Is your infirmary not over-crowded?—Sometimes; there are other rooms that could be utilized for an infirmary; there are three with nothing but old beams in them; Mr. Lockley and I went into it; we could put in twenty-six on removing the old head-boards. It is divided into two portions, Strabane No. 1 and Strabane No. 2; the valuation of No. 1 is £70,069, and of No. 2, £48,762.

5518. That is in the County Donegal?—Yes; the total valuation is £118,831. Well, I went into another question with regard to the encumbrances of all the officials, because I would like to be very conscientious if I possibly could. For the first half-year ending March, 1862, it was £294 12s. 6d.; for the second half-year ending September it was £209 5s. 1d., and the total, £503 17s. 7d.; the following year, the first half ending March, 1863, it was £261 12s. 1d., and for the half-year ending September, 1863, it was £235 12s. 9d.

5519. What expenses are you talking of?—Of all the officials connected with the institution.

5520. I think you must have got your figures in some queer way. The amount spent on officials and retainers in Strabane Union for the last recorded year in the report is £1,098 for the year?—Well, Mr. Chairman, I got these from Mr. Sharkey, and I can vouch for all.

5521. He surely gave you more than the salaries and retainers of the officers; you must have the dispendary declared?—Of course I have.

5522. We have as much to do with that as—

With the Polar Star, I suppose.

5523. You have nothing to do with that; you may go on the figures of £1,100, in round numbers, for salaries and retainers; I hope that does not put out your calculations?—It is a knock-out, I admit.

5524. I am afraid I must give you that figure, for it is the real one?—I suppose the books must be him if that is so.

5525. You take a number of things that don't come under the Poor Law Act—the doctors and sanitary officers?—Strabane urban valuation, the total is £33,977 10s. Now I am in favour—this is my own personal report, not the general report—I am in favour of the union being amalgamated; take, for instance, in my own native parish, Gortin, which was dissolved some years ago—

5526. Were you a Guardian?—Oh, no; my cousin was—Charles Clarke.

Mr. Isaac Kydd examined.

Strabane, continued.

5527. It was dissolved in the year 1860?—After the division there were eight divisions attached to Strabane, and I think the other eight were attached to Omagh here. The eight that were sent to Strabane are very maintainable, but I have not heard any complaints.

5528. You have not a thick population at that altitude?—No; even sheep sometimes can scurry with over it. I have not heard any complaints regarding the removal of the sick or infirm to Strabane, notwithstanding that there is no railway communication; the roads are very bad and hilly, and I never heard of a complaint.

5529. Well, it is a very severe test; there are big hills on both sides?—Yes; both sides of the valley.

5530. You are in favour of amalgamation?—By all means.

5531. And the Gortin people are satisfied with the results of the amalgamation?—Yes; and, unfortunately, I could prove that conclusively. I had properly before the dissolution and after the dissolution, and I had the receipts in my pocket this morning. I could not agree with some of the evidence I heard to-day; instead of increasing the rates, if I rightly remember—I was going to leave the receipts before you, a couple of years before the dissolution and a year or two after the dissolution—I think it was something like £1 in the £ of a saving; the taxes were reduced that much.

5532. Although you pensioned the Gortin officers?—Yes, and gave Don £58, and well I know it. I am in favour of union rating and the extension of outdoor relief, although it largely increased since we came into office. Many of the poor could not be induced to go into the workhouse. I have had the case of a labouring man who became insane, having a wife and six children, and no visible means of support; what was to be done if he did not get outdoor relief. With regard to that case, it was a real bone fide case, and, unfortunately it was in my own electoral division, which made the matter far worse. I made application, and indeed some of the Guardians remitted the application, but I had the majority anyway; I got 66 for the poor wages, and told her, of course, afterwards to do the best she could, to work occasionally when she would get work that would suit her; it was just immediately before the setting of the hay, and she worked at hay, and so on, and I did not see her for the last couple of months, but she is getting it anyway, for I was at Strabane yesterday at the board, and knew it. I must explain with regard to union rating, as you are I am in favour of it. We have a number of very poor districts—a great number of them—and there are a number of fat divisions down here, and I was thinking, as charity begins at home, if there were to extend their charitable hand up here it would equalize matters, and that is the reason I would go in for union rating. Am I making myself intelligible.

Oct. 26, 1901.

5533. I think I understand; you are very glad to have the rich land here at Omagh paying a share of the necessary land expenses at Gortin?—Why not; would you not always like to be in partnership with a good firm; I would think so! The number of men, women, and children, menials admitted to the house from 5th September, 1900, to the 24th of August, 1901, which is a share for Strabane, amounted to 1,175 men, 234 women, and 111 children; total, 1,500. I think that is rather a departure from the evidence the last year.

5534. Dr. BOGERS.—Admitted for a single night?—Yes, of course.

5535. CHAIRMAN.—For what period?—6th September, 1902, to 29th August, 1903.

5536. That is for a year; you might have given bigger figures than that, I think!—1,500 is a large proportion.

5537. The collective number of days is 77,730 odd!—That is about nearly the contents of my report.

5538. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—You belong to Strabane No. 1?—Yes.

5539. Do you give much outdoor relief in that union?—Personally, there are three receiving it in my own electoral division, and they were so very kind to them on Tuesday week, they got it off them, but I went out yesterday and got it for them again.

5540. You are in favour of amalgamation, are you?—Sincerely.

5541. You want Strabane amalgamated with Omagh?—If you lessen the rates I will.

5542. You know Strabane is at the extreme end of the County Tyrone—the extremity is not very accessible always!—There are two extremes; two points determine a line.

5543. Do you not think it would be better if there was amalgamation to have the workhouse in some central place?—I think, as far as position is concerned, you could not improve matters very much except that you lessen the rates.

Mr. PATRICK MCCARTHY examined.

5554. CHAIRMAN.—What union do you represent?—Trillick, Irvinestown; there is portion of it in this county.

5555. What is your view?—The view of our council is to remain in Irvinestown.

5556. You don't wish to come into your own county?—No; it would be so very inconvenient for us to bring the sick poor; it would be over twenty miles.

5557. What is your nearest railway station?—Trillick.

5558. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Is Trillick not as convenient to Omagh as to Irvinestown?—It is only four miles to Irvinestown.

5559. By road?—Yes, and it is as convenient by railway.

5560. CHAIRMAN.—How far is the county boundary from Irvinestown?—It goes into the very town—at the very edge of the town; that is the reason it is so much nearer; that is the view of our board, to remain there.

5561. And you prefer not to come to Tyrone?—No; in the interests of the sick poor. They could be brought with the same convenience to Omagh or Enniskillen.

5562. How far would the boundary at Irvinestown be from Omagh by road?—Sixteen miles.

5563. A good road?—There are good roads at Irvinestown; this road is not so good.

5564. Have you better roads there than at Omagh?—Far better; but very bad between this and Omagh.

5565. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—I suppose it was on the ground of access to the institution that you decided to continue at Irvinestown?—Yes; and the nuisance of bringing the sick poor. That is the chief ground; it is not the inconvenience I studied at all.

5566. CHAIRMAN.—The inconvenience would not be so very great for the Guardians, because they could get a train from Trillick?—Yes; but it would be more expensive.

5567. You would go by train almost altogether; the other way you have to drive out, I suppose?—No; we have the train for 6d. backwards and forwards, and it would be 2s. 4d. here.

5568. What is your station for Irvinestown?—Bundoran Junction.

5569. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Was the question considered at a meeting of the Board of Guardians?—Yes, sir.

5544. Are there not some improvements in accommodation at Strabane?—Yes.

5545. CHAIRMAN.—Increasing the infirmary?—Yes; we are. Look at the number of hundreds we have spent in making a new bedroom and in modern appliances and cooking; there is not a day but we are spending money. There is space there for 500; I think they were very foolish in building such a big place at first.

5546. They were over full at first, and had to have buildings outside?—I know we are feeding them that well that there is an increase in the year over last year. The number of inmates is only 230, and there is nearly room for 500.

5547. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—You have plenty of space, and still you are going to build more?—Yes; we would like to get it filled.

5548. CHAIRMAN.—You would not, at all events, propose to give away half of your union to Strabane?—That is not my business; that is a boundary question.

5549. It would be a very important consideration as to whether Strabane should continue or not?—It is very important, because it is up-to-date.

5550. Would you be in favour of not breaking up the union?—I would, certainly.

5551. Or dividing it into two parts?—I could not see it; I am not going into that question. I got Mr. Stewart's map, and he told me he gave it to a gentleman down in Derry.

5552. CHAIRMAN.—It was produced, I think, in the courthouse by Mr. Harey, the barrister?—And who has the custody of it now, please? If I had that map I would say a word or two on it; in the absence of that map I will not go into it, although I have my scale and compass here.

5553. Is there any other Guardian from Strabane here?—No; I think they were afraid to be examined before you; but, however, Mr. Humphreys will be here to-morrow.

5570. Was notice sent to the different Guardians that the question would be considered?—Yes; they got that notice.

5571. And they were all unanimous?—Yes.

5572. CHAIRMAN.—The Tyrone men?—Yes; and the Fermanagh men were unanimous to keep as there.

5573. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—But the Tyrone men were mixed up with the Fermanagh?—Yes; but we have a meeting of our own at the District Council.

5574. CHAIRMAN.—Did you go into the question of rates?—Yes; it would be cheaper to belong to Irvinestown.

5575. Do they give any outdoor relief there?—They do; to anyone the doctor certifies is not able to come into the house they get outdoor relief.

5576. That is not many?—No.

5577. Is that one of the chief reasons why you object, from a money point of view, to come to Omagh?—I would give that objection to Omagh, but it is not my chief; it is the distance and the convenience of the sick poor.

5578. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—What about the destitute that are not sick?—It would be as convenient for them to go to Irvinestown as to come here.

5579. CHAIRMAN.—As regards the convenience of the sick poor, suppose a different arrangement altogether was made to any existing arrangement, suppose that the sick poor of the Trillick rural district could be authorized to send their sick to be treated in the Irvinestown hospital and pay so much a head for them there, and if, at the same time, the Trillick rural district was brought into the Omagh Union, your chief objection would disappear about the sick poor, because they would be treated in the place where you say they ought to be treated; then your objection would be the inconvenience to the Guardians?—No; the inconvenience of bringing the sick poor to Omagh by ambulance would be to be treated.

5580. But supposing the Trillick rural district is brought into Omagh Union and that the sick from the divisions next or near Irvinestown were boarded out, or could be sent to be treated in the infirmary of the Irvinestown Union, and the Guardians of the Omagh Union should pay for them there the average cost of maintenance, would you have the same objection?—I would have the same objection.

Oct. 23, 1902.

Mr. Patrick
McCauley.

5581. What would your objection in that case be?—The inconvenience to the Guardians then.

5582. And you would feel it just as strongly as you did before?—Not quite so strong; it is the sick poor I feel the most about.

5583. But if the sick poor were settled as you wish, you would still feel an inconvenience, as a Guardian?—I would.

5584. The inconvenience would be the entire cost—the difference between 6d. and 2s. 6d. 1—Yes.

5585. You would lose most of the day in either case?—You get home quicker from Irwinestown, because the board would be over sooner. But here in Omagh you would have to wait until the last train.

5586. Mr. MURKIN.—No; you would have a train from here at ten past three 1—Well, we get home soon after one o'clock in the other case.

5587. CHAIRMAN.—Do you see any other objection?—I am afraid of the Omagh people being highly rated.

5588. You are afraid they would put outdoor relief on you?—They give outdoor relief indiscriminately; here there is no doctor's test at all, I think.

5589. Mr. Muldoon.—You are aware, of course, that the amalgamation of that portion of Irwinestown Union does not involve the destruction of your District Council—I am aware it would not for some time.

5590. If you were relieved of that, would you take more kindly to amalgamation?—I would not amalgamate with Omagh anyway.

5591. Omagh is not so very inconvenient to that part of Tyrone 1—It is very inconvenient to part of our district.

5592. It is the Quarter Sessions town of all that district 1—It is.

5593. And you are here two or three times at Assizes 1—No, I am not; I don't come for the law.

5594. In the event of the meetings being monthly, don't you think the Guardians would come to Omagh on a Saturday 1—For one, would not.

5595. If there was an election of a doctor do you think you could be persuaded to come 1—I don't believe it.

Mr. DAVID McSHERRY examined.

Mr. David
McSherry.

5596. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the Trillick Council, too?—Yes.

5597. You have heard the evidence just given 1—Yes.

5598. Is there anything that you would like to dissociate yourself from?—No; there is not.

5599. You agree pretty much with what has been said?—Yes; of course Irwinestown is a great deal nearer to Omagh. Irwinestown is built partly in Tyrone and partly in Fermanagh.

5600. But you would feel very much going away from the workhouse at your door to a place so distant as Omagh 1—Some of us could not come on Saturday. I could not myself, for it is our market day there as well as here, and Irwinestown is very easy to get at. Their meetings are on the market day, and a lot of people go there and kill the two birds with one stone.

5601. There is not much outdoor relief given in Irwinestown 1—There is not any unless certified by the doctor.

5602. I don't suppose it was over 5l. a week 1—I don't suppose it was.

5603. Do you agree with what your colleagues has said about outdoor relief; would you be in favour of confining it on the present lines 1—I would.

5604. Have you ever heard of any hardship resulting from your too strict administration of outdoor relief 1—No; I don't think it is too strict.

5605. Well, any alleged too strictness 1—I don't think so; the doctors certify where it is necessary.

5606. Have you ever heard of any families being in great distress or suffering owing to their unwillingness to go to the workhouse and owing to the fact that they did not get any outdoor relief 1—No, I have not; nothing has come to my notice that way.

5607. Mr. MURKIN.—Have you many labourers in the locality 1—About the average.

5608. What happens to them when the head of the family gets sick 1—If he has not a family to support him he goes to the workhouse.

5609. If he has a wife and family 1—In most cases the family are able to support him before he is ready for the workhouse.

5610. Do labourers' children grow that quick down there 1—Very few go to the workhouse.

5611. Take a man between thirty and forty with

four or five young children, who are, none of them, able to earn at all, where there was no earning in the house 1—I don't know of any such case.

5612. If you have many labourers you can hardly help having cases of the kind 1—Well, of course, he has to go to the workhouse if he is not certified by the doctor.

5613. And the family has to go with him 1—There is not any such case in the workhouse.

5614. CHAIRMAN.—You have not had whole families coming in 1—Not since I was there.

5615. You have had a man coming in for treatment, leaving his family outside 1—Yes.

5616. You don't know how that family gets on?—Nearly in every case some of them are able to work.

5617. But where they would not be able to work 1—I don't know of any such case.

5618. Mr. MURKIN.—I suppose there is some resolution on the books to the effect that outdoor relief cannot be granted except on a doctor's certificate 1—I believe so.

5619. Then that detour a Guardian from proposing such a thing 1—I don't know that I have ever known any of the Guardians to propose such a thing.

5620. You have heard the Chairman say that if there is such a resolution it is quite illegal 1—I heard so.

5621. I hope you will hear that in mind if any case of destitution comes under your notice 1—I don't know that there is any such resolution.

5622. What is your objection to having Tyrone a county with in itself instead of separating yourself and going to another county; what is the reason you desire that unusual position 1—Convenience, principally.

5623. CHAIRMAN.—Being so near Irwinestown 1—Yes.

5624. Mr. MURKIN.—Railway facilities are good in connection with Omagh 1—It is hard getting from Trillick to Omagh. It is not so easy getting from Trillick to the railway station; it is fully two miles.

5625. Have you any idea of the number of Tyrone people in the Irwinestown Workhouse 1—I have not.

CHAIRMAN.—There are no other witnesses from a distance here now. I don't know whether it would be worth going into the Omagh evidence.

Mr. Muldoon.—I think not.

CHAIRMAN.—I don't know whether you have any observations to make?

Mr. Muldoon.—We can do that to-morrow morning.

The Sitting was adjourned.

THIRTEENTH PUBLIC SITTING.—THURSDAY, OCTOBER 29TH, 1902.

Oct. 29, 1902.

At the Courthouse, Osnagh.

Present:—Mr. MICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. COEY BRODER.

Dr. EDWARD C. THOMPSON, M.D., examined.

5620. CHAIRMAN.—We will be very glad to hear the views that you were kind enough to offer to give the Commission?—Well, I will be very glad indeed, I need hardly say, to help the Commission in any way I possibly can by giving an expression of my opinion on the subjects referred to the Commission, but would it not be better for you to put any questions to me on the subject?

5621. If you wish, certainly. The first of our questions was about the amalgamation of unions; is that a subject on which you have any view?—Yes; I have a very strong opinion upon the amalgamation of unions. I am confident that there are a great deal too many workhouses in this country. After the time of the famine, and when the population of Ireland was eight millions, and when the people were very much poorer than, I am glad to say, they are now, of course it is perfectly clear that the workhouses were required, but it is equally clear that they are not wanted now. For instance, in Tyrone we have six workhouses, which house 800 poor between them, very little more than the one asylum for Tyrone and Fermanagh combined; at any rate, three workhouses should be quite sufficient for the County Tyrone.

5622. There are six at present, and you think three would be sufficient?—I think the retention of the workhouses in Strabane, Osnagh, and Dungannon should be more than ample for the County Tyrone.

5623. Then, as regards the other workhouses—Chesham, Clough, and Cookstown—I should imagine they are hardly wanted; the number of poor people in them is very small, and, of course, the expense of maintaining them is very great.

5624. Then, as regards provision for the treatment of the sick locally, if those three workhouses were closed?—I think, as regards the treatment of the sick, if the district hospitals were really made efficient hospitals, which, of course, they are not, they have no pretension to be, and if there was established in our county one efficient surgical hospital—take Derry, Banickillen, or Armagh—some of those hospitals that are really good—

5625. Dr. BRODER.—On your own county?—I am leaving that for others to say. I think by such a system you would have ample accommodation for the care of the sick. Another suggestion I would make, speaking from my experience in County Tyrone, is that I would change workhouse hospitals out of the workhouse altogether and utilise the present fever hospitals as workhouse hospitals. If you changed the name of these hospitals and removed them from actual contact with workhouses it would be a good thing when you have these admirable buildings. In Osnagh you have a first-class fever hospital, also in Dungannon and Strabane. If you changed these hospitals from the body of the workhouse and turned the fever hospitals into workhouse hospitals, with very little expense you would make them very much better hospitals. The present workhouse hospitals in the body of the house could be used for the more infirm inmates.

5626. CHAIRMAN.—That is as regards the workhouses you would keep open; as regards the workhouses that you would close?—There is a good deal of talk about technical education. They could be utilised for that purpose.

5627. I mean more what provision you would make for the sick at the places where you closed the workhouses?—I think if you had a proper system of ambulances connected with the different district hospitals you would be able quite well to convey the sick to the three unions.

5628. The longest distance we heard yesterday was twenty-five miles over a bad road?—That is rather a long distance, but the number that would have to be conveyed for that length would be very few. And then

you have got tramways and you have the County Tyrone well supplied with railways. You would not have much difficulty, so far as our county is concerned, in bringing the poor to these different institutions.

5629. A considerable number of sick would have to be removed by ambulance?—They certainly would, but with a proper system of ambulances I think you would have no trouble.

5630. You really think that these three unions, if the workhouses were broken up, could be served by the three you propose to keep on, even for the sick?—I think so, even for the sick.

5631. Then your own cases in your own infirmary, they come from the extreme end of the county?—We have them coming from all directions.

5632. Have they ever to be brought by ambulance?—No; they always come themselves; there is no ambulance connected with our infirmary at all.

5633. They are all cases fit for removal?—They are sent even in carriages; friends take a carriage for them and come with them; there are lots of cases of surgical injuries and strangulated hernia, and other cases, that come to the hospital from long distances.

5634. They would be brought in a carriage with good springs?—Exactly.

5635. Dr. BRODER.—Would it be a great advantage to have an ambulance arrangement?—It would be an advantage if we had, but in our county infirmary we have not the money.

5636. If there was some system for the whole county, an efficient ambulance system, to bring acute cases that could not go by train?—It would be a great advantage if we had it.

5637. In the case of perforations and cases of that kind, owing to the want of a proper system of ambulance, deaths must very often take place when otherwise the patients could be operated on?—My own experience is that the outside public has no idea of the suffering to which the poor are exposed, owing to the want of a good surgical hospital in a county where it does not exist; not only that, but the number of people who are crippled that, if you had a good surgical hospital, could be operated upon, and enabled to earn their own bread. I have seen it not only in this county, but other counties, notably before there was an improved condition of things in the infirmary at Derry there were a number of poor people used to come down here from Derry—people who had to other place but Belfast. There is no comparison between this country and England. In England you have an immense number of wealthy people, millionaires, and others, who like to spend their money in establishing hospitals, and keep them up afterwards by large subscriptions. In this country we have nothing of the sort, and the people who have money are not in the habit of subscribing to these institutions, and won't do it. In Tyrone we have had an example of extreme generosity on the part of a number of gentlemen who have largely subscribed to build the new hospital which you saw to-day. We have got the hospital, but the difficulty we have now is in getting money to keep it up.

5638. CHAIRMAN.—Don't you think it is a sound principle that all hospitals for the treatment of the poor should be maintained out of the rates rather than out of casual subscriptions?—I most certainly think the State should look after the sick and wounded soldiers of the army of labour not only in this country but also in other countries. If you had a perfect system of district hospitals and had then a good central county hospital for the care of surgical cases, manned by a really able surgeon, and paid well, with his practice restricted to consultation work with his professional brethren and time given him to devote himself to the scientific aspect

Dr. Edward C. Thompson.

Oct. 29, 1900

Dr. Edward C. Thompson.

of his profession, able to be called in in any severe surgical case in the district hospitals, you would have in each county a perfect system for looking after the poor, and I have no hesitation in saying that in the absence of that system you have the poor exposed to inefficient treatment, and really torture in many cases, and there are a large number of cripples unable to earn their bread existing in every county in Ireland in consequence of not having a suitable and proper system. I believe it would be a model plan if you could have these district hospitals removed from the care of the Boards of Guardians and placed under an asylum and hospitals committee. The Guardians have the best intentions in the world in this country, I know they have the best intentions to do what is right for the care of the people, but they really don't understand what a hospital should be or what the care of the sick means; they don't understand proper nursing; they think of saving a few pounds, and instead of saving money the result is greatly increased expense. A proper and thoroughly efficient system, such as I suggest, would be the greatest possible benefit to the poor and the taxpayers of this country.

5645. Your suggestion would be that all hospitals should be maintained by a committee, such as you have to deal with yourself?—Noted by the County Council, who represent the taxpayers.

5646. Dr. BROWN.—Largely composed of the County Council?—Yes.

5647. Principally composed of the County Council?—You could not have that, because that would give them more work than they could do, but they are sufficiently acquainted with their own county to be enabled to nominate proper people from each district to look after these institutions.

5648. CHAIRMAN.—Should a council could reserve to itself certain matters on which the committee could only report if there was any difficulty to hand over complete control?—Of course they could, but I don't anticipate there would be any difficulty on the part of the County Council; they have nominated an excellent committee for our county hospital.

5649. How do they stand on that hospital committee?—Sixteen of the County Council and eight others.

5650. Therefore the County Council has a preponderating voice?—Because they give the most money.

5651. But you would propose they should have it under the district scheme?—Yes.

5652. Dr. BROWN.—Could you point to any savings by having all hospitals under one management?—I think it would save a good deal of confusion and tend to the same treatment in the different district hospitals, and these people by degrees would become skilled in the requirements of these different hospitals, and probably take a good deal of interest in the management of the hospital and the care of the sick, and I have no doubt by the abolition of these institutions that are not required in our county, and other counties as well, wherever you have efficiency you will have economy, and wherever you have not efficiency you will have waste, and when dealing with the sick and poor a county authority, like the County Council, should take particular care that they are treated with every advantage that can be given to them so as to ensure that they shall not suffer, and shall have the best possible medical care that money can provide them with. As regards the county hospitals, I would like to see the Poor Law medical service in Ireland completely re-organized so that you should give the dispensary medical officers and workhouse officers a chance of something better than they get when appointed in the way of money and position—that is that all these positions should be better than the actual dispensary doctor has got, but he might look forward to being promoted to these different positions or he showed himself efficient and able.

5653. CHAIRMAN.—In what way would you carry such a system out?—By examination.

5654. You have independent County Councils in each county; do you propose promotion should be only within the limits of the county, or that men should be promoted generally throughout Ireland?—I think it would be a good thing if you could have it established that admission to the service should be by examination, and promotion by efficiency, ability, and attention to business.

5655. That would be a good competitive examination, like for India?—Yes; if you want a county surgeon to look after the roads he is examined to see how he knows his business, but in this country in the case of the appointment of a doctor the question is one of politics

and religion; it does not matter twopenny if you are the best surgeon in London in certain places in this country; it is simply a question of what religion or politics you are. I would have a man promoted solely for his own professional ability, and brains, and work; the men that succeed generally know something about their business, and I have no doubt it would not be hard to re-organize the Irish Poor Law medical service so that these should be the qualities that should distinguish the men who have to take care of the lives and relieve the suffering of the poor. You should make the service as efficient as you can possibly make it.

5656. You had in your mind some method of promotion by some body?—Suppose there is a vacancy in the Omagh County Infirmary and they want a surgeon, the man appointed in that position should be a man who is able to satisfy a board of examiners that he is capable of holding the position; there is no other way in which you really can have an efficient person appointed.

5657. The mere preliminary qualification of a diploma or degree?—He should have a superior medical qualification in the first instance, and in the next instance he should satisfy the board of examiners. If you appoint an assistant master you examine him to see how he is qualified for the position; how much more necessary is it that a man who has to perform difficult surgical operations should be able to perform them? He should certainly not be appointed surgeon to a surgical hospital unless he has had at any rate five years' experience of surgical work. For instance, in the Asylum the Local Government Act ordains that a fresh appointment is to be made in the position of medical superintendent in the asylum he is to have five or seven years' residence in an asylum before he is capable; how much more necessary is it that the surgeon of a county infirmary should be a man proved able to do the work he is called upon to do. Surgical work, I need not say, is a handicraft. There is a general idea in the country that anybody, once he is qualified, can walk into a hospital and do any surgical operation he is called upon to do. In these days, with abdominal sections, and difficult operations, and septic treatment brought to such perfection, a man is a standing danger if he is brought in to do a surgical operation if he does not know his work. As a rule when you are qualified, you just know about enough, as far as practical work is concerned, not to poison the whole community. It is only by practice and experience that you can become able for hospital work, and it follows as a natural consequence that a person appointed to a very important position should be a person who knows something about how to carry on the work he is appointed for. If you had the district hospitals properly managed, properly assessed—what they are not—the patients properly looked after—what they are not—re-modelled in every way and brought up to date, and difficult cases and other things that could not be well attended to in the district hospitals, moved to the county infirmary, then you would have, I maintain, a perfect system for the care and looking after of the sick. And if you had these institutions not under the care of the Boards of Guardians but under an asylum and hospital committee in each county, nominated by the County Council, you would have a very efficient means indeed of doing all that is necessary for the care of the sick, and those seriously affected by surgical ailments especially.

5658. As regards the question of removal by ambulance, am I right in thinking it is not a matter of very great importance as regards the comfort or health of the patient whether he is removed fifteen or twenty-five miles in a good ambulance?—Not at all; the additional ten miles would be comparatively unimportant, and I need not say in these days, when probably in the near future you will have motor cars and motor ambulances, there will be nothing to prevent them going quickly to these different hospitals; the motor car will probably be as easy to keep up and maintain, and just as cheap as a horse ambulance would be; for these long distances you require a two-horse ambulance probably, and you certainly will get over the ground much quicker in a motor ambulance, and with very much less shaking to the patient. I don't think once you have a patient in an ambulance that it matters very much whether he has to travel ten, fifteen, or twenty-five miles.

5659. A comfortable ambulance with a skilled attendant?—See what happens in campaigns; look at the distances that have to be travelled by patients under conditions that existed in South Africa.

5591. Of course that was necessary!—That was necessary, but still they were conveyed with comparative safety in suitable ambulances. There is another point about infectious hospitals. Supposing the workhouse hospital here was turned into a district hospital there would be nothing in the world to prevent an iron annex being put up, lined with non-inflammable current, and made to contain five beds for men and five for women, or any size. Very often there are no patients here in the workhouse hospital, and, as a rule, there are not more than three or four.

5592. You would want different wards for different diseases?—Certainly; the same as in the asylum.

5593. You would want two or three wards in each fever hospital for each sex?—One for each sex would be sufficient.

5594. Dr. BARNES.—To separate scrofula from typhus, and typhus from typhoid?—Yes; you could easily manage that; four small wards.

5595. You might not have male and female at the same time?—No. Then again, when the fever hospital was not in use you could utilize your fever hospital again; she could be disinfected. We constantly send a nurse from our institution to assist the nurse at the Oagh Workhouse fever hospital, and she is disinfected and comes back to us.

CHAIRMAN.—That is done in a great number of hospitals now.

5596. Dr. BARNES.—In the same way you would not require to staff in the fever hospital?—Only when they were wanted.

5597. You would not require even to keep one; nearly all the fever hospitals have one permanent nurse; a good deal of waste!—A good deal of waste; you could utilize her for the purpose of the other hospital when she was not required. In the asylum they have two nurses for infectious complaints, and the wardens, when not required in the asylum, are used in the body of the house.

5598. Would you transfer cases from the district hospitals to the county infirmary?—Certainly; cases requiring surgical treatment, abdominal sections, &c. It would take a large sum of money to turn the district hospitals into real surgical hospitals.

5599. But cases of emergency might often be done there?—Certainly.

5600. Would you recommend that the surgeon attached to the county infirmary might be available to assist the district surgeon?—Certainly.

5601. And that his remuneration attached to the county infirmary would cover all such charges?—Except his travelling expenses.

5602. His fees?—If it was a difficult operation that would be a matter of arrangement.

5603. It would be much better that he would be available without the idea of a separate fee?—Certainly; that would be simply a question of what, when he was appointed, he agreed to do, under what conditions he was appointed.

5604. About surgery, you mentioned that every doctor is not qualified to be a surgeon; how would you keep up efficiency, even attached to a district hospital?—There is a good deal of minor surgical work that is done in a district hospital, and that should be capable of being done by the man who is in charge of it.

5605. Occasionally, I suppose, if he had a case sent from the district hospital to the county hospital you would recommend that he might come with it if his other arrangements would permit, and in that way keep in touch with better surgery?—Certainly; I need not say in this county my professional brethren constantly send operation cases to the infirmary here and often come and help at the operation, and are very glad to come, and I am very glad to see them.

5606. And in that way they keep in touch with all the newer arrangements; you would not recommend a post-graduate course?—For the dispensary doctors.

5607. No; but as regards the district hospitals?—I would certainly recommend a post-graduate course. Every man that wants to keep himself up in his work must keep in touch with the advance in surgical work. For instance, he should go to London to spend his holiday looking at what is going on in the surgical hospitals, and a good many men do that.

5608. A great many men do that?—Men that are interested in their profession do that, or they lapse back to inefficiency. If a man wants to get on he must work at his profession. He should get every facility such as army surgeons are getting at the present time

under the new scheme. A medical officer of the dispensary who applies to the Guardians stating that he wants to go through a post-graduate course, the Guardians should certainly give him leave and be very glad that their officer was so anxious to get on.

5609. With the rapid advance in surgery, you think that is necessary, at least for a man attached to a hospital?—I am sure it is essential.

5610. You know a great deal about the medical men attached to the county infirmaries?—I do.

5611. Do they, as a rule, go?—I am sorry to say that a good many of the county infirmaries in other parts of Ireland are not as good as the infirmaries in the North of Ireland; I think they should be all remodelled.

5612. About the North, do you know that a good many men do go over?—Dr. Palmer—well, I don't want to particularize them; I know them all, and I know they are all men who take the keenest interest in their profession, and do excellent surgical work, every one of them.

5613. Then you would have the district hospitals attached to the county infirmary as a branch hospital; you would not bring down the county infirmary level, but would bring up the district hospital level?—Bringing it up as perfect as you could make it; if you did that you would do a great deal to improve matters in this country which at the present time are in a very bad state.

5614. An interchange of the nursing system would also tend to efficiency?—The central surgical hospital should be the training school for the nurses of the district hospitals. Take the Tyrone County Hospital, the nurses have to pay a fee to become nurses, they are thoroughly trained in practical work; of course there is a great deal of the work of teaching nurses that, in my opinion, is simply useless, but they are trained thoroughly, so far as practical nursing is concerned. They come from the best class of families in the county, they are well-conducted girls, they are in touch with the poor, which is a great matter. For instance, the nurses coming from different parts of Tyrone, when they are trained, if they go to district hospitals they hardly go to one that they don't come in contact with patients that they know belonging to their own county, and the patients are more at home with them than with nurses coming from large city hospitals, and they do their work most admirably. I think the county hospital should be the training place for the nurses of their own county as far as they possibly can learn them. The Local Government Board have got an idea that to require 140 beds to train a nurse; that is not the case; you can train a nurse in a small hospital with fifty or sixty beds, such as we have got, quite efficiently.

5615. Those are matters that have been discussed, and we need not enter into just at present. Regarding some of the other points?—Then there is the question of the workhouse themselves. I need not say that so far as my experience goes of the Irish workhouses that they are in a very inefficient and, I would say, incredible state. They are housing places for the poor where they can linger on in their miserable condition without actually very acute suffering until their time comes to go to their graves, but as far as any comforts or proper care goes it does not exist in the workhouses I have seen.

5616. CHAIRMAN.—You are speaking of workhouses as distinguished from the infirmaries?—I am not speaking of the workhouse infirmaries, they have been vastly improved of late years; you have an excellent one, for instance, in this town of Oagh, where the patients are extremely comfortable and well looked after in every way.

5617. You are talking of the aged and infirm wards?—Yes; where they are all huddled up—good characters with bad characters; there is no separation and no discipline such as should be. I should say the workhouses here should be much the same as the county asylum, where they have reading rooms and some amusements, and patients that are able to work are given little things to do; in these places they do nothing but loll about.

5618. You have some workhouses in your mind?—I have a good number.

5619. Have you visited many?—I have visited a good many. I was a Local Government Board Inspector for some time. I visited a number of the workhouses in the North, Oagh, Derry, Strabane, Lonsdale, Enniskillen, Clough, Castleblair, and Oobokroo; there may be others, but I visited all those, and some recently.

On 19, 1905.
—
Dr. Edward C.
Thompson

Oct. 23, 1892.

Dr. Edward C. Thompson.

5698. And some workhouses in the South?—That, of course, is a good while ago—1881.

5699. Do you remember what workhouse?—I was in Cork; in one of the chief wards in the oldest arrangement was partitioned off the ward, in which they had a McFarlane's patent trough, and that was the closest where the patients had to go for some of the functions of the human body; the stench, of course, was abominable. But I know some workhouses not far from this, and in a place where you would imagine things were much better, where the only sanitary arrangement is a bucket.

5701. At night?—No; that is the only way they have as far as a closet is concerned, and I was speaking to one of the Guardians, who said that was a very much better thing than they have in the country, for there they go behind a ditch for this purpose; but that is a fact. I was not very long ago in this workhouse; there is not a bathroom or a closet in it, and the only arrangement is a bucket.

5702. What ward would that be in; in the sick ward?—In the aged and infirm ward. I must confess I don't see much difference in what ward of the workhouse; this is the general system in this workhouse; it was told me by the master himself.

5703. I am rather sceptical of its accuracy!—There is no mistake about it; I went myself and saw it.

5704. Perhaps you will write me on a slip of paper the name of the workhouse?—I will; I will tell you afterwards. These workhouses, too, are badly lighted.

5705. Dr. BROOKS.—Would you suggest anything in the matter of classification?—Of course I would classify the inmates of the workhouse and remove the children from the workhouses as far as you can possibly do so.

5706. What would you do with the children?—I would board them out as far as possible; I would take them away out of the workhouse, for as sure as you don't you simply are building up a workhouse population for the future.

5707. You would board them out in the district?—Board them out, or take a house in the town, as they have done in Sheffield; get them out of the atmosphere of the workhouse as far as you possibly can. Of course there are some children with their mothers that you cannot separate.

5708. CHAIRMAN.—That is the question; about separation, how far do you think the legislature should sanction separation?—In a great many cases it would be a very good job for children if they could be separated from their mothers.

5709. Could you draw a line?—Where it was proved the mother had no means of living, where she was dragging her children about, as a tramp, from place to place, where the children were suffering, and it was clear had no comfort. The other day I went into the Oragh Workhouse tramp ward, and saw the place after the race; one unfortunate woman came in with four children; she had tramped the whole way from Donagall. There they were, five looking little children; of course they had suffered from want, but it was clear they had a good physique if they got a chance; they were wet through and shivering with cold and hunger; it was a reproach to civilisation to see such a state of affairs.

5710. Dr. BROOKS.—Would you approve of legislation to deal with them?—I would; I know it would have to be carefully guarded.

5711. Could you suggest any safeguards?—It requires a great deal of thought to suggest remedies.

5712. It has not occurred to you?—It has occurred to me, but I know the difficulties surrounding a question of the sort, but where you see children treated in this way by their mothers, and their mother is a bad character, and has no means of existence, but exposes her children to suffering, the children should be taken hold of by the State and put into homes and brought up to be decent members of the community. You may inflict a hardship upon a mother, but really I don't see what the hardship is. In the example I have quoted you have four human beings suffering and likely to suffer in the future, and you can do nothing on account of a sentimental grievance to the mother. It is a question that requires the gravest consideration, but it demands a very great change in the existing system.

5713. What about the tramps?—They are a positive danger to the community and a nuisance; they call the workhouse their hotel, and between the jail and the workhouse they spend their whole time.

5714. What would you do?—Certainly, if they came to the workhouse, I would keep them locked up for three or four days and make them do work that would pay for their keep. I would have a place separate and

distinct for them, and in the first place I would keep them thoroughly cleansed, and in most of the workhouses they have no baths for the purpose.

5715. With regard to the inmates?—I would remove all the inmates from workhouses to an auxiliary asylum.

5716. Why an auxiliary asylum?—In the Oragh asylum, if they go on as they are at present doing—they are emptying the workhouses and sending their filth and microbes into the asylum, with the result that the asylum will have to be enlarged at enormous expense. If there was a proper place to put these people in you could take 100 or 150 or 200 patients out of the Oragh asylum and clear all the workhouses, and have an auxiliary asylum under the care of the assistant medical superintendent subject to constant supervision by the medical superintendent of the asylum. For instance, in Oragh you have a jail that could be turned into an auxiliary asylum.

5717. It would mean a separate staff?—It would, but if you throw a large number of people into the asylum you will require an increased staff as well.

5718. Not a new staff?—Not a new staff.

5719. Not a clerk or superintendent or medical?—The cost of building is enormous. These salaries would not be very much, considering the expenditure of capital.

5720. Where would you draw the line; are there not very large numbers in the asylum of practically the same class that are at present in the workhouses?—There are a very large number.

5721. Drawn from the same class in the community?—Yes.

5722. CHAIRMAN.—Your idea is you would not leave the inmates in the workhouse?—I would not; I would put them into an asylum for the insane. If you choose not to make use of an auxiliary asylum, all right; you will have to enlarge the present asylum, but I would not leave an insane person of any description in the workhouse. Another thing that is most necessary is the establishment of a home for the treatment of consumption. Every doctor knows now that phthisis is about one of the most infectious diseases there is; if you don't take care you spread infection right, left, and centre. Unless you isolate the people afflicted with this complaint you spread the disease all over the country. You could utilise one of these disused workhouses and turn it into a consumptive sanatorium; besides you have a much better chance of having a patient cured in a proper place where you have all the arrangements that an increased scientific knowledge of the disease provides.

5723. What kind of a site would you look for—close to the sea or in a mountainous country?—High and dry, with plenty of sun—as much as you can get in this country.

5724. Would the sea be an advantage or a disadvantage?—I don't know that the sea is any great advantage; some of the sanatoria at St. Moritz, Davos Platz, and other places, are up in the dry mountain air.

5725. Would it be an advantage to have one near the sea?—I have a great belief in the sea myself, but this would be rather a difficulty if you want to have a consumption sanatorium in each county.

5726. You have workhouses, which may be rented, near the sea and inland; which would be best?—I cannot say that statistics will prove that there is any great advantage in being near the sea.

5727. Dr. BROOKS.—There is no disadvantage?—There is no disadvantage.

5728. CHAIRMAN.—You would have one for each county or group of counties?—You would require one for each county.

5729. Dr. BROOKS.—From your own knowledge, do you think there is an increase of consumption?—I cannot say about the increase; I think there is a tremendous amount of it.

5730. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose cases are recognised now that used not to be?—Yes; a microscopic examination of the sputum makes you pretty sure you are correct in your diagnosis.

5731. Dr. BROOKS.—Regarding paying patients in the county hospital and also district hospitals, do you think much could be received from that source?—The pay wards in the county hospital are of very great advantage, and they are largely availed of.

5732. I don't exactly mean pay wards, but a patient might pay something?—Every patient that is able to pay should pay something. If we got a patient into our hospital who pays 10s. a week, without giving them anything very elaborate in the way of a better dietary, we do make a difference.

5732. Do you think that fair to a poor person?—Certainly; because it encourages others to pay. I don't see if a person pays 10s. or 15s. in a ward why he should not get some little better food than a person who does not.

5734. Everybody requires the same amount of food?—There are little extra comforts.

5735. CHAIRMAN.—You don't deny to the lowest class of patient any little article of food or comfort?—Certainly not, but if they pay something extra to the hospital I think they should get something extra; I know they don't in the asylum; a patient who pays gets the same; I cannot see the justice of the principle.

5736. In all the large hospitals don't they get exactly the same treatment?—The paying patients get better; for instance, in the Adelaide Hospital.

5737. Very often the medical officer does not know what the patient is paying?—In the pay wards!

5738. Oh, of course; but one patient may pay 5s. a week and another 15s. —Oh, there is no difference made in that way.

5739. It is only to encourage them to pay, so that they should feel a certain independence attached to paying something, even though it may be a small thing?—Yes.

5740. What is the smallest amount you receive?—5s.; it greatly depends on the patient as we know them.

5741. Would it be any advantage to go below that—5s. or 3s. 1?—Certainly it would be a great advantage to the hospital if we could do it.

5742. You think some of the patients would gladly give a few shillings?—I think so.

5743. That system is in operation at Enniskillen?—It is, but there are disadvantages connected with it; there is a difficulty in asking persons about their means. For instance, I would have great hesitation when I admitted a patient to the hospital in asking him about his means and what he is to pay; there is a difficulty about it as far as the head of the institution is concerned.

5744. It is more a matter for the committee?—It is more a matter for the committee.

5745. Dr. BROWN.—Or the matron?—The matron might do it.

5746. If it was done as a systematic thing it would soon be generally known?—Certainly.

5747. Some persons suggested that it was the governor who gave the lines should do it?—Yes; he might give a different coloured line or mark upon the line if a person was able to pay.

5748. You would approve of the principle?—I would, certainly; that as far as they possibly could pay they should be allowed to pay. Another thing about the workhouses is the separation of husband and wife; as far as possible they might be allowed to pass their time together.

5749. CHAIRMAN.—If they wish?—If they wish; some of them don't; a good number don't. Another thing is the day-room for patients that are able to be up; now they have no place to sit in except the wards, and above all things most important in the treatment of the poor is having some person to look after them. In the workhouse they have what they call invalid wards, but I don't see much difference between the invalid wards and the rest of the house in most of the workhouses I have seen.

5750. Do you think the system of Jubilee or district nursing at all prevents the overcrowding of the district hospitals?—I am sure it does.

5751. Would you be in favour of the extension of this system and placing it on the rates?—Certainly; it is just as necessary as having a midwifery nurse.

5752. There are a great many cases that could be treated in their own houses if you had a district nurse?—Certainly.

5753. Dr. BROWN.—And you could discharge them earlier from hospital if you knew there was a district nurse to visit them?—Certainly; that is done every day with people living near Omagh. We tell them to go home, and know the district nurse will attend to them after a little treatment in the hospital.

5754. That would tend to relieve the hospital and tend to economy and efficiency?—Certainly.

5755. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—You say you approve of amalgamation and think that these workhouses would be sufficient for the County Tyrone?—I am sure of it.

5756. What class of inmates would you put in those five workhouses?—The poor, of course; just the same as you have at the present time.

5747. You would put in the infirm and aged?—Certainly; the same as at present.

5748. What about the children?—I would not put the children into the workhouse at all if I could avoid it, but as far as possible keep them out.

5749. What about the harmless lunatics?—I would remove them from the workhouse and put them in an auxiliary asylum. I often wondered why it was that a plan of that sort was not adopted, that one of the workhouses or jails was not utilized for the purpose of an auxiliary asylum. For instance, you will have to build an Omagh asylum before long; it is completely full.

5750. Perhaps if you dug a little deeper you would have changed your opinion; are you aware that auxiliary asylums are more costly than lunatic asylums?—I have dug pretty deeply, because I have been connected with an asylum for thirty years.

5751. Are you aware that patients can be kept cheaper in a lunatic asylum than in an auxiliary?—Certainly I know that, because you don't take into consideration the amount of the capital expenditure in erecting your building; if you take the £50,000 you have spent in Omagh asylum and take the interest on that and add it on to the cost per head of the lunatic I doubt if you will find any difference in the cost.

5752. CHAIRMAN.—Is not that done, doctor; I rather think it is; repayment and interest instalments are calculated as part of the annual income?—Then take the cost per head; if you do that I don't see that you really would have any great increased expenditure by utilizing one of these buildings for the housing of the harmless lunatics.

5753. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Do you mean one of the disused workhouses or a building in addition to the present asylum?—Closing one of the disused workhouses or jails.

5754. Are you aware by doing so you lose £5 per head per patient?—Yes; but is not this Commission going to make recommendations, and if that is a mistake can they not say that the same percentage per head should be given for these harmless lunatics that are going to be put into a separate institution.

5755. Do you think the British Treasury is so soft?—They have been liberal lately; I don't see why they should not give us more money.

5756. Have you been able during your time in Parliament to get any extra grant from the Treasury?—I don't say that I have, but I don't know whether you have not. If a lunatic is entitled to a capitation grant of 4s. per head in the county asylum, surely if you have an auxiliary asylum under the control and management of the same board, because they happen to be in a different building it is no reason they should not get the same capitation grant, and I have no doubt if this Commission recommends that one of these workhouses or jails should be utilized for harmless lunatics the Government will give us the capitation grant.

5757. Is it your view that by amalgamation economy could be produced; are you aware amalgamation presents considerable difficulty?—I am sure of that; for everything good you want to do you have to conquer insuperable difficulties before you succeed.

5758. Do you think it is by retrenchment and reform rather than amalgamation?—You can do a good deal by retrenchment and reform, but I doubt if you can save much money as workhouses are at present managed.

5759. You say we could shut up Cloghery, Castlederg, and Omeagher?—I think so.

5760. What would you do with the inmates of those localities?—I would bring them to those other remodelled and improved workhouses, or almshouses, or homes for the poor; I would abolish the name workhouse, because if they are anything they are not workhouses.

5761. Still by some other name you would allow the institution to remain?—I would keep no institution in these places.

5762. What would you do with the sick?—The sick would be brought to the hospitals of Dungannon, Omagh, or Bisham.

5763. You would deprive those outlying localities of the facilities you would give to other parts of the county?—Patients from parts of the Castlederg Union have to go long distances to the Castlederg Workhouse.

5764. Do you not think some institution would be required in these localities?—I do not; I think once you have a patient in an ambulance it matters little, as far as the patient is concerned, whether you have to take him fifteen miles or twenty miles.

Oct. 29, 1901.
 Dr Edward C.
 Thompson.

5765. Might it not happen that they would die on the way?—They might die going five miles; not more likely to die by being an extra half hour in the ambulance.

5766. Why should you take the advantage of having an institution for the healing of the sick and the care of the aged and infirm from one locality to another?—That is the difficulty you have to deal with; all the witnesses that come to you from the different districts are interested witnesses, and will all tell you that they want the institution in their own locality.

5767. I think it is the general view of almost every witness that some institution will be required in the district in place of the workhouses amalgamated—something in the shape of a cottage hospital or something that will give facilities for the sick?—I think we have too many workhouses in this country.

5768. But you don't think we have too many hospitals?—I think you would be much better off if you had an arrangement such as I suggest.

5769. There is the difficulty of transportation?—I don't look upon that as a very great difficulty.

5770. The bringing of the sick and the aged long distances?—In our country there should not be much difficulty, because it is well supplied with railways.

5771. Would it not appear to you that it would be just as well to try and remodel those existing institutions—that is to cut down the staff and expenditure?—I don't think you have got a large enough staff. What do you think of a ward with twenty-five helpless people with no proper person trained to look after them except pauper inmates, and when they want to get their meals the workhouse master has to go in and help; is that proper care of the sick? I say it is anything but that. I maintain, and do so from long experience and a very great deal of thought, that if you really want to look after the poor and treat them as they have a right to be treated you will have to remodel all these workhouses and greatly increase the cost of looking after the poor; it is a scandal the way the poor are looked after.

5772. Are you aware the object of our Commission is to cheapen the method and not to increase the cost?—I had a good deal to do with suggesting this Commission. I brought under the notice of the House of Commons the perfectly scandalous and disgraceful treatment of the poor in the workhouses.

5773. How does the treatment of the poor in Ireland compare with the treatment of the poor in England?—Very badly; the workhouses in England is a great many instances are a great deal too good.

5774. Have you not yourself said in the House of Commons that the poor in England were not as well treated as they are in the poor country of Ireland?—No, I never did; because I did not know, and I never like to say anything in the House of Commons that I am not pretty sure of. I have seen some of the workhouses in England, and, as I say, I think they are almost too good; you must take care and not make the workhouses too comfortable; but I do say that when you have a workhouse filled with helpless poor people you cannot treat them too kindly or look after them too well, and I say it is no way to manage a ward for twenty-five patients with no proper nurse to look after them—no trained nurses, but paupers.

5775. CHAIRMAN.—That is not a nurse in the shape of a sick nurse?—But the workhouse people are all sick.

5776. Would you call being aged and infirm sick?—I call them all sick.

5777. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Then why take them away from their localities?—If you go into the Oranagh Workhouse and walk through the wards you will find they are not suffering from acute trouble, still there they are; they are old and infirm and feeble, and complaining of pains and aches, and you could not cure them as anything else but broken down and worn out.

5778. That being so, would not these people require some local institution?—Yes; but, believe me, you will have them far better looked after in a large institution, such as I say, than in these little small workhouses. If you want to see really bad workhouses go and look at the small ones; the larger ones, as a rule, are much better.

5779. CHAIRMAN.—Including Cork?—I don't know anything about Cork now; I am only telling you what I saw.

5780. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—About the Guardians, you say they are very extravagant in their management?—Oh, faith, they are not; there are very few Guardians who bother themselves much about the workhouse busi-

ness at all; they like to go and attend the meetings and have discussions, and all that, but as to knowing anything about what the workhouse is or should be they simply know nothing about it.

5781. I suppose they know how they get the money to keep up the workhouses?—Yes; but if these institutions were properly managed you would not lose any money; the reason you are squandering money is simply from inefficiency.

5782. Let us take a concrete case—the Oranagh County Infirmary—Is surely it efficiently managed?—I am not going to say anything about it.

5783. Let us compare the two institutions?—You could not compare them.

5784. What is the cost per head of the inmates of the County Infirmary?—I think it is wonderfully cheap; 2s each about.

5785. CHAIRMAN.—The average cost of each bed is £42 and the cost of each patient £2 12s. 6d.—But it is a hospital; you cannot compare them.

5786. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Is not the workhouse but a hospital?—It is a different story; look what it costs to perform a serious surgical operation.

5787. When you have made such a sweeping charge against the Guardians of Ireland you ought to have some ground to offer for it?—I am not making a sweeping charge.

5788. I take your own institution to compare with the infirmaries; it does seem to me that you cannot show that the Boards of Guardians are extravagant—I simply say you have a thing to do, and must do, and you should do it as efficiently as you can, and are a much money, but at the same time have your institutions efficient institutions that you should not be ashamed of, and you should be ashamed of a great number of the Irish workhouses. If we had our own government in this country, as you and I want to have, we would have very different workhouses.

5789. Have there not been a great many improvements made recently in the workhouses in the North?—Certainly, there have been a great deal of changes.

5790. Supposing there is a continuation of that, in ten years won't they be almost perfect?—I don't know; if you take the amount of progress in the last thirty years and compare the condition now with what they were thirty years ago, and then look forward to thirty years more, I am afraid if you measured the change by the years it would not be very much.

5791. You say the infirmaries are fairly well managed?—Yes, some of them; the district hospitals are greatly improved, but the Local Government Board insisted that they should be improved, and proper nursing, for instance, introduced.

5792. Have you ever looked at the distery role of the Oranagh Workhouse?—I have; the doctor has ample power to give a potent anything he wants; they ask me to be very well cared and fed.

5793. And has not the doctor the same supervision over the distery in the body of the house?—Of course he has, but he cannot well interfere with the general diet; if there was anyone in the house that he might require extra diet he has power to order it.

5794. I was rather surprised to hear the comment you passed on the doctors in public positions; you said there ought to be a board of examiners?—I did not pass any unfavourable comment.

5795. Did you not say that these men were not fully qualified for the positions they hold?—Oh, no.

5796. I understood you to say that a board of examiners should be established to judge of the merits of these officers?—I think I gave voice to the general opinion of medical men in this country.—Dr. Biggar will correct me if I am wrong—that if you want to have an efficient medical service for the army and navy, for instance, the admission to that is by examination; no man not admitted who is not competent and fit to look after the lives of the soldiers and sailors. Thus you have got a medical service in this country to look after the sick, and afflicted, and poor. If you require an examination to test the fitness of the medical officers in the army and navy to look after the soldiers and sailors, why should you not test the medical officers who go to look after the broken-down soldiers of labour, who give their services to the people, and everyone of whom when he comes to a certain time of life, should have an adequate pension.

5797. The ordinary laymen think that when these gentlemen are sent out of college they are fully qualified?—I am very sorry for the ordinary laymen.

Oct. 29, 1903.
Dr. Edward G.
Thompson.

5290 If the Colleges of Surgeons and Physicians are serious in the matter, do you think it rests with the Poor Law Guardians of Ireland to remedy that?—I think there should be a further test.

5291 Dr. Thompson.—If a man had been in the ordinary medical service for ten years you would not consider him competent to take charge of important surgical operations, although he might be a thoroughly efficient officer otherwise.—There is no medical man I am acquainted with who would think so little of his duty, except in the case of a pressing emergency, as to attempt a severe surgical operation, as we understand it in these days, unless he was specially qualified. Surgery, though associated with experience and knowledge and judgment, is a handicraft; a man must have his hand in continually at it in order to be any use at it.

5292 Mr. Macrae.—You think that the ratepayers of Ireland should assist these gentlemen to climb to a higher level?—In the interests of the poor.

5293 Is not the population of Ireland poor?—Certainly.

5294 Are they not all poor?—Not all; they are poor, I am very sorry to say.

5295 And would you ask these poor people to assist men comparatively better off than themselves?—That the doctors are well off! I am afraid not.

5296 In comparison with the ordinary ratepayer?—Surely the doctor must be better off in some respects than the ordinary ratepayer, though I am sorry to say in many instances I doubt that they are.

5297 Do you not think that the burden on the ratepayers of Ireland is heavy enough?—If you can make the Government take hold of the service and pay the doctors you will be able to manage to have a much more efficient service and save the ratepayers a great deal. Again, if you have got a very capable doctor when you can thoroughly rely on and trust you will not be putting more charge on the ratepayers if you pay that doctor £250 a year; I dare say he would save the ratepayers £200.

5298 How do you make that out?—In his administration—the treatment of the sick, the way he treats wounds, the medicines he gives, and the appliances he gets; in fifty ways that you might not have any cognizance of at all. A doctor who does not know his work would not do it so economically.

5299 What are you going to do with the young men when they come out?—Make the Irish Poor Law service an attractive service—a number of the Irish doctors would like to stay in their own country rather than go into the army or navy if they had any prospect. Make the Irish Poor Law service the same as the army and navy, and give the man who goes into it some hope that by his successful treatment of the poor and by proving he knows his work he may gradually creep up into the higher positions in the service and you will have a very different sort of men going into the service. A man goes to a dispensary in the West of Ireland; he is hopeless and helpless; he has as much money at the beginning as he will have at the end; he cannot even hope for a pension. Let him go into a service in which he can rise by ability, brains, and attention to his business, and kindness to the poor, and you will have a very different condition of things; you will not have waste and extravagance, for I venture to say if you had a service of that sort you would have it conducted for a great deal less money than at present. At the present time, on the question of superannuation, a doctor is dependent on the Board of Guardians; if he has been independent and done his work well he is not at all well—he may have offended the Guardians in many

ways, and not be popular with them, although an able man, and they won't give him a pension, although he is entitled to it. Let him get a pension as a right, the same as any other officer in the Civil Service; let him get a pension as a right when he comes to a certain age. Is it an efficient service for a doctor of seventy, seventy-five, or eighty to have to look after the poor; is he able to get up at night, exposed to all weathers? Has he the physical capacity of giving efficient service to the poor? I say he has not, and I say that inefficient service of that kind is simply waste; not only that, but, of course, the poor are not properly attended to or looked after.

5300 So you think three workhouses in this county sufficient?—I am sure of it.

5301 And you would board out all the children?—I would. I think Sheffield in England is a good example; they have taken a house in the town and take the children away altogether, put them under proper people to look after them who understand bringing up children, and they take them away from the workhouse atmosphere as far as they can possibly remove them, and, of course, the result is extremely beneficial to the community and the children themselves.

5302 When you say that the Guardians, as already constituted, are not a suitable body for conducting the Poor Law system?—I don't say that; I only say about the hospitals and asylums. I state that is my opinion hospitals are different from workhouses, and they should be under the care of the asylum and hospital committees of the County Council.

5303 You think representative government should come to an end in that respect?—That is representative government; is not the County Council representative in the last sense?

5304 You think the County Council should support the county infirmary, although they have only a representation of two-thirds?—The county infirmary is in great difficulties; we have been moved out of our hospital to a very much more expensive hospital, and are expected to do the same work. The result of moving the patients out has been very greatly increased work. When I came to the hospital in 1877 there were only about 500 patients and sixty operations that year. Now this year we will have 750 internal patients and on an average from 120 to 140 surgical operations every year. The place is growing and increasing simply because we have got a better institution; the people like it.

5305 CHAIRMAN.—Your view is that the rates ought to maintain such a hospital?—Certainly; and give us the money we want in order to do our work properly; the addition to the rates would be a trifle, and it could be saved in other ways. You have no idea of the cost of surgical dressings at the present day—everything connected with the treatment of patients; instruments, for instance; everything is very costly; then there is the electrical treatment of surgical diseases—every county infirmary should have a hospital fully equipped with all these new plans of dealing with disease. Take the treatment of lupus, as an example; we have got a small fund in connection with the infirmary, the Black Memorial Fund, and by means of that I am able to send a patient suffering from lupus to Dublin; but we cannot treat them here.

5306 Dr. Thompson.—Does the county pay for them?—No; we have a little memorial fund to the late Mr. Black.

5307 Do you not think that that would be a case in which, if the patient was not able to pay, that the Guardians should pay?—Certainly; but they come to us, and they come from a distance.

Dr. FLEMING, Medical Officer, Omagh Workhouse, examined.

I don't know that there is very much that I have considered views on, but if there was anything that you would wish to ask me.

5310 CHAIRMAN.—You have heard Dr. Thompson?—Yes.

5311 Do you concur with him?—In a general sort of way I do concur with him.

5312 Is there anything as regards your own particular hospital?—One of the things that I have the strongest views on is that the system of appointing officials in the workhouse is not satisfactory. I don't think the system of appointing officials by a Board of Guardians consisting of seventy members is satisfactory. I don't think a body of that sort is in a fit position to

judge impartially of who are fit from the medical officer down through the master, matron, and other officials. It ends in embarrassing the Guardians, and in questions of that sort being decided on political, religious, or some other ground than efficiency; personal friendship forms a large element in the matter. And I think if there was a committee of some sort which would represent all shades of opinion and selected from people who were known to be intelligent, held responsible positions, were above being influenced by various petty motives—a small committee to make these appointments or, at all events, examine the candidates for these appointments in some way or other, and say whether they were fit, and their recommendations should be

Dr. Fleming.

Oct. 29, 1900.
Dr. Fleming.

practically binding on the Guardians—if the Guardians are to retain the power of electing that would be satisfactory. I don't think any plan of work-house management will produce satisfactory results if it is to be administered by incompetent, inefficient, and unsatisfactory officials. The worst of rules will work well if administered by trustworthy, honest, upright people. These really are the views that I hold chiefly strongly. As to the question of amalgamation of workhouses, I really have not gone closely into that matter. I am inclined to think amalgamation would be an advantage; I don't know how many for this county as compared with the six that do duty at present, but I would think a fewer number of somewhat larger institutions in which more expense might be gone to in seeing that every ward was looked after by some really capable responsible officer. The wards filled with old and infirm people might be bigger wards, and should have a head over each—some really capable person, man or woman, who would see that the work in the ward was satisfactorily done.

5833. Dr. BROWN.—About hospitals themselves, have you any suggestion to make?—At present our workhouse hospital is, I consider, a pretty satisfactory one—the people are comfortable in it, well fed, and well looked after. I have a very efficient head nurse there, who is very conscientious and very capable.

5833. CHAIRMAN.—What about the female side of the house?—The accommodation is insufficient in some respects. Some time ago, on Dr. Bigger's suggestions, we had plans drawn out by the architect for an enlargement of the hospital, giving us a better surgery and operating room, giving us two wards for convalescences, and increased accommodation generally, and I thought it would be a very good thing if these suggestions were carried out. However, there were various other questions looming in the distance, and the Guardians did not think well to go on with that suggestion at the time; I was sorry they did it. There is no question whatever that the hospital could be greatly improved.

5833. Dr. BROWN.—Do you think it is a good thing to have a hospital in three different places all separated by a considerable space?—Do you mean the way we have now?

5833. CHAIRMAN.—On the male and female infirm side you have large sick wards?—That was part of the plan that these two wards at present occupied by sick should be abolished in that part of the house and established in the hospital proper.

5833. Dr. BIGNER.—Would that have a tendency towards inefficiency? for instance, a day like this, how is a nurse to cross from one part to another?—She doubt about that.

5834. How do you do the night nursing?—There is no real night nursing done; if there is a sick or bed case the nurses take turns to sit up, but in the wards under ordinary circumstances, if a person takes ill in the night some of the other attendants have to get up and call a nurse.

5835. Do you think it right to leave the sick so that a nurse has to be called by an attendant?—It would be better if there was a night nurse who went regularly round.

5836. What is the present number of your infirm patients?—There are not many.

5837. CHAIRMAN.—About forty?—There are hardly as many; there are very few on the men's side of the hospital proper.

5838. Dr. BROWN.—Do you think it right that forty people should be left without a nurse at night?—I have not known that anything has gone wrong.

5839. You might not know; it is not the interest of the present staff to tell you that anything has gone wrong during the night?—No; but I really have not known of anything; there are always several others in the ward, and if a person was to be taken suddenly ill they could ring the bell or go for the nurse.

5840. Are they not equally sick?—No; there is generally a proportion not so bad, and there is in every ward what we call a ward attendant, who is not sick, and who sleeps in the ward.

5841. If there is a sick patient at the very far end, has he to go and wake that attendant?—That would be the case; but even supposing you had a night nurse going regularly round, that nurse might not be in every ward every hour.

5832. If you had them in one place, could she not almost hear any person moving in any of the wards during the night?—She would have to go round; I think it is a good thing; I don't want to argue against it.

5833. Would she not know the cases that were particularly ill and look after them; do you think it is right to call on a nurse at night who has been on duty from seven o'clock the previous morning?—No; that is a standing grievance.

5834. Could you call that efficiency?—It is not efficiency.

5835. Mr. MURKHAUGH.—You say the system of appointments is very unsatisfactory in your eyes?—It is.

5836. Does it differ very much from what it was formerly?—If a complaint has to be made about an individual for not satisfactorily doing their duty that question comes before a large body of something like fifty people who have not necessarily the time or opportunity of giving close attention to the matter, and they cannot possibly get hold of the merits or demerits of the question, whereas a small committee could investigate the whole matter and try and understand it properly.

5837. Have any appointments made under the new system been more unsatisfactory than those made by the old Guardians?—I am not comparing the present Board of Guardians with the old Guardians; that was not the idea in my head; I consider any large body of Guardians an incompetent body to judge. I don't think as much care has been taken in appointing the various officials in various workhouses as an ordinary man would take in selecting a servant for his own house.

5838. Have any unsatisfactory appointments come under your notice lately?—Not just immediately lately, but I have in my mind various unsatisfactory appointments, and I have sufficiently indicated to the Guardians at various times what I thought of these appointments, and my opinion has been overruled in most cases, scotched even, and in fact my giving any opinion as to the efficiency of a person who was likely to be appointed has rather seemed to have the effect that my recommendation has done them harm rather than otherwise.

5839. If my recollection serves me right, I think the Guardians insisted that your authority should be supreme in that house, and gave orders that all under your control would have to obey you or leave the institution?—Yes; but it is very difficult to be continually bringing definite and specific charges against people when you know that the result of that will be a very unpleasant scene, and different people making statements that it is not possible to substantiate. I make one statement, and various other people come up there and make other statements, and I don't think a body like a Board of Guardians is in a position to weigh the value of my statements against the value of the statements of other people.

5840. Do you not think that the representatives chosen by the people who pay the money are the people to make the appointments?—I would be quite willing that the representatives chosen by the people should select from their own number a sufficient number of specially qualified people, but I don't think a crowd of representatives are the proper people.

5841. Then your objection is to the large number and not on account of any want of judgment on the part of the Guardians or fair play?—Not as a body; but I don't think a crowd of any number of people elected indiscriminately, and not for their particular intelligence about various things I have in my mind, are the proper people to decide on the question. They should select from their own body a certain number, a comparatively small number, of specially qualified individuals, who would see after these things.

5842. Have the Guardians shown any lack of sympathy towards the poor or the destitute in the workhouse under your control?—I don't know; I am not prepared to answer that question quite straight; I am not sure about that.

5843. You don't know of any instance where they have shown lack of sympathy?—I think they have often shown lack of wise sympathy.

5844. In what way?—I cannot exactly specify, but many things have been done which I am not prepared to bring up just now, which certainly did not end with my approval, but I thought in general an endeavour was being made to set fairly in the poor, though it often had, in my idea, an opposite result from what was intended, such as the appointment of inefficient and unsatisfactory, and continuing in that place of inefficient and unsatisfactory officials.

5845. Has the new body made any recent appointments?—I don't like to specify any appointments that have been made; I don't think it would be quite fair for me to do that.

5846. Are you not aware that in all conditions of life wherever a position is sought concerning proceeds even for the highest offices?—Yes.

5847. Then why should the Guardians be deprived of the same privilege of being canvassed?—I am not saying that they should be altogether, but I think they should delegate that to a small number of specially intelligent people.

M. T. W. D. HUMPHREYS, J.P., examined.

I have to apologise for not being here yesterday. I don't think I could give you very much more information than you had from me at Londonderry.

5851. CHAIRMAN.—Is there anything you would like to say now?—There is nothing I would like to say, only the great question is about casual paupers, and, as you know very well, it is a matter involving great difficulty. The numbers, I think, were given you yesterday, and three appear to be nearly one-third of women and children. If you had only to deal with adult males it would be a very easy matter. After two or three instances of coming back to the union they could be prosecuted and sent to jail; whether that would be right or not is not a matter for me to say, but how can you deal with the other one-third of over 1,300 people who are women and children. In Strabane a great many of these casual paupers are people who come to the farms to be hired; they get their money together, one man keeps it, and five or six come into the workhouse merely for the lodgings and to get their breakfast; they are rather casuals and are their perpetual tramps; that is the only thing; it is a very difficult matter.

5852. Where you keep a workhouse open do you think you might still keep the casual ward open, putting restrictions on their going out so soon?—If you do that you add to the rates.

5853. Or you might keep out such people altogether?—You cannot do that.

5854. The effect of the rule would be to keep out people who come for a night's lodging only. I think they might be given a certain amount of work to do before they get their breakfast?—Then they would go without their breakfast; you cannot stop them. You know what they did at Limerick; it was at the time of the severe shock smallpox, and they vaccinated all of them; that lasted very well until the doctor refused to go on, because according to the present law you cannot pay a doctor for vaccination unless he proves that the vaccination has been effective, and they never came back on the third day to show their arms, so the doctor got nothing, and therefore he refused to go on. I believe that has relieved the Limerick people of a great many casual paupers. I saw that one of the leading councillors in Donagh made a rather curious allusion to the distance from Strabane Workhouse to the outside boundaries of the locality. He said that moving the people of St. Johnston's to Stranorlar would not be nearly as far as to Strabane, but he forgot to mention that far the intermediate place Strabane is much nearer than any of the places he mentioned, and he also forgot to say that there is no union in the whole of Tyrone nearer than Strabane to the place that he took as his point d'appui.

Mr. McAlister.—I have only a few observations to address to this Commission on the part of the Omagh Guardians, who principally advised me on the question of amalgamation. First of all, I should say, on behalf of the Guardians, they have listened this morning to the evidence of Dr. Thompson and Dr. Fleming, and they are not in entire agreement with the evidence given by those gentlemen, and will express their own views when they come into the box. At their meeting on the 19th of October they considered the question of amalgamation as affecting the County Tyrone, and they passed a resolution in favour of absorbing three of the unions of the county in the other three by a majority of twenty-one votes to three; that resolution is their minutes. If we could differ from our minds the evidence given on behalf of the three doomed unions and looked at the map of the County Tyrone, I think it would be seen that the three unions proposed to be

5848. CHAIRMAN.—Perhaps you would like to relieve the Guardians from that privilege?—To some extent; they could do it themselves. If I was one of a crowd who wanted to carry out some project the first thing I would propose would be that we should select from our own selves half a dozen men who would deal with the details.

5849. In case three of the six unions in the county were amalgamated, what would you put in their place?—I have not given much consideration to the question of amalgamation, and I am not prepared to give an opinion that I think is worth anything on that point.

5850. You would not care to venture an opinion?—No.

Left—Strabane, Omagh, and Dungannon—cover the arms of the County Tyrone fairly well, and evidence has already been given, and will be repeated, that the three unions which will remain will be amply sufficient to house the poor. Mr. Cathcart, one of the most capable officials in the county, is prepared to give evidence that even one union in Tyrone would be amply sufficient, and he has worked out a scheme for one union to be retained in Omagh, which is a central place, and easily reached from all parts of the county. I don't think the other witnesses will go as far, but they will give positive evidence that the three unions proposed to be left will be amply sufficient for the county. As to the evidence given yesterday for Clough, Castleberg, and Cookstown, there is this to be said—it was the evidence given not by members of the County Council in that capacity but by men with local sympathies, and such institutions as workhouses did hard and will always have advocates for their retention. The principal objection, apparently, to the dissolving of these unions arises from the difficulty of getting Guardians, it is said, to attend at further distances in the new unions. Of course the difficulty of Guardians attending unions and to the duties they were elected to discharge has always been to some extent one in Ireland. It was recognised in the Local Government Act itself, and Parliament has imposed penalties and fines upon men who are elected to public positions and fail to turn up at a reasonable number of meetings, and the Guardians of the Omagh Union are convinced that these safeguards are amply sufficient to protect the taxpayers of those places, and are quite confident that there will be no difficulties on that head. Mr. Cathcart is prepared, further, to state that it will be possible under the reform that we believe will result from this Commission that fewer meetings will be necessary, and his experience is that when there is important business to be discharged at a meeting he has a full attendance, and it is only when what the newspapers call routine business comes on that it is not always possible to get a quorum. As regards the deportation of paupers, I think, after the evidence of Dr. Thompson this morning, we may dismiss that from our minds; it is an objection that will not really press, especially if there is established in the district some provision by which the sick poor will be attended to in a disused workhouse, which is part of the scheme of the committee of the County Council who contemplate that some of the unions would disappear. The Guardians of the Omagh Union think that the financial advantages to be gained by this amalgamation will be considerable, and that the taxpayers of these places have not considered how much they will gain by having removed from them these three terrible establishments in Cookstown, Clough, and Castleberg. The dissolution of the Gortin Workhouse has worked well, and I am informed Mr. Clarke will give very valuable evidence of the advantage gained by that locality by being dissolved and amalgamated with the two neighbouring unions. The Guardians quite admit that the evidence, generally, which Dr. Thompson gave about the Omagh infirmary is perfectly accurate, and it has been very largely availed of. The Guardians of Omagh think it is an intolerable burden on the county to maintain six unions when three of them cannot be defended on any principle or any information that they are doing work adequate to the expenditure which must now be involved in their maintenance. They also think that there is now an opportunity for reform, and they are before a strong Commission which they believe and hope will resolutely grapple with this subject and relieve them of the intolerable burden of maintaining so many unions in this county.

Oct. 26, 1903.

Dr. Fleming.

M. T. W. D. HUMPHREYS.

Oct. 25, 1894.

Mr. William
Cassidy.

I would wish to inform you that I don't appear on behalf of the District Council; they are not bound by anything I say.

MR. CHAIRMAN.—They permit you to appear and give us your own view.—They are not bound by anything I say.

MR. CHAIRMAN.—They are aware you are coming up.—The committee are aware; I believe they agree with me to a large extent.

The first question to be considered in connection with Poor Law Reform is the proper working of the Poor Laws with, at least, equal comfort for the poor, and thus leads to the question, can unions be profitably amalgamated? In my opinion amalgamation of unions ought to take place for the reasons—first, that the number of poor seeking relief has decreased at a rate never expected at the time when the present workhouses were erected; secondly, that the facilities for travelling are now so practically perfect as to provide a ready and efficient means for removal of the old and infirm to any reasonable distance; thirdly, that the inmates of workhouses in rural districts are very largely composed of persons suffering from sickness, who could be more effectively nursed and treated in district hospitals. Dealing particularly with the County Tyrone, I would propose that only one workhouse should be maintained in the county for the reception of able-bodied paupers, situated at Omagh, as distinct from sick and infirm; this would admit of all the able-bodied inmates being removed from the other six workhouses in the county to the County Workhouse, where they could be employed in some industry, such as nail-making or basket-making for the men, and sewing for the women, whereby they would contribute to their support. In the County Workhouse the services of the medical officer and trained nurses would not be required, as any acute case of sickness occurring amongst the inmates could be treated by the dispensary medical officer in the ordinary way upon a "red line," while urgent surgical cases could be treated in the county hospital, which is an institution also supported by the poor rate. The workhouses of Dungannon and Strabane should be converted into district hospitals, to be used exclusively for the treatment of the sick poor, and the old and infirm over seventy years of age. For this purpose the sick and infirm from the Unions of Clough, Cookstown, and Dungannon should be maintained and treated in Dungannon district hospital, and those in the workhouses of Castlederg, Irvinestown, Strabane, and Omagh in the Strabane district hospital. These two district hospitals could then be fitted with modern appliances and a competent nursing staff, the expense of which would not press so heavily upon the ratepayers, when the area of location would be so much increased. (The paupers in Irvinestown Workhouse belonging to the portion of the union in the County Fermanagh would have to be similarly transferred to whatever accommodation would be provided in the County Fermanagh.) The following unions could then be dissolved, viz.: Castlederg, Clough, Cookstown, and Irvinestown. A dissolved workhouse in each province, or otherwise, as considered necessary, should be fitted up for the treatment of consumption. This institution should be equipped and maintained by the Government, and a fixed charge should then be made on each Board of Guardians in accordance with the number of patients sent from any union. When a consumptive person becomes chargeable on the rate, either by outdoor relief or otherwise, his removal to the special consumptive hospital should be compulsory if, in the opinion of the medical officer who is in charge of the case, the condition of the patient will admit of his removal with safety. District hospitals should contain wards for the exclusive use of patients willing and able to contribute to their support, the inmates of which should not be compelled to wear uniform except in cases where, in the opinion of the medical officer (from a sanitary point of view) it is necessary to do so. Boarding out of decrepit children should be compulsory, and no child should be retained in the workhouse except those of able-bodied inmates. The boarding out of children is open to abuse, and requires much care in the selection of homes and in the inspection of the children at their new homes. The children should on no account be brought back to the workhouse for inspec-

Mr. WILLIAM CASSIDY, Clerk of the Omagh Union, examined.

tion, as this periodic visit to the workhouse reminds the children of their origin, while one of the objects of the boarding-out system should be to induce the children to forget their past and to become merged in the population of the district. Outdoor relief is a subject that very few people agree upon. In my opinion this form of relief should be discontinued in all cases except in those of widows having families depending on them, and where the bread-winner of the family is disabled by sickness or accident from providing for his wife and family; all other cases should only be relieved in the district hospital or workhouse, as the case might require, except the medical officer shall certify that removal to such hospital or workhouse would be attended with risk to the patient, in which case outdoor relief might be given while the patient is unable to be removed. If the present system of outdoor relief is to be continued (the annual expenditure under this head in the Omagh Union is about £1,400), I would suggest dispensary relief for all purposes, so as to constitute a certain ceiling on the granting of outdoor relief, as I believe the increased areas of unions likely to be brought about by amalgamation would make it impossible for the Guardians attending a meeting to properly judge of the merits of an application from a remote part of the union otherwise than by acting on the report of the relieving officer. The cost of maintenance in the County Workhouse and in the district hospitals could then be apportioned and levied on the several dispensary districts in proportion to the number of inmates or patients supported from each. The matter of dispensary relief would necessarily involve the question of dispensary representation as distinguished from the present system of clerical division representation. I am of opinion that the increased number of Guardians in any union brought about by a large scheme of amalgamation, such as I have endeavored to outline, would make the board of council entirely cumbersome, and to obviate this difficulty two or three members should be elected for each dispensary district, who could also act as a dispensary committee for the examination of the medical officer's books and records. The question of district councils presents the greatest difficulty, but I think this might be met by forming the members elected to represent the dispensary districts comprised in the present Poor Law unions into a district council, in a similar way to that at present existing, and that the present clerks of unions and councils should continue to act as clerks of the district councils. For this purpose the law should be so altered as to provide for the existing clerks of the councils continuing to discharge their duties in connection with the preparation of the voters' and jurors' lists notwithstanding that he has ceased to hold the position of clerk of the union. This would materially reduce the amount of compensation to be paid in the retiring clerks of unions which have been dissolved, without inflicting hardship on any other person. If it is considered advisable to convert a workhouse in this county into an auxiliary asylum in preference to building additional accommodation at the district asylum, I would recommend that the Omagh Workhouse should be selected for that purpose, as its proximity to the present asylum would admit of the same committee of management conducting the business and the same medical supervision being enabled to, in addition to which the same set of convicts could supply both institutions under the same contract. If this were carried out the County Workhouse could be located at Dungannon, and the district hospitals at Cookstown and Strabane. Fever hospitals should be continued at the three large towns, as this class of patient could not be removed by rail. The tramp nuisance seems to be beyond the reach of reformation, nevertheless I make the suggestion for what it is worth, that all strangers to the district seeking relief should be obliged to make application in the first instance to the constabulary, and produce a letter from his last employer giving satisfactory reasons for his presence in the district. Thereupon the constabulary should have power to issue an order for admission to the County Workhouse. In all other cases the tramp should be dealt with under the Vagrancy Act. I would strongly recommend that the meetings of Boards of Guardians, and the ordinary meetings of district councils, should be held monthly instead of weekly, as at present. This would enable all the business to be

sanctioned at a meeting to be printed on an agenda and distributed to the members previous to the day of meeting. I admit the preparation of an agenda is contemplated in the rules for the guidance of district councils, but where the meetings are held weekly the correspondence is mostly received on the meeting of the meeting, which prevents the agenda being issued. Without knowing what business is to be transacted, Guardians generally take it for granted that there will be nothing of importance, and thus their absence from any weekly meeting can be made up for by their presence at the next ordinary meeting, only a week distant, whereas if the meetings are fixed as monthly, business of sufficient importance will be contained on the agenda to induce the Guardians or councillor to make an effort to be present. The committee of management of lunatic asylums hold their meetings monthly, while the expenditure to be dealt with is many times greater than that of an ordinary workhouse. I have previously referred to, and might be taken as recommending, dispensary relief; that is not so, except as a safeguard in respect of outdoor relief and to cover what I consider an injustice, the practice of fixing dispensary areas for sanitary purposes. In the event of a general scheme of amalgamation, I would be in favour of county relief, as this would simplify the keeping of accounts in connection with district hospitals, fever hospitals, and workhouses, and would admit of patients being sent from one hospital in the county to another; it would also admit of the nursing staff being distributed as their services might be required. Cottage hospitals, such as I have seen recommended, would be quite unworkable. Each cottage hospital would require to be equipped with a doctor, nursing staff, accoucheur, medicines, medical appliances, provision stores, etc., which would make the expense of this class of hospital out of all proportion to its usefulness. Much might be done in this direction by providing in each dispensary district a midwife with nursing qualifications, who could take charge of a patient pending his removal to hospital. In future transactions in the office of relieving

officer I would recommend that the new appointments should be for comparatively small districts with proportionately smaller salaries. It is not necessary that a relieving officer should devote his whole time to the duties of his office, but I think it is most necessary that a person seeking relief should not be obliged to visit a relieving officer ten or twelve miles distant; this will be still more important in the event of amalgamation. These are my ideas.

5837. Dr. ROBERTS.—Would you explain why you think cottage hospitals would be unworkable?—The great expense in connection with them.

5838. What great expense?—Dr. Thompson appears to think all institutions for the treatment of the sick should be elaborately, and thoroughly fitted up.

5839. Not necessarily?—I think he stated so; and that is one of the reasons I would recommend that only one or two institutions should be kept in the county thoroughly equipped and up to date.

5840. CHAIRMAN.—You don't know yourself anything about the management of the hospital?—Oh, no.

5841. You would not venture to offer an observation on it?—I would not.

5842. Mr. BULDOON.—Did you wish to say anything about the matter of fever nursing or consumption?—Nothing more in connection with consumption; I think the medical men who were examined here to-day perhaps gave better information than I could be expected to do. In my opinion the number of consumptive patients is not to be judged by the number that are contained in the different workhouse hospitals, for in my opinion there are a great many people in the county suffering from consumption that would not take refuge in an ordinary workhouse hospital. There is a belief very prevalent in the county that consumption is incurable, and they may as well remain at home and die as go into the workhouse hospital, whereas if a proper institution was established, with up-to-date appliances, people would take advantage of it, and be glad to pay for it. That is my opinion.

Mr. MATTHEW RODGER, J.P., examined.

Mr. Matthew Rodger.

5853. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the Omagh District Council?—I am.

5854. You have heard Mr. Cathcart's statement recommending that three unions should be broken up?—Generally speaking, I fall in with Mr. Cathcart's view of the subject; there is one thing in which I differ with him, and that is in regard to outdoor relief.

5855. You think the grants have not been excessive?—I do.

5856. And you would not restrict them in any way?—I would not; I would rather extend the outdoor relief.

5857. In what direction?—I would extend it in the Clough and Cullinagh directions in the case of amalgamation.

5858. Would you increase the class of persons who get it, or give it to a larger number of applicants?—I think the people are very happy who receive outdoor relief; it is impossible to bring those poor people to the workhouse at all.

5859. What class of people would you propose should be added to the number?—I refer to the deserving poor.

5860. Give me an instance of a family that in your opinion would not be likely to get it now and that you think ought to get it?—I don't know of any case; we are very careful in investigating each case, and we have also very reliable officers who inquire into each case. Supposing the Guardians from a distance know nothing at all about the case the relieving officer gets notice a week or two weeks previous, and investigates each case, and gives all the information. I don't know of any case unless in the town of Omagh. It might be very difficult to investigate a case thoroughly in Omagh, but in the rural districts I don't think there are any abuses.

5861. In your neighbourhood, in the cases you know of, what kind of people are getting outdoor relief?—Most deserving poor.

5862. Without mentioning any names, if you give me the circumstances of one or two cases?—We had a late case—it is off the books now—a widow with a large family, her husband died some time ago, and this poor creature was getting 4s. a week; of course the children were very young.

5873. Where did she live?—She lived in the village where I reside, with 400 inhabitants.

5874. She had a house there; what rent did she pay?—1s. a week.

5875. And then she had 2s. from the Guardians in addition?—Yes; she is very industrious herself.

5876. She was earning something was she?—Yes.

5877. How many shillings did she earn a week?—2s. and her food per day; 2s. a week.

5878. What ages were the children?—One was quite an infant; the others up to eight years of age when we began the outdoor relief.

5879. All at school and some earning?—As a rule the children attend school very well with us; the clergy look after them and see that they attend school.

5880. Do you know any elderly people who are receiving relief in your neighbourhood?—Yes; we have eight in our division.

5881. You have given one case, now some other cases?—Generally speaking, they are all widows; we had a widower who was receiving relief, and some of his children came from the army, but they did not stand to his wants in any way; they were rather spendthrifts; they simply left the poor old fellow, and he came down to the workhouse, although it was against his wishes. I have known cases where the priest and even the police went to a place where it was not safe to go in with the roof and walls falling, and the poor people would die there sooner than come into the workhouse; such cases I think are deserving of outdoor relief; besides there are many in the workhouse who, if they were getting outdoor relief, would be very useful in the country.

5882. How much would they earn?—They would earn their food at any rate, or the rent of their little rooms.

5883. Would they earn 5s. or 6s. a week?—No; of course they would be disqualified from relief if they were earning such a sum at all; we understand it is only the quite destitute are eligible for outdoor relief; there is great sympathy for these old people when they are getting a little allowance. I think many of these poor creatures should be boarded out in respectable families, the same as the children. It is a wonderful

Oct. 29, 1913.

Mr. William Cathcart.

Oct. 29, 1901.
Mr. Matthew
Kedgers.

contrast between supporting these people outside and in the workhouse. I see from the abstract it is almost 7s. a week we pay in the house, that is taking into consideration the upkeep of the house; outside we are only paying 2s. on an average. Supposing we increased it to 4s. we would make them happy and comfortable; they would have liberty and freedom; nothing could compensate them for want of liberty and freedom.

5894. Would you not be afraid you would have too many applications?—I don't know; we would use the supervision we are using; I don't think there would be any abuses; they have a horror of mixing with some of the characters that are in these workhouses; of course classification would be a great improvement.

5895. Mr. MURPHY.—You are in favour of boarding out children?—I am.

5896. You think that in a good system, and works well?—It works well, and I need not tell you that our Guardians are very particular in giving these children to proper families.

5897. An impression seems to have got into the minds of some of the Guardians from other unions that the Omagh board is rather extravagant in the matter of outdoor relief?—I am convinced that these gentlemen are not in touch with the poor people at all. I heard some of them yesterday.

5898. You think it would be a hardship for any Board of Guardians to refuse to grant outdoor relief to deserving cases?—It would be very cruel; personally, I would abolish all the workhouses; I am prejudiced against the system; I would change it all to outdoor relief and hospitals.

5899. The trouble would be giving relief to the proper people?—With proper supervision I think it could be conducted pretty well.

5900. Do you think if the Guardians of Omagh did not give so much outdoor relief, would some of those people who are receiving the relief come into the house?—Many would die outside and starve before they would come in.

5901. They have such a dislike to the institution?—They have a horror of it, I mean the very deserving poor—old respectable people many of them—their children have gone out of the country.

Mr. Edward
Collagher.

5902. CHAIRMAN.—What did you wish to tell us?—I have very little to say. I came in deference to a notice that the Commissioners were sitting here. I am not a Guardian; I am Chairman of the Urban District Council of Strabane, and having received a notice I thought it respectful that I should come here.

5903. A proposal has been made here by the Omagh Guardians that three unions should be allowed to remain—Strabane, Omagh, and Dranganish?—That is a question we, in the Urban Council, did not touch. I find the districts that are proposed to be abolished have opposed it, and the districts that are serious would like to be strengthened. It seems to be a question that there is a great deal of division on, and I don't wish to express an opinion.

5904. Do you think your own union is too large; do you wish to have it?—No; I don't think there is any desire on our part.

5905. Do you think the union should remain as it is?—That is with regard to Donagel; that is a question we, in the Urban Council, have avoided; we don't wish to touch on these contentious matters at all. We have studiously avoided giving any opinion upon that.

5906. You have opinions upon it, I suppose?—As the Chairman of the board I would not be disposed, seeing that we took no vote on it and our council would probably be divided, I would prefer not, as representing the board, to say anything.

5907. Is there anything you would wish to mention?—Anything that I would say, I think, has been pretty well said already; there would be a desire that there should be more infirmary or hospital accommodation.

5908. There was a view put forward by the County Donagel, and the Lifford people especially, that your district about Strabane should be enabled to contribute to the cost of any people you sent in to the Lifford infirmary; do you think that would be fair? You send a large number of patients from the Tyrone por-

5892. You heard the evidence of Dr. Fleming, our medical officer, as regards the appointments; what do you think; you are a member of the new board, and you were a member of the old board; how does the new board compare with the old?—I think the new board should take great credit to themselves.

5893. It is quite true that the doctor did not draw any distinction in the matter, but you heard his comments on the method of appointing officials?—I was surprised indeed to hear Dr. Fleming make any complaints, because there is great attention paid to every suggestion he made to the board; I think there is nothing the new board should take more credit for than the five appointments they have made.

5904. I find there has arisen in the country since the new bodies came into office a great desire to change the system. I would like to know from you, as a member of the old and a member of the new body, what do you think of the new bodies as compared with the old in the management of the workhouse and the treatment of the poor?—They certainly have a very warm feeling of sympathy with the poor, to do all in their power for them, but I must say they are a most economical body. I have had experience of both; they seem to be altogether governed by economy in the management of the whole concern and the administration of the Poor Laws.

5905. And from your experience of both systems do you think that due care is taken in making appointments to any office that falls vacant?—I don't think it could be done in any better way than they have managed their business; of course they have a great feeling for the ratepayers; they truly represent the ratepayers; they come from amongst them, and know the grievances of the ratepayers and the position they are in, that they cannot afford to pay more rates.

5906. When a recommendation comes from the doctor for any comfort or improvement in the house, how is it treated by the present Board of Guardians?—With the greatest respect; I never saw anything towards Dr. Fleming, any courtesy, or to any official in his position—any other doctor coming there.

Mr. COLLAGE.—Would you allow me to mention with reference to outdoor relief; I would not be in favour at all of abolishing outdoor relief except that provision was previously provided for them in a district hospital or almshouse.

Mr. EDWARD GALLAGHER, J.P., examined.

5907. What did you wish to tell us?—I do, but some of our people contribute towards them by giving three guineas; for instance, I myself subscribe three guineas a year; that entitles you to a bed.

5908. That is done by the County Donagel people, but they have to pay as well, you say that infirmary is a good deal; do you think it is fair you should be called upon to pay for your patients that you send there?—It would not be unreasonable, but a good many who go there are acrobats, who belong to the County Donagel largely; they have a claim there as Donagel people.

5909. There are some, I suppose, who go who are bona fide Tyrone people?—They are; in the case of accidents.

5910. And they don't pay?—The county itself does not pay, but individuals do. From Shim Mills there are a great many accidents, and the Messrs. Harison contribute to the institution very liberally, and so do a good many Strabane people. If we, in Tyrone, had a claim there it would require in all probability that the hospital should be enlarged.

5911. But any that you did send that you should pay for them?—It would not be unreasonable; but I would not like to give a decided opinion.

5912. You think some of the workhouses might be remodelled and made into homes for the aged and infirm poor?—That is the prevailing opinion.

5913. With apartments for married couples?—With apartments for married couples, because there is a great aversion, even among the very poor, to go into the workhouse hospital.

5914. As regards transport?—That is a very hard question; it is very difficult to know how to deal with them. I think that the suggestion made by Mr. Outhart that they should first have the authority of the constabulary would have a very salutary effect, I believe, because the police have to visit these in the morning to get the names and everything, and if they

were obliged to go to the police before they entered—the police very often have the record of these people—it would deter some of those who are professional crimps; on the other hand, there are some people who may be out of employment, and hardships might be imposed on those.

5011. I think that touches all the questions dealt with by your counsel?—That, and they refer to the hospitals and the outdoor relief question. I think it is pretty well attended to in Strabane; I don't think it is abused.

5012. You give it almost at the same rate as in Omagh?—I think so; there is just one particular case, where there are some people who become unable to take care of themselves; there should be some means of compelling those people to be removed to whatever place would be provided for them. I know a case recently where a woman was lying alone, she had cancer of the face, and she lived in a mere hovel, as dirty as possible; she would not hear of being removed to the house, and she was only removed to the workhouse hospital when some of her neighbours found her lying on the floor miserable, and within a few days of her death.

5013. It would be very difficult to get an Act of Parliament passed compelling a sick person to go to the house?—It is a very difficult case to deal with, because they are a source of danger.

5014. Some of these people will ultimately yield to the persuasions of their clergy?—No; some of them will not, and they run the risk, and some of them die without having the ministrations of the church. It is

very difficult unless some kind neighbour looks after them.

5015. There are a number of cases like that occur, but they are comparatively few?—A good many, where they are lone people and will not go into the workhouse.

5016. You would like a law passed giving Boards of Guardians power to make them go?—Yes, under certain conditions; that the doctor should investigate the case and see it is a case in which they are likely to be in danger and die.

5017. There is no such law in any other part of the kingdom?—There is not; but there are new laws every day, and there is no reason Ireland should not contribute to the statute book.

5018. Dr. BROWN.—You would not give those cases outdoor relief?—I would not where they are living alone and unable to take care of themselves, and after a certain age they are virtually unable to take care of themselves.

5019. You said something about improving the hospitals?—Yes; it would require a change altogether in the workhouse hospitals.

5020. In what way?—Not connected with the workhouse directly, but having more an infirmary, a district hospital; the name would be changed at all events, and not so immediately associated with the workhouse, because there are many people who would require to go to hospital and would not touch the workhouse hospital.

5021. They would go more readily?—They would if it were isolated and on different lines.

Mr. ROBERT S. CHAMBERS examined.

5022. CHAIRMAN.—What is your view about the unions in the County Tyrone; how many ought to be left open?—I have been of opinion for a long time that we might do with less; something about what was suggested here to-day and yesterday. To go as far back as 1823, we put in a candidate here for Parliament, and that was his chief plank; that and tenant right; that was Mr. Macartney, so I am not a new convert to it at all. There may be some difficulty about it; if they were willing to be amalgamated or join with us, or be annexed, the same as Gortin, there would be little trouble, or if we could show them that the rates would be less.

5023. You would be in favour of carrying out an amalgamation of how many unions?—I would be in favour in any case, but we would have less trouble if we could show them it would be an advantage to them.

5024. In how many unions?—I think three would do, but when giving evidence I would go for amalgamation generally all over Ireland—with a decrease in population, and I do not think there are as many poor as formerly.

5025. There is no doubt about that. In three days of the workhouses were founded there were as many poor as the whole population now?—Yes; I remember myself about that time; there were 1,400 in Omagh at the end of the Famine years, and in Clogher over 1,100; I was there as a mere boy.

5026. Would you leave any provision for the sick at these places or be willing to follow the Gortin precedent of removing them entirely?—No doubt there would be a difficulty there; they would not be so near as Gortin; that was only eight or ten miles.

5027. But the most distant part of Gortin from Omagh or Strabane would be a considerable distance?—Yes; we got six electoral divisions, and they are all well valued except Gortin and Moyle; the others are small valuations, mountains, and we have not many poor from that quarter, nor there is not so much outdoor relief there as in other places, say Omagh town.

5028. The Gortin people have come into a larger valuation, and ought to get a good deal of benefit out of it?—Yes; Mr. Clarke could tell how they are benefited; something about one-third.

5029. You think that is fair that poor districts should be aided by being brought into larger valuations to have lower rates?—Indirectly it might benefit them, but I am not in favour of union rating, because it tends to some abuses that I will explain by and by.

5030. You mean outdoor relief abuses?—That is one of them.

5031. As a general principle, do you think it fair that the better off parts of the country should aid the very

poor parts of the country?—Yes, if the ratepayers should consider themselves philanthropists.

5032. But considering themselves fair-minded men?—There is such a diversity of opinion about it; I heard a gentleman explain yesterday that it was hard for them to pay for Castleland and Dungannon, where they got the poor and worked them out, and had the benefit of their time; it was hard for other people to pay for them; that was his evidence, and I believe it.

5033. Mr. MURKIN.—Those people that go to the towns, have they not spent a good many years of their life in the country and gratified to the towns?—It is possible some of them may, but they generally don't stop in the towns; it is the parties reared in the towns stop there most. I know some of my own men come back after being away, and say they would much prefer to live where they were reared.

5034. People who have been evicted out of their farms and have no shelter, they have to come to the towns?—Yes; but there are very few cases of hardship of that kind in our parts of the country, or even in this union.

5035. I have often heard it mentioned at the Board of Guardians when the question was raised about outdoor relief being so largely given to the town of Omagh; it was pointed out that a good many of the recipients of outdoor relief had come from the country?—There might be a few of them, but if you make inquiries you will find they are a different class; I could describe some of them very well.

5036. CHAIRMAN.—What kind would they be?—I believe there is a large number in Omagh getting outdoor relief that spend the money in drink; it is not denied.

5037. Dr. BROWN.—Spend part of the money they receive?—Certainly; it is not denied; there is not a relieving officer does not know it perfectly well, but they cannot help it; they have stated so. Some respectable people in Omagh have told me they used to get women to wash, and when outdoor relief was given so freely in the town of Omagh they said "No; we are getting outdoor relief; we will wash no more."

5038. Mr. MURKIN.—How much relief do those people get?—If you take up the lists of outdoor relief furnished to the Guardians twice a year nearly the half is in the town of Omagh.

Dr. BROWN.—What is the valuation of the town?—Mr. MURKIN.—Between £12,000 and £15,000.

Dr. BROWN.—What is the valuation of the union?—Mr. MURKIN.—£101,000. (To Witness).—

Do you think any person in receipt of 2s. a week has such an amount of money that they can give up working and live in luxury and drink on that?—No, I don't think so for a moment, but they generally have some other means of supporting themselves.

Oct. 26, 1905.

Mr. Robert S. Clements.

5940. You say they give up work when they get outdoor relief?—I say just that.

5941. But you said it?—Well, some of them; I can give you the names of the people who told me those things—Miss Charlton is my authority that the woman refused to wash. The Guardians for Omagh don't belong to the District Council, and they come here for the express purpose of putting parties on outdoor relief, and if they don't succeed on one day they try another with a different board and a different chairman; the clerk is here and can verify everything I say.

5942. Don't you know the method at the Omagh board is when an application is made to hand over the application to the relieving officer, and for the relieving officer to make a report, and never in any case when the relieving officer does not say the person is in destitute circumstances to give relief?—That is perfectly true what you say, but they modify it in another way; it is so similar to other cases that they can make no distinction, and must give it; the Guardians act on the report, but they act over it. You know, Mr. Murnaghan, you are not always the chairman; you are in the House of Commons.

5943. I am not ashamed a bit of saying I give outdoor relief?—I know you take more pains than any chairman in Ireland, and I don't say that outdoor relief is given properly is not well laid out money.

5944. CHAIRMAN.—But in practice it is very difficult to ensure that proper persons only get it?—Very difficult; and it is more difficult still since there was union making. The first year I went there was in 1873, the population was far greater than then now, and more poor; there might be cases of hardship then, but I don't know that they were greater than now. In 1873 there were twenty-eight on outdoor relief at a cost of £124 4s. 6d. In 1878, twenty-eight on outdoor relief, at a cost of £131 15s.; 1883, this was immediately before the Gorlin Union was annexed, there were 192 on outdoor relief, at a cost of £403 7s. 6d. When Gorlin Union was annexed in 1890 we had 167 on outdoor relief; I don't think Gorlin swelled it so much, for they are pretty cautious down there; the amount was £266. In 1898 it was £26, and £261 3s. 4d. In 1900, 290 paupers, at a cost of £1,833 4s. And in the two half-years previous to this £1,408 10s.; that shows a great increase.

5945. In your opinion the poverty is less?—Far less—with a decrease in population and so many of the old people dead and less in the country. The statistics show every ten years what we lose in population.

5946. The word destitution is a very strict word?—It is.

5947. Do you think it must be given on a less strict basis than destitution?—What we complain of is this—what is everybody's business is no one's. Since divisional ruling was abolished a great many try to get the most they can; I never did in all my life refuse a case, or was a party to refusing a case, where I believed they were destitute, in my own division or anybody else's.

5948. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—In the old Board of Guardians did you allow the Guardians for the electoral division making the claim to decide whether it should be given or not?—We gave them more discretionary power, and the other Guardians did not interfere so much; now it is different; if it was on the electoral division or even dispensary district it would not be as bad. The electoral division would be the best, but feeling that I would take the dispensary district. Another point I have not heard touched on, and that is what should be the period for chargeability on the electoral division, or dispensary district; formerly three years out of five would make it chargeable on the electoral division; it was varied several times; we would require to fix a basis in the event of going back to the old rating; that, almost every witness, admits is fair; we would like to know what is fair to make them chargeable.

5949. CHAIRMAN.—Those that advocate going back to the electoral division might not like going back to the law of chargeability as it was at the time the change was made?—I think it would give a lot of trouble, because it would require to have one almost living a long time there. I think six months' residence in a dispensary or electoral district should make them chargeable.

5950. That is very short?—If you go for longer it will give a great deal of trouble in getting up the evidence.

5951. The reason you suggest that is that you are afraid if you had a longer qualifying period the change would be a union charge?—That would be one of my reasons, and then the difficulty of finding it out. Now the papers would not give us the facts when fixing it on the old chargeability.

5952. You are aware, being so long connected with it, there have been a great many changes in the chargeability?—That was a point none of the witnesses touched on, and I thought that was an omission.

5953. They all thought they should go back to the old state of things?—If you took six months or one month, or a year or three years; but something that could be got at that would be far the best.

5954. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—What would you think of a county rate for Poor Law purposes?—Over the whole county?

5955. Yes?—Then I think you might abolish a good many of the Guardians; I am an advocate for doing away with them to half. I find we have eighty-one or eighty-seven, and it is unworkable. They don't take the same interest as if one was left single to represent a division.

5956. CHAIRMAN.—You think it is difficult to do business when there is a full meeting?—It is possible to do business, but it is unworkable.

5957. Dr. BURNHAM.—It is a loss of time to the representative himself?—When the Act was framed first there was no intention of having more than one for each electoral division; it was Major Gordonson proposed it; it is only a name; it will give no representation except in a few instances. In this union, if forty-four could not manage it, I don't know how it could be managed at all.

5958. CHAIRMAN.—There are some Boards of Guardians much larger than yours?—I met a gentleman from Wicklow, and he told me they had eighty-six also.

5959. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—Suppose three workhouses out of six were abolished, would you put anything in their place for the accommodation of the sick?—I think it would be a very convenient thing to have a hospital.

5960. CHAIRMAN.—You heard Dr. Thompson's evidence?—There was a lot of his evidence I could not follow.

5961. About the removal of the sick?—I heard of that.

5962. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—The doctor has very high notions?—Very; and I think if they were all followed it would double our rates.

5963. You think the doctor should go to the Treasury and not to the newspapers?—We should not depend altogether on the Treasury; we should pay a little consultation and get what was fair from the Treasury by fair means.

5964. You think there might be hardship in the case of a transportation of twenty or twenty-five men?—There might be, but there are far greater facilities for sending them now than formerly.

5965. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose you remember the time when they used to come in here in a cart and a feather-bed?—I do, and I was the first that proposed an ambulance; I thought that was terrible.

5966. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—You heard Dr. Fleming's evidence?—Yes, but not all.

5967. Do you agree with him in what he said about the method of appointments?—Oh, I don't think we can revert to that method of appointment at all.

5968. He suggested a committee?—A committee might not be much better than we have.

5969. You think as a rule the ordinary man does his business fairly well?—I think they do the best they can in any appointments made since I went there, except one or two nurses that did not turn out well.

5970. In the matter of nurses, it is pretty hard for an ordinary layman to judge?—It is, and except in the case of one nurse or an assistant, we had not any differences of opinion with Dr. Fleming at all except in one case; he had very little to complain of.

5971. What is your experience when the doctor asks for any improvement or change of a hospital character?—I see the board that is there now quite as willing, if not more willing, to comply with his request as the old board, and no obstacle put in the way. I never saw any suggestion put forward that was not granted.

5972. Have you any suggestions to make about tramps?—Very little; the same thing troubles them in all countries, and sometimes in England, and they do not do much more than we do. There were some suggestions put forward here that I would not entirely

agree with. I think some of these tramps might be decent, honest, hard-working men, but the majority are the reverse. I think if there were a ticket for relief given by the police, and they were made go to the police barrack instead of to the relieving officer, it would have a good effect; and let the police question them. Now the arrangements are that a member of the police force comes in the morning before they are discharged, and I think it is putting the wrong end of the stick first. If they saw them coming in it would be far better, for the police informed me a few days ago that about one-third of the tramps that come into the house are either drunk or under the influence of drink, and I think if the police saw them the evening before their admission it would be much better. If they went for the ticket first they might not come in. This could be worked out very easily, for in every town where there is a workhouse there is a police barrack, and it would be far easier to meet a member of the force at the barrack than probably the relieving officer, who might be on other duties, and it would be no hardship on the applicants.

5973. Mr. MADDON.—You were present at the board meeting when the resolution in favour of amalgamation was passed?—I was.

Mr. CHARLES CLARKE examined.

5974. CHAIRMAN.—We are hoping to hear from you how the amalgamation of Gortin Union acted on the divisions that used to make up Gortin Union?—It acted most favourably.

5975. Did you take any notes of it in a business way yourself?—No; I just practically know it from work.

5976. How did it act in regard to the rates?—It took on an average 4d. off the 5s; some years it might be more off and other years not so much.

5977. That was, I suppose, very largely owing to your small valuation under the old system and the large valuation in the new union?—I think the rates were saved very much by the cutting down of officials.

5978. Their pensions are still existing?—They are, but we made them as small as we could, and that was a considerable saving. We did not send very many paupers to Omagh; it is doubtful if there are half a dozen.

5979. A good number went; I was there the day they arrived, and there was a large number went up to Omagh?—There was.

5980. They don't go now as much as they used to?—Not at all.

5981. You give them outdoor relief instead?—I think the outdoor relief is about the same. When we find there is a fit case we give it, and sometimes they may show it, but in the meantime until we find it is so when we don't take it off, but as soon as we find there

5974. And it was carried by twenty-one votes to three?—With reference to rating, I would first go on the electoral division, and in the event of the majority not agreeing with that, the dispensary district.

5975. CHAIRMAN.—That is what you said already?—I have to add something to that with regard to sanitary works.

5976. We have nothing to do with that?—We have to find out how many cess and poor rates—that we have always paid—now they are collected together; they have all got the same of poor rate; nothing appears to be levied now for any purpose but poor rate. I think it rather a stigma on Ireland to say that we are levying poor rate all the time, and no other rate; why should it not be called district rate or county rate; you would think we were a nation of paupers. I would suggest that we change it to county rate or district rate.

5977. Mr. MADDON.—You must go into Parliament to alter that?—I don't see why it was done.

5978. CHAIRMAN.—It is a long story, Mr. Clarence?—I suppose it is, but I hope there will be a change yet.

is a penny spent wrongfully we take it off. There are a lot of summers, but there are a lot of things that are not true when you go to the bottom of them.

5987. Mr. MADDON.—You know some of the inmates of the Gortin Union who did not come to Omagh?—I did; some of them did not enter a workhouse since; you see the place was handy, and when it was handy they would slip in back and forwards.

5988. CHAIRMAN.—And a nice homely management?—Yes; and when the house was taken away they went to work.

5989. Mr. MADDON.—And you think it would probably have the same effect if some of the other smaller unions were closed up?—I believe it would, for it pains the locality to have the workhouses out of it. So far as the removal of the sick poor is concerned there is portion of the union thirteen or fourteen miles from Omagh, and there is no complaint at all. If a pauper wants to be removed I send a note as here to Omagh and they send out the ambulance; it is no inconvenience at all or hardship; in fact not easy come; very few indeed. I would be strongly in favour of cutting down the number of unions to area two in Tyrone; well, three would do simply, and in the course of a few years two, and in time only one will be necessary.

5990. CHAIRMAN.—You would always want some place for the sick?—Undoubtedly.

Mr. JOHN GORMLEY examined.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I can scarcely add anything to what has been already said with regard to the Omagh Union.

5991. CHAIRMAN.—You heard Mr. Outhurst's statement?—Yes, and also the doctor's, the County Council, and a couple of J.P.s, and it is behind time for me to make any remarks at all.

5992. You are in favour of amalgamation?—Yes; I was deputed by the board to express my views on that point.

5993. How many workhouses do you think you would close?—I agree to a great extent with Mr. Clarke that the nearer they are to the door of the workhouse the more ready they are to go in. For instance, Castleblayney is much like Gortin, it is middling mountainous, and I believe the same thing would apply there in a few years that applies to Gortin; they would not know anything at all about a workhouse nearby, and the saving of the upkeep of the other union would mean a saving of the rates; but then I heard Dr. Thompson's elaborate report, showing that these hospitals would cost up all our savings.

5994. You would be afraid of that?—I would.

5995. Mr. MADDON.—What do you think of the doctor's proposals?—I am sure, from his point of view, they are very good no doubt; he is always a kind man to the sick and the poor, but the ratepayers have to be considered, and he knows very little about the

difficulties the people who represent them have to contend with when the rates go up, and this new staff of governors, if they were deputed to come in between the elected ratepayers and the ratepayers themselves, and be lavish with the rates, I am sure things would not work very sweetly.

5996. CHAIRMAN.—You think the ratepayers would not be satisfied?—They would not; they have full confidence in the man who represents them.

5997. They think the Poor Law is administered economically at present?—I have heard no complaints.

5998. Even regarding the outdoor relief?—Some complaints that people get it that don't deserve it, but it is very hard to draw the line. In our district we only give it to the destitute, or where the bread-winner of a family is knocked down we give it temporarily.

5999. Dr. BROOME.—Are you frequently in the workhouse hospital?—Yes.

6000. How often have you visited it in the last year?—It is the standing rule that the clerk summons us in turn—five or six to visit monthly. My month was July, but being on a number of committees I have occasion to visit it more frequently. For the last twelve months I had occasion to be in the hospital once a month on one committee or another, even in the fever hospital of late.

Oct. 29, 1905.
Mr. Robert B. Clements.

Mr. Charles
Clarke.

Mr. John
Gormley.

Oct. 29, 1903.
 Mr. John
 Gurnley.

6001. Is that a rule with the Guardians to visit so often?—No; the rule is that in their turn the clerk sends them notice to come, and that committee when summoned does attend.

6002. Where do they attend?—They meet an hour earlier on a board morning.

6003. In the clerk's office?—Yes; and inspect the whole house—hospital and all.

6004. Do they go round the hospital and inquire what is necessary?—Any committee I was over on we did, and if there were any complaints we were anxious to hear them from the patients.

6005. CHAIRMAN.—Of course the doctor and nurses go with you and call attention to whatever they think necessary to look after?—Yes.

6006. Dr. RUSSELL.—Did the doctor ever accompany you?—He did; I was a couple of seasons around with him with regard to the enlargement of the hospital, and on other occasions we had the assistant doctor several times; we always called upon him if we thought his assistance was useful, and he kindly consented to give his assistance.

6007. Mr. MURPHY.—You heard Dr. Fleming's evidence here to-day; do you agree with what he said as regards the method of management of the present body?—No; I was rather surprised.

6008. In your experience have not the recommendations of the doctor been generally carried out?—As far as possible. I am there at forty or fifty out of the fifty-two board meetings; I have missed very few meetings, and I never yet heard any complaint or remarks passed when the supplies of the hospital were asked for, whether the doctor was lavish or not; there was no complaint; the doctor and the board pull well together; I never saw any reason for him to complain.

6009. And when the visiting committee go through the house and any improvements are asked for, is it not customary for the visiting committee to make a report as to the desirability of having these requisitions complied with?—Yes.

6010. How does the report be received by the Guardians?—It is always carried out except it was some very elaborate report at enormous cost, which, I suppose it is in the memory of gentlemen sitting here, there was one such report; that has not been carried out yet; that was for the enlargement of the hospital, which was going to cost £2500 or £3000.

6011. As far as you knew, as a Guardian and a regular visitor to the institution, how is the house conducted at present, and how do you think the officers perform their duties?—I have been there now for thirteen years, and I am almost sure the inmates are as

well cared for and the house is as well conducted as ever it was. I never heard any complaints or my paper complaining that any officer was asked to bark, and, for Dr. Thompson, I might also state I heard people who got in a terrible time with Dr. Fleming in the workhouse hospital, and also with Dr. Thompson in the county infirmary, say they were far more satisfied with the treatment they got under Dr. Fleming's care than in the Tyone infirmary, and the cost was only half.

6012. Patients that had been in the infirmary and in the workhouse hospital, and they said the treatment in the workhouse hospital was better than in the infirmary?—Yes, as far as food is concerned; I am not talking of medical attendance.

6013. That is the Guardians' part of the business; that is what I wanted to get at, because we heard Dr. Thompson speak rather harshly about the management of the workhouses of the country; he did not indicate enough particularly, but the workhouses throughout the land; he said they were disgracefully managed. From your experience of the house, are the people not fairly comfortable?—Yes.

6014. Are they not as well off as labourers in the country outside as far as food and clothes and firing are concerned?—As far as food and heating and comforts, they are far superior to many labourers.

CHAIRMAN.—I think Dr. Thompson excluded the infirmaries from his remarks.

6015. Mr. MURPHY.—But I ask Mr. Gurnley as regards the body of the house. How do you think the inmates are treated as regards food and clothing and firing?—A great portion of the inmates of the house are far too well treated. I suppose in the recollection of a great many here about four or five years ago we improved the treatment there; I think they got better twice a week to their dinner, which is a great improvement; I was one of the committee that recommended that. I may also add that was on Dr. Fleming's recommendation, and we carried it out, even though we knew it put an additional cost on the ratepayers. My experience always was that the doctor was taken as supreme judge, and we always conceded as far as possible to his views and wants.

6016. Mr. MADDEN.—Would you be in favour of continuing union rating?—There is a difference of opinion on that; dispensary district rating, I think, would be no harm. I believe it causes more hardship on the District Council than on the Board of Guardians with regard to it, so I don't think I can express an opinion on that.

The sitting terminated.

FOURTEENTH PUBLIC SITTING,—WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 11TH, 1903. Nov. 11, 1903.

At the Courthouse, Enniskillen.

Present:—Mr. MICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURFAGHAN, and Dr. COVE BIGGER.

Mr. John Muldoon, B.L. (instructed by Mr. J. F. Ward), appeared for Enniskillen Rural District No. 2; and (instructed by Mr. Walsley) appeared for Lismakee Guardians.

Mr. C. Dransfield, B.L. (instructed by Mr. M. E. Knight), appeared for Clonoe Guardians.

CHAIRMAN.—Gentlemen, the main object of this Commission is to inquire and report whether any, and what, administrative and financial changes are desirable in order to secure a more economical system under the Poor Laws for the relief of the sick, the insane, and all classes of the destitute poor in Ireland without impairing efficiency of administration. Various questions are involved in such an inquiry; for instance, the dissolution of Poor Law Unions, the alteration of

boundaries in various areas, the provision of auxiliary lunatic asylums, the better classification of the insane, sick, healthy, and children, the means of dealing with casuals or tramps, the erection of additional hospitals in some locality remote from existing hospitals, the best methods of obtaining payments or contributions from such patients as may be able to defray the cost of their treatment, either wholly or in part, together with various other questions of interest and importance. The usual course the Commission takes is to examine, in the first instance, the Chairman of the County Council, or some leading witness on behalf of the County Council, and if the Chairman of the County Council of Fermanagh is in attendance we shall be glad to examine him.

Mr. JEREMIAH JORDAN, M.P., examined.

6017. CHAIRMAN.—At present there are three Poor Law Union Workhouses situated within the boundaries of the County Fermanagh—Irvinestown, Enniskillen, and Lismakee—and there are two other parts of the County Fermanagh, situated in other unions—part of Clonoe and part of Ballyshannon, the Belleek district. As far as your knowledge goes, do you think any of the unions in the county could be broken up and other arrangements made for dealing with the sick poor?—Well, sir, without any prejudice whatever against any of the unions, I am, generally, for amalgamation on the basis of economy, and any observations that I have to make will be on an economical basis mainly, but also upon efficiency as well as economy.

6018. You think it would be possible in the County Fermanagh to have a smaller number of workhouses?—I think it would, sir; that is my present conviction.

6019. And if any workhouses were closed for Poor Law purposes what would you suggest might be done with the disarmed workhouses?—Well, before leaving the other point, I would like to say that the County Fermanagh is a small county, and I think if unions were broken up at all the area should be coterminous with the county, with one exception, that is the addition of the eight divisions in the County Cavan that under peculiar circumstances—very peculiar circumstances—were continued at the passing of the Local Government Act, and in opposition to the vote of the Board of Guardians in the Union of Enniskillen. The circumstances came up before the House of Commons, and under very strong pressure your board consented that for convenience sake and all the matters stated in the memorial that went to your board, that these eight divisions should remain connected with the Union of Enniskillen, and I would say that the county and those eight divisions, with various adjustments, ought to be amalgamated as one area.

6020. One union the entire county?—The entire county with those additional divisions; that would be Enniskillen No. 2 Rural District.

6021. The county with district No. 2 added to it should be one Poor Law area?—Yes; the boundary of the union should be coterminous with the county, with the addition of those eight divisions; that will be able to make a very special claim. They did make a very special claim before you and before the House of Commons, and will be able now to make a very special claim before this Commission.

6022. What are the grounds on which you suggest that these eight Cavan divisions should be continued with Enniskillen Poor Law Union?—Well, Mr. Micks,

I would prefer if you could get the petition that was sent to the Local Government Board at the passing of the Local Government Act of 1898; if you could get that by any means you have stated there much more fully the justifiable ground that caused you to add these to the Enniskillen Union contrary to the vote of the Enniskillen Guardians.

6023. That is not to remove them from the Enniskillen Union?—Not to remove them, because they have been in connection with Enniskillen Union since the Poor Law came into operation.

6024. That proposal of yours would involve the closing of Irvinestown and Lismakee Workhouses?—the workhouses.

6025. Have you any suggestion to make as to what should be done with those workhouses if they were dissolved?—I have not at the moment any distinct plan to lay before you, but plans or suggestions might arise in the development. I think it would be wrong to hurry, until some development would take place, to try to find some occupation for these, just for the sake of finding occupation for them, until matters would develop, and some for which they could be used. But at the present time my impression is that the Lismakee Workhouse might be turned into an auxiliary asylum.

6026. For Omagh?—an auxiliary asylum for the Counties Fermanagh and Tyrone; for the harmless idiots of those two counties; and also that the hospital might remain for the sick at the Lismakee Union.

6027. Then you would only close the workhouse so far as it related to the able-bodied and infirm; you would not close it for the sick?—I would not close Lismakee Workhouse for the sick at all, and if possible I should make it an auxiliary asylum, that is always having in view economy.

6028. Do you think there could be any economy in that; in using the entire building for another purpose, how would you effect any economy?—That is certainly a matter of calculation—of pounds, shillings, and pence. Assuming that these harmless idiots will not be permitted to remain in workhouses, I believe it would be economical to put them there rather than to send them to Omagh.

6029. They would occupy the main block of the workhouse—the sick would be in the present infirmary and the fever hospital patients would be in the fever hospital I suppose?—Yes; that is assuming that harmless idiots must leave the workhouse, as I think it ultimately will be, for they are not well treated in the workhouses.

Mr. Jeremiah Jordan.

Nov. 11, 1903

Mr. Jeremiah
Jordan.

5030. What reduction in the Poor Law staff would you make owing to such changes as that?—I could not tell you.

5031. You would not want the clerk of the union?—No; I don't know that you would want the master.

5032. You would want some similar officers?—You would want some similar officers—both male and female attendants at any rate.

5033. Unless you had only one sex there?—That opens another question that the other sex might go somewhere else, but a friend of mine has a theory which seems justifiable that about one of these ill-considered asylums would be sufficient for the North of Ireland without making an auxiliary asylum in each county. However that is a matter of detail, and he will give it to you himself when he comes up.

5034. Then you have not gone into the question of pounds, shillings, and pence as to what might be the money position?—No, I have not; my view at the present time is more for efficiency and classification than the money question.

5035. What would you do then with the various classes, the aged and infirm we will say, of Lismacul and Levestown; they would come into Enniskillen Workhouse?—They would come in here or wherever the central place would be.

5036. Enniskillen, I believe, would be the centre?—I suppose it would be for the Local Government Board to settle that, and I think it would settle itself.

5037. Then as regards the women who come in with illegitimate children, that class?—I cannot tell you what you would do with them.

5038. They would come in similarly to the central institution?—Oh, of course, if you could not devise some other remedy they should come in similarly.

5039. You have no other attachment in contemplation?—I have not. I heard it suggested—but it is not my idea, so I need not detail it.

5040. What is it?—I heard it suggested that these women might be handed over to the care of charitable communities.

5041. Penitentiaries?—That these women might be handed over to penitentiaries of different denominations, where ladies would take charge of them, and reduce the immorality, and I heard it also suggested that in proper time the children should be taken from these people and boarded out, as we board out orphans now.

5042. What is your experience of boarding out children?—We are very much in favour of boarding out children at Enniskillen Workhouse, and we have boarded out all the available children.

5043. Under the existing law?—Yes; and I am for boarding out children.

5044. Do you see any objection to getting the law stretched so as to include other classes, say people whom the Guardians might not think proper people to have charge of children; would you give them sanction?—I have no objection to stretch the law so far as to enable us to board out children to the utmost extreme, because I think they get incorporated in society and become better members of the community.

5045. You have not much outdoor relief in Enniskillen Union?—Comparatively little; the clerk of the union can tell you, but relatively, I think, in other places it is very small, and I think the tendency is to keep it small.

5046. On what general lines do you deal with applications for outdoor relief?—All I can say is, as a member of the board, that when an outdoor relief case is brought up by the relieving officer some Guardian that knows it will advocate it, and it is generally discussed; in fact I don't think there is anything at the board so much discussed with us as outdoor relief.

5047. What class of cases do you give outdoor relief to?—The people who are living in small cottages—isolated poor people, old people.

5048. Are they people who are not capable of being removed to the workhouse owing to their health?—I believe they might be; I believe that the workhouse after all would be probably healthier and a better place for them from a sanitary point of view than where they live, but they have an objection to come in—some old people—and we respect that objection.

5049. You don't adopt the test that some unions adopt and say to the destitute, "If you want relief you will have to take it in the workhouse unless a doctor certifies you are not fit for removal."—We used to do that in the Enniskillen Union, but we are not doing that now; at the same time I think we are

exercising a fair discretion, not to be too rigid; I think the other test was too rigid, and did not leave any room for any sympathy or charity whatever. Before you go any further the question of representation would come up, and if there was amalgamation and the present representation remains I think it would be unwieldy; we would have to build a hall for them if they came here; that is one thing that stands in the way of amalgamation, except you are able to remedy that by legislation.

5050. To what extent would you reduce the representation?—The representation under those circumstances would surely bear to be reduced one half; in fact it ought never to be more than one half, but some friends in the House of Commons thought it would be desirable to give the various sections of the community a chance to get in. They proposed it and it was accepted by the Government, and was not seriously opposed, but it was felt all round that the representation was nearly too many; it was doubled, and I think it is unwieldy, and it would be much more unwieldy if there was amalgamation; there really would have to be legislation in reference to that, or an amendment of the Local Government Act.

5051. You would suggest simply that you should go back to the old one-member constituency; I take that to be your suggestion?—No; my suggestion is that it should be reduced to half, but then the question of the area of representation comes up.

5052. The electoral division?—I heard it suggested that dispensary districts should be the area for taxation or representation.

5053. Or both?—Well, I am not in favour of taxation by small areas; I don't know how it would work out; we should have so many representatives, say from each dispensary district; I don't know how that would work out, but I think it would reduce the numbers; that would be advisable. Then as to the area of taxation, I am not in favour of that; I am in favour of the widest area for taxation possible.

5054. Would you go to the extent of a county rate or even a rate over the whole country?—I am at present in favour of union rating, as we have, for all purposes, and if I was asked to choose between the two I would take county rating and vote for it, and if it was a matter over the whole country I would vote for that again in preference. I go for the widest possible area of taxation.

5055. On what ground would you go for such a wide area as the entire country of Ireland?—I think it would assist the needy portions—the poor portions—by those which are richer and not in need at all.

5056. If it were thought that would be going a little too far and that the locality ought to have some check on its expenditure, would you think it a prudent thing to have a certain portion of the expenditure paid out of a county or country rate and the remainder charged on a particular area?—Such as outdoor relief?

5057. Whatever it may be?—What would the portion be that would be on a restricted area?

5058. I have no portion in my mind; it might be a fourth or a half of the entire expenditure without distinguishing between any class of expenditure, so as to make the local people have direct personal interest in economy—I don't know why they should have so very much less interest as to make them careless. I think any man taking a public position ought to discharge it to the best of his ability, whether it is local or whether it is on a wider range, and so far as I am concerned, except there would be enormous pressure brought to bear upon me, as sometimes there is, except that I would discharge my own duties as well as I possibly could, irrespective of whether it was local or not.

5059. Indubitably, but sometimes human nature is weak!—Sometimes we are not very strong.

5060. Do you think there ought to be anything to strengthen one a bit?—So far as my present expression goes, unless I see to the contrary, I would not be in favour of that.

5061. You would rather have the wide area?—Yes; but I may be wrong. I am not giving the opinion of the County Council, it is only my own personal opinion. There are gentlemen here belonging to the County Council who may have different views, and they have as good a right to their views as I have. Then I think the idea, both the men and women, ought to be out of the workhouse, for on my visits to the workhouse I did not think the state of the harmless idiots was satisfactory; I don't think they are properly super-

intended, and they ought to go to Omagh for the two counties, and then I suppose there would have to be buildings erected for between 300 and 500 people at a cost of £30,000 or £40,000, and County Fermanagh built at any rate it has paid enough to Omagh without building. And when we have a place like Lisnaskea or Irvinestown, if the cost would be the same there as it would be at Omagh, and you would save the building of a house, it would be better to send them to one of those places. I think so, but, of course, this is subject to shinking oak.

6052. There are just your personal views at present?—Then the sick; as far as I see it would be very difficult to remove the sick of any class, say from near Clones, Newtownbutler, or near Belleek; it would be difficult to remove them by train.

6053. At present they come to the county infirmary, and there is no ambulance connected with the county infirmary?—No.

6054. They are generally people who can travel by train?—Very often they are of the better class.

6055. And they come in a vehicle of their own or hired?—But no contagious diseases go to the county infirmary. I think if you could utilize the hospitals in connection with any disused workhouses—you have the dispensary doctor there, and the addition of a nurse or two would save the poor from being brought down to the central place—if it would not cost more than at present.

6056. We have had medical testimony of a very high quality to the fact that patients could be removed, say twenty-five miles, in a good ambulance as easily as they can be removed fifteen?—That is a question I could not go into; that is a question for yourself; but if there were any inconvenience whatever in removing them, as there seems not to be now from what you say, I would say that it would be better to utilize the hospitals connected with those other places.

6057. The existing hospitals?—Yes; if it would not cost more than it costs now. Anything that would be in the interests of the poor, and efficient without excessive cost, I would be favourable to.

6058. Mr. McMAHON.—You say that on general principles you believe that a county should be self-contained in the matter of the administration of the relief of the poor?—I did not say that; I only said that one county being a small county.

6059. Perhaps I should have said your own county; we are dealing with Fermanagh now; on general principles you say that the county should be self-contained?—Now, in the state of the population and facility for conveying.

6070. And you think one workhouse in the county would be sufficient for the needs of the poor?—I think it would.

6071. You think there should be some place in these deserted workhouses for the care of the sick?—I do.

6072. Do you think now that there would be no injury to the poor by the abandoning of some of the houses in the county; by the giving up, for instance, of Irvinestown and Lisnaskea?—I don't think there would be any injury to the poor.

6073. There would be no difficulty in the way of locomotion getting the people sent to Enniskillen?—There is a railway running through the whole county from Clones on the one hand to Ballyshannon on the other.

6074. So that there would be no difficulty from that point of view. And instead of tramping ten or twelve miles these poor people should be sent by train.

6075. Do you think the Enniskillen Union is sufficiently large to accommodate the whole county as a workhouse?—I think the Enniskillen Workhouse was built for a larger number at first, and accommodated a larger number at first, than you would have in the whole county now.

6076. As regards the homeless lunatic, you think that if it would not be any additional cost it would be better to have an auxiliary asylum than to send them to the lunatic asylum at Omagh?—I think, in the first place, it would be better to have them separated from the workhouse and from the poor, and sent somewhere—the only somewhere they could be sent to would be Omagh or an auxiliary asylum—and I think an auxiliary asylum would be cheaper.

6077. You know if they were sent to Omagh additional buildings would have to be erected at an additional cost of money; the house at Omagh is already full?—You and I know that from being members of the committee.

6078. The Chairman asked you if you had gone into the cost of an auxiliary asylum as compared with that in the asylum; I suppose you would not be able to do that, because you could not fix the staff that would be necessary?—No; the observations I make are subject to this contingency.

6079. It is only medical experts that could tell the staff and what would be the requirements of an auxiliary asylum?—Quite so.

6080. And until that was known it would be hard for any ordinary man to make a calculation as to the cost?—I make no calculation; there are general opinions of my own, and, as I say, to be regulated by efficiency and economy.

6081. But still if the auxiliary asylum could be managed at a cost no greater than that in the lunatic asylum you would prefer the auxiliary asylum?—I think so.

6082. You think it is not well to have a great number of people together if it could possibly be avoided?—For the people we have—the idlers, both male and female—in Enniskillen, I think they would be as well in an auxiliary asylum, and if you take into account the extra buildings we would have to erect at a cost of £30,000 or £40,000. The County Fermanagh has spent far too much on buildings in the same asylum. I think they would be as well, if not better, in an auxiliary asylum, whether that would be a county asylum or whether one of two or three for the province of Ulster; that is a matter of detail, and I am not fixed to any principle in relation to the merits of these two.

6083. As regards the boarding out of children, you are in favour of that?—I am in favour of boarding out the children and getting them incorporated in the community, and I am in favour of dressing them like other people's children and sending them out to school without any distinctive badge of pauperism on them.

6084. You have a comparatively large number of children in the Enniskillen Union at present; how does that happen?—I suppose the parents are there, and we cannot board out the children without the consent of their parents.

6085. I am informed there are a number of orphans still in your house?—I suppose they are not of age yet.

6086. Have you an age limit?—We have; the Chairman of the Board of Guardians is here, and he is so efficient that I reply—"Don't tax my mind with anything that comes into his sphere; he will be able to give you clearer evidence on that than I can."

6087. Mr. Dromgoole.—You have said that, with regard to Fermanagh at any rate, you think the boundaries of the union should be coterminous with the boundary of the county; you know, of course, the district of Rosslea?—Well, I know something about it.

6088. You know where it lies?—I do, right well.

6089. And that is in the Clones Union?—Yes.

6090. And I think I am right in saying that Rosslea is about eight miles from Clones?—I don't know; I have driven it several times, and it is a pretty long journey; that is all I know.

6091. Clones is the town to which the Rosslea people would naturally go on an appeal to Enniskillen?—I think it is their market town.

6092. Enniskillen would be up to twenty or thirty miles away from it according to the part of the district you take?—Yes, it would; but I would not consider it more than eight miles, because if they get to Clones it would be very easy coming down on the train.

6093. That is the Rosslea people could get to Enniskillen conveniently by first going to Clones and then taking the train, which is something under an hour; do you think it would be very easy to get the people from the district of Rosslea to serve as Poor Law Guardians in Enniskillen?—I don't suppose it would, but we have them serving in Enniskillen at a greater inconvenience than that.

6094. But you think it would be easier to get them to serve in Clones than in Enniskillen?—It would be easier, of course.

6095. It would add considerably to the expenditure of time and of their own private means in doing the journey you speak of?—Yes.

6096. You spoke of Lisnaskea and suggested that that should be discontinued as a workhouse; it should be used as an auxiliary asylum?—And hospital.

6097. Of course it would be necessary in any building you would turn to this purpose; it would be very important that there should be a proper sanitary system and water supply?—Yes.

Nov 11, 1900.

Mr. Jeremiah Jordan.

Nov. 11, 1903.

Mr. Jeremiah Jordan

6089. And, of course, if those did not exist it would be almost a necessary part of turning it to this purpose that money should be expended in doing so?—If it did not exist, do you mean the water?

6090. I mean a proper water supply and proper sanitary arrangements in the place?—I don't know whether you want to apply that to Lismuckish or not, because I was at Lismuckish Workhouse the other day and I saw a very efficient pump going to pump the water to the house, and I was talking to the chairman of the board, and he said Lismuckish is probably one of the most sanitary places in Fermanagh.

6100. Are there any sanitary arrangements inside?—I don't know.

6101. If there were no sanitary arrangements inside that would be one reason, to a large extent, why the place should be discontinued?—That I would take it that under the efficient chairman they have—

6102. They would spend the money in doing it, I have no doubt. Did you notice the motive power that drove the pump?—I did.

6103. What was it?—It was a donkey and one of those harmless Riels.

6104. Mr. Alderson.—I believe Lismuckish is in the centre of your own division which you have the honour to represent in Parliament?—Yes, it is.

6105. And you know the district extremely well?—I ought to know it; I was reared in that part.

6106. I am sure I am right in saying that you have not consulted them before giving your evidence here to-day?—I think I should not be compelled to submit my personal opinions to them.

6107. You are aware, of course, that in Lismuckish there is a very strong idea that they should remain the centre of a workhouse system?—They have as good a right to their idea as I have to mine, but I have told the Commission that I am giving nothing but my private opinion, and you should not subject my private opinion to political influences of that sort.

6108. I should not like to?—The very moment our friends in Lismuckish or elsewhere like they have a remedy with me; they have only to get rid of me, do you see, and I would not have the slightest objection to anything they do, for they are very respectable people, and considerate, and I will not object to any course they take.

6109. Would you be in favour of the Enniskillen Union absorbing the portion of Irvinestown, that is in the County Fermanagh, and that portion of Ballyshannon that is in this county?—I would; that is theoretically, without having any idea of it.

6110. And you think in the peculiar circumstances of these eight electoral divisions in Cavan they must continue to come to Enniskillen?—I think they are forced by the Act of Parliament and the Local Government Board in their adjournment of the union in harmony with the Act of Parliament; I think they are forced to come here.

6111. When you take these additional burdens on Enniskillen and retain that portion of Cavan, don't you think Enniskillen is fairly well off?—It is not a matter of well off; it is how you make these divisions well off.

6112. Do you think it is competent to take on any more?—I think it is quite competent by readjustment and classification; we would not be taking on so many more as would appear on the books now if there were a readjustment and redistribution of the different classes.

6113. Lismuckish Union is situated on the top of a hill—the workhouse and the infirmary?—Yes.

6114. Has it not always been regarded as a model workhouse and a healthy situation?—I have told you I have heard from the chairman that it is one of the healthiest places in Fermanagh, and I have nothing to put against that.

6115. And its district comprises all the islands in the Upper Lake?—I could not tell you that; I would think some of the islands in the Upper Lake might go to Cavan, but I am not certain. Is it all Upper Lake from Enniskillen to Belleek?

6116. And the union workhouse is situated near the lake?—It is.

6117. Would you think it convenient or possible to make such arrangements for the transit of the sick poor to Enniskillen, or paupers, taking them from these islands?—Once they got to the mainland they would be all right, the difficulty is getting out of the islands. I was up at Belleekwater the other day in connection with this question, and I was sympathizing deeply with the people in the islands.

6118. Would it not make a great difference if they had, in addition to coming off the island, to go twenty-five miles to Enniskillen?—It is only about eight or nine miles from Enniskillen to Lismuckish.

6119. Does not the Union of Lismuckish go four miles on the other side of Enniskillen, and it is ten miles from Lismuckish here?—It is nine miles by road.

6120. It is twenty-five miles long?—I don't know that; where do you put in the twenty-five miles.

6121. From Cavan; do you know the Cavan electoral division; how far do you think that is from Enniskillen?—I don't know; can anybody tell from Lismuckish to Cavan how far it is; it is a matter I have no knowledge of.

6122. Do you suggest that these people have any connection with Enniskillen; do they come to markets or fairs here?—Paupers don't want to come to markets or fairs.

6123. But the Guardians who represent the paupers?—A great number of them, I think, would be in the fair yesterday.

6124. And you think that because you have a fair in Enniskillen once a month and that you have here?—No, no; you are shirking that.

6125. Have they not a fair in Lismuckish once a month?—I go to it sometimes; several of us go there.

6126. Except, Mr. Jordan, that you have a fair in Enniskillen once a month and that the representative lives in Enniskillen; have they any other connection with this town?—Several of them come here to do business from time to time; why, there is scarcely a man in that district but occasionally comes to Enniskillen to do business.

6127. Do you suggest to the Commission that if they were connected with the Enniskillen Union they would be frequent attendants at Board meetings in Enniskillen?—No, I do not suggest that, because we have plenty of people here within a very short space of Enniskillen that don't attend, so it would be no security for them not to attend when the people at our doors don't attend; you sometimes can hardly get a quorum.

6128. As regards the attendances at board meetings the destruction of Lismuckish would not work out well?—I could not tell that.

6129. As regards the eight divisions of the County Cavan which still propose to come to Enniskillen, this is a very poor district?—It is poor, but it is not so poor after all; here for a long time they paid no rent at all, and then when they came to buy out their land they got it very cheap, and while apparently the country is very bad they are not so badly off as in other places.

6130. It is a mountain district?—It is indeed, and you would not live in it if you got it for nothing.

6131. Is it not so situated between two mountain ranges that it is almost impossible to get to Banbury at all except through one gap?—Yes.

6132. Don't you go to the town of Ballyvaughan, which is the Quarter Sessions town near Banbury?—I have been at Ballyvaughan two or three times at Land League meetings, and that is all I know about it.

6133. You know, at all events, that in this district of Cavan they are numerous in coming to Enniskillen?—Am I not in favour of that too; because they are compelled—

6134. They are compelled by the geographical situation to come that way?—Yes; and it is their market town.

6135. In the event of Enniskillen Union absorbing these portions of Irvinestown and Ballyvaughan which are in this county, and keeping that portion of Cavan which still comes into this town, and in the event of Lismuckish being continued and taking in that portion of Cavan which comes into the County Fermanagh, don't you think that would be a very good arrangement, and that the County Fermanagh would be well off?—I don't look at it as all as to Enniskillen being well off or ill off.

6136. The County Fermanagh being well off?—I don't look at it in that light at all. I think for the purpose of economy and efficiency this amalgamation should take place, no matter where you have the workhouse.

6137. Amalgamation is the extent I suggest, would that satisfy you?—What is that?

6138. Enniskillen absorbing Irvinestown and Ballyvaughan, and retaining portion of Cavan, which now comes in, Lismuckish being preserved and taking in that portion of the County Union which comes into Fermanagh; would not that make the County Fermanagh fairly well off as regards Poor Law?—What do you mean by fairly well off; do you mean pecuniary advantage?

6139. That there would be no hardship inflicted on the sick poor; the Guardians would be able to attend to their duties, and Poor Law administration go on with efficiency and economy?—That is a matter of opinion, but my opinion is the other way.

6140. Will nothing satisfy you except the destruction of Lismacree?—I refuse to answer that, because that assumes that anything I have said would go to Mr. Jeremiah Jordan.
 It to me. I have no interest in destroying any place, much less Lismacree.

Nov. 11, 1920
 Mr. Jordan

The Earl of BELMONT, P.C., Q.C.M.G., examined.

6141. CHAIRMAN.—For some time, Lord Belmont, you have been Chairman of the Enniskillen Board of Guardians?—I was a member of the Enniskillen Board of Guardians, I think, for about forty-two and a half years, from September, 1856, until the Local Government Act came into operation. At different times I filled all the chairs, and for about half the time, I think twenty-one years, I was chairman, but it is right to say there were two breaks in my time when I was not living in the county. But I was seventeen or eighteen years actually constantly attending as chairman, and I was, I think, three or four years vice-chairman before that, and at a very early period of the time for some time, I forget how long exactly, up to 1852 I was deputy vice-chairman, and therefore I know what went on then. I have not been a member of the board since the Local Government Act came in; therefore my knowledge does not embrace some things. I only heard Mr. Jordan mention one circumstance I was not aware of, and that was that they had abolished the rule with regard to outdoor relief, that there must be a medical certificate that the person was not fit to be removed; I don't think I knew that.

6142. You are familiar with the Poor Law conditions of the county generally?—With the centre of the county; this part of the county I certainly am.

6143. Have you formed any opinion on the question of the breaking up of any Poor Law unions?—Yes; I think an amalgamation would be advisable on the ground of economy, and I don't think there would be any inconvenience sufficiently great to counteract that advantage, but I don't quite follow Mr. Jordan in his suggestion as to how it should be done. If you will allow me I will tell you what I think might be done; I believe, I am not quite sure—I speak subject to correction—I believe the Banbury Union was not an original union.

6144. It was not; it was made in 1858?—It was formed out of Omeagh, before I was a member, and that probably was a reason why the Omeagh division came to Enniskillen. I know the country there; I have driven from Ballymacnall through Banbury to Down, and I cannot see the slightest difficulty why those eight divisions should not have been in the Banbury Union; there is a very good road over what they call the Gap—quite as good as many of the roads in our county—and it is a good deal nearer to Banbury than to Enniskillen, because the town of Down is twenty-two English miles from Enniskillen, and the Guardians of that part have to come twenty-two miles to get to Enniskillen.

6145. They come to Belmoe, I suppose?—They come to Belmoe; the poor probably have to walk and the others come by train. It is quite obvious they could not go to the Carrig Union, because they would be fifty miles, more or less, going there, but I think they might go to Banbury.

6146. But if Banbury were broken up?—I don't think it could be broken up. However that is not for me to say. I think it is so far from Carrig it would be necessary to keep Banbury. Then, with regard to the other side of the county, until 1859 we had one division that is now in Irvinestown in Enniskillen, Kilkenny Division, and I was told there are three County Tyrone divisions in Irvinestown. I don't think those could possibly go into the Omeagh Union, and if there was a breaking up of Irvinestown those four divisions must come to Enniskillen, but they would be better off even now than the Down people are. I would be inclined to put the whole of Irvinestown into Enniskillen. With regard to Ballymacnall Union I think the part that is in Fermanagh must remain with Ballymacnall; it would be more convenient for everybody it should. I don't see any difficulty in bringing Lismacree into Enniskillen. Lismacree Union comes within three-quarters of an hour's drive from Enniskillen—the nearest point—the town of Lismacree is only ten Irish miles; of course Carrig is further, fifteen Irish miles, but, even so, it would be nearer than Down at the pre-

sent moment. I don't think you could take the Clones part of Fermanagh into Enniskillen—its ruin within a few miles of the town of Clones—and Clones being a rather important centre the union should still exist.

6147. Have you considered whether any general scheme of small district hospitals might not make it possible to break up some of the workhouses?—Well, I have not considered them in detail. I have a paper here that shows the accommodation in Enniskillen. Enniskillen has room for 855 persons, and I believe in the famine time, when we had a wooden auxiliary building, which has now been pulled down, but which I remember very well—not in operation, but standing on the ground—I was a member of the board; we took in a thousand people. And I find the total number on a daily average in all the five workhouses in Fermanagh, including portions of Ballymacnall and portions of Clones, is only 552. Therefore if we had them all we should still have 300 spare places in Enniskillen Workhouse. I see Lismacree could hold them also, but Irvinestown could not hold them all, but still I don't propose that you should take any part of Ballymacnall or Clones into Enniskillen, and that would take more than 200 off and bring it down only to 350 and something.

6148. Would you be in favour, Lord Belmont, of putting different classes or kinds of inmates into workhouses that might be closed as general workhouses; for instance, making a workhouse for the infirm at Irvinestown or Lismacree?—I have not considered the matter of the infirm.

6149. They are a very numerous class?—Yes; most of the people are infirm except the children, but I don't think they are many.

6150. There are a large number of children in Enniskillen at present?—I am told there are thirty-two, which does not seem a large number for this union, which, before you took Kilkenny off, was forty miles from end to end. With regard to your question I cannot give you any opinion as regards Lismacree, because I don't myself see what it could be used for.

6151. Suppose it might be used for infirm workhouse inmates?—If it was wanted.

6152. These people could be sent by train?—They could be sent easily enough; of course there is plenty of accommodation, and more than enough, in Enniskillen, but with regard to what has been said about harmless idiots I think it probably would be an advantage to have an overflow-house from Omeagh, just as in the County Dublin there is an overflow-house from Richmond Asylum, and I should suppose that the medical superintendent of the asylum would have charge of them; it would be necessary to have an assistant; there is an assistant now at Omeagh; always has been. It would be necessary to put an assistant in Irvinestown; I say Irvinestown, because it is nearer to the Omeagh Asylum.

6153. Some suggestions have been made to the Commission as to the possibility of boarding out aged infirm people?—Well, I never considered that matter. I never heard it suggested until your inquiry. Of course I have heard of children being boarded out.

6154. In some countries something has been done in the way of boarding out aged infirm people?—That is a new point.

6155. Do you think it would be a prudent or economical course?—No; I think some arrangement might be made, as is done in England, to allow married couples who are aged and infirm to spend a good deal of time together.

6156. They don't stay together very much?—I don't know; perhaps they don't wish to, but they can, I believe, if they do wish. I think they would be more comfortable than in some of the very inferior houses that they would have to live in if they were boarded out. I think the children are quite a different matter.

6157. Of course the cost of maintenance of an inmate in the workhouse at present is considerable, and they could be supported very much more cheaply by being boarded out?—That is a question I cannot form an

Nov. 11, 1905,
The Earl of
Belmore.

oulion on. I see by this paper that the cost of maintaining inmates in Enniskillen is a good deal higher than it used to be. When I was that a member it did not exceed 2s. and something a week; now it is 3s. and something, and is sometimes 4s. and something.

6152. Taking the cost of maintenance under all heads, as you do when ascertaining the cost of a lunatic in Omagh and other asylums, the cost of a workhouse inmate would be £25 a year, more or less?—I should not have thought it would have been so much.

6153. That is merely for food the 4s. 6d.; the proper way to take the cost of an inmate is to take all the expenses of the establishment—salaries and everything else—and divide the expenses by the number of inmates?—If you want to get an average, it is; but in a private house, taking another person or two into a big house it makes very little difference; they share the servants and the house, and nearly everything but the food.

6154. But that is not the method adopted in an asylum; they take the entire cost?—I am not much given to statistics; I would rather not discuss them; I like talking about general principles.

6155. In the county infirmary here a great deal more is obtained by way of payment from patients than used to be the case?—I am not a member of the infirmary committee now; I have been an annual governor for a good many years. But I don't quite remember that very much was obtained in Enniskillen from the patients before the Local Government Act.

6156. Now a considerable sum is obtained?—There is perhaps a better system.

6157. I wish to ascertain your opinion whether you think it would be well to adopt a similar system elsewhere with a view to get as much recompense as could be obtained; at present the system in the infirmary is that people are asked to pay as much as they really can spare; a very poor person comes in or sends a child in, and that child will not cost a certain amount at home, and it was explained to me by some of the managing body of the infirmary that at least these people could pay what the child or person would cost at home?—That would be rather hard to ascertain.

6158. It would be; but even to the extent of 1s. a week, do you think it would be desirable to have local bodies entrusted with the power of assessing and fixing a sum which could be legally recovered, leaving it to the discretion altogether of the local bodies?—Do you mean the county infirmary or the workhouse infirmary?

6159. Both?—I don't see how the Board of Guardians could interfere with the county infirmary.

6160. Oh, no; with their own inmates?—I really never considered that question; I would rather not give an answer; that may be one of the things that has rather grown up since I was chairman of the board. I was not able to attend the board the last year I was chairman; I have not attended the board for about, I think, six years now.

6161. If people had to pay some little sum, don't you think it would take away out of their minds a good deal of the idea of pauper assistance?—Of course, if they have to pay they are not paupers.

6162. It would do away with that idea?—Yes; that would be an advantage.

6163. Was there any other point you would wish to mention?—Mr. Jordan made an observation I should like to say a word about. He suggested the mothers of illegitimate children should be boarded out in some way.

6170. Sent to penitentiaries?—I think that would be all very well in the case of the first time the woman came in, but I know something about an association in Dublin, the Protestant Girls' Aid Association, and I understand they make an absolute rule never to take a girl in a second time, and I dare say it is a very good rule, because if a girl knew she could come backwards and forwards, as in the workhouse, it would be an encouragement to her to lead so immoral life, but if she only came in once I think it would be very good to have her to go to some of these institutions under different religious denominations.

6171. Those who gave evidence in favour of that had the view that if they were taken the first time it would reclaim them?—I understand they get these situations when they have tested them a little while, and heard the children cry, and have them better educated than they would be in the workhouse.

6172. Do you know how it acts; have you any information as to how these girls turn out afterwards from that society?—I have not got any information as much about the girls; I got their report the other day.

I subscribe to the society. About the children—and it appears to be very successful as regards the children—they are not grouped together in a large establishment.

6173. That institution is in Dublin, and I dare say we shall get some evidence from it?—That institution is in Dublin.

6174. Mr. MURKIN.—You dropped a remark in connection with the Ramsey Union; perhaps you would not mind explaining why you think the Ramsey people should not go to Carran?—It is in the north of the County Cavan. I don't know Carran, but in former times—in the days before the railways—I had to traverse Carran going to Dublin, but I have known the north of Carran from Carran upwards, and I think that part too far from the town of Carran.

6175. Too far for the sick; but about workhouse inmates?—I cannot give evidence about that part of the county; I know it more from maps.

6176. Your remark would apply more to the sick than to the others?—It would apply to everybody; there is no railway connection between Ramsey and Carran without coming round here and by Flasscourt station.

6177. You heard Mr. Jordan's remark about rating, what would you think of his suggestion about an extension of the area of rating to the county?—I don't quite follow that.

6178. A question was put to him with regard to his view as to the area of rating and he said he would like to see the area as wide as possible?—I have very strong opinion one way or the other. We are union rating now, but before we had union rating I had to pay rates in two or three divisions in Enniskillen, where there were a great many parsons, where the rates were high, and in two country divisions, where the rates were low—and I really don't think it makes very much difference whether there is union rating or district rating if you have to pay rates as I had. Of course the persons who had to pay rates in the cheap part were better off, and persons in Enniskillen were worse off.

6179. Would you go outside the county?—If you had a part of Tyrone in a Fermanagh Union I would not like that for Fermanagh.

6180. Would you go as far as a national rate instead of a county rate?—Oh, no. I think the body that has to manage the affairs of the union should control the rating. I don't see how you are to make your estimates or anything if you do that.

6181. CHAIRMAN.—The same way as they are done now?—I think our estimates in Enniskillen were exceedingly well done. Mr. Morrison for a great many years was the clerk, and I thought he did his work extremely well and ran the union very cheaply considering its immense size; it only cost £4,000, and it is very little in excess of that now.

6182. The Guardians estimate what they want and send the demand to the County Council?—Mr. Murkin mentioned a general rate for all Ireland. In the same way the county would send its demand to the national body.

6183. Mr. MURKIN.—I did not think the Ulstermen would consent to a rate so widespread. In your calculation as to 551 inmates in the workhouses, you have included the harmless lunatics?—Everybody that is in it.

6184. If the children and harmless lunatics were taken out of that calculation the number would be much smaller?—Ninety-five would be taken off.

6185. That would leave 456, roughly?—Yes; 450 about.

6186. Then you think the present houses in Enniskillen would be sufficiently large to accommodate that 450?—As far as I can see it would go very nearly double; there may be more cubic feet of air in each room.

6187. Dr. BROWNE.—Do you know whether there is a certain amount of unpopularity attached to the workhouse infirmaries on account of their connection with the workhouses?—I suppose there is. I believe people would rather go into the county infirmary than the workhouse infirmary.

6188. Is that partly on account of the separation from the workhouse?—I think it is the idea that a person going into the workhouse infirmary becomes a pauper, but I only know it from hearsay. I don't know that I ever talked to anybody about it; but supposing I had anybody connected with me, a servant or anybody in my place, who wanted to go into the infirmary, they would very much object to going into the workhouse infirmary, unless it was a contagious disease, when it is understood they must.

6180. Would it enlarge the usefulness of the workhouse infirmaries if separated from the workhouse and made district hospitals?—I don't see how you could work it.

6181. It could be done?—I am not a judge, but I would see difficulties in the way. Of course if you give up one of the present houses, say Lisnakea, as a general workhouse, we might apply it to a purpose of that sort; that would involve, of course, the keeping up of another staff. I think the great advantage in amalgamation would be that you would get rid of two staffs and merely have the staff in Enniskillen.

6182. You have not considered the separation of consumptive patients?—I have not; there are a great many new theories about consumption that I never heard of until a late year, and I don't like to give information on a subject of that sort.

6183. Mr. Muldoon.—Barnboy Union lies close to the Carran Union, does it not?—I suppose part of it touches the Carran Union, but I really don't know where the division is; I don't know whether, for instance, Bellebar is in Barnboy or Carran.

6184. Are you aware that the most extreme limit of the Barnboy Union would not be more than eight or nine miles from Carran Union Workhouse?—No, I am not aware, but certainly if you had the Derris division added on it would be a great deal more.

6185. CHAIRMAN.—How many miles is it from Swanbar to Carran?

Mr. Muldoon.—Thirty, I am instructed.

Witness.—If you show me the map I can tell. (Map produced.) Are you talking of the town of Carran?

Mr. Muldoon.—The town of Carran, where the workhouse is now situated, is the extreme limit of the Barnboy Union.

6186. CHAIRMAN.—Swanbar?—I should say it would be eighteen or twenty miles (English).

6187. Mr. Muldoon.—In the event of the Barnboy Union being broken up, it would be naturally absorbed by Carran?—If it was broken up, but I assume it could not be broken up. If it was necessary to form it after the other unions were formed it is a very good proof it was wanted.

6188. If the people of Carran are in favour of the amalgamation of unions and the lessening of the number of workhouse Barnboy would be one of the doomed unions?—It might be.

6189. And, naturally, it would be absorbed by Carran?—Of course it would if it was broken up.

6190. You are aware that the local people of the district that now come to Enniskillen are almost unanimously in favour of coming to Enniskillen?—I believe they like to come to the Enniskillen fair.

6191. And if there was any order made or report made recommending the contrary it would run counter to a large extent to the local feeling?—It may; but that is not my point of view.

6192. It would not make for efficiency?—I think it would make for efficiency.

6193. A district which is unanimously in favour of coming to one place, to compel them to go to another would make for efficiency?—It would, because it would reduce the rates.

6194. Nobody has suggested abolishing Enniskillen—even Mr. Jordan?—I believe Irvinestown suggested it.

6195. Have you ever driven from Derris to Barnboy through Glas Gap?—I have driven from Barnboy to Derris through the Glas Gap.

6196. Often?—Once.

6197. Is that your experience of the drive; you have never reversed the drive?—I have not reversed the drive.

6198. What time of the year was this?—In August, twenty years ago.

6199. You have never seen the road in winter?—I have not, but I can imagine the road; I have seen other roads like it.

6200. You will never face that drive again?—I have never been but once that way.

6201. I am instructed it would be very hazardous for you to drive it again?—In Australia I have driven across roads a hundred times worse than that, and I have had to swim my horse across a river; I would say the Barnboy road is much easier than that.

6202. Are you aware that when the inhabitants have to go to Ballyconnell, their Quarter Sessions town, they have to come round by Bellebar and take the train?—No; but I would not contradict it if you say that is the case; but if I was going from Derris to Ballyconnell, and I had the means of driving, I should certainly drive instead of going round by Bellebar.

6203. You know the Lisnakea district?—Of course, I have travelled it by road and train.

6204. There are a great number of inhabited islands in the union?—I know there are; some of them once belonged to me.

6205. It would be somewhat inconvenient the transit to Enniskillen under such circumstances; at all events there would be some local reason for retaining a Poor Law administrative system?—I can understand that a people who have a workhouse in their midst are unwilling to give it up.

6206. You can see no other reason?—No.

6207. They have no railway on the west side of the lake?—No; but they can just as easily come here as go across to Lisnakea across the lake.

6208. It is only six miles across?—I have been all down the other side of the lake by road; it is a very easy road.

6209. In case the northern part of the county is looked after by Enniskillen and the southern part by Lisnakea, and that portion of Glenties is taken in, would you have any objection to Fermanagh County being Poor Lawed in that way with two unions?—I have not considered that question, but I don't see anything would be gained by doing it. I think it would be better to have one in the way I have suggested, leaving the part of Fermanagh that is in Glenties Union to Glenties and leaving the part of Ballyshannon that is in Fermanagh to Ballyshannon.

6210. That would not be much of a reform?—It would be a great reform.

6211. The county would still not be self-contained?—I don't attach any advantage to its being self-contained; it would be a compact area.

Mr. Muldoon.—Except when it is proposed to bring in Carran, then the self-contained principle is a good one.

6212. Mr. MURPHY.—Before you just leave I would like to have your view on the question of representation that has been raised here by the Chairman of the County Council. I would like to know what representation you would suggest for the localities that might lose their workhouse?—They would have to come to Enniskillen, of course. But Mr. Jordan, I think, suggested—I don't know that I quite follow him, because I think there have been some changes since I was a member of the Board of Guardians; when I was a member of the board we had one of the biggest boards in Ireland; we had forty-two divisions, and there were forty-one other members, then there were the ex-officio Guardians besides, that brought the number up to nearly ninety or ninety-two; I hardly ever saw half of them attend; perhaps on one or two occasions, when there was some great rump, these may have been a little more than half, but I don't think I ever saw fifty of those ninety attend, and, therefore, it shows the board was absolutely too large, and you could hardly have given them sitting room. I think if you have the whole of the other two unions you must, of course, reduce the numbers by having only one elected Guardian for each division, but I don't see any objection to that in any way. Probably, of course, there may be an old case where there are two people of different political opinions in each division; that would not be often the case, and I don't think it would affect party positions.

6213. That is the only change you would think necessary?—Yes.

6214. What about dispensary committees, they were very useful bodies?—I don't know much about dispensary committees; I was nominally a member of the Enniskillen one, and I was a member of the Skiddo-Cross committee in Tyrone, but I only attended the committee once, and that was for the election of a doctor; I don't know much about it.

Nov. 11, 1905.

Mr. Hugh R. Lindsay.

Mr. HUGH R. LINDSAY, J.P., examined.

6224. CHAIRMAN.—You have been Chairman of the Board of Guardians for some time—I have.

6225. And, as a County Councillor, you are familiar with the county generally?—Well, fairly.

6226. Have you formed any opinion as to whether it would be beneficial or useful in the interests of economy and efficiency combined to break up any of the unions of the county?—I have; I would be in favour of amalgamation on the ground of economy, and that the present system is not satisfactory. I would go in for amalgamating Lanesboro and Irvinestown with Enniskillen.

6227. What would you do with the Ballyshannon part of Fermanagh?—I would also take it into the Enniskillen Union and Glenties No. 2 district into Enniskillen Union, and make the county the unit, together with the eight Ovens divisions.

6228. You would propose to retain the Enniskillen Union as it is?—I would.

6229. In the event of the breaking up of the Bawnboy Union, do you think the Enniskillen Union could take some of that as well?—I am not so certain on that point; I dare say we could. We might take one or two of the divisions on this side of Bawnboy. The roads are good from here into Bawnboy and Swinburn, and thus across the market town for the whole district.

6230. If the workhouses were closed at Lanesboro and Irvinestown what arrangements do you think would be necessary at those centres?—I would abolish them entirely.

6231. And bring the sick here?—Yes; I think I would be inclined to go in for hospitals at the extreme ends of the county—one at Garrison or Belleek, one at Belleek or Blackburn, and one at Roslea or Newtownabbey.

6232. How far is Roslea from Glenties?—Four Irish miles.

6233. Would not that be a very short distance to have between two hospitals?—It would, unless you were thinking of establishing Glenties and putting it into Monaghan.

6234. How would you propose to deal with the sick of Glenties No. 2 district if the hospital were retained at Omagh?—You would treat them there.

6235. Supposing you take Glenties No. 2 into the Fermanagh Union, the new Enniskillen Union, would you oblige the sick to come here; you said you would have a hospital at Roslea?—If you had a cottage hospital at Roslea or in Newtownabbey it would accommodate the sick of No. 2 Glenties district.

6236. Supposing there was a hospital at Glenties and that the District Council of Glenties No. 2 or the Poor Law body for that district should be empowered to board or send the sick into the Glenties hospital to be treated at the average cost of maintenance in that hospital?—Yes; I should say that would meet it.

6237. And that would make it unnecessary to keep up a separate institution?—Yes.

6238. You would merely have the cost per head for the actual number of days?—Yes.

6239. Might that also be applied by the Belleek district sending their sick into Ballyshannon?—It could.

6240. So that it would be unnecessary to have a hospital at that end of the county?—Yes; you could utilize Glenties and Ballyshannon Workhouses for that purpose.

6241. What would be your view about the Irvinestown Union?—That it should be merged into Enniskillen.

6242. Would you let that part of Tyrone go to Omagh?—I would let that part of Tyrone go to Omagh; it is not too far away from it.

6243. The amount given in outdoor relief is relatively very small indeed in this union?—It is.

6244. Are you aware whether any allegations have been made as to any hardship resulting to the poor owing to any rigorous, or alleged rigorous, administration of the Poor Law under the head of outdoor relief?—I cannot say that any case of hardship has reached my ears, but sometimes the Guardians are a shade pecuniary in such cases.

6245. It has not been represented to you on any authority that any real hardship has resulted?—No.

6246. By the amalgamation of these unions you would look to a large reduction in salaries?—I would.

6247. That would be your chief saving?—Yes; it would abolish two staffs of officials. There would be a very substantial saving with regard to the teaching of the children. The present teaching of the children of the three unions costs about £200—that is the portion of this county in Glenties and the portion at Belleek. I should say that two teachers would be sufficient to teach all the children; there cannot be more than forty or fifty in the county.

6248. Would you like the children to be educated altogether from the Poor Law institution of the future?—Yes. I believe the boarding-out system is much healthier, better for the children, and they make a better start in life after; and since the lady inspectors were appointed their lot is somewhat improved.

6249. Would you think it well that the powers of Guardians should be enlarged for putting out children so that you practically might be able to board out all, if not nearly all, the children you have?—Yes; I would go still further on that.

6250. You would go to the extent of saying all illegitimate children should be boarded out?—I would if the mothers were not sufficiently careful to look after them.

6251. You would leave that to the Guardians whether they would take the children or not from the custody of the mothers?—I would.

6252. It might be feared that some encouragement to immorality would be given if it was made too easy to a woman to get rid of her child?—Yes; there would be that danger.

6253. Do you think that the Board of Guardians would consider that in each case?—I expect they would.

6254. And they would not make a loose general practice that would act unfavorably on morality?—I don't believe they would.

6255. You think the discretion might be safely left to them?—I think it would be safe in the hands of the Guardians.

6256. Do you think there would be any difficulty in getting suitable homes for the boarding out of the children you have at present in your workhouses?—I don't think there would be any difficulty.

6257. You have not experienced difficulty in the past?—No; on the contrary.

6258. Is there competition for them by suitable people?—Yes.

6259. Your poundage rate in Enniskillen for Poor Law purposes is very low?—It is.

6260. A great deal lower than Irvinestown, for instance?—Yes, in Enniskillen and Glenties Irvinestown. It is 1/6d. in Enniskillen?—They are a model board.

6261. You have a very large number of women with illegitimate children in your workhouse at present?—Unfortunately, we have.

6262. I think the members of the Commission are about twenty-two of them a couple of days ago?—Yes.

6263. There were two of the women that were then that had been married, but they had two or three children before they were married?—Yes.

6264. So that practically nearly all the female inmates of the workhouse are mothers of illegitimate children?—They are.

6265. They are a rather troublesome class?—Indeed they are, and very useless; you can get no work out of them at all.

6266. You are aware, I presume, that a great many of these women have two, three, and four children?—Yes.

6267. They keep on going out and coming back again with additions to their families?—Yes; and there seems very little chance of remedying that.

6268. In Poor Law institutions for the future do you think it would be possible, in the way we were discussing just now, to exclude these women from workhouses and treat them elsewhere?—Well, it might be; as an institution or home.

6269. These are penitentiaries at present managed by various religious associations or bodies?—Certainly; it is not desirable to have them in the immediate neighbourhood of the deserving sick in hospital.

6270. At present they are employed as scrubbers, not as attendants or wardresses?—Yes.

6271. Would you be disposed to try such a system if the religious communities were in favour of co-operating with the Guardians?—I would.

Nov. 11, 1903.

Mr. Hugh R. Lindsay.

6272. On the question whether disused workhouses might not be used, even if the union were broken up, for other purposes, Poor Law purposes first and lunatic asylum purposes in the second place, would you approve of a workhouse like Irvinestown or Lismahon being used for putting all the inmates of a certain class in, say all the inmates of the County Fermanagh—I think Enniskillen Workhouse would be quite sufficient for all purposes.

6273. You think it would be unnecessary to consider that question unless Enniskillen were too small—I would.

6274. Now, as regards lunatics, Omagh asylum is too small for its present purposes, and if this workhouse were closed and if it were considered by Parliament that lunatics for the future should not be maintained in workhouses, would you be in favour of having disused workhouses used as auxiliary lunatic asylums?—I would be in favour of two or three for the whole province of Ulster, not including Belfast.

6275. Did you think where these might be placed?—I did not; I should not like to offer an opinion on that; you would be a better authority on that than I would be. I suppose the expense of these would be decided.

6276. Part by the Government and part payment per head; each county that would need would pay so much per head?—Yes.

6277. You think that would be cheaper, or have you considered the question whether that would be cheaper than enlarging the existing asylums?—I would rather see lunatic lunatics kept away from the present Omagh asylum; the authorities there don't seem to want them at all.

6278. They are over-full, but if they got an additional building they might have no objection?—They might not.

6279. But as regards fever for the County Fermanagh, how would you propose to deal with fever cases?—As we stand at present we probably would encounter as much difficulty, or do encounter as much difficulty, or more, than if we had the whole county in one union, because we have to go to Down, which is the extreme end of the County district, and we get most of the patients in from that part for the fever hospital.

6280. How far is Down?—Seventeen Irish miles.

6281. You have patients occasionally from there?—Most of them come from there.

6282. How far would they be at Down from the other nearest workhouse, say Monaghan or Mohill?—I should think probably Banbury would be the nearest, and this road Lord Belmore refers to through Glen Gap is probably one of the worst roads in Ireland—you have to walk the bulk of the road; to go to Banbury by any reasonable road from Down you have twenty-five miles.

6283. How far would Down be from Mohill?—I cannot say.

6284. As regards fever from Irvinestown and Lismahon, do you think these cases might be treated here at Enniskillen?—Oh, yes.

6285. With a good ambulance?—Yes; the roads are much better in the County Fermanagh than probably in any other county; the road from here to Clones is quite level, and the same up to Derrylin on the west side of the lake.

6286. Your fever hospital here is large?—It is.

6287. Quite equal to any emergency that would be likely to arise in the county?—Yes; I see others of them have not such accommodation.

6288. You have a considerable number of fever cases at present?—We have a lot of diphtheria cases, and as to the occurrence of fever patients I would hope the winter might come in, because our roads are so level.

6289. They have started motor ambulances in some parts of England?—Yes; I saw that. A motor fever van would be very desirable, and would cause no inconvenience to the poor patient.

6290. Have you considered the question of the housing out of aged and infirm people?—I am afraid there would be a difficulty in that.

6291. The possibility is that the proposal would be that the people should be boarded out with relatives?—If they were well paid for I dare say it would be an inducement to the people to take care of them.

6292. Do you not think that elderly people might be treated to see that they got good food at all seasons?—I think they might, but they would be rather more inclined to take healthy children than old people.

6293. Then the proposal is not attractive to you at present?—No.

6294. As regards the question of rates, you heard Mr. Jordan's idea, which seemed to come into his mind on the spur of the moment, about having a county rate or even a national rate?—I would not be so much inclined for a universal rate, but I would go in for a union rate or county rate. There are two reasons why a union-or-large rate is more useful to us—very poor people in some of the backward districts get a little relief from the wealthier classes, and where an improvement or a sanitary good is to be carried out in one particular district, if the expense is scattered over the whole union it is not so much opposed as if the expense were confined to the district.

6295. You would think it fair that the highly-rated parts of the union and the less highly-rated part should be continued under a county rate?—I do; it comes very hard on the very poor. When it was formerly divisional rating it came very hard on the division to raise a certain amount of money to keep up the requirements of that division, inasmuch as the land was low let and the rate had to be pitched high to raise a certain sum of money.

6296. You think there are too many Guardians at present?—Yes; I would be inclined to reduce the Guardians to less than one-fourth the number that are in the County Fermanagh at present. We have in the Enniskillen Workhouse about one Guardian to every two paupers, and in some of the unions they have one Guardian to each pauper.

CHAIRMAN.—I think the County Down part has eleven paupers and seventeen Guardians.

Mr. MURKIN.—And in the Tyrone part there are eleven Guardians to seven paupers.

6297. CHAIRMAN.—As regards getting contributions from people who are not destitute, but who are poor, would you be in favour of giving Boards of Guardians a discretion in fixing some small scale on which an individual should pay?—I would; I would give them the same discretion that they have with regard to the paying patients in the hospital, and that is not abundant in any way; the charge is fixed according to the man's means.

6298. That is in the county infirmary?—No; but our own infirmary.

6299. You got very little, but if it were the rule always to examine each case and see whether that person could pay, supposing a person was earning 4s a week and had a large family he would be a poor person, but if a member of his family came in for medical relief that member would cost a certain amount at home?—So doubt.

6300. He could pay a little?—In that case we do charge a little.

6301. What is the least you charge?—3s. 6d. a week, or 6d. a day.

6302. I was thinking of a payment so low as 1s. a week?—That would be very low, but it would raise him from the standard of pauper.

6303. Make him feel more independent?—Yes; we have penance on our books, and we get from 4s. in 6d. a day from them.

6304. I observed a large number of the fever patients are entering as paying patients?—Yes. As regards tramps, I would make no provision in the workhouse at all for tramps. I think the present system encourages the tramp system. We meet always, I should say, here an honest, poor artisan or labourer coming from one place to another; I would enable the police to give that man a ticket for one night's lodging and board in a licensed lodging-house, but he should have proof with him that he was a bona fide working man, but I would not make any provision in the workhouse for the professional tramp.

6305. Dr. RUSSELL.—What would you do with him?—Leave them each in his own district.

6306. CHAIRMAN.—If it not to be feared that they might still go marching about?—I don't think so, sir.

6307. They don't stay every night at the workhouse?—The bulk of them, I think, in this county do; they get a night at Clones, a night at Lismahon, then in Enniskillen, Irvinestown, Ballyshannon, and on to Derrygal; these are all easy day's marches.

6308. Dr. RUSSELL.—Have you any limit of age for boarding out children?—Fourteen.

6309. But young children; what age do you begin?—We board them out sometimes very young and sometimes not so young.

6310. There is no limit?—No.

Nov 11, 1903.

Mr. Hugh R. Lindsay.

6311. Why are not all your children in Enniskillen boarded out?—There are many of them with their mothers, and then we have no power.

6312. Are there not some orphans?—There are some indeed we could send out, but not many with us at present.

6313. What do you think about any provision for consumptive patients?—That is more in the line of an expert witness, but I certainly say it would be very desirable to have a hospital for such patients. We have got out of a small wing of our workhouse. You have got out of a small wing of workhouses of three or four counties for that purpose. I may say further, with regard to the eight divisions of Clonon, that at the time of the passing of the Local Government Act the clergy of all denominations, magistrates, ratepayers, and the poor were very strong in favour of being retained, and got up a strong petition and gave strong reasons—much stronger than I could.

Chairman.—We will ask for a copy of that petition.

6314. Mr. Drummond.—You are in favour of the amalgamation of unions?—Yes.

6315. And one of your reasons, of course, is greater economy?—Yes.

6316. And that economy would be effected to some extent at any rate, if not entirely, by the lessening of staffs?—Not having duplicate staffs?—Yes.

6317. Supposing the Rosalia portion of the Clonon Union were taken from Clonon Union and brought into Enniskillen it could not effect that economy; you would still have your Enniskillen staff and Clonon staff left?

—Of course if you cut off part of a small union like Clonon it gives an inducement to the Commission to abolish Clonon.

6318. If Clonon were not abolished, but only this part cut off and brought to Fermanagh, it would make no addition to the staff?—Not here.

6319. Am I not right in saying that leaving on the artificial boundaries of the Clonon Monaghan and Fermanagh, the natural centre to which the people of Rosalia go is Clonon?—Yes.

6320. That is their market town?—There is a market in Rosalia.

6321. It would take a great deal longer time and occasion more expense to get to Enniskillen?—It may entail a little expense; it is eight miles from Newtownblunder to Rosalia, and there is rail down to Enniskillen.

6322. Except the fact that Enniskillen and Rosalia are in the same county, geographically, there is really no connection between them compared with the connection between Rosalia and Clonon?—That particular district about Rosalia it seems it might be better accommodated at Clonon.

6323. Am I not right in saying that the boundary of the county next Clonon is only about 300 perches away from Clonon?—I cannot say.

6324. But you seriously suggest that it may be a necessary part of this scheme to build a hospital in Rosalia and Newtownblunder?—It has been suggested, such as cottage hospitals.

6325. Do you happen to know anything as to the state of the hospital arrangements in Clonon Union itself?—I do not.

6326. Would you be surprised to know that they are more than usually perfect and up-to-date?—I hope so.

6327. If that were so do you think it would tend to economy to put up a cottage hospital, or any sort of hospital, a few miles away in Rosalia or Newtownblunder simply because it was over the boundaries of the county?—No; if you retain Clonon, and your hospital is so perfect, it is better to trust there.

6328. And supposing you increased the Enniskillen Union, would the officials be satisfied to work for exactly the same pay; would there not be a possibility of their pay having to be raised?—I take the case of the schoolmaster and schoolmistresses, they are teaching a few children, and I don't think they should get an increase if they get double the number of children to teach.

6329. Take the case of the clerk?—You might have to give him an assistant; we pay all our officials well, I may tell you.

6330. Mr. Muldon.—It was proposed in 1898 to send the Clonon divisions that now come to Enniskillen to Banagher?—It was.

6331. And the Enniskillen Board of Guardians passed a resolution in favour of doing so?—Yes.

6332. And the petition that was presented to the Local Government Board was against that?—Yes.

6333. Was not the whole matter debated then both here and at Banagher?—It was.

6334. And there was a discussion in Parliament as the result of which the petition was allowed?—It was; the petition was a very strong one, and was strongly supported by every class in the division.

6335. And are not the Guardians from this division unanimously in favour of continuing to come?—They are unanimously in favour for many reasons; Enniskillen is their market town; they have only to go to Belcoo and get the railway there, and I have heard some of them say that if they were attached to Banagher they would never go there.

6336. You are a total abolitionist with regard to all the unions except Enniskillen?—Well, Enniskillen is the centre of the county; you have the railway coming there from Clonon, Sligo, Belleek, and Bandon.

6337. That is the only reason you could put forward?—Certainly I believe it will be a matter of great economy for the subgroups. At present it will not be much of a saving, but eventually it will be.

6338. Looking at the map, Lisnaskea appears to be fairly central?—It is central between Enniskillen and Clonon.

6339. Would you be equally in favour of the abolition of the other unions if it was proposed to retain Lisnaskea as a great central union for the County Fermanagh, situated upon a hill, and such a model workhouse?—I might if all the conditions were equal to Enniskillen.

6340. Do you know Lisnaskea?—I have heard its name by which they get their water there, and it is said they have not the very best sanitary arrangements. We have spent a couple of thousand pounds on that thing in Enniskillen.

6341. Are you aware the Local Government Inspector has again and again reported about the pure air and good water they have at Lisnaskea?—I never read as of his reports about Lisnaskea.

6342. Do you know anything about the poor rate in Lisnaskea?—I have just heard it is a fraction lower than Enniskillen.

6343. Would you be surprised to hear it was 12 lower than Enniskillen in 1902, and 14 this year, because Lisnaskea spent £200 on a consumption ward? If I am right in saying it is 14 lower on an average, it would be some reason for Lisnaskea not being so anxious to join you as you are to join them?—I would not put that down as an argument; if you want reform you must pay for them; a slight increase in rate is an argument in favour of making Enniskillen the centre.

6344. Keep that point before your mind; would you not think it also some reason for making as the centre that workhouse which was most efficiently and most economically managed?—I am not wedded to my scheme. If you can put forward a better one I have no objection.

6345. Would you have any objection to a scheme by which the workhouse was retained at Enniskillen and took charge of the whole of Fermanagh in Ballymaginn and Fermanagh, and still retained the eight divisions in Clonon, and Lisnaskea looked after the lower portion of the county?—It is not for me to either object or approve. I am giving my evidence for what it is worth.

6346. Would you have any criticism to pass upon it?—It may work fairly well.

6347. You don't go as far as Mr. Jordan; do you not know anything of the district served by the Lisnaskea Workhouse—the inhabited islands. Do you spot at those islands?—No; I think there is a distillery on one of them. Unfortunately, I cannot afford to shoot at them.

6348. Would you be surprised to hear that in the district served by the Lisnaskea Workhouse there are over 200 inhabited islands in the lake?—I don't say there are.

6349. Do you suggest to the Commission that in numerous cases it would not inflict hardship on the poor?—Not in very many cases, because the whole number of inmates in Lisnaskea is not a very great number.

6350. But in their transit from these islands to Enniskillen do you not think it would be a more efficient system to leave Lisnaskea as it stands?—Referring to the eight Clonon unions, I have never heard a case of hardship in transferring patients.

6351. You have not brought any patients from these islands to Enniskillen?—I am giving you a case in point—the eight Owen divisions.

6352. How do you bring them from there; you bring

them to Bellef and put them in a train?—In the case of fever patients we put them in the ambulance.

6353. And you have a good one in Enniskillen?—Yes; a new one.

Nov. 11, 1905.
Mr. Hugh R. Lindsay.

Dr. THORNTON examined.

6354. Mr. Dromgoole.—You are a medical doctor practising in Clones, and you were for a considerable number of years a member of the Clones Board?—Yes; and County Council.

6355. And you are intimately acquainted with all the workings of the Clones Union?—I am, for I act as locum tenens for all the dispensary doctors around.

6356. Before coming here to give evidence to-day, have you consulted with the members of the board as to your evidence?—There was a small committee formed, and a draft report was submitted to them at a special meeting, and it was unanimously adopted. They came to the conclusion that the real expense and saving to the ratepayers is not in the amalgamation of unions but in the amalgamation of workhouses. They consider that two for each county used as workhouses would be quite sufficient, and the spare buildings or unused buildings could be utilised—either one in each county or one in every two or three counties—for a convalescent home and for those chronically afflicted, such as cripples, and another could be used for the insane and imbeciles, because we think one of the greatest hardships under the existing Poor Law Act is that imbeciles, of which we have eight at present in Clones—they were, on the advice of Mr. Courtney, drafted from the body of the house to the hospital, and they are more trouble to the nurse than three times the number of ordinary patients; they are helpless themselves and won't attend to their own persons. We think there should be a central institution and these people taken over by the Commissioners of Lunacy and a stipendium given for them; a specially trained nurse in mental diseases should take charge of them. We consider that if you abolish a union like Clones all the saving it would be to the ratepayers would be the saving of the clerk's salary, which is only £30 a year.

6357. CHAIRMAN.—That is liberal?—He has his perquisites afterwards, and if you abolish the union all these perquisites go to the Secretary of the County Council, and if you follow Mr. Jordan's advice and send them to Clones and appoint an assistant you will get no clerk to do the extra work of Clones No. 2 and Lismacash for £20 a year, and the existing clerk will be expending superannuation. If we abolish the workhouses of the county and have only two we do away with the principal causes of expenditure—the master, matron, and schoolmistress.

6358. You speak of abolishing workhouses as workhouses?—Yes, and make each union remain contributory. As I am appointed to give evidence for the whole union it will save time if my evidence is taken to-day for the Monaghan portion of the union.

6359. Where do you see any economy?—I think the main principle in the Poor Law—

6360. Is your proposal with a view to efficiency apart from economy?—It is more for efficiency apart from economy.

6361. Do you see any possibility of economy resulting from your suggestions?—Yes; by closing up two workhouses.

6362. You would close Irvinestown and Lismacash to a certain extent?—As workhouses; I would leave them as district hospitals.

6363. You would treat the sick at Irvinestown?—A district hospital is essential in the case of accidents or fractures, or the case of a person with an illegitimate child wandering on the roads. How could you cart that off to Enniskillen thirty miles from Roslea?

6364. As far as the Roslea people are concerned, even if Lismacash were broken up could they not be received as paying patients at Clones—paid for by the Fermanagh rates at so much a head per day?—Then the question is not so much hospital accommodation; but if you take into consideration the expense Clones Union has gone to—the last three years we have spent over £1,000; in average £379, we have a perfect average, and on the hospital up to £200, and on other necessary works £200 or £300 more. We have a perfect average and a perfect supply of water at 6d. per thousand gallons; in fact if we take the words of our inspector, Mr. Lynch-Staunton, we are perfect only for the sipping of the wall.

6365. Mr. Dromgoole.—You have got a new ambulance?—Yes; we have two ambulances—a modern one, which cost £60.

6366. CHAIRMAN.—You have not worked it out in figures?—The present cost is about 8d. in the £.

6367. What do you estimate it would be in the future?—Taking away the expenses of three allocations, I should say we should go down to what we were the first year of the Local Government Act—6d. or 4½d. in the £—and the persons in the Clones Union are maintained at the scale laid down by the Local Government Board—first-class rates. In Clones we are a happy family, and wish to be left as we are. We don't want to get on a squabbling board. We say small unions could be contributory to a central place.

6368. A small union would cease to exist, and the ratepayers that used to belong to the small union would become ratepayers of the larger union?—Yes; we say that would be a hardship on the representatives and also on the poor.

6369. Owing to the long distances?—Yes; and not even that, but it is a well-known thing that the poorer classes will not go into the workhouses or hospitals unless they are convenient to their friends where their friends can see them; the poor won't go from the extreme end of the county to Enniskillen, because they will be separated from their friends.

6370. Have you any statistical evidence to show what number of visits are paid to your sick in the hospital?—I know as visiting days nearly all the sick in the hospital are visited.

6371. Are you sure of that?—I am; unless some chronic cases that have no friends. On visiting days I have seen the friends sitting around the beds.

6372. Is there anything else you would like to say?—Nothing, except that I think it is essential to classify the inmates. I don't think the virtuous aged should be put among the rest.

6373. Dr. BOGGER.—You said something about contributory; what did you mean?—If the Clones Workhouse were closed we should be made contributory to a larger workhouse. We have a cheaper rate now, and it is more economical for the Guardians to attend to their business there. It would be impossible to get the Guardians to come thirty miles to the board in Enniskillen; that would be virtually disfranchising them.

6374. CHAIRMAN.—It would be expensive and a loss of time?—In Clones No. 2 they would have to come six or seven miles to the station and spend the whole day coming to Enniskillen.

6375. Dr. BOGGER.—Where do patients come from that are admitted to the fever hospital at Clones?—It is a county hospital, and it is contributed to by the Fermanagh portion of the union.

6376. Do you take patients from Fermanagh into it?—Yes, at 5s. or 6s. a week; that is only the actual expense; we don't charge anything at all for the services of the staff.

6377. You give an advantage to Fermanagh?—We do; there is only a small river separating Fermanagh from Clones.

6378. Have you any idea of the number that comes from Fermanagh?—For the first twelve months they were nearly all from Fermanagh. There was an outbreak of typhus in Roslea and they all drifted into Clones.

6379. Then Fermanagh gets a large advantage from it?—They get an advantage. There was an old rule before this Local Government Act that Fermanagh patients should be admitted to the fever hospital on those terms.

6380. Who manages the fever hospital?—A joint committee appointed by the subscribers and the County Council, the original annual subscribers.

6381. Is Fermanagh represented upon the board?—It is not.

6382. Where do you get your rates from for the support of the fever hospital?—County Monaghan and a contributory fund from Fermanagh at so much per head.

Nov. 11, 1905.
Dr. Tierney.

6363. Therefore you get your patients supported largely out of a county rate?—Yes; there are two county fever hospitals and one hospital in Monaghan—Monaghan, Clones, and Carrickmacross. Carrickmacross is a hospital, and Clones is tabulated in the Local Government Act as one of the county fever hospitals.

6364. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—You say the committee of which you are spokesman decided there would be no advantage in amalgamating uncles?—There would not. They believe it would be a hardship on the poor and on the representatives.

6365. Do you not think that better service to the poor could be given at less money by a concentration of the system?—I do not believe in the case of the poor. If you take the ordinary hospital of the workhouse it is generally filled with the case of accidents or the aged coming in to die; the paucity might use it, but the small farmer, if anything happens him, goes to the county infirmary. It is generally only the very poor that go to the workhouse hospital.

6366. Do you not think a small hospital would suit the needs of these localities, and remove the aged and infirm to the central place, where they could get better treatment at less expense, because the staff is already there?—That is one portion of our scheme that these unions, whilst not abolished, could contribute to the aged and infirm.

6367. And in the displaced localities you would simply have a hospital for the accommodation of the sick of that locality?—We would have a district hospital.

6368. And you would have a corresponding reduction in the expense of the upkeeps?—The only reduction you would have is the master and schoolmistress. You would want a matron for a large hospital.

6369. CHAIRMAN.—Not with a head nurse?—In our hospital we have two trained nurses.

6370. The matron has no charge of anything connected with the hospital?—In all workhouse hospitals it is not fair to expect a trained nurse to cook and nurse, both.

6371. It is easy for the Guardians to appoint a servant?—Then there would not be much saving in that; our matron has only £250 a year.

6372. She does not do the cooking?—No; she takes charge of the clothes and superintends the laundry. If you appoint a cook as a servant there would not be much saving; you would want a housekeeper to look after the clothes and the laundry.

6373. There would be no difficulty about that, that is done in all hospitals?—If you were a member of the Clones Board of Guardians you would have the matron meaning about looking after the clothes.

6374. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Are there many able-bodied paupers in your institution?—There are some, and in the scheme we have drafted we think if there was an industrial home started for three or four counties they should be deported to it, and the law regarding leaving the workhouse should be altered so that they should not leave without a month's notice. It would be a hardship if you drafted an able-bodied pauper to Omagh, or somewhere where there would be a trade or industry carried on, that he could claim his discharge in three hours under the present law.

6375. CHAIRMAN.—A month would be a long time?—It would act as a deterrent from coming in again.

6376. It might keep the really destitute from getting relief?—I don't think the class of destitution that Mr. Murkaghan speaks of are destitute unless from their own faults.

6377. You would not make a man starve for a fault?—No; but on the other hand a person who is able to work can get it.

6378. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Really, as far as we have gone in our investigation we have found very few able-bodied paupers in any institution?—Very few that you might really call able-bodied.

6379. CHAIRMAN.—Except the women with illegitimate children?—Yes.

6380. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Have you any suggestion to make with regard to able-bodied women with illegitimate children?—The theory of sending women for a first offence to a home is in my opinion a very good one, but, of course, the expense of that would be very considerable. If we take it on a small scale as an industrial school—£250 a year—it would be very large.

CHAIRMAN.—The workhouse costs £200.

6401. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—You see something desirable in the suggestion if it could be worked out?—Yes; I believe there should be something done to help them, and, as regards the workhouse children, under-

tensely, when they do leave the workhouse they are workhouse children always. There should be something done for that, and, as far as I know, in the Clones Union the majority of the female children when they leave generally come back as mothers.

6402. CHAIRMAN.—Are you sure of that?—A lot of them do.

6403. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—If these children were taken very young and sent out amongst the farmers of the country?—We came to the conclusion that it would be much better if the children of the whole county or of two counties were controlled in an untraced workhouse, and when they came to a certain age as means of education was given them, for in some places the Compulsory Education Act is not in force.

6404. CHAIRMAN.—There is a good deal of promise exerted by the various clergy to get the children to go to school; they look after them very closely?—Yes; it keeps up the majority of the school.

6405. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—And the relieving officer a regular intervals visits the house and gets a report?—We believe if they were brought up and educated until twelve or fourteen years, and placed with farmers, they have a better chance of settling into the larger population and away to America.

6406. Where they lose the costs of the workhouse?—If a child is sent out, boarded out in the locality, he is pointed out as "Little Jimmy from the Workhouse," and when he grows up and becomes a farm labourer he is still "Little Jimmy from the Workhouse," and he never raises his head until he gets out of the locality where he is known.

6407. Dr. BROWN.—Have you known many of them?—Unfortunately, I have known too many of them—boys and girls. "Who is that girl?" "It is Orla from the Workhouse." Even their own mistresses speak the same way of them.

6408. Have you any experience of boarding out?—No.

6409. A child that is boarded out at a year old, would it not lose all knowledge of the workhouse and the people in the district disassociate it altogether before it is fifteen?—I don't believe so. I believe it will be always branded. I believe they are the only class I would encourage to emigrate.

6410. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Do you not think such a long connection with an institution would have a bad tendency—fourteen or fifteen years in an institution?—It might leave a stain on them, but at the same time you must look to the education of these children.

6411. Dr. BROWN.—A child that is boarded out his education is looked after by the relieving officer, the inspector, and perhaps the local committee?—I think we have two cases of boarded-out children in Clones.

6412. You don't know at what ages they were boarded out?—I think they were very small, and the attention applied to them was very little; the relieving officer might, or did, report in his book occasionally, but that was all the attention that was paid to them.

6413. Are you a member of the Board of Guardians?—I decline to answer that; I don't want to create myself at the time.

6414. CHAIRMAN.—You are aware that since the Act of 1839 great changes have been made with regard to the boarding out of children?—I am aware of that.

6415. And relieving officers over the country are pressed very closely to look after them, and there is a committee of ladies?—Yes; I know things are much better than they were.

6416. Mr. Tierney.—So far as your union is concerned at Clones you have an absolutely first-class union there?—We have.

6417. A large amount of money has been spent on it?—There has.

6418. And that money was raised not by loan but paid out of the rates?—Yes.

6419. And as a consequence of that your rate for two or three years went up to 8d., but your normal rate is 5d.

6420. Whatever changes should be made, as far as Clones is concerned, in your opinion, could there be a more efficient or economical administration?—We don't believe there could.

6421. As to persons who are not destitute but who would require medical aid, have you any suggestion to make as to that?—In that case one of the great hardships under the present Poor Law is that poor people who require special treatment of the eye, or operation, must be branded as paupers by coming into the house before they are sent for treatment. If they are entitled

to medical relief outside they should be sent on the recommendation of the medical officers at the expense of the union, or partly at the expense of the union, to some medical specialist. A lot of bad cases to my own knowledge have refused to come into the workhouse to be treated as paupers before they are sent to be operated on for amputation.

6432. As to dealing with tramps?—I think they should not be admitted unless certified by the medical officer as unfit to proceed.

6433. CHAIRMAN.—You would have to pay a doctor one guinea for giving that certificate; would it not be cheaper to give the man a breakfast, which costs only 2d.—It is never too dear to do a good thing.

6434. Mr. Drompsdale.—Your union gives very little outdoor relief?—We give absolutely none; the relieving officers and medical officers have the power to grant relief.

6435. CHAIRMAN.—Have you based of any hardship resulting from that?—No; because the relieving officer and medical officer have power to grant relief; the medical officer has power to order it through the relieving officer until the next board day; it is generally always allowed until the doctor certifies the patient is fit to be removed.

6436. When the case is dealt with by the Guardians, if they refuse to give a weekly payment and offer the house instead, and the applicant for relief refuses the house, have you ever heard it alleged that any hardship resulted?—They never refuse to give outdoor relief so long as it is certified by the medical officer and relieving officer that the case is unfit to come in.

6437. Supposing the case can be removed, but the applicant won't come in?—In exceptional cases it is still continued; in cases of fathers of a family.

6438. Your payments are practically all for outdoor relief in Clonsilla?—No, sir, it is not; we give some; we only give it to deserving cases.

Mr. JOHN BARRY examined.

6439. Mr. Drompsdale.—You are Chairman of the Clonsilla Board of Guardians?—Yes.

6440. Your board has spent a considerable sum of money upon the drainage and alterations in your infirmary, and all that?—Yes—up to £1,200.

6441. And you have paid all that?—We have.

6442. You took it out of the current rates?—Yes.

6443. That raised your rate to 8d. for a couple of years, but now you will be going down to your normal rate of about 5d.—5d.

6444. Included in your union you have a considerable portion of the County Fermanagh?—Yes.

6445. And that is roughly represented by what we call Rosetta?—Yes.

6446. And the market town for the people of that district is Clonsilla?—Clonsilla.

6447. Would it be a great inconvenience for the people of the Guardians to have to come to Enniskillen?—It would be a great inconvenience.

6448. It would be a question of going the same journey into Clonsilla and then going into the town of Enniskillen?—Yes; twenty-two miles.

6449. Your board are in favour, I take it, of the Clonsilla Union being maintained as it is?—Yes.

6450. You have an efficient union, and think you can manage it economically and efficiently yourselves?—Yes.

6451. So far as workhouses are concerned, do you think the entire number of workhouses should be kept in the county as they are?—No; I think a portion could be done away with.

6452. How many do you think would be sufficient to use as workhouses for the county?—There might be about three.

6453. Have you any suggestion to make as to what should be done with the buildings that were not being used as ordinary workhouses?—They might be used as auxiliary asylums.

6454. Or industrial houses?—Or industrial houses.

6455. Would you be in favour of classification of inmates?—Yes. For instance, as it is you have aged people of good character mingling with people who are not of good character.

6456. You think some attempt should be made to classify those people?—Yes.

6457. What would you do with the children?—I think

6458. Dr. BROWN.—And cases that cannot be removed?—And cases of fathers of families. We look on it that if the bread-earner of the family is laid up it is much cheaper to give him, or his wife than to take the whole family into the house, and it does not cost any air on them, but we have very few applicants for outdoor relief.

6459. Mr. Drompsdale.—You are in favour of extending the present area of charges?—I am; to a union charge.

6460. As to weekly meeting of Boards of Guardians, do you consider it is necessary they should meet so often as that?—I do not; as a member of the county infirmary, I think if we are able to manage an institution like that with a monthly meeting the Board of Guardians could manage too.

6461. CHAIRMAN.—Very large discretion is given to the superintendent medical officer; would you propose that any union official should have similar discretion?—I think so.

6462. Mr. MITCHELL.—Do you not think that would introduce laxity of management?—I don't think so. In the asylum at Monaghan we have a large body of inmates and we have only monthly meetings, and there is no abuse. The medical officer and clerk have charge; it has never led to any abuse, because his books could be examined.

6463. You could hardly compare the asylum with a workhouse, there are so many questions coming up at a workhouse meeting?—At the workhouse meeting it is generally unrepresented children in the union, reports from the Local Government Board, and the average cost of maintenance.

6464. You have very cold water at Clonsilla?—Yes; that is the reason we wish to live in peace, and one of the best people that we live in peace is that we very seldom get into the public press.

all the children of the county should be confined in one separate workhouse that would be set apart for them.

6465. Until what age would you keep them?—I suppose until they would be about twelve.

6466. Then what would you do with them at the end of that time?—I would hire them out as servants to the farmers or put them to trades.

6467. They having got a certain amount of education in the workhouse up to that?—Yes.

6468. Would you have the present union-at-large charges remain as they are?—Yes.

6469. As to the unions, do you consider the present way of having the inmates in the workhouse along with the other people is a good plan?—I think that they should be removed, or, in case that there was one of the workhouses set apart for those people—

6470. Where they should get proper treatment for insane people?—Yes.

6471. You have no alternative but to have them in the workhouse as ordinary inmates or in the infirmary treated as sick people?—That is all.

6472. And neither of these is suitable to the peculiar case of insanity you are dealing with?—No.

6473. Would you be in favour of what Dr. Tierney suggested, as to being able to send poor people who require operations or require to be sent to hospitals to be able to give them relief, and send them direct to the hospital without bringing them into the workhouse beforehand?—Yes; I would be in favour of that.

CHAIRMAN.—I think you may take it for granted that the Commission have taken that point.

6474. Mr. Drompsdale.—As to tramps, how do you consider that question should be dealt with; are you greatly troubled with the question of tramps?—We are.

6475. How would you suggest that should be dealt with?—I would fall in with what Dr. Tierney has suggested that they should not be admitted except on a certificate from the medical officer of the district that they were not fit to proceed further on their journey.

6476. Do you know, as a matter of fact, that those people do abuse the privileges they get of being able to go in there and take their night's lodging as they like?—They do. It is not charity at all; it is only keeping those people in their idle ways; they go from one union to another, living on the roads.

6477. As the law is at present you cannot get at them?—Not as the law exists at the present time.

Nov. 11, 1902.
Dr. Tierney.

Mr. John
Barth.

Nov. 11, 1906.

Mr. John
Synge.

6468. As to the meetings, do you think it is necessary that the Guardians should have weekly meetings?—I think it is unnecessary. I think a meeting once a month would be quite sufficient; there is nothing to prevent them except the signing of the books.

6469. CHAIRMAN.—And if the urgency arose you think the clerk could summon a special meeting?—Yes.

Mr. Dringdale.—That is all the evidence I have to offer for the Glens Union; I think it is clear the position we take up. We have what we consider an efficient union; we have spent a great deal of money on the sanitation and proper furnishing of the workhouse, and we think that, although there is an artificial geographical

boundary between Fermanagh and Monaghan, we are the centre for that district. We boast that we have achieved both efficiency and economy, and, undoubtedly, our provisions are in very perfect order and our rates low, and we would look with very great objection upon being taken from our present admirable position and put somewhere else.

CHAIRMAN.—Of course the question will arise again in Monaghan.

Mr. Dringdale.—If our boundaries were increased we would not object to take in other divisions, but we object to being wiped out, and we won't go to Lisnakeel.

Dr. Leonard
Kidd.

Dr. LEONARD KIDD examined.

6470. CHAIRMAN.—Now, Dr. Kidd, you have come views to lay before me?—I submit the general proposition that there are an unnecessary number of hospitals and workhouses in Ireland, and that if the State must support a percentage of the population represented by the sick, the insane, the aged and infirm poor, and certain classes of children, this work must be done in the most efficient way with due regard to economy, and the children educated and brought up to be healthy and useful citizens of the State. I take Fermanagh, which I know best, to prove my case. The population is 65,000. For general hospital purposes one bed per 1,000 of the population in rural districts is considered sufficient, but as the conditions existing in Ireland are peculiar owing to the emigration of so many of the family I take the standard as one bed for 800 of the population; therefore Fermanagh would require about sixty hospital beds for acute medical and surgical cases, exclusive of fever, but in order to provide for emergencies I fix the number at eighty. But there are at present three union hospitals in addition to the County Infirmary providing, according to my estimate, and exclusively of the fever hospitals, 218 beds—County Infirmary, 99; Baniscliffon Union, 88; Lisnakeel, 43; and Irvinestown, 40. I am not absolutely certain of these figures, it is very hard for me to get at them, but it is approximately 225, and I think eighty would be sufficient. These eighty beds I would divide into two classes of hospitals, A and B. A.—With provision, say for sixty beds constructed, equipped, and furnished on modern lines as a first-class medical and surgical hospital, with a house surgeon and efficient nursing staff. B.—Comprising the remaining twenty beds, divided between, say, three cottage hospitals under charge of the local doctors, and placed in such localities as a consideration of the population, area, and physical characters of the district to be served suggested as the most suitable, taking means of transit into consideration. Aged and infirm paupers—I am aware the above provision will leave a class as yet unprovided for—I refer to chronic or incurable cases, aged and infirm paupers. It is, however, obvious that there is a great deal more accommodation for such cases than is actually required. The three unions are capable of accommodating about 1,000 inmates, but last year the daily average was only 227—Baniscliffon 163, Irvinestown 88, and Lisnakeel 52. One of these buildings, therefore, would suffice for the entire county, the abolition of the other two representing a great saving in the salaries of staff and out-patients. This one union building so retained I classify as C. I believe a similar arrangement to be applicable to every county in Ireland—i.e., one large centrally placed class A hospital, while the number of classes B and C would depend on population and other local considerations. These class A hospitals would be supplied from the best of the county infirmaries or reconstructed union hospitals, such being located in the largest town of the county subject to its being central and to have a visiting staff of two or three, the medical officers of unimproved union infirmaries to be, as far as possible, transferred to the new class A hospital. All these classes of hospitals I would put under a hospital committee of the County Council or committee appointed by the County Council, and, adopting the county as the administrative unit, support them by a county-at-large rate, they and the asylums to be under the supervision of a special department of the Local Government Board to direct the local boards who, with the best intentions, seldom have a nice appreciation of hospital requirements. Much useless legislation would have to be repealed and provision made for paying—I don't know whether this is quite within the

scope of your inquiry, but it is no harm to make the observation—and provision made for paying the medical men in charge of hospitals in proportion to their work and responsibilities. Infirmary surgeons are now paid on a scale fixed seventy years ago, when the practice of medicine consisted largely in bleeding, and emphysema in position and pinch plasters. Those hospitals in class A that reach a sufficiently high standard in construction, equipment, and in arrangements made for teaching, should be recognized as training schools for nurses. I submit that nurses trained in such hospitals will receive a more practical training and acquire more experience in the kind of work they will have to do afterwards in the district or cottage hospitals, where there are no students or dressers, than in clinical hospitals where there are classes of students, dressers, clinical clerks to do all the work, that in their absence must fall to the lot of the nurse. I would prefer to see the nursing arrangements of each county self-contained, every hospital in class A having a staff larger than is required for its own actual wants so as to be always able to send on emergency extra assistance to the smaller out-lying hospitals, and also contribute to the finances of the hospital by their earnings in nursing private cases. Such a plan would enable frequent exchanges to be made between the large hospital and the smaller ones, in this way keeping all the nurses up to their work. I think every nurse employed in rate-supported hospitals for the benefit of the poor should have a midwifery training, especially if there is any district nursing to be developed. The county infirmaries, up to the passing of the Medical Charities Act of 1891, had provision for a dispensary and out-patient department. I consider this out-patient, or extern, department should be revived (not only in the county infirmaries, but also in each district or cottage hospital), and put in charge of the local dispensary doctor, whether he be a member of the visiting staff in class A or not; the ordinary dispensary work would then be done in the extern department of the hospital. This would represent a large saving by the abolition of many dispensary depots and caretakers. Moreover, the want of provision in the existing county dispensary depots for the examination and treatment of surgical cases, especially females, is a grave public scandal, and sufficient to deter many decent people from attending. A properly-worked extern department in all hospitals, together with efficient district nursing worked from there, would result in a substantial reduction in the number of patients seeking admission. I do not mean that district nursing should be confined to the hospitals as centres, but worked from them it could be most efficient. The question of patients' payments in rate-supported hospitals is quite different from the same principle when applied to hospitals supported by charitable donations. I consider the rates merely supply a grant in aid. In the Fermanagh Infirmary the number of patients, taking the average number of beds occupied, as thirty-eight; the annual cost of each bed occupied was in 1898 £27 15s. 7d., and in 1899 £30 15s. 1d.; the average cost of each patient was in 1898, £27 5s. 3d., and in 1899, £27 10s. 9d. I worked out that without the smallest hardship to the patients they could give an £300 a year income, as follows:—That one of the thirty-eight beds should pay 1s. 6d. a day, or 10s. 6d. a week, six should pay 1s. a day, eight of a day, 3s. 6d. a week, ten should pay 2d. a day, and twelve 1d. a day, which comes to 7d. a week, equal to £12 a year, that is a total of £300, and I wish to remark that twelve of the thirty-eight pay only one penny a day, and these twelve don't live as cheaply at home, so that at this price there is an economy to them in being sick in the infirmary; they may make more

by it. It is argued on behalf of the farmers that they should not pay, because they contribute county cess, but in Fermanagh the valuation of the county is £241,221, and it only requires 1.3d. in the £ valuation to produce £1,400, our maximum income; the average of the county is £27,756 acres, and £ of a penny per acre will produce £1,400. Thus, a man whose valuation is £3 will pay, say, 4d. annually to the infirmary, and a £5 valuation will pay, say, 5d., or a holding of five acres will pay, say, 4d., but even these small figures present the case in its most favourable light for the farmer, because by the refund from the agricultural grant they are reduced by half, and a £5 valuation pays, say, 3d., and a five-acre holding pays, say, 2d.

6471. And you think that is too little for medical attendance during the year?—I think it is very little for a man to have medical attendance and the rent of his teeth. With regard to fever hospitals, I would manage them in much the same way as the general hospital; one central, and the cottages having a wing with, say, two beds for each sex. The question of a fever hospital is more difficult than that of a general hospital. I would not, in contrast to general hospitals, charge patients in fever hospitals, where they go as much in the interests of the public as in their own, and payments might only provide an additional obstacle to the prevalent dislike to fever hospitals. The central fever hospital should provide facilities for the treatment of at least three varieties of fever in each sex, without the risk of contact. The permanent establishment to be increased by temporary erections in cases of epidemics. I think the best way to work that would be at the Local Government Board had at certain centres a depot where for hire materials for the erection of temporary hospitals might be sent wherever required. An efficient ambulance service would, of course, mitigate the drawbacks of moving patients actually sick long distances, but I am in favour of so locating district hospitals as to reduce the objection to distance to a minimum; the further away the hospital the more unwilling the patient is to go. I admit, too, that if cases were sent earlier than they usually are the objection to moving them has less reason, and also that immediate removal to hospital is often the only means of saving some cases. Now, I come to tubercular cases. Tuberculosis is a subject in which I have given some special thought. I wish to plead for special provision for the treatment of tubercular cases and to protest against the idea that the existing workhouses, unless they be completely reconstructed, are suitable for the purpose. Unless these cases of pulmonary tuberculosis are suitably housed in special buildings in selected sites, with a resident medical officer, treatment will be a failure and a reputable method brought into disrepute. I think groups of cottages should combine to promote suitable sanatoria, which, to equaise expenditure, should be placed in the counties not having an asylum. Take, for instance, Tyrone and Fermanagh; we pay large rates in support of the Tyrone Asylum. As far as I know there are no contracts for that asylum placed in this county and if consumptive sanatoria were established by counties, or groups of counties, I think they should be placed in those counties that have no asylum, so as to equalise the expenditure of public money. Then again, there are an enormous number of surgical tubercular cases, other than pulmonary, admitted to hospitals in Ireland. These are all chronic cases, and require the same hygienic treatment that lung cases require. They cause a great congestion in hospitals intended for acute cases, but have to be admitted because their home surroundings are such as to make recovery practically impossible; such cases would do best in convalescent homes near the sea-border, which could be maintained by the receipts of the patients in them and other hospitals. I suggested some five or six years ago, but I could not get sufficient support, that the Counties Fermanagh, Sligo, Tyrone, and Donegal should unite in having a convalescent home with twenty beds in the neighbourhood of Bundoran. The average cost of each occupied bed would be about £30 to £35 a year, and the Fermanagh Infirmary would always be able to support four or five beds in constant occupation. With regard to epilepsy, I consider the practice of keeping epileptics or insane of any description in unions should be abandoned unless certain unless are to be converted into auxiliary asylums, but this raises the question of increased expense for medical attendance, which such institutions should not be without. It might be more economical to enlarge the existing asylums to meet the demand. The total number of mental cases in Fermanagh was only thirty.

6472. In the asylum?—No; in the workhouse. As far as I can make out from the Blue Book there were only thirty mental cases in the three unions in Fermanagh.

6473. I think that is a mistake. Take, for instance, Ramakillen Workhouse, a large number of the inmates are at present under medical treatment in the sick wards, and they are classed as sick, not as insane. In future returns that difference will be pointed out—I got my figures from the Blue Book, and could only have thirty. Now, sir, with regard to the boarding out of children, I am very opposed to this; the one argument in its favour is the removal of children from the so-called atmosphere or taint of the workhouse. I admit children should be removed from the workhouse, but boarding them out removes them to an atmosphere very little better. Having visited children that are boarded out I could see they are taught nothing in the way of a trade; their highest objective seems to be a farm drudge or cattle-boy, nor have they even been taught the best way of doing farm work. I submit all the poorer children should be grouped in separate establishments for which purpose some of the unused workhouses would answer. Such an establishment would serve two or more counties, and should also be placed in the county not having an asylum. I would call these institutions industrial schools, in which young children would be taught on the most modern lines, and when old enough each child to receive some technical instruction so as to acquire some trade or handicraft. So long ago as the time of Edward VI. suggestions were made for the training of the children of tramps, "which being once brought up as idleness would hardly be brought afterwards to any good kind of labour or service." I consider the children of tramps should all, without option, be sent to such schools so as to be under good influence and prompt at a time when they are most impressionable that their first impressions might be of a desirable character. As far as I can see in Fermanagh—I am not quite sure about this—but there seemed to me to be about thirty children in Ramakillen, twelve in Lismacul, and about twelve in Brinkinstown, so that one large institution would perhaps serve two or three counties. On the other hand I am in favour of boarding out people at the other extreme of life, provided homes can be found for them, and I submit no system of poor relief should be sanctioned by the State, which permits or encourages people to forget or evade their moral obligations in the matter of the support of relations. The average cost for food and necessaries alone for maintaining an indoor pauper appears to be about 3s. 6d. a week. I only speak of food and necessaries, I am not talking of maintenance or establishment charges, but I only take food and necessaries to contrast it with outdoor relief. This amount, or even less, given to the relatives of the aged poor would suffice to enable them to keep the old people at home, but even this outdoor relief should only be given after, and subject to, careful inquiry. Contrast this 3s. 6d. a week for the indoor maintenance of a pauper with £5 a year, or 1s. 11d. a week, generally allowed for a boarded-out child's food and schooling. 1s. 11d. a week, or 3d. a day, is not enough to provide sufficient or suitable food for a growing child of seven or eight, much less for one of fifteen. I think that were children put in schools under sound hygienic conditions, well fed, under frequent inspection, they would escape many of the ill-effects of ignorance, dirt, and neglect, much would be done to improve the general health and physique of the people, and an important step taken to diminish the spread and ravages of tuberculous and other preventable diseases.

6474. Dr. Bowen.—You said something about every nurse having a midwifery training. How could that be accomplished in county infirmaries?—I should think it should be part of their curriculum that they should be sent to a lying-in hospital for three or four months.

6475. Have you any idea where they could be sent or whether there are any hospitals that could take them?—I should think there would be ample facilities between the Coombe and the Rotunda and the National Lying-in Hospital at Belles Street, and similar institutions in Belfast and Cork.

6476. Are they not doing their maximum of training?—I don't know that.

6477. I know in the lying-in hospital in Belfast they have a list of perhaps twenty applicants, and cannot take them all—that a great many of those people would probably become nurses in such hospitals as those if there was this system of district nurses; the number of nurses you select or appoint won't represent an additional number going to these institutions.

Nov. 11, 1903.
Dr. Leonard
Kidd.

6478. Won't the other wants still have to be supplied of monthly nurses?—No; because these people will do a great deal of it in the country at these district hospitals.

6479. How could they go off to act as monthly nurses to ladies in the district?—I would let the lady in the district provide for herself; I would not provide for her out of the rates on any account.

6480. Won't it require a large number of establishments for training in the country?—I don't think so; I think you have ample facilities at present.

6481. CHAIRMAN.—Would there be enough cases in lying-in hospitals in the shire cities in Ireland to train that large number of medical and surgical assistants?—I think there would be no difficulty about it. I want to see cases one night myself from the Coombe.

6482. Dr. BRIDGES.—Was there not a nurse at each of them?—Indeed there was not; the unfortunate student was none and everything.

6483. CHAIRMAN.—There was many a night when you get no case?—That is so; but very seldom.

6484. Dr. BRIDGES.—You got the training in a very short time?—No; I spent six months in the Coombe.

6485. You mentioned that there was a want of appreciation in the asylums and hospitals on the part of the authorities and Local Government Board?—No, I did not; I don't refer particularly to the asylums, but I say as a whole as a general expression.

6486. What is the use of a general expression unless you mean somebody by it?—I mean as a general statement there is a want of appreciation of the requirements of hospitals.

6487. CHAIRMAN.—You mean the ordinary country Guardian would not know how a hospital ought to be run?—Quite so, even although his intentions are the very best; there are a great many things they don't realize.

6488. Dr. BRIDGES.—How are the patients admitted into your infirmary; what is the mode of procedure?—They are supposed to get a line from a governor.

6489. Are the governors always available?—Oh, yes; there is no difficulty; and, as a matter of fact, there are more names passed as entered by me than by anybody else, because a great many people come without lines. I happen to be a life governor, and I admit them. On the other hand dispensary doctors often send cases asking me to take them in, and they are passed through the books in my name.

6490. CHAIRMAN.—Even if you were not a governor, there is some discretion on the surgeon's part as to admission?—Legally, there is not; the law is old and bad.

6491. Would you recommend a change in the law to that effect?—I would. At present I am supposed to have no discretion but to take them in.

6492. Dr. BRIDGES.—What way would you suggest for broadening the system of admission?—I would simply have the qualification of sickness, and no line whatever.

6493. Would you say any doctor in the county should recommend a patient?—Certainly; I would put no obstacle in their way at all.

6494. How much do you actually receive from patients admitted?—I think the maximum we got was £20 a year; when I was appointed it averaged £15 or £16, and we worked it up to about £20.

6495. CHAIRMAN.—You think it is highly desirable that people should be made to feel independent?—I think they would appreciate much more what was done for them. I don't see why pauperism should be thrust on people.

6496. Dr. BRIDGES.—You think it would also take away the idea of pauperism?—I think it would; I think it would make people more independent and self-respecting.

6497. You would recommend it for all the hospitals in the county?—Yes, except the fever hospital, and that is for the benefit of others.

6498. You did not give us any idea of the requirements for consumptives?—It is rather hard to do that. In the first place I think all tuberculosis should be made a notifiable disease; you could not put them all into hospitals at present, but if they were notified and under inspection I have no doubt an immense deal could be done to reduce the amount, and, in fact, the mortality in England has fallen considerably already as a result of their efforts.

6499. That is not due to treatment in sanatoria?—Partly, and partly to ordinary hygienic efforts.

6500. How long are cases of bone disease due to tuberculosis usually kept in?—They vary; you get rid of some very quickly, and on others you have to operate

time after time. Even in London a case of the kind will require a dozen or half a dozen operations. In London now they are shifting them to places on the sea-board; they are hardly justified in operating on them in large centres.

6501. Is it your idea that the sea-board has a highly beneficial effect?—I think it would.

6502. CHAIRMAN.—On a surgical case, or phthisis is well?—Largely surgical tuberculosis; there are cases of pulmonary tuberculosis that probably will not do so well. If you want the best results you have to pick and choose your cases; some will not do in places where others will.

6503. Dr. BRIDGES.—You could not give us an idea of what the average period in hospital would be for these cases of bone disease?—I can tell you this, that coming over my beds the other day, out of thirty-five there were twenty-six surgical tuberculosis.

6504. CHAIRMAN.—On which you had to operate?—In nearly all the cases.

6505. Dr. BRIDGES.—That did not leave you many medical cases?—No.

6506. That is a very large percentage?—It is enormous. I think when we talk of tuberculosis and not taking from consumption in this country we leave out the surgical tuberculosis cases altogether; there is a appalling death rate.

6507. CHAIRMAN.—And an appalling maiming rate; people that are useless for life?—I believe if there were preventive measures taken it would in a short time result in a gigantic saving. I find in 1898 the average cost per bed occupied in the infirmary here was only £27 15s. 7d., and in 1899 it was £30 14s. 1d. per bed occupied. Of course it is more now, because in the last three or four years these alterations have been made, and the accounts are all mixed up.

6508. That is very low?—It is extremely low; and last year, in 1902, in the Tyrone Infirmary it was £40 per patient, and a bed occupied in a London hospital would run from £80 to £100 or more; it is £45 10s. in Belfast; and the average cost per patient with us in 1898 was only £2 5s., and in 1899 £2 10s.

6509. On your account for the difference between £30 in your infirmary and £40 in Tyrone?—They have larger establishment charges. The difficulty is to draw reliable figures, because the system of accounts is never uniform.

6510. Is your £27 and your £30 not the total cost of the institution; every expenditure divided by the number of patients?—With me it is, but it took me a great deal of trouble to find it out, and there is no uniform system; you cannot draw conclusions from one hospital to another; you seldom have the same basis to work on.

6511. Tuberculosis is a very great cause of disease; I suppose intemperance is also a great cause of disease?—It is indeed.

6512. You are aware of that in your practice, of course?—I am.

6513. Has it ever occurred to you the desirability of having a State or other asylum for the reception of imbeciles with a view of curing them?—It has very often; I think it would be a very desirable thing, but what I have never been able to decide to my own satisfaction is how it is to be done; how you are to get people into it.

6514. At all events a diseased workhouse assemblage might be used for that?—It might.

6515. The extent to which intemperance prevails is a serious question in most parts of the country?—It is.

6516. You were speaking just now of the management for district hospitals; would you propose that the County Infirmary should be under the same management as the district hospitals?—I think so.

6517. They would be all a part of the county system?—Yes; part of the one whole system.

6518. The hospitals would be in class A?—One only in each county; possibly some counties might require two. In this county I would have only one situated at Baniskillen.

6519. The other hospitals at Enniskillen or Irvinestown would be class B?—Yes, if there were any.

6520. They, of course, would not treat nurses?—No; but they might be supplied from the person hospital here.

6521. Do you think they would be unsuitable for training?—I do.

6522. You spoke about district nurses, did you mean district hospital nurses, or nurses nursing in the district among the houses of the people?—I know there is a large movement of the kind going on at present, and I think that district nursing among the houses of the

people should be the best, worked through the means of nurse cottage hospitals, as far as it was possible, and that the nurses should be part of the staff of these hospitals.

6521. They should live in the nurses' home adjacent to the hospital?—Yes, as part of the establishment, as far as it was possible. Of course I know there are some districts in which there would be no hospital where it would be well to have a nurse.

6522. And you would have these nurses acting under the direction and supervision of the dispensary medical officer?—Yes much on the same principle as the Jewish nurses.

6523. As regards the removal of fever patients to large hospitals, we had evidence that fever patients in large numbers are removed from some parts of Essex. Union to a distance of twenty-four miles?—Yes; my impression is that if these fevers were recognized at an early stage the risk of removing them would be comparatively trifling. On the other hand I think it presents an additional obstacle in the way of inducing people to go to hospitals if you say "You have to go twenty or twenty-five miles," and I think in these districts hospitals there should be some provision for a limited number of fever patients that might be jumped on at once and brought there. As a rule the country establishments are not the very best; they might be improved.

6524. Mr. MURMAGHAN.—Have you considered the staff that would be necessary for these hospitals that you class under letter B?—Well, of course, that would depend; you would have first to fix the size of these hospitals, but I should think, for the hospital itself, supposing you had a cottage hospital for six beds, you would only want a head nurse and a probationer.

6525. Under the control of the dispensary doctor?—Under his direction.

Dr. J. Wilson examined.

6526. Dr. BROSSE.—Would you let us know your views upon the question of amalgamation?—I am of opinion that Farnham should have one central workhouse hospital, and my impression is that that workhouse hospital should be a distinct and separate institution from the workhouse proper; that it should be altogether free from control of the Board of Guardians and placed under the control of a central sanitary committee.

6527. CHAIRMAN.—Like the County Infirmary?—Like the County Infirmary, or like an asylum managed that way. With reference to the workhouse children, I am under the impression that they should be boarded out and taken away altogether from the unhealthy atmosphere of the workhouse. As regards the aged and infirm, a good many of them should be boarded out too, and provision made for them in that way; others could be made comfortable in the wards of the workhouse by a little extra attention. I think you would require an auxiliary for idiots and senile for consumption. If you could get rid of the idiots it would be easy to make provision for the consumptives in another institution.

6528. Dr. BROSSE.—You don't mean to say that you should have an auxiliary for consumptives; would that be for the county?—That would be for the county. I think you ought to have one central sanatorium for the county.

6529. Have you any idea what provision should be made for the consumptives of the county; what size hospital?—I have not any idea as to the size of the establishment; my idea is that there should be one central spot for consumptives run on the lines of a sanatorium.

6530. Do you think patients would go to the sanatorium?—I think they would, for they have been fairly well educated to that in this county; we had a local sanatorium run here by a local gentleman, and most people who had means were very glad to avail themselves of the sanatorium.

6531. CHAIRMAN.—Whereabouts was that?—At Stone-
down, down the lake; and I must say the success was very fair.

6532. Is the house occupied at present?—It is not; it is derelict.

6533. Dr. BROSSE.—What was the cost per week?—I really could not tell you; the patients were charged according to means—according to their means. It is fixed now.

6534. And the larger hospital?—I should think the preparation of nurses should be there. Now, for instance, I calculate that in the infirmary here I ought to have one nurse to every five or six beds; that would give me six or seven nurses.

6535. Do you see any economy in the change you suggest?—I cannot altogether say I see an economy, because it would be a matter possibly of increased charges, but I would say increased efficiency, and, to my mind, very often increased efficiency should weigh down a matter of economy.

6536. Don't you know the rates of the country think the burden is already sufficient?—I know that.

6537. CHAIRMAN.—Even apart from that, if unions were broken up and a large number of salaries saved, would not the expense of the extra nurses, if such an expense were necessary at all, which I doubt, more than counterbalance that?—The whole thing could be worked to such an extent that any additional hands employed would be paid ten times over by the savings. Take this county, I think the number of hospitals and establishments is appalling in its extravagance.

6538. Mr. MURMAGHAN.—I thought Farnham was a model county?—I don't think they are loose in administration, but the establishments are too numerous.

6539. CHAIRMAN.—You would not consider Lanarkshire extravagant when its rate for Poor Law purposes is 5s. 6d. in the £1?—No; but I would say one institution of the kind would serve for the whole county, and you get rid of the staff, the upkeep, and the maintenance of the other buildings. I think they would make very good quarters as long as they last; they are not good for much else.

6540. Mr. MURMAGHAN.—Do you think two hospitals in addition to the main hospital would be sufficient for the county?—I think so; but that is a matter to be fixed by local knowledge.

6541. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think that is a great loss to the neighbourhood?—I think it is a loss to the community, because if a case of consumption is taken up at an incipient stage the possibility is it may be cured.

6542. Dr. BROSSE.—Are there many cases of consumption in this district?—I cannot say there are; we have very few in the workhouse.

6543. Why do they not go into the workhouse?—Beyond the cases coming in as paupers, people with means will not come into the workhouse.

6544. Is the name of the workhouse a bar?—It is a bar.

6545. And even supposing they did come in, have you a proper way of treating them?—We have not an extra efficient way; it has been improved lately.

6546. Is it really on modern lines?—I cannot say it is.

6547. CHAIRMAN.—It is just isolation?—Isolation, pure and simple.

6548. Dr. BROSSE.—You approve of boarding out children?—I would approve of having children boarded out; you never have a worse pauper than a child brought up in the workhouse.

6549. Do you think they come back to the workhouse?—Indeed they do; they lead a life of idleness and laziness, and you cannot get them out of it.

6550. It has been mentioned that cases of fever come from long distances here?—Yes; as regards enteric fever, the great majority of the cases all come from the Glen district. I have not very much idea of the locality myself, but I have seen patients coming in in a very advanced condition, and I have seen three or four cases of collapse from the journey alone. Evidently these cases are not recognized in the primary stage, and the shock of the journey killed them.

6551. Were these typhoid cases?—Yes.

6552. Has the nature of the ambulance anything to do with their dying of shock?—We have a new and improved ambulance—very different to the ambulance of former days—it is run on tyres, but it is a white sheeted. What I intended the Board of Guardians to do was to have a four-wheeled ambulance, but I was vetoed. If I suggest anything the Guardians go for something else.

6553. Do you think a two-wheeled ambulance is a proper vehicle for removing the sick?—I do not.

Nov. 11, 1906.

Dr. Lumard
Right.

Nov. 11, 1902.
Dr. J. Wilson.

6556. Do you not think the Guardians are very much to blame; did they consider the injury they were doing to many a poor patient?—I don't know what they looked at.

6557. CHAIRMAN.—I think the impression is general that these mountain districts don't permit of a four-wheeled vehicle travelling?—Yes; there is something in that; but why not carry them down on a stretcher to it.

6558. But, as a matter of fact, there are very light four-wheeled vehicles built for these mountain districts?—Yes; but if a patient is wrapped in a blanket and carried on a stretcher a short distance to the ambulance I don't see that it does him any harm.

6559. You have a large number of fever patients to deal with in Enniskillen?—Yes; unusually large. We have only two cases of typhoid now; all the others are diphtheria and scarlatina.

6560. How many cases?—I think we have eleven or twelve of diphtheria, and we are getting in a fresh case of scarlatina.

6561. What is your nursing staff?—It is very antiquated; we have only one nurse to look after the whole crew.

6562. How many night nurses?—We have no night nurse.

6563. Dr. BARNES.—Should you not have one?—I don't say we should, but I tried that before.

6564. You have the responsibility and the power of getting one?—I know I have, but things were made so unpleasant for the last nurse I had down—she would not be allowed to cross the ferry and she would not be allowed to go to a place of worship—owing to the action of some of the antiquated officials.

6565. Why would you let your patients suffer for reasons of that sort?—They have not suffered up to the present.

6566. CHAIRMAN.—Don't you think they are bound to suffer every hour of the day and night?—Yes; but really we have had no mortality. We only lost one case of diphtheria, which died shortly after coming in, and during those eight years we only lost two cases of typhoid. There is not so very much difficulty in getting a nursing staff; I have only to requisition the master and have it done, but the difficulty is as regards the general work of the hospital.

6567. But you have the power to requisition that also?—I tried that on to my heart's content; I might requisition away and get nobody.

6568. Have you ever done so and failed?—I have.

6569. Dr. BARNES.—Whose fault was that; to whom did you send the requisition?—The master of the workhouse.

6570. Did he not comply with it?—I think he did his level best; at least he says he did.

6571. CHAIRMAN.—It is altogether between you both; if an emergency arises you have got the power. You have a large number of midwifery cases too?—Yes; unusually large.

6572. By whom are they attended?—By the night nurse, who holds the qualification of a maternity nurse.

6573. Mr. MURPHY.—I am afraid that your testimony to the Enniskillen Infirmary does not speak well for the position taken up by the Fermanagh County Council and local bodies that there should be only one central institution for the poor in this county. You say the infirmary is very far behind what science requires?—Yes; it is not quite up to date; it has been immensely improved the last few years. I would not call it an up-to-date establishment.

6574. I went through the house lately and it did seem to me a great many improvements were made?—Yes; the Board of Guardians, I must say, to their credit, have done a great deal, but there remains a great deal yet to be done.

6575. But, having done a great deal in a short time, does it not promise that they would do more in the future?—I agree with you.

6576. Why do you suggest that the administration of the Poor Law should be taken out of their hands?—For the simple reason that the Board of Guardians

have no idea of the care that should be taken in nursing sick patients. They come there to vapour and rest, and read their own reports in the newspapers and week; they never consider what is due to the sick poor.

6577. Do they not come there to see that the money of the ratepayers whom they represent shall be as efficiently administered as possible?—Certainly, I agree with you that, as ratepayers, they are entitled to representation on the Board of Guardians to see how the money is expended.

6578. Do you suggest they have any other object in view than to administer the Poor Law system to the very best of their ability?—No; I am not making a suggestion of that sort; you seem to misunderstand me. I think the Guardians are kind and generous enough to a fault, but if we had less sympathy and more work the sick poor would be better looked after.

6579. But the very fact that a considerable amount of improvements have been made lately shows the Guardians are anxious, commensurate with the administration of the rates that they draw their statements from, to improve the condition of the poor?—Yes; they have done a great deal.

6580. Do you not think that a little consultation with the chief men of the board would advance matters better than making wholesale charges against them?—I am not making wholesale charges against the Board of Guardians; you misunderstand me. Only for the active members of the board and the men really who have taken an interest in it you would have nothing whatever done. I am talking about a section of the Board of Guardians who don't seem to understand what is due to the sick poor. I am not talking of the Board of Guardians as a whole.

6581. The administration of the house, except as regards the infirmary, seemed to me to be very far on my inspection?—I have not very much knowledge of workhouses in general beyond the one of which I am medical officer myself and the Derradilly Workhouse. I cannot say I know much about any other workhouses in Ireland.

6582. You think the house is large enough to accommodate the whole county if necessary?—The house proper is a very large institution. I cannot tell you the number of people it was built to accommodate, or even I give you an idea, as I know nothing of the locality, nor can I give you an idea as regards the tax that will be put upon it by taking in other cases. Of course, as regards the hospital, in order to accommodate other unions very probably it would have to be enlarged by making some structural arrangements.

6583. The number in the workhouse in Fermanagh is something like 550; out of that there were probably 100 harmless inmates and perhaps fifty or sixty children; that would mean 350 for the whole county; do you think that house would be ample for the needs of 350 people?—I don't think it would; I think you would have to make other arrangements by structural alterations. You might, possibly; I cannot go into figures.

6584. How is the health of the locality?—So far as I know, with the exception of an outbreak of diphtheria, and a few cases of scarlatina, the health of the locality is very good.

6585. Water supply adequate and good?—Yes; I must say it is adequate.

6586. Good pressure for the house?—Yes.

6587. Mr. LINDSAY.—You are aware of your power with regard to having proper nursing accommodation?—Yes.

6588. Why turn the blame of not having sufficient staff on the Board of Guardians?—I am not turning blame.

6589. I say you are. Do you know of any more up-to-date workhouse in Ireland—free one and to the other than Enniskillen, so far as the Guardians have control over it?—They have done everything in their power to facilitate me.

Mr. LINDSAY.—In the name of the board, I say if the fever hospital lacks in any way it is the doctor who is to blame and not the Guardians.

Mr. PHILIP TERRY examined.

6590. Mr. Dwyer.—You are a member of the Glenties Union?—Yes.

6591. You sent in a report yourself in answer to these queries that were sent by the Commissioners?—I did.

6592. Subsequently to that did you attend a meeting of your board at which the general attitude of your board was resolved on?—Yes.

6593. That is as Dr. Tierney gave evidence to-day?—Yes.

Mr. Philip Terry.

6594. Do you agree with the other members of your board and Dr. Tierney's evidence?—Yes; I listened to his evidence, and agree with him.

6595. And you withdrew your own report?—Yes; I answered the question on my own responsibility. I consulted the referees I represent since, and there were some things in which they did not agree with me.

Mr. EDWARD M. FLEMING, CHAIRMAN.

6596. Mr. Muldoon.—You are Chairman of the Board of Guardians at Lismaskell?—Yes.

6597. And have been chairman for a number of years?—Yes; for about five.

6598. And you are a member of the Board of Guardians for over twenty?—Yes.

6599. Have you considered the question of amalgamation of unions in the County Fermanagh?—Yes; we have.

6600. Tell the Commission the result of your inquiry into the subject; do you think that Lismaskell should be preserved as a centre of Poor Law administration?—Yes, we do.

6601. For what reason do you think it should be preserved?—Owing to its geographical situation for one reason and for the convenience of the sick poor for another.

6602. I believe, on the question generally, that you are in favour of amalgamation?—Yes; partial amalgamation.

6603. But you think it is not practicable in Fermanagh to do without two unions?—No; we wish to give amalgamation a fair trial, but not to rush it.

6604. CHAIRMAN.—You would like to begin with Inverness?—Yes, certainly.

6605. Mr. Muldoon.—Do you think that the portion of Clones Union that comes into Fermanagh could be appropriated by Lismaskell?—I say it would cause no more inconvenience to that portion of Clones than portion of Lismaskell already suffers; it is a kind of home-like shape into our union, and is quite as convenient a portion of our own.

6606. Your union is situated near the Upper Lake?—Yes.

6607. And in that lake there are a large number of inhabited islands?—Yes; there are up to 220 islands inhabited.

6608. Dr. Brogan.—What do you call inhabited?—From one house to a good many.

6609. Mr. Muldoon.—Would you say it would be a good hardship to these people to have to bring them to Enniskillen?—I say it would.

6610. What procedure would have to be adopted in order to do so?—There would have to be a boat.

6611. CHAIRMAN.—No matter what union they belonged to they would want a boat?—Yes; but after entering the hardship of the boat you would be inflicting on them an additional twelve or fourteen miles per Lismaskell, and many sick people would not be able to bear the journey. I think the doctor would tell you that there are plenty of patients who arrive at Lismaskell that if they had to go an additional twelve or fourteen miles they would be dead.

6612. Mr. Muldoon.—I believe from some parts of your union to Enniskillen it would be twenty-five miles?—And over.

6613. Do you think in case of amalgamation the districts would be properly represented at Enniskillen?—I do not. I think many of the representatives would not attend Enniskillen at all.

6614. In your experience of the Lismaskell Union, has it been fairly well and economically managed?—As a union it compares favourably with any in Ulster, and as to the management it is the lowest in Ireland, as far as rates are concerned.

6615. What about the situation of the buildings?—They are all as good as any other workhouse I ever visited, and within the last two years, on the recommendation of Dr. Bigger, we have done a good deal of repairs to it. We have within the last year put in, on Dr. Bigger's recommendation, new grates; we have fitted up two portions of the house for consumptive patients at an outlay of £300 or £400.

6616. And your rate is 2d. in the £ on an average lower than Enniskillen?—Yes.

and I agree with the majority of the Guardians at Enniskillen. Ass. II, 1883.

6617. Mr. Muldoon.—In the event of your original report being acted on and Clones broken up and brought to Enniskillen, would you not have to pass Lismaskell to go to Enniskillen?—I would.

6618. Would you not rather stop there than go on?—I would rather stop at Lismaskell.

6619. CHAIRMAN.—Is that for Poor Law purposes or all purposes—medical charities?—Yes; everything taken in the Poor Law.

6620. But that is not Poor Law?—The rate leviable, provided we had no District Council, would be 2d. of a rating as against Enniskillen.

CHAIRMAN.—We only take the Poor Law expenditure.

6621. Mr. Muldoon.—The Inspector of the Local Government Board has frequently examined the union workhouse?—Yes, he has.

6622. On the last occasion did he say anything to you about the general management of the place?—Yes; he said he would make no the medium of conveying his thanks to the Lismaskell Board of Guardians for having done so much in putting the house in repair. In his last report he said he had nothing to recommend; we had done everything.

6623. In case the Enniskillen Union took in Inverness and that portion of Ballyshannon which comes into this county, and retained that portion of Clones which now comes here, don't you think Enniskillen Union would have large enough burdens on its own shoulders without taking on Lismaskell?—I think it would.

6624. Would you think that under the circumstances it would be a necessity for Lismaskell to be continued as a union centre?—I think so.

6625. About the boarding-out question, what is your view?—Well, after a certain age I would think it is very beneficial to the children to be boarded out, but not until after a certain age. I would like to see the children getting a certain amount of schooling before they are sent out. They can be more efficiently attended to within an institution than they can when sent out to the country; when they are able to walk to school they could go to the country on the boarding-out system.

6626. CHAIRMAN.—At what age?—Eight or nine. I would not say sooner.

6627. Mr. Muldoon.—Did you hear Mr. Jordan's evidence on the boarding-out system?—I did.

6628. Did you agree with that?—I did not; Mr. Jordan said he would wish to see them boarded out at the lowest possible age. I think that is entirely wrong. I would try to place them in the hands of respectable people who would give them a proper training, and it would have a tendency to render them more capable of earning their living in after life than to put them with low people who would only charge a misnomer fee for keeping them.

6629. Did you hear Mr. Jordan's evidence about the officers who would be got rid of in the case of amalgamation?—I did; but take that as against Mr. Lord's evidence with regard to the cottage hospitals and it would be largely on the other side.

6630. What officers have you at Lismaskell?—Master, matron, schoolmistress, porter, and three nurses.

6631. And some of the staff would have to be strengthened in the case of a hospital established there?—Nurses?—In the case of cottage hospitals being located over the country they would have to be made up to date, as far as the hospital is concerned; you would have to put at least two nurses in each of them, and, with five beds, I don't think it would accommodate increasing and outgoing patients, and the outlay that would be entailed and the salaries would be far more than at present.

6632. What would be your treatment for harmless lunatics?—What we would recommend is to send harmless lunatics together with other lunatics of the county to Inverness. I would be very slow to abolish any place if I could not recommend something that would be the means of economizing, and I think it would be economy to have the harmless lunatics, together with the other lunatics of the county, located at Inverness.

6633. Would you still leave the appointments in the hands of the full board?—Certainly.

No. 11, 1903.
Mr. Edward M.
Flanagan.

6634. As regards the reduction in the number of Guardians, would you go as far as Mr. Lindsay in taking away three-fourths?—No; I would say half what we have at present.

6635. You have some difficulty in getting a quorum at present?—In the outlying districts the attendance is bad.

6636. Do you think there should be more sanitary officers appointed by the Guardians?—I do; I consider sanitation is not properly attended to under the present system. I would recommend augmenting the staff and reducing the salaries. In the event of the Government so considering, I think the police would more efficiently carry out the question of sanitation than the sanitary officers.

6637. CHAIRMAN.—You would not object to the visits of the police for that purpose?—I would not; I would be in favour of abolishing the office of sanitary officer and entrusting the police to do the duty.

6638. Mr. Mulholland.—You think there is a large enough police force to take that duty on?—Quite.

6639. Are you in favour of union rating?—Certainly; I think it is the only way that we can have economy.

6640. Would you still continue the weekly meetings of the Boards of Guardians?—I think it would be requisite; I believe there are things that could not bear to be kept over. Many questions arise, and even Local Government correspondence has to be attended to that could not be left over more than a week.

6641. CHAIRMAN.—How far do you live from the workhouse?—At present I live in Lismakea. I think the business would not be properly attended to if there were not weekly meetings; if it was done monthly it could not be done in one day.

6642. Mr. Mulholland.—On the question of outdoor relief, what is your view?—I think it should still continue; there is a good deal of outdoor relief in Lismakea, and we find it is a more efficient way of serving the poor, and at the same time it does not increase the rates.

6643. CHAIRMAN.—How do you make that out?—There might be a great deal more would come into the house who are a great deal more comfortable at home.

6644. Have you fewer inmates since outdoor relief began?—There was always a good deal of outdoor relief in Lismakea, and there were more inmates then; I have seen us having 120 inmates, and we have less now.

6645. Within the last ten years?—Yes.

6646. Dr. Rogers.—In proportion to the population, has the population fallen at the same rate?—It may; it is decreasing, but the poor, I think, are not decreasing; I think they are on the increase.

6647. Mr. Mulholland.—Are you troubled with tramps?—Yes; we are.

6648. How do you think they should be dealt with?—I think they should be compelled to apply for admission to the police before coming to the master or porter; let the police beat them, and either send them to the workhouse or elsewhere. There are two kinds of tramps—the tradesman out of employment, and the knight of the road, who is always there; he was born there, and will die there, and will leave another brood after him.

6649. CHAIRMAN.—Do you see any way of taking the young ones off the road?—Yes; I would recommend that, and I would recommend even taking away the old ones. I would recommend an adult reformatory to get the tramp into. They reproduce as a matter of course, and you will still have them if you don't have some efficient way of stamping out the present tramps.

6650. You would look him up?—Certainly.

6651. Mr. Mulholland.—You know the water supply of the union workhouse at Lismakea?—Yes.

6652. Is it very good?—It is the very best water in Ireland; it is sitting practically on a fountain.

6653. And the situation of the workhouse infirmary is very healthy?—It is; you cannot sink ten feet but you get water above Lismakea. It is built on a limestone rock.

6654. I believe you have a very mixed Board of Guardians at Lismakea; you are not all of the one way of thinking?—On some matters we are not.

6655. Are you the one way of thinking about amalgamation?—We are; we are unknown.

6656. CHAIRMAN.—How do the sick come to your hospital from Derrylin?—In an ambulance; we have two ambulances—one for the fever hospital.

6657. How do they come?—Over the ferry.

6658. Does the ambulance come over the ferry?—Yes. There is a large cat; it is capable of bringing

over more than two ambulances if wanted, and from the lower end they come by Inishmore.

6659. What would be the distance from Derrylin to Lismakea?—About ten miles is the furthest point we have to travel at present.

6660. Is there any difficulty about the ambulance coming over on the large ferry boat?—Not unless there was a storm.

6661. How much is it by Inishmore?—It might be three miles at an average. Then in the event of the coming from the upper end of our union down to Bannockhill it would mean a journey of something like twenty-five miles.

6662. You don't look upon the lake being between you and part of your union as being a serious obstacle?—It is a partial obstacle, but not a serious one; it entails a great deal of hardship on the people coming across; they have often to wait a little time for the conveyance.

6663. What would be the delay they complain of?—Five minutes?—Do you mean that the ferries would not be disposed to go over with a few. The people from that direction generally take it so that if they are not ready for the first they will be ready for the second, at such an hour.

6664. How long does it take to go across?—Three quarters of a mile.

6665. Would the horse and ambulance be in it?—Two horses and ambulances could be in it.

6666. How is that ferry boat propelled?—With oars.

6667. You would not propose that that dam should be thrown into Bannock?—I don't think the people themselves would like it very well; it will be more of an inconvenience to go over the month than across the lake.

6668. Mr. MULHOLLAND.—Your objection to having one workhouse for the Ovensy Farmwork is principally based on the fact that it would be an inconvenience to the sick of your district?—There are other causes as well. I said provided there was amalgamation. The question of cottage hospitals has been advocated, and I say they would entail more cost than the union hospital as it exists.

6669. If it would not entail more outlay here would it strike you?—I would like to be convinced first; I cannot see it at present. The question of amalgamation has been going on at Lismakea for twenty years; we have several times appointed committees, and we found that even with amalgamation, and the present officers dispersed with, and even pensions dispensed, we would be at the wrong side.

6670. The question of coal is a considerable thing in a large institution?—Wherever they are sent you must have an expenditure on coal, and if you buy it at the hospital at Lismakea the Local Government Board say that thirty patients are as many as one nurse can take charge of, so that there would have to be an increase in the number of nurses.

6671. If there is an adequate provision for the sick would your objection to amalgamation disappear?—I would your objection to amalgamation disappear? I cannot see that there could be any more efficient way, either through amalgamation or any other way, than there is at present.

6672. Why do you advocate keeping the children at home until a certain age?—I have given the case—the schooling can be attended to when they are small owing to the schoolmistress being on the ground.

6673. How many children have you in the house?

6674. And you have a teacher for nine children; do you consider that is economy?—It may not be.

6675. Cannot these children walk to the school as well as the children of the farmers or labourers in the country?—I find that they always compare more than favourably with the children in the country schools when they are young; they are better scholars at a younger age than the children in the country are in consequence of being quite conversant to their school.

6676. The experience of other unions is that the children that go to National schools seem to advance more in their lessons than the other children?—It is the reverse in Lismakea. At the last inspection of the children at Lismakea there was the most high reputation that could be given as to their attention and advancement in learning.

6677. CHAIRMAN.—You have a specially good teacher?—The children have been well attended to. Even at the time of the Confirmation in both churches they were better advanced than the country children.

Nov. 11, 1903.
—
Mr. Edward M.
Finnegan.

6618. Mr. MURKIN.—Are there many able-bodied in your workhouse?—Not very many, but even with the hospitals you want the able-bodied pauper to keep the ground and place trim, and you want the women to do the washing and keep the place and the patients clean. In the event of your abolishing the workhouse system you have to call in paid labour, and you would have to pay three times the amount that it takes to keep a pauper.

6619. I did not know that the object of the Poor Law was to keep able-bodied in the union?—You may call them able-bodied, and they are classed so, but there is always something the matter with them.

6620. Are there many of that class in Lismuckish?—I am not at present able to answer that. Mr. Heery has

considered all those points, and so did we, but we left the taking of the notes to Mr. Heery. I say that the able-bodied pauper is needed to keep the place in trim. If he is sent to any other institution paid labour will have to come in. The women equally well are wanted in the same direction. Then as to sending the children to a central institution, I would not be for that.

6621. CHAIRMAN.—You would keep them in the workhouse?—There is a difficulty; sending children who have no father or mother to a central institution might be all right; we have not so many of that class as we have of the class that has a mother; if you take away the children the Poor Law says that the mother must leave.

Mr. HUGH KIRKPATRICK examined.

6622. Mr. Muldoon.—You are a member of the Lismuckish Board of Guardians?—Yes, sir.

6623. And you are the leader of the opposition there?—We have no opposition; when it comes to a question of amalgamation it vanishes.

6624. Are you also opposed to the amalgamation of the Lismuckish Union?—I am.

6625. On what ground?—I have considered the matter carefully, and have come to the conclusion that it would be essential to retain at least two institutions in the county—one in North Fermanagh and one in South Fermanagh. Of course we have three in it, and portions of others added. That does away with Irvinestown, but I would say if Lismuckish was in the same situation as Irvinestown I would do away with Lismuckish; Irvinestown is on the borders of the county altogether; it would be an impossibility to retain Irvinestown and Enniskillen.

6626. You think even if Enniskillen is preserved it is necessary to preserve Lismuckish?—I do. I think they are two centres, and each of them would have a very large area.

6627. Do you think Lismuckish could take in that portion of the Clones Union which comes into this county?

—I do; I know that country thoroughly well, and it would be as convenient for the people of Roslea to come to Lismuckish as it would be to come to Clones.

6628. And in the event of the Clones Union being broken up it would be essential to bring them to Lismuckish?—It would be better to have the whole county made the county as far as Poor Law is concerned.

6629. You have a number of inhabited islands in Lismuckish Union?—We have, but I think you have ignored the more important part, that is the mountainous part which lies to the north-east or south-west, which runs from Roslea along the mountains between that and Brookborough and Fivemiletown—that would be as difficult of access as the islands. From Lismuckish I should say it would be six Irish miles to some portions of the district, and in other places eight or ten miles to come to Lismuckish, not to speak of coming to Enniskillen for an ambulance, which would have no other way of coming.

6630. Do you think Lismuckish is a model workhouse and very economically managed?—As a house I think it compares favourably with any other in Ulster.

6631. You agree generally with the evidence given by Mr. Finnegan?—I do.

Mr. Hugh
Kirkpatrick.

Mr. JOSEPH O'REILLY HOSEY examined.

CHAIRMAN.—The Commission don't want to ask you, as an official, your views on the subject, although you would be just the monthpiece of the Guardians.

Mr. Muldoon.—I only wanted to ask him as to rates, and I think you have that evidence on the returns before you.

6632. CHAIRMAN.—There is just one question; can you tell me when the outdoor relief began to be in-

creased?—It commenced with very small proportions perhaps thirty years ago, or more, and it gradually increased, but it rather decreased for the last year; it was lower than for some years previously.

6633. When did it get over, say, 2250 a year?—I should think fifteen or twenty years ago; the average for the past three years has been 2235 a year; it was scarcely as much last year, it is almost stationary.

Mr. Joseph
O'Reilly
Hosey.

Dr. T. KNOX examined.

6634. Mr. Muldoon.—You know the district of Lismuckish?—I do.

6635. And the union workhouse there?—Yes.

6636. Is it in a healthy situation?—I consider it is.

6637. And it has a good water supply?—The water is very good; it could not be much better.

6638. And the atmosphere is good?—Yes.

6639. Do you think it would be any hardship upon the poor of that district to be amalgamated with Enniskillen?—I think in some cases it would cause great hardship—such as accidents. It would not be in the interests of the sick poor.

6640. And the people of that locality are unanimous in favour of that view?—I believe so.

6641. You heard the evidence of the chairman of the board?—I did.

6642. Do you agree generally with that evidence?—I agree with it.

6643. Recently the board erected a consumptive ward there?—They have two nice consumptive wards.

6644. And one is of recent erection?—Yes; very nicely done up.

6645. Dr. BROOKER.—Are there many patients there?—There is only one female patient at present.

6646. Has it been much availed of since it was opened?—It has not.

6647. What is the reason?—Consumption does not seem to be very prevalent in the district at present.

6648. Do the dispensary doctors in the union send their patients there?—They do not send many.

6649. It would be useful if they did; would it not help to prevent the spread of consumption in the district?—Oh, it would; and I believe they could be well treated in the wards.

6650. Would it not be a training for the individuals themselves?—It would.

6651. You did not think of speaking to any of the dispensary doctors and telling them what nice wards you have for treatment?—They know it.

6652. Have any of the doctors ever been in the wards?—Not in the new wards.

6653. Although they are frequently at the workhouse for registration purposes?—Yes.

6654. Do you not think it would be wise to get them to see them?—Yes; I would be very glad.

Dr. T. Knox.

Nov. 11, 1890.
Mr. James
O'Donnell.

6715. Mr. Muldoon.—You are a member of the Lismuckee Board?—Yes.

6716. You heard the evidence of your chairman?—Yes.

6717. Do you agree generally with that evidence?—I agree generally.

Mr. JAMES O'DONNELL examined.

6718. And you are opposed to the amalgamation of the Lismuckee Union with Enniskillen?—Yes.

6719. And you don't think the Guardians that would be elected there could or would come to Enniskillen Union to represent that division?—It would be impossible for some of them; some of them have to come ten miles to Lismuckee.

Mr. PATRICK CLARKE examined.

Mr. Patrick
Clarke.

6720. Mr. Muldoon.—You are a Guardian of the Lismuckee Union?—Yes.

6721. I believe you live upon the west side of the lake?—Yes.

6722. And you have to cross it to get to the workhouse?—Yes.

6723. Have you heard the evidence of the chairman of your board?—I have. I say it would be a great inconvenience for the Guardians and the sick poor on the west side of the lake to go to Enniskillen. I am for amalgamation in a general way. I think it would be a great hardship on the sick poor from the district on the west side, even for the infirm; there is no railway on that side, and it is up to twenty-three miles from that, and yet it would be worse to send them to Bawnboy. In the great of Lismuckee being abolished I would rather go to Enniskillen. The road is worse and the distance is as great and far more hardship in going to Bawnboy, and from the central position Lismuckee is in South Fermanagh I consider two workhouses are necessary. Were Erinstown situated in North Fermanagh as Lismuckee is in South Fermanagh I would say "Go away with Enniskillen

and keep Erinstown and Lismuckee, and still Enniskillen for an agricultural and technical education college for the youth of the country." It would be much better, and they would not have to travel, and it would not be so great a hardship on the sick poor the Guardians to attend those two unions as for those who come from the upper part of Lismuckee to Enniskillen; but as Erinstown is so situated I say it would be impracticable. And as far as outdoor relief goes I know no abuse of it in the rural districts; there may be in the villages and towns, but in rural districts I consider there is no abuse in outdoor relief.

6724. Did you hear the evidence of your chairman about outdoor relief?—I did.

6725. Do you agree with him?—I do.

6726. Don't you also agree with him generally upon the question of amalgamation?—I do.

6727. That two unions would be necessary in the county?—For the convenience of the sick poor, and I don't believe it would be much economy.

Mr. Muldoon.—On account of the evidence you have given about Enniskillen I advise you to get home as soon as you can. Now I have closed the evidence in Lismuckee, and I appear also for Enniskillen No. 2.

Mr. FRANCIS MAGUIRE examined.

Mr. Francis
Maguire.

6728. Mr. Muldoon.—Are you Chairman of Enniskillen No. 2 District Council?—Yes, sir.

6729. That represents the eight electoral districts of Carran which come to Enniskillen Union?—Quite so.

6730. I believe that is a poor mountainous district?—It is.

6731. And Enniskillen is their market and fair town?—Their market and fair town, and the only town they have any business to outside the district.

6732. And they come constantly to Enniskillen?—They have to come to sell their pork and butter, and transact every other business.

6733. And there is always a good attendance of the Guardians of that portion of the union at Enniskillen?—Fairly good.

6734. Would it be a hardship to those people to send them to Bawnboy or any other union beyond the Glen Gap?—It would be almost impossible to get any attendance from that district in any other union except Enniskillen.

6735. You are aware that in 1893 a petition was sent to the Local Government Board to retain your divisions in this union?—Yes; signed by every household in the district.

6736. All creeds and classes are unanimous?—Yes.

6737. And your District Council is unanimous?—Yes.

6738. How far is Ballyconnell from Bawnboy?—About four or five miles.

6739. That happens to be your Quarter Session town?—It is.

6740. Tell the Commission how you have to travel from those electoral divisions round to your Quarter Session town?—The most of the Quarter Session are from that district is done in the County Carran, and we have to go about sixty miles to the town of Carran to come round by Enniskillen, Carran, and Ballyconnell to Carran—through three counties.

6741. CHAIRMAN.—Quite a circular tour?—Yes.

6742. Mr. Muldoon.—You would have to make a similar circular tour to get to Bawnboy if amalgamated with that union?—Nearly; there is only one bad road leading from that district to Bawnboy; that road is some weeks in some years is altogether impassable from some drifts.

6743. Did you hear the evidence of Lord Belmont to-day that he had gone the road once in August?—I did not.

6744. I believe that district has a mountain range on either side?—It has Ouldagh mountain on one side, one of the highest mountains in Ulster, and the only outlet from it is in the direction of Enniskillen.

6745. How do you get to Enniskillen?—By railway from Belcoo.

6746. CHAIRMAN.—How far are you from Enniskillen?—About fifteen miles, but we have no connection, commercially or otherwise, with Enniskillen; the Guardians can attend their business here, do their work in the market or fair, and attend the meetings of the Board of Guardians.

Mr. JAMES MCGOVERN, &c., examined.

Mr. James
McGovern.

6747. Mr. Muldoon.—You are not the member of Parliament?—No; not yet.

6748. I believe you are only a Justice of the Peace?—Yes.

6749. Are you a Guardian of the Enniskillen Union?—Yes, for upwards of twenty years, and ex-officio for eight or nine years until the late reform of the Local Government Act.

6750. And you represent one of those electoral divisions which are situated in Carran?—Yes.

6751. Do you think it would be a hardship upon

those electoral divisions to transfer them to the Bawnboy or Carran Union?—I think it would be a very great grievance.

6752. Why?—I could hardly say it was physically impossible, but it would be very difficult to bring patients to the hospital at Bawnboy, and the Guardians would not attend at all under any circumstances. It is twenty-five English miles from the nearest part of Carran—that is from the Glacken side to Bawnboy—and, as the Chairman of the District Council said, the only means of approach to it would be

through the Glen Gap, and that is in a very impassable condition during some of the winter months, and it would be quite impossible.

6753. What means would you have to adopt to get to Bawnboy in case you wanted to go there?—Except you had a wagonette or something of that kind, supposing you did not take the Glen Gap, but came round, you would have to go round to Fierroconocent and Sennelburg.

6754. You might get there at the end of the following week?—You will get nobody to make the sacrifice, financially, to go to it; you won't have it represented, and an ambulance could only go that way with the greatest possible difficulty. There was talk of a four-wheeled one; I don't know what kind of a one would go through that way.

6755. Do you agree the people are unanimous against the change?—Most unanimous—Protestant, Catholic, and Methodist. I was at a meeting of the Enniskillen Board of Guardians some ten years ago; we had the most perfectly unanimous representation of all classes and orders—the priests, rectors, and Methodist clergy of all sorts and sizes—and they were unanimous in protesting against being separated from Enniskillen.

6756. CHAIRMAN.—Where is the chief bulk of the

population; does it lie along the lake?—No; it is to the south side of the lake on to Downa. As the Chairman of our District Council said, all the business, fair and market, is done at Enniskillen.

6757. The Downa people all come through Belleau on their way to Enniskillen in the ambulance—that is twenty-two miles?—It is easy getting in from Belleau.

6758. How far is it from Downa to Belleau?—Eight Irish miles.

6759. How far is it from Downa to Mohill?—We know nothing about Mohill.

6760. If you did know, how far would it be?—I could not say; we have no connection with it in any way; either Carrick or Manorbannion would be the nearest union.

6761. How far is it from Downa to Carrick?—Sixteen Irish or twenty-two English.

6762. And from Redlion to Manorbannion?—It is not very far, only there is no business connection with it; it is not more than twelve English. They ignore it in regard to business transactions. Enniskillen is the centre for every sort of business, and it is very easy of access, and the Guardians generally do have less or more business there, and there is never any paucity of members present.

Mr. JOHN MAGUIRE examined.

6763. Mr. Muldoon.—Are you a member of the Enniskillen Board of Guardians?—I am.

6764. For the No. 2 district?—Yes; Enniskillen No. 2.

6765. You represent one of the Clonan electoral divisions?—I do; I represent one of the largest of them, too.

6766. Are you in favour of retaining this portion of the County Clonan in the Enniskillen Union?—Yes.

6767. For what reason?—It is more convenient, and we have business. I come here every week on other business.

6768. CHAIRMAN.—On the board day?—Yes. Tuesday is the pork market and butter market.

6769. Mr. Muldoon.—Where do you go to Quarter Sessions?—Ballyvaughan.

6770. How do you get there?—I drive in the winter time to Drumshanbo and take the train there.

6771. How far is Drumshanbo?—Eleven miles from Downa, and I live a mile on this side of Downa.

6772. And how far in the train?—I forget; I think I had to pay for a return ticket.

6773. Do you know how far it is from Belleau to Mohill?—Over thirty miles.

6774. CHAIRMAN.—And from Downa how far?—Over twenty.

6775. Mr. Muldoon.—Would it be possible now to make this portion of Clonan to any other union?—No, it would not; Enniskillen is the only feasible union, and if any change was made on the next day I would resign my seat, and for no money would I attend any other place.

6776. You heard the evidence of Mr. Maguire and Mr. McGovern upon the subject?—Yes, sir.

6777. And you agree with them?—Yes.

Mr. PATRICK GALLON examined.

6778. Mr. Muldoon.—You are a member of the Enniskillen Board of Guardians, and come from one of these Clonan divisions?—Yes.

6779. You have heard the evidence of Mr. McGovern and the Messrs. Maguire?—I have.

6780. Do you agree with that evidence?—I do generally. I remember when this question was up before, and the best and leading gentlemen in the country came to oppose those divisions going to Bawnboy for the best of reasons; we could not go over those mountains or the sick poor could not be brought over them in the winter months without extreme hardship; they are rugged and wild, and high and impassable; there is only one gap through them; there could be no representation if we went to Bawnboy Union.

6781. CHAIRMAN.—And if Bawnboy was broken up you certainly could not go to Clonan?—No, sir; but we could go to Clonan town far easier than to Bawnboy, for we have a railway convenient, but all would not bring four men to Bawnboy every board day; they would have to pay car hire, at their own expense, to go there.

Mr. Muldoon.—Now, sir, that is my last witness, and I have very few observations to address to you. First, on the question of Clonan, I am perfectly satisfied to leave this question of the electoral divisions in the County Clonan, which now come to Enniskillen, where the evidence leaves it, and I submit, with confidence, to the court it will be very difficult to make any alteration that will be in the interest of economy or good local government in that part of the country by moving them to any other place. The geographical situation of them makes it necessary that they should

go to Enniskillen if they are to be represented anywhere and the poor are to be treated anywhere. Nothing could be stronger than the evidence that has been given, and the course that was taken on the petition when this subject was up before almost determines it for us, that there is nothing for these electoral divisions but to remain with Enniskillen, no matter what reform is suggested by this Commission. Now, on the subject of the Lismakea Union, the views of the gentlemen I represent are that two unions will be necessary in a county so situated as Fermanagh, and Enniskillen, if it takes on that portion of Irvinestown which is in this county and that portion of Ballyvaughan which is in this county, and takes this portion of Clonan, will have a large enough area under its control. And it will be necessary to have another union in this county, and Lismakea should be that one. It is a mountainous and lake district, and without great inconvenience or taking a very strong step, we do not think that Lismakea can be discontinued for the present. The evidence given here to-day is uncontradicted that it is in an excellent situation, the workhouse and the infirmary in the midst of pure air and good water, and that it is a model workhouse; if it is not a model workhouse in every way I am entirely misinformed. But I submit to you that a considerable case has been made for preserving Lismakea, even in view of the reform, which everybody hopes will result from this Commission. I will not take up any more of your time. I have submitted the evidence, and know it will be received with the fullest and most ample consideration.

CHAIRMAN.—Now the Irvinestown District Council.

Nov. 11, 1902.

Mr. James McGovern.

Mr. John Maguire.

Mr. Patrick Gallon.

Nov. 11, 1902.

Mr. John Quinn.

Mr. JOHN QUINN examined.

6732. CHAIRMAN.—You are one of the Guardians of the Irvestown Union?—Yes.

6733. Which county do you live in?—I live in the lower district, Fermanagh, and the reason that I came here was I saw that when the Commission was at Ballyshannon—the district I represent is Boko, in Irvestown Union—and I saw that Ballyshannon wanted to get it put into their union; our poor and the cesspayers don't want to go to Ballyshannon, and asked me to represent their views.

6734. How far are you from Pettigo?—The division I represent is a large island—Boko Island, in the Lough Erne—it comes to within four miles from Kesh and six miles from Irvestown; we wish to be continued on to Irvestown, or if Irvestown is amalgamated we are willing to go to Enniskillen, but don't let us go to Ballyshannon.

6735. Anywhere but Ballyshannon?—Anywhere but Ballyshannon or Donagall.

6736. What do you think yourself as to closing your workhouse?—It is my opinion we never will have as little more again, for there is not a union in Ireland fairer wrought; there is not a man in the division but would be sorry to see it closed, but whatever the wise people with greater heads than ours do for us we will do with it, but don't send us to Ballyshannon or Donagall.

6737. Mr. MURKIN.—What is the reason you are so much opposed to Ballyshannon?—They have over 2000 for outdoor relief for one year.

6738. CHAIRMAN.—It is the outdoor relief that frightens you?—And many other things. I have a brother-in-law a Guardian in Ballyshannon.

6739. Did you ever give him your mind?—We have been chatting about matters.

6740. Mr. MURKIN.—Would you like to go to Omagh?—No; I would rather come to Enniskillen; I would like the County Fermanagh would be kept by itself. I would like union making, and I think there should be some outdoor relief where it is needed.

6741. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you give any in Irvestown?—We do; and I give some in my division.

6742. CHAIRMAN.—What kind of people get it in your division?—Old women and old men—helpless people.

6743. How much a week do they get each?—2s. 6d. a week—very little.

6744. There are not many cases in your union?—There are not.

Mr. JOHN QUINN examined.

Mr. John Noble.

6811. CHAIRMAN.—You also are a member of the Irvestown Board of Guardians?—Yes.

6812. Do you belong to the Tyrone part or the Fermanagh part?—The Fermanagh portion.

6813. Is there any one here from the Tyrone part?—Yes; I see Mr. McCaughey.

6814. You heard the evidence of the last witness?—Yes.

6815. Have you the same objection to go to Ballyshannon?—I don't know about Ballyshannon; I belong to the Milltown division.

6816. What do you think of keeping up the Irvestown Union?—I go in for amalgamation; I think our workhouse quite sufficient for the county.

6817. You think your own workhouse might be closed?—Yes; there is a great decrease in the paupers in the county, and the facilities for travelling are much better than they were.

6818. How many miles from Irvestown Workhouse to Enniskillen?—About ten English miles.

6819. So that there would be only that distance more for any sick person to be taken to the coast?—That is all.

6820. How far does Irvestown Union go on to the road towards Enniskillen?—Four miles.

6821. So some parts of your union would be as near as six miles to Enniskillen?—Quite so; and that portion of Irvestown—the Tyrone portion—I would send to Omagh; I would make every county support its own poor.

6822. In order to reach part of your union you have to go through part of the County Donagall, have you not?—Yes.

6823. That is at Pettigo; that is the part that is in Ballyshannon at present; but you would approve of

6795. Only forty-five in the whole union?—Quite right. And I agree with putting out the children when they are fit to go; a country life will be better than keeping them housed up if they are fairly treated and well looked after.

6796. Mr. MURKIN.—What would you do with the tramps?—I would make them break a yard of stones every time they come in before they go on.

6797. Do you do that now?—No.

6798. But the Guardians have the power?—They don't all agree on that; the tramps are very annoying.

6799. CHAIRMAN.—They don't cost much?—They are just very annoying, but they are human beings, and cannot be left to starve.

6800. Mr. MURKIN.—Many inmates in your workhouse?—I think only two.

6801. CHAIRMAN.—You have more than that. There are only two that are so, but you have a good many of their kind?—I suppose it would be wise to do something, but the cesspayers in our neighbourhood are very content with the way it is wrought since the new law came into force.

6802. Do you think there are too many Guardians there?—I think one for every division would do.

6803. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you think if Enniskillen were made the workhouse for this county you could get Guardians to come here?—Not very often from us. I live twenty-four Irish miles from this town, but I would come every year sooner than go to Ballyshannon.

6804. You would come once a month?—I would; twice a month sooner than go to Ballyshannon.

6805. CHAIRMAN.—Part of where you are would be nearer Ballyshannon?—Yes; but the upper end of my division is nearer than that.

6806. Mr. MURKIN.—Is it because they are extravagant in Ballyshannon you would not visit up there?—Certainly.

6807. CHAIRMAN.—How many families are there in your island?—The people beat all themselves; every one has a boat; there might be fifty cesspayers.

6808. And there is a road to the water's edge?—There is one goes right up the middle from the west end to the east end, then there is one across, and there is a graveyard there, and there were two National schools, but there is only one in it at present.

6809. Do the roads go down to the water's edge at the mainland?—They do; nine or ten.

6810. So it is convenient for boating inland?—Quite convenient.

taking Belleek district from Ballyshannon?—I would; because you have the train and good roads.

6824. You would have to use that into Enniskillen?—Yes.

6825. How far is Belleek from Enniskillen?—I suppose it is near thirty miles.

6826. That is a big district?—But the distance does not count so much when you have the train.

6827. Belleek is only four miles from Ballyshannon?—That is all.

6828. How would it be if there was a district hospital, say at Pettigo, that would receive patients from the Belleek district and from the parts of the Irvestown Union that would be sent between Irvestown and Pettigo, and that they would pay simply a small head for getting there?—I think Irvestown would be a good centre for a cottage hospital.

6829. But it would not be a good centre if you lay your idea of keeping all Fermanagh within the county for Poor Law purposes; you could not ask a Belleek patient to come to Irvestown for medical treatment when they have medical treatment within four miles at Ballyshannon?—That is quite so.

6830. If you only asked them to go a little further to Pettigo, which is in a different union, Donagall, that is a point midway where three unions meet, and you could have a kind of joint hospital to accommodate the poor of the three unions adjoining it?—That would meet the case.

6831. And charge so much a head; would you be in favour of that?—I would; I think even in workhouses there should be a ward set aside for paying patients.

6832. I don't mean that; you misunderstand me. Let the paupers go in there, and let the unions of Enniskillen, and Ballyshannon, and Donagall pay

with a head for any sick people that the medical officer or relieving officer sends to that joint hospital?—Yes, I would quite agree with that, and I think with regard to the tramps they should be handed over to the police; either that or, supposing they were admitted to the workhouse, power should be given to detain them three or four days, or a week, and make them work, and break them off their journey.

6835. Might it not have a different effect; might they not, instead of going into the workhouse, quarter themselves behind hay-ricks and farmers' byres?—The police would soon find them out; there might be a few bad cases, but eventually they would wear out.

6836. If they were smoking a pipe behind a hay-stack they might do some harm to the farmers?—I think they would be too much afraid of the police. I have known cases where they go in gangs and have money; one will remain in lodgings with the purse and the remainder go into the workhouse for the night.

6837. Would they trust one chap with the purse?—Oh, they do; there is honesty among thieves. I consider the Irvinestown Workhouse is a very fine building; I think it would make a very good place for the insane poor from Ounagh; Ounagh is overcrowded, and it would relieve it a good deal.

6838. You would not like to see the workhouse at Irvinestown shut up altogether; you would like to see it devoted to some useful purpose?—Yes; turn it into a good factory; it is a very fine building. I have con-

sulted most of the ratepayers in the Milltown division, and they go in for amalgamation, doing away with half the workhouses.

6837. Mr. MURPHY.—Was the question ever raised in the workhouse itself among the Guardians?—It was generally. The Guardians from the towns are not so much in favour of amalgamation as the countrymen, because they gain less or more by the workhouse.

6838. Trade influence has something to do with unions?—A good deal.

6839. Is the view pretty general that one workhouse would be sufficient for Fermanagh?—I do believe it. The population of the county is only half now what it was when the workhouse was built.

6840. You think you would require something in the way of a hospital there for the sick?—I do. It would not be under the name of a workhouse, and poor honest people would go into it. They have a great dislike at the present time to go into a workhouse.

6841. You have not very many inmates in the workhouse from the County Tyrone; see you swear how many?—I am not.

6842. I am informed there are about seven; do you think that there should be sent over to Ounagh or some institution in the county?—I do; I think the poor of that portion of the Irvinestown Union should be sent to Ounagh.

6843. CHAIRMAN.—The Trillick people are so fond of you that they would rather stay with you than go to Ounagh?—I don't know what is the cause of that.

DR. R. G. GRAHAM EXAMINED.

6844. CHAIRMAN.—You heard the evidence given here to-day with reference to Irvinestown; what is your view, knowing the country so well as you do, about the question of closing the Irvinestown Workhouse?—I would be very much inclined, from a commonsense point of view, for amalgamation, at the same time reserving the necessity of looking after the sick and infirm.

6845. You would be in favour of closing it as a workhouse?—Certainly.

6846. And making proper provision for the sick?—Yes.

6847. Do you think it would be too far to take the sick ten miles into Baniskillen?—But our union extends a great many miles.

6848. I am taking Irvinestown itself—Judging from the distances they have to be brought from other places, I think it would be a short distance; there is a good road and all that kind of thing.

6849. There is a great deal of your union on the west side of Irvinestown?—Lough Erne comes in within three miles.

6850. I mean going Dundee way?—Oh; twenty miles from Baniskillen.

6851. If there were some sort of a cottage hospital, say at Pettigo on the one side, and a large institution here at Baniskillen on the other, do you think much hardship would result to the sick poor?—Pettigo is eight miles from Irvinestown. How far would you bring them?

6852. I would leave that to the discretion of the medical officer; he would send his patient, naturally, to the nearest suitable hospital. You would have practically a hospital within eight miles on either side, so from Irvinestown he would presumably send his patients to Baniskillen, and a bit further down the line he would send them to Pettigo?—Yes, according to that arrangement. With regard to our fever hospital I think it is in a capital situation, and with regard to Irvinestown the buildings could be utilised there.

6853. How far back does your union go towards Castleblount?—Scrambling about eight miles.

MR. GEORGE ARCHDALE EXAMINED.

I am from the Kesh division of Fermanagh.

6854. CHAIRMAN.—Which way would you go?—I am in favour of amalgamation on certain conditions if it would reduce the rates and also be a benefit to the sick poor.

6855. Do you think it would be any hardship to the

6854. How far is Ederney?—Five miles, and until you come into Tyrone there are three miles more.

6855. How far would Ederney be from Pettigo?—Six miles.

6856. So that a hospital, if there were one there, would serve that far and?—Some of the part of the union beyond Leck would be farther.

6857. That is high land, without much population?—Well, it is a good deal of it mountainous.

6858. How far would Leck be from Pettigo?—Nine miles by Kesh, and then the union would extend for two miles beyond that. If I might be permitted, with regard to the nursing business, I must say that with regard to the nursing of children in workhouses I have a very unfavourable opinion of it. I have some forty years' experience, and they do badly.

CHAIRMAN.—We noticed your children at Irvinestown the other day and came to that conclusion ourselves.

6859. Mr. MURPHY.—You believe in sending them out early?—I do. I don't believe in allowing them to grow up in workhouses; I would rather have them out, both for their health and morals.

6860. CHAIRMAN.—When they are a year old?—Certainly.

6861. Dr. BROWN.—Do you board out any?—We do, but only foundlings, orphan children, or deserted.

6862. You would like to extend the boarding out as far as possible?—I certainly would; our experience in Irvinestown is favourable.

6863. Do you have many fever cases there?—Very few.

6864. How often is the fever hospital used?—We had some cases six or seven weeks since, but we might have months here without a case.

6865. Would it be a year without any?—Probably; almost; but that is a very strange thing; our cases come from other parts of the union; we never have a home case at all. I heard some evidence here to-day about water. Professor Cameron says he never examined a better specimen than our water.

6866. CHAIRMAN.—Is there anything else?—No; except with regard to the children.

6867. You are strong on that?—Very strong.

sick poor to have to go a distance not exceeding ten miles?—I think that is more a question for the doctor.

6870. If the doctor thought it was no harm, you would be willing to agree with him?—I would. I certainly am in favour of boarding out children.

Nov. 11, 1906.

Mr. John Noble.

Dr. R. G. Graham.

Mr. George Archdale.

Nov. 11, 1903.
Mr. George
Archdale.

6871. As regards tramps, have you much experience of them?—We have a good many.
6872. Are you in favour of rigorous treatment, or are you disposed to let things go on as they are?—Rigorous treatment, certainly. I would admonish them before the Bench and prosecute some of them.
6873. You would make the law of vagrancy more stringent?—I would.
6874. It is a little difficult to prove vagrancy; at present you would throw the onus of proof on the prisoner?—No; it could be left to the doctor to prove that he was fit to work.
6875. Would you keep him in the workhouse?—Not if he was able to work.
6876. What would the medical certificate be for?—To prove that he was an able-bodied man; that he was not a fit inmate for the workhouse.
6877. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Would you not modify that

to some extent by allowing admission the first or second time he came, and then if he was a frequent visitor use a different system?—It might be modified a little.

6878. CHAIRMAN.—Give him a caution the first time!—Yes.
6879. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—There is danger of these men going to haystacks at night and perhaps setting fire to them, or going to barns or hen roosts, and doing mischief in the locality. Some Guardians have said they would do more harm that way than they do the ratepayers by the small money it takes to pay for their lodging.
CHAIRMAN.—Hardly any union pays as much as £5 a year for tramps.
Mr. MURKAGHAN.—The tramp question is not as much as the ordinary man thinks it is—that is from the point of view of expense.

Mr. Samuel
Armstrong.

Mr. SAMUEL ARMSTRONG EXAMINED.

6880. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the Inverness Union?—Yes.
6881. Are you in the County Tyrone part?—No, sir.
6882. What is your view about keeping up the union?—I want to keep my own union; I am thirty years a Guardian; it is well worked with a good staff of officers, and I want to keep it as we are.
6883. How far do you live from Inverness?—About four miles.
6884. You don't see any reason for breaking it up?—No.
6885. You heard two or three of your colleagues

give evidence in favour of breaking it up?—I would rather keep it on.

6886. Even if you would save a little on the rates?—Yes.
6887. You think it is wiser to have a hospital among your people?—I would rather keep it on, if not I would amalgamate with Enniskillen.
6888. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—You would not go to Ballyshannon?—Indeed I would not; many a time I was in it.
CHAIRMAN.—Well you would find it difficult to get a better-managed hospital.

Mr. Patrick
McCaughy.

Mr. PATRICK MCCAGHY EXAMINED.

6889. CHAIRMAN.—We had you before at Omagh, and I think you did not want to go to Omagh; you would rather stay at Inverness?—Certainly.
6890. What is your reason?—Convenience, and also the interests of the sick poor.
6891. What would be the greatest distance the poor would have to go to Omagh?—Fifteen Irish miles.
6892. I think you were also afraid of outdoor relief at Omagh?—I thought it was too large.
6893. And you were afraid it would spread in the Trillick district?—Yes; the rates are higher there; we manage to keep the rates lower in Inverness. I would suggest there should be no such thing as idiot wards in a workhouse; they should be in the asylum.
6894. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Supposing Inverness was amalgamated with Enniskillen, would you prefer coming to Enniskillen rather than to Omagh?—I would; it would be nearer. I have more interest in Fermanagh than in Tyrone.
6895. Has the question ever come up before your colleagues in Tyrone?—It did; we had a special meeting for that purpose.
6896. But they only came to the conclusion they would stick to Inverness; did they consider the question of connection with Enniskillen?—They did, in the event of its being amalgamated with Enniskillen.
6897. What is your objection to going to Omagh?—The distance.
6898. There is not a great difference in the distance?—There is in the Irish fare.
6899. CHAIRMAN.—What is your nearest station?—Banford Junction.
6900. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Are you aware there are only seven paupers from the Tyrone portion of the union in Inverness?—I am not aware of it. I was there this day.
6901. Do you think a separate establishment should be kept up for these seven people?—I did not say that at all.
6902. No, but I ask you do you?—I do not; but I don't think it should be done away with; there are eight-seven in that place altogether.
6903. There are only seven Tyrone people according to the clerk's return in Inverness Workhouse; do you think there would be any great difficulty in these seven people being sent to Omagh?—It occasionally happens from time to time that people get sick, and taking them in an ambulance fifteen miles I would consider a great hardship.
6904. Won't you have to send them to Enniskillen if Inverness is done away with?—That would be only eight or nine miles.

6905. CHAIRMAN.—How far is the most distant part of the Trillick rural District from Inverness?—About six miles.

6906. Is it not more, the most distant part to the east of Trillick?—It would not be six miles.
6907. How far would that point be from Omagh?—About nine miles; that is the furthest point.
6908. Trillick itself; how far is it from Omagh?—Twelve miles.
6909. And from Inverness?—Five Irish.
6910. So that there is just that difference between the two; that is not every much?—It is for a sick person.
6911. When you get them into the ambulance it does not make much difference?—We have heard of a new system of ambulance, but we have not seen it yet. Dr. Thompson referred to it.
6912. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Are you aware that there is an improved ambulance in Omagh—four-wheeled?—It would not fit some of our roads.

6913. CHAIRMAN.—Is there anything else you would like to add?—No; only to do away with idiot wards in unions. They should be in an auxiliary asylum, for they are not needed as they should be.

6914. Do you think there are too many Guardians?—I don't think there is a bit.
6915. Have you not eleven Guardians to look after seven inmates from the Trillick district?—Eight.
6916. And how many do you co-opt?—Three.
6917. You have eleven Guardians for seven inmates?—And one of the witnesses said he would cut off Tyrone altogether. I suppose he wanted to get rid of me.
6918. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—All he wanted was to keep Fermanagh a self-contained county?—There was more than that in it.

6919. Mr. Muldoon.—I believe you have an excellent little District Council there?—Yes; Trillick.
6920. If you had some guarantee that that District Council would be preserved you don't care what happens the Guardians?—I did not say that; I don't say that at all.

6921. Is it not the District Council that you are concerned about?—It is the distance.

6922. CHAIRMAN.—Are you at all anxious about the District Council?—I am, surely; that would be one reason that I would not like we would be amalgamated with Omagh, because when we get the roads they were retained, but the District Council improved them.
6923. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—What surprise me is that any Tyrone man would want to go anywhere but Tyrone?—Did you hear the Tyrone people anxious to come to Fermanagh for co-rentence sake? I am not surprised at you, being an Omagh man would wish to catch all.

Viscount Cokay, D.L., CHAIRMAN.

Nov. 11, 1903.

6034. CHAIRMAN.—Lord Corry, you are a member of some of the local bodies in Fermanagh?—Several of them.

6035. What bodies do you belong to?—I belong to the Enniskillen Board of Guardians, and, of course, the Enniskillen Rural Council, and to the County Council, as CHAIRMAN of the Enniskillen Rural Council.

6036. You are aware of the discussion that has taken place on the question of amalgamation?—I am.

6037. Have you got any views on the amalgamation of unions within the County Fermanagh?—It would be a good thing if it could be done. You would think it the obvious thing to cut the Cavan divisions off Enniskillen, but the question is where they are to go to. If they could be cut off we could take part of Irvinestown or Laneshaes.

6038. Dr. BARNES.—Could you not take Irvinestown, in any case?—We could, but it would make our board enormously large; we have ninety-four members at present.

6039. CHAIRMAN.—Unless you made it co-member constituencies?—That would be a very great mistake. Some divisions might do with one member; some of the divisions certainly ought to have two; we have one division with only thirty voters and others with three or four hundred voters. There ought to be some arrangement by which there should be, say, one representative for every 100 voters. Lisbellaw and Rosslea have three or four hundred voters, and there is a division near Belleek with thirty voters and another near Belleek with twenty-five or thirty.

6040. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Would you take a basis of valuation or population?—I would combine both; the number of electors principally.

6041. CHAIRMAN.—Would you not be disposed to add to the area of Enniskillen unless the Cavan part of the union could be cut off?—Not if we could manage to reduce the numbers of the board a little, but I would not be disposed to do it by cutting it down half. The old board consisted of ninety members, but very seldom as many as that turned up. The day the doctor was elected we had eighty-one; now we don't have very many, for the Cavan men attend very seldom.

6042. As regards Laneshaes, what do you think of it?—I don't know much about Laneshaes; one hears stories about it in the papers sometimes.

6043. Would you like to take it into your union?—I would sooner perhaps somebody else took it in. I don't know much about it really, only what I read in the papers, and you cannot believe all the papers say.

6044. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—The Laneshaes Guardians claim that they have the best-managed union in Ireland?—The Cavan Guardians also, I think, claim that.

6045. Every board has a right to claim it?—Yes. I believe the Grand Board do that too, but I would sooner keep the Cavan divisions than take Laneshaes. I don't see the good of putting Irvinestown and part of Laneshaes into Enniskillen, and leaving out the rest of the county.

6046. CHAIRMAN.—A great number of witnesses were in favour of having a county union and also having the Cavan portion?—Yes, if you take the whole county, but it would be a mistake to put in three-fifths and not have the remainder.

6047. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—The Cavan Guardians say mountains stand in the way as much it would be impossible to send them to their own county?—I believe they do. I remember a big deputation came before us five or six years ago to discuss this very question; they had three priests, and three parsons, and three Methodist ministers, and a lot of blackthorns. Most of our Guardians came in; we had a room as full as it could be; we went fully into the matter; they all protested against being sent to Bawnboy, and I think the majority decided on sending them, but they did not go. However, the Killybegs division (which is in County Tyrone) was taken off us. You might as well give us that now as the whole of Irvinestown.

6048. CHAIRMAN.—As regards the Cavan part of the union, if they had a hospital established for them at Belleek as a union-at-large charge?—It would be a great help, for they are a very long way from hospital now; their distance is very great.

6049. Would you be disposed to think that no matter what is done with that union it should have a hospital somewhere about Belleek?—It would be a very good thing if it could be worked.

6050. Dr. BARNES.—Do you know what the population is?—There are a good many people up that way I believe.

6041. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Laneshaes has a very bad name about Enniskillen?—I believe it has now.

6042. Would you be surprised to hear that it is much more economically managed than the Enniskillen Union?—I should be very much surprised.

6043. CHAIRMAN.—It is 1d. in the £ lower?—That is not much; we have had a lot of expense in the last few years doing up our workhouse; that won't come again.

6044. They are in the position of having spent £1,000 extra?—1d. in Enniskillen, 1d. in Laneshaes?—If Irvinestown and Laneshaes were closed what would the Local Government Board propose to do with them?

6045. They are open to receive suggestions, Lord Corry; harmless lunatics and technical schools?—Certainly the asylum at Omagh is rather crowded. While I would be very much against a separate asylum in this county, still if we had an auxiliary asylum for harmless lunatics it would be a very great help.

6046. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—I have no doubt that there are people from Fermanagh that could be sent to an auxiliary asylum from Omagh?—Yes; I see the Cavan people are objecting strongly to building a separate asylum, and it is a big county, paying more to Monaghan than we do to Tyrone; so I think it would be a very great mistake to start a separate asylum here.

6047. Have you any views on the boarding out of children?—I have not studied the question, but it would be a very good thing. They would be better brought up and would not have a workhouse stigma on them.

6048. The doctor from Irvinestown was very strong on that; you heard what he said?—I heard some of it.

6049. A suggestion has been made in regard to these unfortunate women that go to workhouses to send them to some kind of religious institution for reform?—Would that do them any good, do you think?

6050. CHAIRMAN.—The way it would work out would be that a woman would never go to a workhouse at all; at all events, for her first baby, she would be sent at the expense of the rates to a penitentiary managed by religious people of the same persuasion?—That would be a help certainly.

6051. She would be there for three or four months before she was confined, afterwards she would be there a month, or a year, or whatever time would be necessary in the judgment of the managers of that place to try to set her right, and give her a fresh, good start?—That would be a good idea, and would help to relieve the workhouse.

6052. It would take out the most objectionable class?—Yes; some of these respectable poor people don't like to go into the workhouse on that account.

6053. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—With regard to tramps, what would you suggest should be done with them; do you think the law should be made more stringent?—I think so; they should be made to do a certain amount of hard work when they came into the workhouse before they go out.

6054. Already, I suppose, they are compelled to break some stones?—At various in different workhouses; some make them do very little and some make them do a lot, and the workhouse where they have to work hard they avoid, and here where they have three workhouses within ten miles from each other, if they thought Enniskillen too hard they would go to Irvinestown, and if Irvinestown was too hard they would go to Laneshaes.

6055. CHAIRMAN.—Would you go so far as to let the police deal with the tramps, giving them an order for lodging if they were respectable people in the judgment of the local officer of police, or if they were regular tramps giving them the lock up and bringing them before the magistrate next day?—If the police would carry out the duties properly it would be a good thing, but the police here so much to do already.

6056. You think they are an overcrowded body?—In some ways they are; they have so many different duties; still if it could be worked it would be an advantage, but there are difficulties.

6057. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Have you any idea as regards the area of rating; which would you prefer?—For some things I would sooner have a smaller area. For instance, about sanitary matters, it is very hard to get a drainage scheme passed for some small village, because the rest of the district object to pay for drains.

CHAIRMAN.—That does not come under our Commission.

Nov. 11, 1902

Viscount
Cory.

6568. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—In regard to Poor Law, to corroboration relief, do you think union rating tends to extravagance?—I think divisional rating would be fairer.

6569. You think there would be a closer eye kept on the expenditure?—I think there would. It would make each member of the Board take more interest in

a particular division had to pay for the outdoor relief—they would go into the merits of the case much more. 6570. We had that before us; some of the old Guardians thought that divisional rating was better.—On the whole I would prefer divisional rating; but that applies more to sanitary matters than Poor Law matters.

Mr. W. R. COCKEY examined.

Mr. W. R.
Cockey.

6561. Dr. BROWN.—You wish to give some evidence?—The point I wish to make specially is that if any of these workhouses became available they should be used as a convalescent hospital; it is greatly needed, and the approved treatment—the open-air treatment—is not within the reach of the poor at all; it is not within the reach of the middle classes, and I think when these gentlemen arrange to have this amalgamation take place among the houses one might be available. The minimum cost of this treatment has yet to be ascertained. Everything up to the present has been done so expensively that the poor have been deterred. I think the experiment might be tried by utilizing one of these workhouses and bringing down the cost to the lowest possible limit; the medical men would be equal to dealing with the subject. I don't think there is anything so much needed as something of that sort.

6562. Have you any idea yourself what might be the probable cost?—We were able to bring down the price of food to 4s. a day—the actual cost of the purchase of the food per patient—but that included luxuries. I am not a medical man, but I should think the food necessary to give weight might not consist of these luxuries. Milk, for instance, is a weight-giving food, potatoes, I believe, are very nourishing, and other vegetables, turnips and cabbage, are weight-giving, and it would be for the medical supervision to settle whether the weight given by this food would have the result of weight given by expensive animal food. If it was the fact that an increase of weight and blood would combat the disease, no matter what class of food, it would be an unquestionable benefit; but up to the present nothing has been done to save the lives of these people. The treatment is not on the open-air system for the poor. I have been looking anxiously for some years for the time when this would take place and one of these workhouses would be available.

6563. CHATELAIN.—If you had your choice of institutions, as far as you know of them round the country, what one would you like, having studied the question as you have done?—I am afraid that Barnaby seems to be the one that would be squeezed out. I would like Dr. Rigger and the Commissioners would go over it and see.

6564. We were over it yesterday!—Fresh air and isolation are the two things necessary.

6565. You know Irvinestown?—I do.

6566. What do you think of Irvinestown?—I should think any of these houses would do admirably; it seems to me a question of knocking plenty of windows into them.

6567. You want fairly reasonable railway communication?—Some of the sanatoria are placed at a great distance from a railway. Cotswold is seven miles from Cheltenham. I would not think the distance so vital; convalescent patients can be conveyed any distance, and the travelling does not injure them.

6568. It would run up the cost very much if you had to bring them in a vehicle from here to Barnaby?—They can go on an ordinary outside car.

6569. An ordinary outside car costs money?—Well, they could be brought on a cart.

6570. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—A suggestion has been made that near the sea would be a suitable place?—I attended the Congress in London, and we had all sorts of opinions, but to sum up, it was that the locality does not matter if you have pure air and food, as a matter of course, but that given you will find doctors advocate all sorts of places.

6571. Your place was on the lake, with plenty of open air?—Yes. I am afraid to talk of the results, because the medical profession don't like that, but our results would encourage the extending of it. My first idea was to open a free hospital; I took the house with that view, and brought a specialist over from England, and then when we had everything settled he said "I won't take charge of it as a free hospital," so I was compelled to change my plans and open it,

trying to charge a minimum—we charged half what they were in the habit of charging in these places, and it filled immediately.

6572. Dr. BROWN.—What was your charge?—Two and a half guineas a week, and the place filled at once; they were as well treated as the doctor wished; a large proportion of them yielded to the treatment; some we could do nothing with.

6573. CHATELAIN.—Was it for one sex or both?—Mixed; it was just conducted like a hydra.

6574. Dr. BROWN.—What was your number?—Fifteen was the maximum.

6575. CHATELAIN.—How long was it opened?—Three years altogether; we treated sixty patients.

6576. Dr. BROWN.—Some of them stayed six months?—Nine months; we had one man from Scotland, who brought his fortune over here and stayed until it was nearly spent, and went back to his work—an artisan.

6577. Have you heard anything of him since?—Yes; he has corresponded with us. And we had a clergyman's wife. I had letters from her husband; she is quite well. There was a lady from Irvinestown—one of Dr. Graham's patients—and her husband came to me and told me that nothing could be better; she became a strong healthy woman, and has maintained that up to the present, and is doing very well indeed.

6578. CHATELAIN.—Was that in a very early stage of the disease?—We found, I think, that mature people were more amenable to the treatment—seemed to be able to combat the disease better than a young girl of twelve or thirteen, or a young boy. They did not seem to be sufficiently hardy.

6579. Dr. BROWN.—Did you get them in the very early stages?—We had them in all stages.

6580. I think they are not recognised very often sufficiently early?—We had them of seven years' duration—some of them.

6581. That must have been a very chronic case! CHATELAIN.—Was the disease related in that case?—That case did not stay long enough; but the evidence we had with that was that after some time this patient recommended another one.

6582. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—What was the average daily number in the institution?—During the whole time I could not tell you exactly the average.

6583. CHATELAIN.—About how many would you have as a rule?—Fifteen for the first four months; then our numbers ran down owing to a very peculiar circumstance—our doctor opened another sanatorium, and carried away all the patients.

6584. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—What was your staff?—A doctor, matron, and two trained nurses from Dublin, and cook; four housemaids with them as servants.

6585. Dr. BROWN.—That was a very expensive establishment for such a small number; the establishment charges would be very high?—These all might be economized, and I think that is what is desirable on different lines—give them the fresh air, give them the food, and regulate their exercise and rest, and it is only a medical man can do that. If you had a resident medical man to do that for them I think a great deal might be accomplished.

6586. That is why, if it is payable off the rates, it must be worked on a large scale as to work it down to a very low cost per head per week?—The necessities of life are very cheap—potatoes are cheap, milk is cheap, and butter and white bread. I wish very much that there could be some of these houses utilized for that. There is another thing I want to give an opinion on as a quins. I quite disagree with these gentlemen about the tramps. I think the safest and best place for a tramp is in the workhouse; if you let him go to the workhouse he gets nights lodging and his food at a very low cost; if you don't allow him to go into the workhouse he probably goes to some hayrack or bog between two or three people, and these two or three charitable people bear the cost of what might be distributed over the union. Then if you put it into the hands of

the police they cannot possibly obtain for him a night's lodging so cheap as in the workhouse. The house is there, the staff is there, the provisions are bought at a minimum cost, and there is no place they can be so cheaply lodged as in the workhouse. I am sorry to see so great a prejudice against these unfortunate people getting a night's lodging.

6987. CHAIRMAN.—Have you looked at the question that some of these tramps are not people who are accidentally out of work, but people who from generation to generation walk about the roads leading an objectionable life?—I think the great majority are tradesmen out of work, and drink every farthing they get.

6988. But the ordinary people are mostly driving on the road don't look like tradesmen?—I think all vagrants should be taken up by the police.

6989. A great many of these people are vagrants?—Oh, a great many are tradesmen.

6990. The people you meet walking from one union to another, a great number of those are hereditary tramps?—I live in town and see a great deal of the workings out of this thing. I was for a long time in the labouring business, and our workmen are a most wretched lot. They will drink until they drink their last penny; they are turned out of the town, and they go to the next town absolutely destitute. I met the case of a millwright once and other tradesmen who drank their money. I think really the Government ought almost to provide lodgings for them in the workhouse, as they get their money; they get an enormous revenue from them.

6991. You think the Encise ought to look after these people?—I think so; but I think they are safer at present. I don't think you can improve on the present state of things; once a man is in the workhouse he is safe for the night.

6992. What view would you take about the children of those people, who have been led round the country—poor little things—staggering after their parents?—That is rather a large question.

6993. It is, but those are the coming generation of tramps?—Suppose they are taken in; there is the Poor Law, which, I take it, decrees that no man shall starve while there is food in the land.

6994. There is no such law in this country?—I thought everyone was entitled to food.

6995. No; it is in the discretion of the Guardians; if the Guardians find anyone destitute they are to provide for them, but it is in their discretion?—That is new to me. I thought they were compelled; the rates are compulsory.

6996. The rates are compulsory, but the relief is not?—That is a pity; we are supporting people belonging to other districts and other districts are expecting ours.

6997. Mr. MURKIN.—Have you any views about the boarding out of children?—I think if you can get a child out of a workhouse before it has received any impression I think it is a great advantage. In this district the Protestant Ophelia Society is a very good example of what can be done; they board their children out, and so see them come in on a show day—the children all look comfortable and well.

6998. CHAIRMAN.—How much a year do they pay?—£20 a year.

6999. How much do the Guardians pay?

Mr. FERGUSON.—£8.

Mr. MURKIN.—£7, with clothing.

Witness.—Perhaps I am wrong about that.

7000. CHAIRMAN.—I had an idea it was 29 or £101.—Perhaps you are right. What I wanted to tell you was an affection springs up between them. I have a man working with me at present; he does not know at the present moment that he is not a member of the family; the family never told him; he believes he is a full brother of the children about, and he is going on earning his living honestly and fairly. I think boarding out is very humane.

7001. They get absorbed into the ordinary family life of the country?—I think so.

MR. THOMPSON TAYLOR EXAMINED.

Mr Thompson Taylor.

7002. CHAIRMAN.—You are the Chairman of the Urban Council?—Yes.

7003. What is the view of your council if they have considered the matter on the question of amalgamation of unions?—The view of our council principally is amalgamation.

7004. To what extent would you be in favour of it in the County Fermanagh?—I could scarcely answer that question, but I know that the members of our board are principally in favour of it. I, personally, as an ordinary business man, would consider it advisable.

7005. To have fewer union workhouses in the county; do you think you could spare one in Fermanagh?—I think we could very conveniently.

7006. Or two?—Or two.

7007. Which of the two could you spare best?—That goes without saying.

7008. The unions you think might be spared are Irvinestown and Lisnakeilly?—I think so.

7009. Have you considered the distances the sick would require to be brought?—I have.

7010. And you don't think it would be too far?—I don't think it would be much of an inconvenience.

7011. If it were considered to be an inconvenience, would you be in favour of having small, cheap, local hospitals at two or three points in the county?—Yes; I think that would be very feasible.

7012. Dr. BRUCE.—Did your council pass any resolution at all on the subject?—They did not; they simply appointed Mr. Cooney and myself to attend here to give evidence if necessary.

7013. It is only merely on the question of amalgamation?—Merely on the question of amalgamation. I am not a member of the Poor Law Board, and have never been a member.

The Sitting terminated.

Dec. 24, 1903.

FIFTEENTH PUBLIC SITTING—TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 24TH, 1903

At the Courthouse, Monaghan.

Present:—Mr. MICKS, (Chairman), Mr. MURTAGHAN, and Dr. COREY BEEGER.

Mr. John Muldon (instructed by Mr. M. E. Knight) appeared for the Monaghan Board of Guardians.

Mr. Charles Dromgoole (instructed by Mr. D. X. Keenan) appeared for the Clones Board of Guardians.

Mr. James Augustine Murnaghan (instructed by Mr. Grant) appeared for the Carrickmacross Board of Guardians.

Mr. William Martin appeared for the Monaghan County Council.

Mr. Murphy appeared for the Rural District Councils of Clones No. 1 and No. 2.

CHAIRMAN.—Gentlemen, our general procedure is to invite the County Council to give their views at the start, but I understand that owing to a funeral Mr. Bussie and some of the members of the County Council are not here yet, but I believe the Clones Guardians are represented.

Mr. Dromgoole.—Yes, sir. I appear for the Clones Guardians, and here my witnesses ready.

Mr. Martin.—I appear on behalf of the County Council for Monaghan the officials will be here in a few minutes.

CHAIRMAN.—Then we might take up the Clones evidence.

Mr. Murphy.—I appear on behalf of Clones No. 1 Rural District Council and also on behalf of Clones No. 2 Rural District Council—the Fermanagh and Monaghan sections of Clones Union.

Mr. Dromgoole.—I appear for the Clones Board of Guardians, and the matter in many respects has been so recently before you in Enniskillen that it will be scarcely necessary for us perhaps to go into such detail as we went into there. The position we take up is this, we are one of the unions on the borders of the County Monaghan, we stretch over into the County Fermanagh, and although the part in Fermanagh is of greater area, at the same time the population of the substantial portion of the union is in this county, Monaghan. In Clones we have spent a very considerable sum of money during the last two or three years, over £100, and we have brought our buildings, and

especially our hospital accommodation, to a very high pitch of efficiency. We have done that in an economical way, we have done it, too, by spending the money at once and raising it immediately out of the rates, and we have not incurred any debts, so that we will be in a position after the current year to have all these buildings paid for. In consequence of the expenditure which has been necessary for us during the last couple of years our poor rate has gone up to 8d. in the £, but that is a very moderate poor rate, considering the exceptional expenditure; our normal rate is something like 5½d., and after this year we expect it will be that. We have a workhouse capable of accommodating 644 inmates, which is a large number of persons than there are in the whole County of Monaghan in all the workhouses put together, although the average number in the houses with us is only eighty-three, and about thirty-five of these are in the infirmary. We are exceptionally well situated, although on the border of the county in one sense, at the same time under the existing conditions of travel, more important perhaps than the actual distance from place to place is the railway accommodation, and I think we will be able to satisfy the Commission that as far as railway accommodation is concerned there is no place that would so well serve the different portions of the county as Clones. It lies on the main line connected with the different parts of the county in a way that no other town is. I will call Dr. Tierney, who will give you evidence as to those matters, and give you the views of our council upon them. We are not, I may say, or—although we think the number of workhouses might be decreased and a less number of workhouses might do for the different counties, say one or two for Monaghan—we are not in favour of abolishing the union that we have. We can only, of course, judge from our own experience, but we think that the abolition of the union in our case would not lead to any system of economical expenditure, and with our present system we can manage better and more economically than if thrown into a larger area, whatever may be done with the buildings themselves.

Dr. Tierney examined.

Dr. Tierney.

7014. Mr. Dromgoole.—You are here on behalf of the Clones Board of Guardians?—Yes.

7015. You gave evidence for them at Enniskillen?—Yes.

7016. You are a medical doctor residing at Clones?—Yes.

7017. CHAIRMAN.—You are also a County Councillor?—I was for years, and an ex-officio Guardian for ten years.

7018. Mr. Dromgoole.—Tell me what are the views of your board as to the amalgamation of unions and the amalgamation of workhouses?—I think, sir, I have made the opinion of our board clear—or I endeavoured to do so—in Enniskillen. Whilst we think that the number of workhouses in the union are too many—

7019. CHAIRMAN.—You have got four?—We think two is quite sufficient for any county, but we do not believe that dissolution of unions would be of any benefit to the ratepayers. In fact the benefit that would accrue in the case of Clones would be about a farthing in the £, and we don't think that efficient service should be sacrificed for a farthing in the £. If you dissolve Clones Union Workhouse you will do away with the services of the clerk, the matron, the master, and the teacher, and also the expenditure on salaries for those officers; that would bring in a sum of £144 12s. or a saving, but then we must take into consideration that if we dissolve those officers we must give those superannuation; each of those officers has a service of about seven years; we will take it on an average, six. In the case of the clerk his annual

salary is £20 a year, the Franchise and Jurors Act being his £70 a year, and an executive sanitary officer, £15; his total salary would be £105 a year; he has about seven years' service, and on the Civil Service scale would bring him to £11 of superannuation.

7020. You propose to give him only the Civil Service scale?—It appears that is all they are entitled to.

Mr. Martin.—There would be something added.

Witness.—I am only taking it on the Civil Service scale; it would be £11. In the case of the matron, whose salary is £20 a year; the last matron we had she retired and she was allowed superannuation on her salary of £25 a year, and £21 a year for matrons and £10 for fuel; light and rooms were allowed to her by the Local Government Board, which brought her salary to £52 a year. In this case if you give her Civil Service scale she will be entitled to £5 a year, and the total superannuation in Clones on the lower scale would be £20 a year. We maintain that if you dissolve Clones Union the clerk of whatever union we would be added on to would be entitled to an assistant, and the smallest thing you could contribute from Clones would be £25 a year towards an assistant. Once a union is dissolved the Franchise fees go to the Secretary of the County Council, which is a great instrument to the Clerk of the County Council. The clerk of the union it would be added on to would not get that; he would only get a small increase, say £25 a year. The office of executive sanitary officer would be dissolved too, and that would go to the secretary of the County Council, £25 a year. We put down £25 a year for

extra carriage of paupers, for from the extreme end of Clonsilla Union you would have to carry them by road nine miles to Clonsilla and thirteen miles by railway to Monaghan; we say the extra cost would be £10 a year, and deducting appreciation and extra increases would bring down the net saving to Clonsilla to about 505 a year. Now the valuation of Clonsilla Union is £22,545; i.e. in the £ 8 hangs in £253 a year; so that in reality the Clonsilla Union, if it were dissolved, would save £1, in the £, and we believe hardship on the poor and loss of efficient service would result; the poor here are in immediate touch with their relatives, and there is an efficient service for Poor Law Guardians themselves, for we believe it would be impossible to get Guardians to take a weekly ticket to Monaghan or any place else, and travel eight or nine miles of a morning; they would not attend.

7021. We might not take, personally, your figures of £1 in the £ as what the result would be if I were to work it out on other lines. You make the calculation in a way that is never adopted for the purpose of amalgamation—I make it from my knowledge of the system.

7022. I know, but it has to be done in a different way—by taking the expenditure and the valuation of the union to which you go; it is not simply what you save in Clonsilla—you get into a new area altogether, and the rates are struck not on the Clonsilla valuation alone?—We say this is the immediate saving to us.

7023. It is not necessary to discuss it, but I only wish to say I don't quite adopt the figures—it is stated by persons who I might say are experts on such houses and houses, that a house with over 500 inmates becomes unworkable. I have heard it stated since after this—I saw it in the *Medical Press*—that a house of over 500 is unworkable for management; a small house under 500 is more manageable and more economical.

7024. Mr. Dromgoole.—Your calculation would be taken upon the assumption too that the management of the larger area which you suppose yourself given over to be as economical as the management of your own union at present?—Yes.

7025. If the result was that there was not such good management?—The saving would be less.

7026. It might be wiped out altogether; taking Clonsilla Union as it is managed and worked at present, what is your average poor rate?—Under the old Guardians and under the new it always varied about 5d. or 6d.

7027. You have now in your workhouse the new dietary scale?—We have; I believe we were one of the first Boards of Guardians in the North of Ireland to adopt it.

7028. Have your workhouse buildings in a very perfect condition?—I think the Commissioners visited it.

7029. And your infirmary?—I believe, without boasting, that our infirmary is as up-to-date as any other workhouse hospital in Ireland.

7030. And your sewerage and all that kind of thing is in a perfect state?—We have spent up to £1,500 in water, sewerage, and new buildings.

7031. Was I right in saying the capacity of the houses is 644 inmates?—Those capacities, I think, should be taken for what they are worth. Under the old system of hygiene these houses were built to hold 650 and 700, but I think under the present system they would not be fit to accommodate that. I think for Clonsilla you might put down 500, but that 500 I would wish to print out to you in Clonsilla would be for the body of the house alone, as the hospital accommodation is quite new. The present hospital was the union fever hospital, and in the case of another union you might say that it was built to accommodate 800; it would now accommodate 600. But Clonsilla, you may say, is a net 500, because the hospital accommodation does not come off it.

7032. Have you any idea of the number of paupers in the county?—I have.

7033. Do you think there are more than Clonsilla Union itself would accommodate?—About 400 would be the number of real paupers; if you deduct the children from that it would be much less.

7034. I just want to ask you a word about the position of Clonsilla and the convenience of access from the other parts of the county. Take first of all that northern union, Monaghan?—If it is considered wisdom to confine unions to the margins of the county, Cootshill No. 2 would have to become a Monaghan Union or be attached to some union in Monaghan; Cootshill No. 2 goes up to the extreme end of Clonsilla at Red-hill; it would be about thirty miles to Monaghan

and to Clonsilla about eight. The extreme end of Cootshill No. 2 at Ballyhay would be thirteen or fourteen miles, and every part of Cootshill No. 2 touches upon or adjoins railways—Scribble, Monaghan Road, and Ballyhay. There is no part of Cootshill I think at a greater distance than four miles from a junction of a railway.

7035. When you get at any of these railways must you go through Clonsilla before you can go to Monaghan?—Yes; you would be just doubling the journey.

7036. Take Castledown and Carrickmacross, the same thing applies to them?—I think Castledown would be central for the two, and if the workhouse there was retained the extreme end of Monaghan, such as Clonsilla and part of Traugh, could be taken into Castledown. In Monaghan you have Monaghan Junction and Smithborough in the centre and Glasslough the extreme end. From Clonsilla to Bracken is six miles; the other portions on Monaghan Union are about three miles from the Junction, so that they could be brought in by train much cheaper than by road. This county is an exception to any other county in Ireland in the sense that we are threatened with an immense expenditure on asylum buildings. If we have a separate asylum for Curran it will mean, according to all the people of authority—

7037. Chairman.—Do you want us to go into that? No, sir; but I say the expenditure would be immense, even if we have never a separate asylum; we are threatened with an expenditure of from £2,000 to £10,000 for additional buildings as we stand at present. I maintain that this expenditure in Monaghan could be saved by immediately taking possession of Monaghan Workhouse. It is built, I believe, to accommodate up to 1,000; you might say 800 roughly, and the medical officer that supervised the asylum could supervise it; it is only just across the road, and, moreover, Monaghan has ample accommodation for hospital purposes. They have a fever hospital and the county infirmary, which could be used for the poor, and, if necessary, a cottage hospital could be established at Aughanador for Traugh, and could do for the lower end of Tyrone. We say it would be a great saving on the County Monaghan and also Curran—that £10,000 could be saved by immediately taking possession of Monaghan Workhouse buildings for asylum purposes.

7038. Really, every railway in Monaghan communicates directly with Clonsilla?—They do; there is no portion of Cootshill No. 2 at a greater distance than four miles from a station on a line of railway.

7039. Mr. Dromgoole.—471 is the total number of paupers in the county?—Take the children off that and it is, roughly, 400.

7040. Chairman.—You are anxious to say something about the boarding out of children?—I think, in answer to a question in Keshidale, I did not express why I was against it. Unfortunately, a number of children in the workhouse are generally illegitimate, and a respectable man, no matter how humble his position—a labourer—would be the very last to adopt an illegitimate child into his family.

7041. Do you speak from conjecture or experience?—Experience; the few cases we had at Clonsilla, the people who adopted these children were generally persons whose reputation would not stand investigation.

7042. Is that a case of hiring out or boarding out?—Boarding out.

7043. Did you hire them out?—No. They put the children into the workhouse, and when they grew up their immediate relatives will across the Guardians to get them out as slaves and work them. That is the reason I would be against boarding out children, because even if they were not stigmatize their own relatives would take them for the purpose of gain, not of philanthropy.

7044. Have you had any instances of that?—My experience of workhouses is that it is a field day when a child comes to fourteen to see which friend will get him.

7045. For the hiring out?—That is the hiring out. 7046. We are speaking of boarding out?—I think the class of people who would take those children—

7047. Now, are you speaking from experience about the boarding out?—Our experience is limited.

7048. To what extent?—We had only two children boarded out in Clonsilla.

7049. That would be rather small to generalize from?—I think, from my knowledge of the county, you would not get respectable people—no matter how poor—to take children, and if they did take them it would be for the purpose of gain.

Nov. 24, 1903.

Dr. Tierney.

7050. I think the evidence is overwhelmingly strong against your view—I mean legitimate children.

7051. Mr. Dromgoole.—What would you suggest to do with them?—My suggestion is there should be one dressed workhouse for a county, or for two counties, which should be used principally as an industrial school, and these children, if possible, should be learned some trade, and, as I said before, they are about the only class of the community I would encourage to emigrate, because if they don't get out of the district in which they are known they are branded.

7052. Would there be a necessity for adding to the existing industrial schools?—I would not consider that the existing industrial schools are on the lines that we should adopt; there is a difference of opinion about industrial schools.

7053. What is your opinion?—I would not be in favour of sending children there.

7054. CHAIRMAN.—Why?—If you read the Commissioner's report on industrial schools they are not up to my standard of industrial schools for children.

7055. The education?—The education is good enough, but Dr. Fogin has condemned the food and the care and attention paid to them. I think if we had smaller industrial schools—one for every two counties, where they would be under the care of the Guardians and their friends—it would be much better.

7056. Is it your impression that he has condemned industrial schools generally as regards food?—No; but he has condemned some, and some of the principal ones that are looked up to. I believe class D is not sufficient for any industrial school; they should be all class I.

7057. Mr. Dromgoole.—You would give in these schools a trade to these children?—I would, and I maintain they should be taken entirely out of the hands of the Guardians; there should be a joint committee for the two counties to take charge of the children of the two counties.

7058. CHAIRMAN.—Do you know that there are such schools at present?—I believe there is a school of that class in the South of Ireland, and there is a female one on the Shannon.

7059. That is the one at Glin, and there is one at Trim?—And these children are trained as servants, and sent out, and they do well.

7060. Mr. Dromgoole.—You think the other system only brings them up as labourers?—I believe so.

7061. CHAIRMAN.—Would not that be a very useful career for a workhouse boy to become a labourer—a class that is scarce and difficult to get?—I would limit the labouring class as much as possible, because, as far as I know, the labourer is only one degree above slavery from childhood to death.

7062. But the labourer is necessary?—He is, but I would limit it to the lowest class of intellect in the community. If a boy had more intellect than an ordinary labourer he should be encouraged to rise above that position.

7063. Even at the expense of the rates?—We should not live on the slavery of our brothers; we should encourage them to rise, and, moreover, machinery at the present time has limited the market for labourers.

7064. There is a great scarcity of agricultural labourers at present?—There is, but the work in Ireland for them is limited to about two months in the year, and the farmer cannot expect the labourer to sit down and starve for two months in order to get work for two; if they gave them constant employment they could have plenty of labourers, but they give them an empty house and charge 25 an acre for potato ground, and give them two months work only.

7065. Mr. MURKIN.—Is it your experience that there is only employment for labourers for two months in the year?—There is a scarcity of labour, and agriculture has gone down one-third of what it was; the farmers, to my own knowledge, who were agriculturists, have now become graziers.

7066. Is not that largely due to the scarcity of labour?—It is not; it is due principally because they don't think it will pay to raise crops and send them to market to sell and compete with the foreign markets.

7067. Have you any practical experience?—I have, unfortunately; and I know that the crops you raise yourself will not pay for the labour.

7068. Still with all that, don't you think the country should be kept cultivated?—It should; but if you take your own country, Tyrone, and take your ordinary farmer, let him raise whatever crop he likes, both

animal and otherwise, will he utilize it for his own use; surely not; he will go for the Yankee produce and sell his own.

7069. Still don't you think it would be a desirable thing to utilize the young of the country who have no special gifts for higher walks of life?—That is what I say; that should be limited to persons with very low intellects.

7070. Don't you think the children raised at the expense of the rates would be suitable subjects for such purposes?—If they follow the natural ability of some of their fathers they would be much higher than labourers.

7071. Why should their fathers be in such a high position?—Some of them, to my own knowledge, are very clever men.

7072. That is not very creditable to them?—If a child comes into the world against his own wish, and if he has natural intelligence, you should not brand him as a slave.

7073. I would like to know on what ground you think it right that the children raised at the expense of the ratepayers should be placed in a higher position than the children of those ratepayers?—I don't mean to say so; unfortunately, that is one of the reasons of the dearth of labourers at the present time. Take your smallest farmer, or an ordinary cottier, will he be content to have his children in the position he was himself? I understand he won't. Even in the servant market in this county at present, which is recruited from the very small farmers and cottiers, they will never think of sending their children to a position they hold themselves; they always try to better them.

7074. Why do you say the farmers only employ the labourers for two months in the year?—Unfortunately, that is the fact.

7075. Don't you know that there are eight months of busy time for the farmers?—The ordinary farmer sows March and April getting his crops in and July and August getting them home.

7076. Is it not the experience of most farmers that they find it impossible to get hands to stay with them?—Any farmer, if he treats his labourer well, will get him to stay with him.

7077. Are you aware hired boys are getting 65 and 70 a half-year, or 111?—I am aware of that.

7078. That speaks to the contrary? Yes; because, unfortunately, the farmer prefers to give 111 to a boy, and only 25 a week to a married man.

7079. Then you would educate these children of the State and give them a trade, and then encourage them to emigrate; do you think that would be fair to Ireland?—My belief is that we should take as the first plank in our platform the benefit of the children, not the benefit of Ireland or any other country.

7080. Then in your calculation of the saving, I think you forget to take into consideration the great saving in fuel and on the upkeep of the buildings?—The fuel at Clonoe we might, roughly, put down at 650 a year.

7081. In the neighbouring Union of Omagh it is 2400?—We generally contract for 100 tons, and get it eighty or eighty-five tons.

7082. That seems very strange indeed?—I think we should be regarded as a very economical and wise union.

7083. The poor people are not shivering under it?—They are not.

7084. Don't you think economy could be pushed to starvation?—I don't think you could say so in Clonoe. If the inmates we have in Clonoe were drafted to a neighbouring union there would be extra wards required, and the number of extra wards required for our poor and for the poor of the neighbouring unions would also have to be heated, and there would be extra fires; in a ward that would accommodate sixty or seventy you could not burn 120 for the sake of saving extra fuel.

7085. CHAIRMAN.—You have no such wards as that?—No; but if we drafted seventy from Clonoe to Monaghan the Monaghan expenditure of 120 or 130 tons a year would be raised to 300.

7086. You might not want the extra wards; the wards are not full in any case at present?—You might save a little, but you could not fill the wards; you could only put a certain number into every ward.

7087. Mr. MURKIN.—If you had some form of concentration, don't you think the classification could be better, and the arrangements internally very much improved on the present system?—That is what I

Nov. 24, 1905.

Dr. Tierney.

maintain that concentration of workhouses—two workhouses would do, but the unions should not be dissolved; they should be contributory.

7022. You are in favour of these—?—Concentration of workhouses, but not of unions; we say the unions should remain as they are, and be contributory to these concentrated workhouses.

7023. CHAIRMAN.—That the Guardians should meet and deal with the poor in the central workhouse?—Yes; in the same way that the County Council conducts the system.

7024. What would be the business of the Board of Guardians meeting at Clones if their inmates were at Castleblayney or Monaghan?—To receive the reports of the unions to which they contribute; the numbers lodged to the rates of the district.

7025. Would they have anything to do except to read reports?—That is what they have to do at present.

7026. They could not give directions as to what was to be done in workhouses remote from them?—Generally in all workhouses that is left to a few men.

7027. You could hardly have three or four Boards of Guardians interested in a distant workhouse and all giving contradictory orders?—You could not; if we sent our poor to Castleblayney, and the average cost of the maintenance of the paupers was 4s. 6d. a week, and we sent ten or twenty chargeable, what is the money we could not draw a cheque for twenty paupers at 4s. 6d. a week?

7028. If you were only there for the purpose of drawing a cheque, I don't see what you would be?—We could see to other union affairs and the district hospital, which would be essential.

7029. What would you do at Clones for a distinct hospital?—We would still retain our hospital.

7030. And close up the big main building?—Let it go to the rate and fall, or sell it for road material; that is the only thing you could do with it; it is essential to maintain the district hospital.

7031. And at Clones you could easily do so, because it is detached from the rest of the building, and has a separate entrance?—It has a separate entrance.

7032. If the other building were knocked down and the site sold?—If we take the example of the old jail in Monaghan—one of the finest of buildings—it only brought in £300 to the ratepayers. Would it not be better to let it stand as an old curiosity and charge 1s. a week in 100 years for the benefit of the ratepayers.

7033. The site would sell for something material?—Very little.

7034. Is the land round Clones not of much value?—I don't think you would get people to buy land convenient to a hospital.

7035. There are a good many buildings near the hospital here in Monaghan?—I don't think so, unless at a convenient distance.

7036. Mr. Dransfield.—There never was any complaint as to the way that your inmates were treated in Clones?—We never had any complaints.

7037. CHAIRMAN.—Except giving tramps the cold bath?—That was done away with.

7038. And I believe I did it myself?—You may have been the man doing, but I was the person that worked it with the Guardians.

7039. Mr. Dransfield.—Any regulation the Local Government Board made was always complied with?—Yes.

7040. These Boards of Guardians are also District Councils, and they would have to meet in any event?—Yes; the Guardians could remain, because you would have District Councils meeting as usual, and the Guardians' business could be done once a month.

7041. Dr. Brogan.—You know the fever hospital at Clones?—I do.

7042. Do you think it is suitable for the requirements?—It is, unfortunately, not up to date as it should be.

7043. How would you suggest it should be made up to date?—They are repairing it at present. When the present joint committee got possession of it four years ago it was dilapidated completely; we have spent over £150 in repairs the last three years.

7044. Is it suitable now?—It is not up to date but it is suitable enough as a building.

7045. CHAIRMAN.—Are you one of the committee?—I am not; but Mr. Knight is here. It is supported both by private contributions from subscribers and from the county.

7046. Dr. Brogan.—Does the county give a large annual grant to support it?—No, sir; the annual grant is sufficient with the private subscriptions to maintain

the hospital, but, unfortunately, the Act of Parliament lays down that the County Council cannot give a greater grant than was given a certain number of years before the passing of the Act.

Mr. Knight.—It is not that; but not less than the average for the years preceding the Act.

Witness.—In the case of Clones it is £500 a year the county contributes; the rest is made up of private subscriptions, and, unfortunately, we cannot do what we would wish to do at Clones, because we can only utilise what we can save; we cannot get a grant for repairs.

7113. You would require something to put it in proper order?—Mr. Knight is the secretary of the present committee, and he will tell you that they have expended over £250.

7114. Was it the joint committee that appointed the nurse there?—It was.

7115. Did they not think it advisable to appoint a nurse with a fever training?—We considered her a brilliant improvement on the old woman of sixty-five who was there; we considered her a brilliant success, and, moreover, to get a nurse for the county fever hospital you would have to expend £40 or £50 a year, and it is doubtful whether you would be recouped.

7116. It is a long distance from a doctor?—If we were to appoint a nurse with fever training and give her £40 out of a county contribution of £50 the private subscribers would leave very little for the poor.

7117. Does not that point to the fact that you have not a large enough grant?—If we had the hospital in proper repair the grant would be quite sufficient, for the fever cases in Clones are very few; we might not have more than half a dozen in the whole year, and we were at a considerable expenditure last year; we had an outbreak of typhus, in which we had to get a second nurse from Dublin or Belfast, and that came out of the subscriptions from the county, which narrowed the amount we could have expended on the place, so that everything worked against us since we got possession.

7118. You say you believe in the amalgamation of workhouses; what workhouses would you suggest?—I say under the circumstances of Monaghan that Clones should act as a workhouse for Clones, and Monaghan, and Cheshill No. 2, and that Castleblayney should act for the lower end of the county.

7119. CHAIRMAN.—You would close Carrickmacross and put it into Castleblayney?—Yes; and close Monaghan and make it a portion of the asylum buildings, and bring the poor to Clones, and take in Corvhill No. 2.

7120. About this nurse, you say she has no fever training?—The only training she had was that she was a nurse in an Asylum or some place in Scotland.

7121. Are you sure she was not an assistant housekeeper?—I don't know what she was; that was what she told us.

7122. Don't you think, as a medical man, it is rather a terrible responsibility to leave fever patients in charge of a woman whose only experience as having acted as assistant housekeeper in a hospital?—I think it is only right we should have a trained nurse, but the grant would not allow it.

7123. Would it not be better to appoint nobody than such a woman?—If any difficult fever case comes they immediately get a trained nurse, and she is more used as a matron.

7124. Has not this woman nursed herself, without assistance, two cases of fever?—She nursed two cases—one of scarletina and another a doubtful case, whether diphtheria or typhoid—that is all she has nursed inside twelve months.

7125. Mr. Muldoon.—I think you commenced by saying you were opposed to amalgamation entirely?—Of unions.

7126. In the event of amalgamation being agreed upon you would keep two in the County Monaghan?—I would keep all the unions, but only two workhouses.

7127. Then you think amalgamation is entirely unnecessary?—Amalgamation of unions is not necessary, but I believe less workhouses would do.

7128. And, so far as the Commission is concerned, Ireland could not be benefited by amalgamation of workhouses?—Less workhouses in Ireland would do, but the amalgamation of unions would be no benefit.

7129. In the event of amalgamation being recommended by this Commission, and that they would be in favour of having only one union in Monaghan County, where would you say that union should be

Nov. 24, 1923.

Dr. Tierney.

suggested—When that comes very likely we will have Mr. Muldoon representing North Monaghan, and we will get him to run Clones.

7153. That would be poaching on your preserves, for if you are made for anything it is for Parliament!—Unfortunately, the County Monaghan won't touch medicine again for a while.

7154. In the event of one workhouse being retained for Monaghan, where would you keep it?—I would certainly say there should be two.

7155. In the event of one?—There is no one workhouse in Monaghan would fold this day.

7156. And we know from your evidence in Banishillen that Clones is still to retain the portion of Fermagh that goes to it?—If, unfortunately, the unions were content with counting the ratepayers would a thousand times rather go to Lanesboro.

7157. They have a splendid workhouse at Lanesboro—was good at Clones?—Indeed it is not.

7158. Clones has a small valuation?—The County Monaghan portion may be small; the valuation of Clones Union is £28,000.

7159. What portion of that is in Monaghan?—Over half.

7160. In the event of its losing that portion that goes to Fermagh there would be a very small reason for retaining it in this county?—We might open our arms and take in the whole County Monaghan if you wish.

7161. You think that public money should be spent on the education of pauper children where you have promising children, regardless of Poor Law principles?—Oh, no, I would not; I would say they should be raised above being slaves for their lives; they should get an education.

7162. And where you have a promising boy you

should not stint money upon the education of the boy?—Oh, no.

7163. Would you go so far as to make lawyers or doctors of them?—They might become judges if all care if they had ability to go ahead.

7164. And you can see no objection from the public point of view to lavishing money on boys like that?—I would lavish no money. I would say we should have a central industrial school for a couple of months in which the education of these youths should be taken care of; you could give them a trade suitable to them. If these boys could have ability afterwards to become doctors I don't see why they should be kept down. My belief is that professions should not be limited to any class of the community.

7165. Would you make their position better than that of the children of independent labourers in the community?—I would not; the children of labourers in the present system of education, and if they have the ability to go ahead afterwards what is so precious then?

7166. If your theory is carried out, can you not so that you would be producing proper children from the facilities you would be affording for their education; would that be desirable?—No, sir; you would be putting no premium on pauperism, because the children that would go to those establishments would be the inmates of the workhouses, and it is one of the greatest blots on the Irish character, that of pauperism—to be branded as a pauper is the last thing they wish. I am told here by the secretary of the County Council that Clones fever hospital can get up to £200 a year.

7167. CHAIRMAN.—You think Clones won't be long until it takes advantage of that?—I am perfectly sure we will get it into repair straight off.

Mr. John Smyth.

Mr. JOHN SMYTH examined.

7168. Mr. Dransfield.—You are the Chairman of No. 1 District Council of Clones?—Yes, sir.

7169. That is the portion of the Clones Union that is in the County Monaghan?—Yes.

7170. You have heard Dr. Tierney's evidence here today, do you agree with that evidence?—I do.

7171. And, as far as you know, these are the views of your board?—Yes; the views of the board I represent.

7172. I don't want to go through it all in detail, but taking the position of Clones with regard to the county, so far as railway communication goes, all the railways of the county converge on Clones?—They do.

7173. And from every part of the county it is easy to get to Clones by railway?—It is.

7174. And does that apply to any other place?—Not to any other place so much as to Clones.

7175. Take, for instance, Monaghan, except the eastern portion of its own union, is it not inconvenient to get at from any other part?—You would have to come via Clones; taking the Sheshin part of Monaghan Union, that is just as convenient to Clones as to Monaghan.

7176. You think that there could be less workhouses in the county than there are at present?—Yes; I should say two workhouses would be quite enough for the county.

7177. Would you suggest what workhouses would be most convenient?—I would agree with Dr. Tierney—Coolshilagh for the South of Monaghan and Clones for North Monaghan.

7178. Otherwise you are in favour of the amalgamation of unions?—No, certainly not; it would be impossible to get the Guardians to come a long distance.

7179. CHAIRMAN.—As to Monaghan, and how do you expect the Monaghan men to come to Clones?—The Guardians from the further end of Clones are further off now than the men who would have to come from Monaghan.

7180. Mr. Dransfield.—Take Coolshilagh No. 2, the people from that, in order to get to Monaghan, except they took a long journey by road, would have to go to Clones first?—They would.

7181. And then to travel on to Monaghan?—Yes.

7182. That would be a longer journey than from almost any part of the Monaghan Union into Clones?—It would.

7183. Mr. MURPHY.—You say it would be impossible to get the Guardians to attend from a distance?—

I think it would; the majority of the Guardians are farmers and labouring men, and they could not afford to attend.

7184. Does not that apply to all large unions even existing at present?—Yes.

7185. Has any disadvantage arisen owing to that?—At the present time there has not.

7186. Of course, the further from the place of meeting the more difficult it is to get to it, and the more the attendance of the Guardians?—Yes.

7187. That exists already; in order to remove that difficulty you would have to have workhouses scattered all through the county. The desire is to try and concentrate, if possible, the Poor Law services in such a way that it will be better than it is at present, and at a less expense. There is no other way that I can see done except by bringing under one control a large number of the inmates. How are we to get around that?—I think the meetings should be less than they are at the present time; I would say once a month would be quite enough.

7188. Would that get rid of the difficulty of attendance?—It would; it would be much easier for them to go once a month instead of once a week.

7189. I know that in the case of a union that has been amalgamated with another union no difficulty has arisen, although the distance is very considerable.

Of course it depends on who the Guardians are.

7190. You think two workhouses would be sufficient?—I do.

7191. Do you not think one would be enough?—I don't know how you would arrange the one.

7192. Supposing you had the children taken out and boarded out, as there seems to be a very general demand and supposing the lunatics were taken out, you would reduce the number of paupers to 400?—I would not agree with boarding out the children. I think they would not be put in proper places.

7193. Do you come from Clones?—I do.

7194. Are you aware in Clones Workhouse there is a boy there fourteen or fifteen years old, and he cannot be kept out of the house, simply looking to that place at his home?—I know that.

7195. And the master of the house says he is of no service at all, and won't go out and stay only do you think it would be a desirable thing to keep that up?—I would not.

7196. That exists in your own workhouse?—I know that.

7174. Mr. Dromgoole.—You know this boy?—I think it is Mallicky; he is insane.

7175. CHAIRMAN.—Oh, no?—Then I don't know him.

7176. Mr. Dromgoole.—Do you know the case Mr. Monaghan is referring to?—I do not.

7177. The boy you speak of is a boy called Mallicky, who, I understand, is an imbecile?—I think so.

7178. CHAIRMAN.—It is not the boy we refer to; it is possible the boy may be somewhere else, but wherever it is it is the same for the purpose of the argument; possibly it is not Clones.

Mr. Muldoon.—In the event of only one union being left in this county, where would you place it?—I don't believe one union would suit.

7179. Do you understand that question, in the event of one union being left in this county where would you leave it?—I would leave it in Clones; it is the most central place for railway communication.

7180. Mr. J. A. Monaghan.—You say that the County Monaghan is very well served with railways?—Yes; it is very well.

7181. Can you get easily from South Monaghan to Clones from the Carrickmacross district?—Yes, you can.

7182. Would you not have to go all round about? There is no direct way to get from South Monaghan to Clones?—Oh, yes; it is direct.

7183. Mr. Muldoon.—You would have to pass Monaghan?—Certainly not.

7184. Mr. J. A. Monaghan.—Would you not have to go down to Enniskillen and round?—Yes; but it is not an inconvenient way.

7185. It is inconvenient to get from South Monaghan to Clones?—It is not.

7186. CHAIRMAN.—Would you have a good attendance of Guardians from Carrickmacross?—I am afraid not.

7187. Mr. Dromgoole.—If it is inconvenient to come to Clones would it not be more inconvenient to go to Monaghan?—Certainly; you would have to go by Clones.

Nov. 24, 1906.

Mr. John Smyth.

MR. JOHN SMYTH EXAMINED.

7188. Mr. H. Murphy.—You are the Chairman of the Clones Board of Guardians?—Yes.

7189. And you are resident in the rural district of Clones No. 2 in the County Fermanagh?—Yes.

7190. That is slightly the larger portion of the Clones Union?—Yes; it is the largest portion.

7191. And you have, of course, always co-operated in the best manner with the Monaghan portion of the Clones Union?—Always.

7192. There has never been any friction?—No.

7193. Now, the district that you reside in is in the district of Banislee?—Yes.

7194. And the union stretches for a very considerable distance there?—Five miles beyond Banislee.

7195. And Banislee itself is four miles from Clones?—Yes.

7196. Was it with the hearty co-operation of the Fermanagh Guardians as well as of the Monaghan Guardians that this large sum of £200 was spent on the hospital?—It was.

7197. And not only on the hospital was the money spent, but in putting up a system of sewerage—the latter system?—Yes.

7198. The whole of that benefit would be lost to your people if this system of making union boundaries with only areas were adopted?—Certainly; it would be lost to Clones No. 2.

7199. As a matter of fact, does the commerce of the district, the attendance at fairs and markets, follow the county boundaries?—Certainly not.

7200. And the commerce of the people of your county is in the town of Clones?—Yes.

7201. Clones is the centre in which they buy and sell?—Yes; it is their principal fair and market.

7202. You also know some portions of the County Cavan?—I do.

7203. Are you not aware, of your own knowledge, that a very large area of the County Cavan considers Clones as its centre for dealing as well?—Yes; all round Banislee and there.

7204. The Guardians elected from your side of the county find it very easy to attend in Clones, because they can combine public business with their private business?—Yes.

7205. If, with these new-fangled notions of efficiency, these very twisted and convoluted county boundaries were adopted and a member of your principal intelligent farmers were forced to go to Banislee, would they not be simply losing their day there, except as far as discharging a public duty; they could serve no private end?—They could not, because they would have four or six English miles to Clones and twenty-two miles by rail to Banislee, and they would not be able to stand, and would not go.

7206. What would be your suggestion, supposing amalgamation were at all desirable; what amalgamation would you propose?—I would not be in favour of amalgamating the unions; I would say that less work would be done in the county would do.

7207. But supposing a great number of people are possessed with this fancy for amalgamation, and it were to be carried out in the way that would be least injurious, as you might put it, or most beneficial, as the advocates of it would put it, what would you propose

should be done?—I would dissolve Lisnaskea and take that portion from Lisnaskea and add it to Clones, and send the other portion on the other side of the lake to Banislee.

Mr. John Smyth.

7208. Lisnaskea is divided by Lough Erne, and you would give all on the right hand side of the lake to Clones?—Yes.

CHAIRMAN.—That is going into what we have already dealt with in Enniskillen.

Mr. Murphy.—I am not doing more than drawing your attention to the evidence given at Enniskillen.

CHAIRMAN.—You are going into Lisnaskea Union.

Mr. Murphy.—Yes; I suppose something will be done with Clones Union; we will either be amalgamated with somebody else or somebody else amalgamated with us; that is the way the tide is flowing. I will tell you shortly what Mr. Smith's views are: His views are, if you want to enlarge the area, then enlarge the area by first retaining the existing Clones Union as it stands in the two counties of Monaghan and Fermanagh, adding to it that portion of Lisnaskea Union on the north-east side of the lake, adding to it the district of Banislee and sweeping round Outehill in the County Cavan, perhaps an electoral division deep of Cavan; and with regard to what would remain of Outehill Union, there it takes Banislee, and takes in Rural District No. 2 of Outehill, which is in the County Monaghan. And Mr. Smith's contention is that all that area at the present time, physically and commercially, regards Clones as its centre.

7209. (To the Witness).—Are not these the views not merely of yourself, but of the entire of the Guardians elected by the Fermanagh portion of Clones Union?—Yes.

7210. How many Guardians are elected by the Fermanagh portion of Clones Union?—Twenty-five.

7211. And they, practically, all hold these views?—Yes.

7212. And you also say that you would be put to a considerable lot of inconvenience by having to go a great distance, because you anticipate if Clones were extinguished you would be sent to Banislee?—Yes.

7213. And you also consider that you would be at the dead loss of all you have expended on the hotel?—Yes; we have contributed over the half from Fermanagh.

7214. But you would also have to bear your share of the expense of the building of the cottage hospital that was proposed at Newtownbutler or Bonmahon?—Yes.

7215. And in neither of those towns is there at present any large building that could be taken over?—None.

7216. Mr. Muldoon.—All roads lead to Clones?—Yes.

7217. It is the centre of Ireland?—No; it is not.

7218. In the event of only one union being left in the county, where would you place it?—I would say one union would not be enough in the county.

7219. But in the event of the Commission differing from you, and thinking one union would be enough, where would you advise them to place it?—Clones.

7220. Clones would be quite sufficient?—Not at all; no, sir; but in the event of your saying one workhouse would do.

7221. Whatever scheme is adopted Clones must be,

serious cases in the hospital or any outbreak of fever Dr. Henry has power to requisition any trained nursing he wants and the committee will pay for it. It is not an *ad-hoc* case as it might be, but the joint committee have spent a good deal of money on it, and tried to make it better than it was. I think it is only fair to them to say that, because I was there in the old days.

7252. Dr. BAKER.—The contribution you receive is from the County Council?—Yes.

7253. The hospital only serves the union?—The patients only come from the union.

7254. Do you think that is fair or equitable to other portions of the county that have to keep up their own fever hospitals?—There is a fever hospital here, and they get a contribution from the County Council; there are three in the county.

7255. There is none in Castletown, and therefore they help to support your fever hospital in Clonac and there in Monaghan and Carrickmacross—I take it that if a fever case came from Castletown it would be removed either to Carrickmacross or Monaghan.

7256. It is an advantage to the County Fernagh also to have that hospital?—It is a great advantage to them; they pay nothing. I think I am right in saying that a good many of the fever cases come from Fernagh. Last year we had a bad outbreak from Roslin.

Mr. Murphy.—With reference to the question about Castleblayney fever hospital, as far as I can read the

Act our hospital is a county fever hospital, and we would have no power to refuse a patient from Castleblayney supposing they thought it a proper thing to send us down a patient.

Witness.—I don't think the question has ever arisen as to from what district we were entitled to take a patient.

Mr. Martin.—The fever hospitals in the county are maintained out of county-at-large charges, and not by any particular portion.

Mr. Knight.—Castleblayney has a union fever hospital attached to the workhouse, but the others are county hospitals.

7257. Mr. Martin.—Do any of your patients come from Fernagh?—They do in the fever hospital.

7258. How are they paid for?—In theory, the County Fernagh should contribute towards that.

7259. It does not?—It does not.

7260. Do you see any objection to that system?—It is an unfair system that they should not contribute; I quite agree with you about that.

Dr. FERRIS.—The secretary of our County Council applied to the County Fernagh to pay. The County Council of Fernagh passed a resolution that they were willing to contribute at the rate of 5s. a week.

Mr. Murphy.—It would be the treasurer's business to ask for this, but no report was ever sent him by the medical officer that there was a Fernagh patient in.

Mr. Drommond.—That is the case for Clonac.

Mr. Martin.—Perhaps you would allow me to examine the County Council officers.

MR. DEVIS CAROLAN BEING EXAMINED.

7261. Mr. Martin.—You are the Secretary of the County Council?—Yes.

7262. They have had before them this matter of the reduction of the number of workhouses in the county?—Yes.

7263. Are the County Council of opinion that there are too many workhouses?—Yes.

7264. And that, with advantage to the ratepayers and without disadvantage to the inmates, the number could be reduced?—Yes.

7265. There are four workhouses at present in the county?—Yes.

7266. There is also Outehill Workhouse outside the county and part of the union is inside the county?—Yes.

7267. Do you think that at least two of the four workhouses in the county might be dispensed with?—Yes; it is not what I think, but what the County Council think.

7268. Now, with regard to the locality; we have heard a great deal of discussion as to the particular place in which it would be desirable to place whatever workhouses are left; have you anything to say on that subject?—The County Council did not express any opinion on that subject.

7269. With regard to the amalgamation of unions, the County Council have not expressed any opinion on that subject?—No.

7270. It was merely with regard to the workhouses?—Yes.

7271. And, of course, the great extra expense is on account of the number of workhouses?—Yes.

7272. And not so much on account of the number of inmates?—No.

7273. By reducing the number of workhouses you would largely reduce the staff of officials, and thereby reduce the rates?—Yes.

7274. CHAIRMAN.—Had the County Council any idea in their mind about closing workhouses and retaining inmates?—No.

7275. They meant to break up the unions and close the workhouses?—Closing the workhouses is all the length they went.

7276. And breaking up the unions?—You see really the District Council's meetings rather clash with each other. I don't think they discussed that question; it was merely closing the workhouses.

7277. Once you close a workhouse it is rather difficult to say where the functions of a Board of Guardians come in?—I heard some theories about that this morning.

7278. Mr. Martin.—There has been a considerable discussion, and likely to be more, with regard to the county system for the counties of Monaghan and Carrickmacross?—Yes.

7279. Some people have been advocating a separate system in Carrickmacross?—Yes.

7280. That was partly grounded on the large number of inmates in the Monaghan asylum and the difficulty of providing accommodation?—Yes.

7281. If some of the workhouses were closed for their present purpose they would be left available for some of the inmates of the asylum?—Yes.

7282. And that would get rid of a good deal of this question of extra building for asylum patients?—Yes.

Mr. Martin.—I suppose you have the areas and the valuations of the different unions.

CHAIRMAN.—We have.

7283. Mr. Martin.—Can you give the Commissioners an idea of the union rates?

CHAIRMAN.—We have that; we know the rate is 5s. 6d. for the last audited year for the Union of Monaghan for Poor Law purposes?—On buildings it is 7s. 6d.

7284. That includes a lot of other things?—It is our demand.

7285. For Poor Law purposes it is 5s. 6d.?—The union demand on us comes to a certain sum.

7286. Mr. Martin.—How many county fever hospitals are there?—Two—Monaghan and Clonac.

7287. And there is one baronial fever hospital?—Yes—Carrickmacross.

7288. Whatever funds are supplied to them are supplied equally out of the county-at-large rates?—Yes; and charged on the county at large.

7289. CHAIRMAN.—Nothing charged on the barony of Farnley?—No; all on the county at large.

7290. There is really nothing in the names baronial and county?—There is in the finances.

7291. Mr. Martin.—The County Council have not power to prevent as much for the baronial hospital as for the county hospital?—No.

7292. CHAIRMAN.—What is their limit for Carrickmacross?—Under £100; it is regulated on the three years before the standard year; but the other two are held to be county fever hospitals—they can get up to £200 per annum. Carrick, unfortunately, is limited to the standard year; it is £50 odd. There is a clause introduced into the Act of 1902; the second section empowers the auditor when it is proved to him—unfortunately we have not been able to work that yet with the Local Government Auditor—whether it is the county auditor or the union auditor, whoever it is, who is to take it up has not yet been finally decided; nothing has yet come of it.

Mr. MURPHY.—That only enables the County Council, if they think fit, if they are satisfied there is a good reason for increasing the grant, to do so?—Yes; they must get the certificate of the auditor.

7293. Mr. Martin.—There is no baronial or county 2 K

Nov. 26, 1923.

Mr. Michael R. Knight.

Mr. Denis Carolan
Becks.

Nov. 24, 1901.
Mr. Devlin
Chairman
Rush.

fever hospital at Castleblayney?—No; they have a perpetual grievance in Castleblayney; they have nothing but their workhouse fever hospital.

7294. And, of course, that is supported by the union?—Yes.

7295. Mr. MURPHY.—So Carrickmacross has a perpetual grievance, Castleblayney has a whole grievance, and the others have advantages?—Yes.

7296. Did the County Council, in considering this matter, name any distasteful workhouse suitable for an asylum?—No. Unfortunately, there were too many friends of every workhouse present. With reference to that question the County Council were very anxious to assist Carrickmacross; there were resolutions passed at the County Council to assist Carrickmacross.

7297. Still, would it not be better to have them all placed on the same basis?—I believe the County Council are of the same opinion. With regard to the resolution of which Dr. Tierney spoke about the County Fernagh contributing towards the patients sent to Clones, a resolution was passed, on the motion of Mr. John Smith, Chairman of the Clones Rural District, and sent to Fernagh, and we received a reply from Fernagh, consenting, and it was that, I believe, named the sum of 4s. or 5s. for each patient, and I believe there has been no patient since.

7298. Has the question ever been looked into seriously whether it was possible for the Fernagh County Council to act on that resolution?—It was a matter for the Clones people to look into; not us.

7299. I know in the neighbouring county there was a resolution passed to give a contribution to a hospital outside their borders, and the legal opinion was that there could be no annual contribution; it should be per head?—Yes.

7300. There may be something different in the laws regulating the fever hospitals and county infirmaries?—It is hardly so strict, but a county infirmary is very strictly defined.

7301. There are altogether in the County Monaghan 465 inmates of workhouses; out of that number there are about fifty or six children and thirty harmless lunatics; do you not think some workhouses in the county could accommodate that 400?—I don't like giving my private opinion. My own opinion is if it were not for the inconvenience of conveying patients long distances, it would be rather long, I am afraid, to convey them from one end of the county to the other—helpless creatures like you see drawn into the workhouse.

7302. The largest proportion of the inmates of a workhouse are the sick; take away the sick, the lunatics, and the children, and you would have only about 200 in the whole county?—It was the sick I had in my mind when I spoke of the conveyance of these poor creatures such long distances. It is a great stretch to draw them from the extreme northern part of the county into Monaghan—where these poor people come from there are very few railways.

7303. CHAIRMAN.—You have nothing to do with the administration of the Guardians?—No; except they send the demand to me.

7304. But before you become secretary to the County Council?—No; I was a solicitor.

7305. Have you ever heard of any complaint against the Monaghan Board of Guardians for their administration of the Poor Law as regards giving or not giving outdoor relief?—No; I knew in old times they used to complain there was no outdoor relief given; that was on a question of principle, I expect.

7306. But as resident for a long time in the neighbourhood, have you ever heard of any alleged individual cases of hardship?—I don't think I did; if there was there were other charitable societies to step in privately—charity frequently did step in. I have known instances of that sort myself, but there was no case of a person dying of want in my memory.

7307. Or of any terrible suffering?—There might have been if there had not been local charity, but it is a good many years ago since I remember a thing of the kind. In 1879 I remember being secretary of the relief committee when the potato crop failed; it was private assistance. A great many people in the district would not care to let it be known that they were in straitened circumstances—people who were just as badly off as some of these who were publicly relieved.

7308. That was a special season, but in the ordinary times?—No; there is only the usual reluctance of some poor people to go into the workhouse, and private charity generally finds them out. But there is a great

difficulty in dealing with certain individuals who have the old-fashioned dislike for the workhouse; they would die of starvation sooner than go in; that is only my private opinion.

7309. Mr. DUNNE.—With regard to the convenience of access by railway in the county, is it not a fact that the only railway lines in the county run north-east and south-west from Clones?—Yes.

7310. The lines converge upon Clones?—Yes; the railway lines.

7311. And, so far as the railway accommodation goes, no other town is at all so well accommodated as Clones in that respect?—No.

7312. And, taking the whole south of the county, they could only get to Monaghan by railway by going through Clones?—Well, the railway is not often used; the tendency of the Great Northern Railway is not to concentrate the people coming this way.

7313. If you go so far away as Castleblayney or Carrickmacross it is by railway they must go?—No; many people come by road; it is eleven Irish miles to Castleblayney, and to Carrickmacross twenty Irish miles by the coach-road to Carrickmacross through Castleblayney, or it is shorter by Ballybay.

7314. The north-western section could as easily get to Clones as to Monaghan?—They would have to come to Monaghan first to get to it.

7315. About Rostown?—Yes; that is a mountain part; that is uninhabited; it is nine miles from where they live to Monaghan by road.

7316. County Clerks paid, I believe, £20,000 as its contribution to the erection of the asylum buildings here?—They must have paid a good deal more.

7317. They contributed a large amount at any rate, and if there was any scheme by which Clerks had to make an asylum of its own it would probably look for a refund from you?—I am afraid so.

7318. If there is no such scheme carried out the asylum buildings are not sufficiently large to accommodate the number of insane people?—So it is said.

7319. And your board were of opinion that some of these workhouses might be used for asylum inmates and prevent the necessity of further expense?—Yes; for the inmates.

7320. If a workhouse were devoted to that, what workhouse do you think would be most convenient?—My board did not decide that question.

7321. What would you think in your private capacity?—I would not like to give an opinion; I don't know them well enough.

7322. But Monaghan would be the nearest?—I won't give you any opinion.

7323. CHAIRMAN.—How are the lunatics brought in?—Principally on outside cars.

7324. For what distance?—Long distances.

7325. Down near Clones?—The people from that point come by rail through Clones, but from the western part of the County Monaghan, and Clones, Carrickmacross, and Ballybay, you see them on cars coming through the town; some come by railway.

7326. Are they paid for by the asylum committee?—I don't know.

7327. Does it come into the accounts?—It does not come to me. I only get a demand for a certain sum of money.

7328. Mr. MULLEN.—How far is it from the town of Monaghan to Monaghan Road station?—Five Irish miles.

7329. What town would you say in Monaghan is the most central town; this is a matter of geography?—The most central town of the county is Ballybay; I know that from political reasons; we always met for political purposes in Ballybay.

7330. That is the political centre?—No; it is the geographical centre.

7331. How far is Ballybay from Monaghan?—About eight Irish miles by road.

7332. Therefore when you want a town which is a union centre Monaghan would be the union centre of the county?—For the northern part of the county.

7333. Take that County Council map in your hand.

CHAIRMAN.—It is hardly fair to ask Mr. Rush. The County Council have not gone into this, and Mr. Rush is only here to give evidence officially.

7334. Mr. MULLEN.—Perhaps it would not interfere with the views of the County Council if you pointed out Clones to me on that map; is it on the borders of the county?—On the borders of Fernagh and Clones.

7335. If you wanted to select an out of the way place could you select a better town than Clones?—Well, I won't press you!

Mr. THOMAS TOL, J.P., examined.

Nov. 26, 1900.

Mr. THOMAS
Tol.

7334. Mr. Martin.—You are the Chairman of the County Council?—Yes.

7335. You have heard the evidence of Mr. Rushe, the secretary?—Yes.

7336. And you agree with what he said?—Yes.

7337. The County Council are in favour of a reduction of the number of existing workhouses; they consider there are too many?—Yes.

7338. And it would be an advantage to the ratepayers to have them reduced?—Yes.

7339. How many do you think there ought to be?—There should not be more than two.

7340. You don't say either, I suppose, which two that ought to be?—No; the County Council did not wish to take sides.

7341. But, of course, you have your own private opinion, but don't wish to express it?—No.

7342. Mr. Dransfield.—When you would have only two workhouses would you contemplate doing away with the existing unions?—Really, I would not go in for amalgamated unions at present; the principal thing that concerned the County Council was to reduce the rate, and the doing away with two workhouses would considerably reduce the rate.

7343. How would you utilize the workhouses?—I don't see why they should not be worked by a joint committee.

7344. You think that would accomplish all the economy that would be required, and there would be no necessity of doing away with the unions?—If the joint committee worked properly I think the unions should not be done away with.

7345. You have not got sufficient accommodation in your county asylum in Monaghan?—No.

7346. Do you think that any of these buildings that would be thus done away with could be utilised for the purpose of supplementing that?—That is the opinion of the County Council.

7347. Have you any idea as to which of these workhouses would be most convenient for that purpose?—I decline to express an opinion.

7348. CHAIRMAN.—If the union is kept on and the workhouse closed, what would be the duty of the Guar-

dians of the union that lost its workhouse?—Their business would be to look after the affairs of the union, and I think if a joint committee was formed—

7349. That is what I want to know; what would the duties of the Guardians be?—They must meet to discharge the business of the Rural Council.

7350. I am speaking of the Board of Guardians?—They could look after the business of the union itself.

7351. Mr. Martin.—Mr. Tol's suggestion was that there should be a joint committee to manage all the business and do all the duties of the Guardians. Mr. Tol does not suggest that the union should be kept up.

7352. CHAIRMAN.—I think he seemed to say he would not touch the union; he would break up the workhouse. I don't see how, when you come to deal with it as a practical case, how you could manage it?—How can Clons and Monaghan work the Lunatic Asylum with a joint committee?

7353. If you propose to do it that way that is all right; then the Board of Guardians would go with the workhouse?—No; the Board of Guardians could appoint so many members from their own body.

7354. Could not the County Council do that?—Well, even if the County Council so arranged, it would have to be wrought by a committee from some body.

7355. Mr. Dransfield.—Who would administer the outdoor relief?—That would be a matter to be settled afterwards.

7356. That would be a matter that could be more easily administered by people having a small area to control?—With proper supervision, I don't see that that would affect it.

7357. Mr. Martin.—The relieving officer could report to the joint committee?—Yes; the Guardians have very little to do if there is a competent relieving officer.

7358. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Your idea is that every union should remain intact and be responsible for its own expenditure under the Poor Law?—Yes.

7359. Your idea is that there should be some representative body to look after the interests of each union?—Exactly.

7360. To see that the people from that union were properly treated and the cost was properly placed upon the union?—That is my idea.

Mr. THOMAS CHATFIELD, J.P., examined.

Mr. Thomas
Chatfield.

7361. Mr. Martin.—You are the Chairman of the Council No. 2 Rural District Council?—Yes.

7362. Just tell the Commissioners what your views on this subject are?—Well, the majority of the Council is in favour of amalgamation.

7363. CHAIRMAN.—Would you wish to break up Cooteshill?—I don't exactly say that, because there appears to me to be a body of selfishness in the thing all round, and every one wants to keep their own, but certainly I would be in favour of amalgamation for a reduction of taxation. I think the majority of our Council are for that.

7364. Mr. Martin.—You don't charge the County Council with selfishness?—Oh, no; certainly not.

7365. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—How many workhouses do you think would suit the needs of the county?—I think two would be quite sufficient.

7366. CHAIRMAN.—You would be willing to go into Clons or Castleblayney?—I don't say that, or the Cooteshill people would be down on me for that too; but if Cooteshill is going to be closed up we would like to be in the County Monaghan.

7367. Mr. Dransfield.—Supposing you had to go into some other union, which would be more convenient for you—Clons or Monaghan?

7368. CHAIRMAN.—On Castleblayney?—There are seven districts in Cooteshill No. 2; there are two of these nearer to Castleblayney and there are five of them nearer Clons.

7369. Mr. Dransfield.—They are all on the railway line that runs through Ballybay as to Clons?—Yes; some of them come from Rockcross on the Great Northern Railway.

7370. Which is the more natural town for you to go to—Clons or Monaghan?—Clons, surely, from each side.

7371. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Castleblayney seems to have the largest number of inmates of any union in the county?—Yes.

7372. Is there any reason for that that you know of?—No; except that it is a poorer country.

7373. It seems to have almost double the number of inmates of the other unions?—I think that although we would be in favour of the amalgamation of workhouses, I don't think it would be prudent to have amalgamation of unions, as far as I can see.

7374. Mr. Martin.—There is a large portion of Castleblayney in Armagh; perhaps that accounts for the number?—Most of our Council would be in favour of having rural district rating.

7375. CHAIRMAN.—You want to close workhouses; for what purpose would you keep up unions?—We think the smaller they are it will be to the interest of the people who represent them to look better after them with regard to outdoor relief and everything of the kind; the smaller the division is the people who represent that division are more in favour of looking after it and keeping down the rate; when it goes into unions rating they are not so anxious.

7376. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—And while you would like to see the inmates put together and classified in the large institution, you would like to retain for the Guardians the supervision of the out?—Yes.

7377. The question of outdoor relief has been raised here?—Yes; we don't go very much in for it at Cooteshill; not in No. 2; they do in No. 1 a little.

7378. Are there many labourers in your district?—They are very scarce.

7379. CHAIRMAN.—You have to pay your share of the No. 1 outdoor relief?—Yes; that is our grievance.

7380. It would rather encourage you to get additional cases in your district so as to equalize the balance?—Yes; certainly; I think it does. If it was a rural district rating I don't think there would be the same extent of outdoor relief.

7381. Or dispensary district rating?—Yes.

7382. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—The smaller the better for you?—Yes.

7383. CHAIRMAN.—Take, for instance, Monaghan Union and Monaghan rural district, which, with the exception of the town, are identical, and in Cooteshill you have two equally-balanced rural districts, but in the

Nov. 24, 1905.
Mr. Thomas
Crawford.

other places you have not?—They are not equally balanced—No. 1 is considerably larger than No. 2. It is the opinion of No. 2 that we are the milch cow for No. 1, and we would be inclined for amalgamation.

7394. Mr. MURPHY.—Is that because No. 1 includes the town of Coothill?—Yes.

7395. CHAIRMAN.—That is where a good deal of the outdoor relief is?—Yes; a good deal is in the town of Coothill.

7396. Mr. Martin.—Some of these divisions of Coothill are actually nearer to Monaghan than to Clones; do you know Letterkeeny, for example?—Yes.

7397. Is not that nearer to Monaghan than to Clones?—There may be a few outlying townlands, but certainly, if you take in railway accommodation, it is six miles from Mr. Swan's Cross to Monaghan.

7398. How far by direct road is Clones away?—It is about six or seven.

7399. By road?—Yes; about eight miles.

7400. How far is it from Monaghan Road to New Blinn?—Four.

7401. How far from New Blinn to Clones?—Four more—Irish miles.

7402. How far is it from Monaghan town to Monaghan Road?—Six miles, I believe.

7403. Did you hear Mr. Roche's evidence that it is five?—I believe it is six; I understood it to be six miles.

Mr. Martin.—That is all for the County Council.

Mr. Muldoon.—I repeat, sir, the Monaghan Board of Guardians, and I will examine some witnesses before you, principally upon this question of amalgamation. I have but very few observations to address to the Commission. The Monaghan Guardians are in favour of amalgamation, and they submit to the Commission that they are situated in the centre of the county for all practical purposes; that they have already the most important union in the county, the valuation of which is over £100,000. The valuation of any other union situated alone in the county is not more than half that. Carrickmacross—and there is this to be said for Carrickmacross; it is the only other union after Monaghan that is situated entirely in the County Monaghan. The view of the Monaghan Guardians is this—that that portion of Castleblayney Union which

goes into the County Armagh might be utilized in the Armagh Poor Law system, and that portion of Clones Union that goes to Fermanagh might be left there, either to Lomahoe or Keshmullen, and the present workhouse in Monaghan would be ample for all the Poor Law needs of the county. The valuation of the Clones Union is only about £62,000—I am not at this moment familiar with the actual figures of the valuation of the portion of the Clones Union which is in this county, but I should imagine it is about half that, and at this stage I desire to say that I think the Clones Union has acted very skillfully in this matter, because it must have seen early from its own and important that it was one of the doomed unions, and it forthwith commenced to see what portions of other unions it might absorb, and has been here and in Fermanagh courageous enough to say that it should come into the very centre of the County Monaghan and absorb the union, which is the largest and most important union in the county. I think that was a very bold scheme worthy of Dr. Tynan at his best. I think it will be observed that all the evidence here, sir, is in favour of amalgamation, but, of course, when it comes to the amalgamation of particular unions then we have considerable objection, but there is underlying all the evidence that has been given a strong idea that two unions upon the County Monaghan are an intolerable imposition, and the Monaghan Guardians look to the Commission to suggest a remedy for this state of things, and we trust you will report in favour of one union workhouse being sufficient for the entire county, geographically and every other way; then we suggest the most important one should remain—that is Monaghan. They have excellent buildings there, they have accommodation there for more than three times the average number of paupers resident in all the union workhouses of the county. Under these circumstances they think their union should remain and the others should be absorbed. We don't go into the question of sharing unions and leaving Guardians; we think the workhouses should go, and the Guardians should go. Of course, this won't interfere with the ordinary Local Government business of the county, for the District Councils will remain for the administration of the Acts which have been entrusted to them.

Dr. HALL examined.

7394. Mr. Muldoon.—Are you medical officer of the Monaghan Union Workhouse?—I am.

7395. How long have you filled that position?—About twenty-three years.

7396. Have you yourself considered the question of amalgamation of unions in this county?—I have.

7397. What is your view?—I think one union quite sufficient for the county—one workhouse.

7398. And do you think that one should be situated in the centre of the county?—As near the centre as possible.

7399. I believe Ballybay is actually the geographical centre?—So I have heard from Mr. Roche today.

7400. But they have no union workhouse there, and how far is Monaghan from Ballybay?—About seven miles.

7401. It is your view then that the union workhouse should remain at Monaghan?—Either Monaghan or Castleblayney.

7402. The workhouse has good buildings?—Yes.

7403. And it would accommodate far more than the number of paupers which are now in all the workhouses of the county?—It would probably accommodate 600.

7404. What would be your proposition as regards lunatics confined in the workhouses of the county?—I would like to see them under the lunatic asylum authorities.

7405. What would you do with the idiots in the workhouses?—Well, send them to lunatic asylums.

7406. CHAIRMAN.—Do you mean all mental cases?—Yes; should be transferred to asylums.

7407. Mr. Muldoon.—As to the boarding out of inmates, what is your view?—I would certainly board out children when they come to four or five years of age.

7408. CHAIRMAN.—Or even younger, would you think?—As soon as they can safely be boarded out.

7409. As soon as they can eat what is going?—As early as possible.

7410. Mr. Muldoon.—You think the boarding out of

inmates would lead to some abuse?—I am afraid it would. I am afraid it would lead to the extension of outdoor relief—that is to grown-up inmates.

7411. CHAIRMAN.—It would be outdoor relief in another name?—Yes.

7412. Mr. Muldoon.—Would you be in favour of boarding out harmless lunatics?—That might be done with advantage.

7413. Would you be in favour of a classification of inmates?—I would.

7414. CHAIRMAN.—How would you carry out that classification?—I would make a difference between those who have become paupers through sickness and weakness and those who are habitually paupers, the latter either spent their lives in the workhouse or in jail.

7415. You did not mean putting into one workhouse all the inmates?—No, sir; but according to character.

7416. Mr. Muldoon.—How would you deal with the class which we may call the criminal class of paupers?—I would refuse them the workhouse?—Do you mean to say tramps? Oh, I would refuse them entirely. I would make them a Government charge; put them elsewhere in the hands of the police.

7417. You think that would be an effective method of dealing with them?—I do.

7418. With regard to the employment of paupers in the workhouse, what is your view?—I would like to see the paupers all kept busy in some way or other—either in the market garden or, if they know any trade, to give them some light work at that trade—they would be far happier.

7419. CHAIRMAN.—Suppose you had very few in your workhouses who would be able to do even a few hours' work in the day?—Well, even very little.

7420. How many men could do masonry spreading for inmates?—I would not ask them to do that; I would give them the very lightest work to keep their minds occupied.

7421. Mr. Muldoon.—Would you propose to keep them at employment which would compete with labour

under outside?—What I had in my mind more was to be in for market-gardening, where they could send their produce somewhere else.

7422. As to the dietary scale in Monaghan, what is your view?—I think it is very good.

7423. Are there any papers providing extras?—I think at the present moment there are four.

7424. In case of any workhouses being discontinued in the county, how would you propose to deal with the distressed workhouses?—You would want to have in each town where a workhouse at present exists, you would have to have some sort of a district hospital; I think district hospitals might also be started in towns where workhouses do not exist.

7425. Have you any town in your mind when you suggest that?—Ballybay, and another place in Enniscorthy.

7426. In the event of these district hospitals being established in these towns and union workhouses dissolved, do you see any difficulty in transporting paupers of the county generally to Monaghan?—There would be no difficulty that could not be got over, I think.

7427. Do you suggest district nursing?—I do.

7428. You think it would be necessary?—Certainly; I think it would be most serviceable.

7429. CHAIRMAN.—That is to have a district nurse in every dispensary district?—Yes; the same as you have a midwife at present.

7430. Mr. MULDOON.—What is your view on the question of the women who use workhouses for the purpose of giving birth to children?—I would like to see them in separate establishments by themselves.

7431. Do you mean a separate establishment or a separate part of the building?—I would have them in a separate establishment in the county.

7432. What would you do with the children?—Board them out as soon as possible.

7433. CHAIRMAN.—You mean for the women something not under the Guardians at all?—They might be under the Guardians; but suppose you take a part of one workhouse—that is if any of the workhouses are abolished—a part of a workhouse might be taken over for these women.

7434. Or if they were sent to a religious penitentiary?—That would be a very good way.

7435. Under the management of the religious body to which they belonged themselves?—That might be a very good way out of the trouble.

7436. Then they would be saved still further contamination that they are apt to receive in the workhouse where they meet with other women even in a worse position than themselves?—That would be a good idea.

7437. And their children could be boarded out?—They might.

7438. Mr. MULDOON.—Do you think these penitentiaries should receive support from the rates?—I think so.

CHAIRMAN.—The rates at present support the women in the workhouse, and they possibly would have to pay for in a penitentiary.

7439. Mr. MULDOON.—One such institution might serve for a number of counties?—Yes; a great many.

CHAIRMAN.—And would receive as well as maintain.

7440. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—The number of that class in Monaghan is very small?—In the town of Monaghan very small indeed.

7441. I understand only two within the last year or two?—That is all.

7442. CHAIRMAN.—You think they don't go elsewhere?—I don't think so. I hear there are only about five in the entire county.

CHAIRMAN.—There are existing penitentiaries in Ireland. I don't know whether they would be equal to this task or not.

7443. Mr. MULDOON.—What is your view upon the outdoor relief question?—I have always been against outdoor relief, and I am against it, except relief on a medical certificate.

7444. CHAIRMAN.—Take the case of a man who had a large family and had no charitable friends to look to, if he got knocked up by accident, broke his leg, and had wife and family what would you do in that case; you would not offer them the workhouse?—I would not like to offer them the workhouse; I would sooner try and get up subscriptions for them.

7445. Free Law relief, you think, ought not to deal with such a case?—I don't like outdoor relief in any form; it has a demoralising effect on the people.

7446. You have been all your life connected with Monaghan, and the outdoor relief has been very small in this union?—Very small.

7447. Going about as much as you have done, have you heard ever any reasonable complaints against the Guardians in the Union of Monaghan on account of any suffering that might have occurred owing to their refusal?—I have never known an instance of it.

7448. Mr. MULDOON.—But the Monaghan Guardians do give outdoor relief?—They have since the passing of the Local Government Act, but very little.

7449. Is it not your view that in the case which the President of the Commission has put to you, of the bread-winner struck down, it might be useful in such a case to give outdoor relief until he would get better?—I think it is a case for private charity.

7450. Do you not think that while a charitable organisation would be starting a subscription the person might suffer considerable hardship if the relieving officer did not visit him?

CHAIRMAN.—I suppose you don't look to subscriptions so much as to the charity of individuals?—Yes.

7451. Is not that a precarious thing?—It is quite possible there would be hardship.

7452. It would be the relieving officer's business in case there were any hardship to at once afford relief by giving provision?—If a man was sick relief would be given under a medical certificate; that is one of the cases, I think, in which relief should be given.

7453. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—For instance, in the case of a man who had a decided dislike to go into the workhouse, would you leave him there to die?—If the man was sick the medical officer would give a certificate saying so.

7454. He might not be absolutely ill, from a professional point of view, but he might not be in good health or able to do anything; would you leave that man to starve?—I don't know of such a case, and cannot see that such a case would occur.

7455. It has come under the notice of some Guardians?—I have never known a case of it.

7456. CHAIRMAN.—You believe there would be a charitable feeling in his neighbourhood?—I am certain of it; the neighbours would not see him want.

7457. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Is that fair to the neighbours—that they should not only contribute to the upkeep of the union but also assist local cases?—I think it would be a very small thing, and I don't think people should be relieved from individual charity of that sort; I think it does them good.

7458. It does the people good who give?—And the people who receive.

7459. But the patient who is only awaiting the influence of charity, don't you think his position is rather risky?—I don't think so.

7460. Mr. MULDOON.—Do you think that some of the relief now given in outdoor relief does not go down to the maintenance of the poor?—I cannot speak from my own experience, but I have heard a good deal does not.

CHAIRMAN.—There was only £117 in the last audited year spent in this union; it is very, very small.

7461. Mr. MULDOON.—You think the reduction of workhouses would lessen the tramp evil to a great extent?—It is bound to do that.

7462. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think the tramp won't go on marching even if these barracks are closed to him; that he won't go on marching and put up in farmers' yards and under haystacks?—I would let the police look after that; I would pass a law that a tramp was to report himself at the police barracks of every town he went through.

7463. It would be rather hard to enforce that?—They are not killed with work.

7464. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—The tramp question is not of great importance to Monaghan?—I saw a few days ago about a dozen go on.

7465. CHAIRMAN.—The fair day, I suppose?—I think we do suffer greatly from tramps here.

Mr. MURTAGHAN.—There was only one on the particular day given on this sheet.

7466. Mr. MULDOON.—In the event of its being considered desirable to continue two unions in the county, would you say Monaghan would be a more convenient place than Clonsilla?—I would; Monaghan and Castleblayney.

7467. You think Clonsilla is an out-of-the-way place for a union for the northern part of the county?—It is exactly on the edge of the county.

7468. Dr. BROWNE.—About the county infirmary, does it serve for the whole county?—It does.

Nov. 24, 1908.

Dr. Hall.

Nov. 24, 1903.

Dr. Hall.

7460. Do you get many cases from the extreme south and extreme north?—No, of course, so many as we get quite close.

7470. The numbers decrease as the radius increases?—Yes.

Chairman.—We found that was not the case to a very remarkable extent at Lifford; we found great numbers coming from long distances.

7471. Dr. BAKER.—How do the patients mostly come to the infirmary?—A great many by train and a great many drive over.

7472. It is more a surgical hospital, I presume?—We take in both surgical and medical cases.

7473. How are they admitted?—By ticket from the governors.

7474. Are there any restrictions at all; if any poor person goes there that is a proper case is there any trouble in getting a ticket for admission?—I don't think so.

7475. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose if an urgent case comes in you have full power to take it in?—Yes; we are bound to take in any medical or surgical case.

7476. Dr. BAKER.—They would have to come on their own responsibility?—That it is understood we take in all urgent cases at once.

7477. Are there many consumptive cases in the workhouse?—No; at present we have none.

7478. In the infirmary?—There is one at present.

7479. Is it isolated?—No it is an old man, who only came in to-day or yesterday.

7480. Have you any words for the treatment of consumption?—No; not any special words. I am quite in favour of isolation. When I have two or three consumptives in I try and keep them in a ward by themselves.

7481. In these most consumption in the county, in the immediate neighbourhood of Monaghan?—Not very much; not any more than the average; it is not worse than other counties.

7482. Do you and a good many cases of surgical tuberculosis?—We get a good deal of that; it is very prevalent.

7483. Could you make any recommendation how consumptive cases should be treated?—Some of the distasteful workhouses might be used as a place for consumptives—as isolation hospital or sanatorium.

7484. Do you think would consumptive patients go very far to get into such an institution?—I think they would, because a good many people come to me for information about how they should get to the one in Wicklow; so I think they would take advantage of the hospital.

7485. Have you been often asked about that?—Very often.

7486. You know how difficult it is to get into that?—I believe it is.

7487. And how long a period they have to wait, so that a case might be hopeless before they get in?—I have known of such cases.

7488. Would that lead you to believe that there is an urgent necessity for something to meet the increase of consumption?—Yes; I think it would be most advantageous to have a hospital of the sort.

7489. CHAIRMAN.—In some healthy situation?—Yes; the healthiest of course.

7490. Near the sea would do as well as the mountain?—Yes; as long as it was not too relaxing.

7491. A place like Brandon?—Brandon would be first rate; a fine healthy place.

7492. Mr. James Monaghan.—When you say Monaghan would sufficiently meet the needs of the county, is that in regard to the number of inmates?—Yes.

7493. The same statement could be made of any of the other unions in the county?—I cannot answer that.

7494. Do you think it would be a suitable locality to serve the needs of the whole county; how would you get here from Carrickmacross; is it not a most difficult thing to get from Carrickmacross and the district south to Monaghan?—I believe it is.

7495. It is over twenty miles; in some parts twenty-six. If then there were two workhouses is not chosen in the same situation to Monaghan that Castleblayney is to Carrickmacross; both on the extreme edge?—Monaghan and Castleblayney, I think, would be the two most central ones.

7496. Don't you think Carrickmacross is just in the same position as Monaghan?—I think if you look at the map you will find Castleblayney is more central.

7497. Mr. Muldon.—In the case of a re-arrangement, you don't mind whether it is Carrickmacross or Castleblayney?—No; but somewhere in that district.

7498. Mr. Dringdale.—You told us your own opinion is that one union and workhouse would be sufficient for the county?—Yes.

7499. And that would be Monaghan?—I say either Monaghan or Castleblayney.

7500. The asylum buildings at present in Monaghan are not sufficient for the needs of Monaghan and Castle?—So I hear.

7501. The present workhouse buildings in Monaghan are just across the road from the asylum?—They are.

7502. And don't you think that if it should be decided to abandon Monaghan Workhouse it could be very successfully used as an addition to the asylum buildings?—Certainly.

7503. That would save considerable expense in adding to the buildings, and they would be there under the same supervision and control as the existing asylum?—They would.

7504. Mr. James Monaghan.—With regard to the boarding out of children, how would you arrange the locality, if there was only one workhouse; do you think the children would be distributed equally over the county?—That is a question that the Guardians would have to see to.

7505. It would be a difficulty?—I don't think so; I think that could be managed the same as the Protestant orphan as managed now. The Guardians could have a list of respectable farmers who were anxious to take in children, and the Guardians could have a supervision over them or get the various clergy of the different dioceses to visit them.

7506. You would not be in favour of outdoor relief, and in that case you would have to transport all the paupers to this Union of Monaghan, which is a long distance by railway and very inconvenient?—Once you get into a train it is a very little matter if you have to go a little distance farther.

7507. Is not Monaghan rather favourably situated for transport?—Yes; I think there are a good many.

7508. They would not get near Carrickmacross easily?—I don't know about that.

7509. Mr. MURPHY.—In the case, for instance, of people who would become temporarily destitute, would it not be a hardship to take them away from their own locality and send them to some central institution, and have them come back again in a fortnight or three weeks?—I have said already in each town I would have a district hospital; they could be transferred to the district hospital.

7510. Would there not be a difficulty in transferring people suddenly left penniless from one portion of the county to a central institution simply for a fortnight or three weeks?—That would be a case of illness.

7511. No; not altogether illness, but absolute destitution; that the people had got into such a state that they had nothing to do?—If there were cases that happened like that there would have to be some provision made for them.

7512. That is one of the difficulties of concentration; outdoor relief would come to the assistance of those people if there were some means of giving something to take them over until they got employment?—If a case occurred where it was either outdoor relief or starvation, of course give outdoor relief.

7513. Outdoor relief, starvation, or sending them to a central institution; one of the difficulties of that is that if you send them to a central institution you take them away from the locality and shut them up from the world, whereas if you give them outdoor relief in the course of a week or a fortnight they might get something to do; that is one of the difficulties we have to face, and I would like to get some little light on the subject.

Chairman.—You would be afraid they would continue on the relief but if they got on once?—Yes.

7514. Mr. MURPHY.—But with proper supervision, would there be any danger of that?—Supposing the relieving officer had more power than he has at present, supposing the auditor looked to him for the proper performance of his duty, do you not think that difficulty could be overcome to a certain extent?—I think it could, but I think such cases would have to be treated on its merits.

7515. But you seem to be decidedly against outdoor relief on principle?—I am.

7516. I want to ask you your principle and to get you to admit that you are wrong?—You are supposing an extreme case.

7517. No; these cases do occur, and occur frequently?—I think, for the credit of Monaghan, I may say they don't.

7513. I know heads of families become temporarily impeded. I know instances of it in my own neighbourhood. I have had considerable experience of it, and know it does occur. I don't think it occurs here; they would all be relieved in the neighbourhood.

7514. I am glad to hear you have in Monaghan such charitable disposed people. I am sorry to say in some parts of the country we have not got them?—In Monaghan, I think, we have.

7515. Dr. BROWNE.—Just one question: about the class of cases treated in the district hospitals, about operation cases, what would you recommend should be done; would you recommend they should be treated in the district hospital or brought to a larger institution in the county?—I think I would leave it to the medical officer in charge.

7516. CHAIRMAN.—It would be necessary to have in

every district hospital some place where emergency operations could be safely carried out?—Yes; you would want that.

7517. Dr. BROWNE.—But there are operations that could not; would you recommend that those should be taken to the county infirmary?—I would leave that to the medical officer himself; possibly in the district hospital he would be single-handed, and he might wish to come over to the county infirmary with his patient.

7518. CHAIRMAN.—We had evidence to that effect from some county surgeons, who thought it would be a good plan, with a premium for an easy method of transfer from the district hospital to the county infirmary, which should be the main headquarters for surgical operations of the county; do you think that would be possible?—I think it would.

7519. And desirable?—And desirable.

Mr. PATRICK KIRKMAN examined.

7520. Mr. Malleson.—You are Chairman of the Monaghan Board of Guardians?—Yes.

7521. And have been chairman since the Local Government Act was passed?—Yes.

7522. Have you considered the question of the amalgamation of unions?—Yes; I consider amalgamation of unions for this county is desirable.

7523. Is it your view that one union in the County Monaghan would be sufficient for all practical purposes?—I think so, for the area and size of the county, and particularly for the number of workhouse inmates in the county; now at the present time we have 471 inmates in four workhouses, and in 1880 we accommodated in Monaghan Workhouse 1,380.

7524. And you think the workhouses could be reduced to one situated in the town of Monaghan without inflicting any serious hardship on the sick poor?—With regard to economy I consider that the only way you can economize is by amalgamation—having a county union and a county rating;—and Monaghan, to my mind, in that case, owing to the extent of its buildings and the farm attached, is the most appropriate and suitable.

7525. And owing to the central situation of the town?—The central situation, from Monaghan to the County Tyrone; the furthest point of our union is fifteen English miles towards the Clogher Union.

7526. And you have good buildings; excellent buildings and excellent staff?—We have good buildings, but a quantity of them vacant; we have only in the house at present 115, and we could accommodate over 1,350.

7527. Do you think that upon such an amalgamation of unions taking place some provision should be made for the sick poor in some of the outlying localities of the county?—I would; I would approve of some of the disused workhouses being utilized as hospitals in the case of accidents or emergencies under the supervision of the dispensary doctor and the dispensary nurse, which would mean very little further expense—hospitals in towns in which the present workhouses exist.

7528. As regards Monaghan Workhouse, at present it is so far to transfer paupers and the sick poor from the furthest point of the electoral division of Derragh to Monaghan as it would be to transfer such persons from the extreme end of Clones to Monaghan?—Much the same.

7529. How far is it from Monaghan to the remotest part of Derragh?—Thirteen Irish miles; fifteen or sixteen English.

7530. And the distance from the remotest district of Clones to Monaghan; how much?—About the same. The Southdown or Wattle Bridge on the canal, it would be sixteen or seventeen miles.

7531. In the event of amalgamation taking place as at in this county, can you see any reason for retaining Clones, having regard to its proximity to Monaghan?—I don't see any reason for retaining Clones; if, for the convenience of transferring the sick poor to it, Clones is retained you would have over twenty-seven miles to transfer the sick poor from the furthest part of our union to Clones, and I see in the evidence given in the County Fermanagh that they are despatching limousines and establishing a hospital there.

7532. Would you be inclined to change the name workhouse both as regards the workhouse proper and in regard to the workhouse hospital?—I would; I know there are a number of well-to-do people in our district who have been abandoned by their families; the family had to leave to seek employment in foreign countries, and after a number of years forget their

sick parents, and those parents had to go to the workhouse. I know there are a number of them in our district who would die at the back of the ditch before they would go to the workhouse; that is the reason I would change the name of the house to a home, or something like that.

7533. CHAIRMAN.—What do you attribute that dislike of the workhouse to?—The name poorhouse or workhouse; I have known it in my own experience as a member of the board.

7534. Mr. Malleson.—In the event of amalgamation, do you see any difficulty in the transit of a sick person to the district hospitals; would any real difficulty arise in this county?—District hospitals I would suggest, in the present union; if dissolved the hospital would be retained in Clones, Castleblayney, and Carrickmacross under the supervision of the dispensary doctor of the district and the nurse—that would be in the case of accidents or emergencies. Then the sick can be very easily transferred to Monaghan by ambulance; and I don't see that railway facilities will improve the question of removing the sick poor, for this reason—if we had to remove a sick patient from the furthest point in Derragh to any union in the county we would have to have an ambulance there and transfer them from the ambulance to the railway carriage, and the Clones people would have to transfer them from the railway carriage to the ambulance too; the medical profession themselves would object to that.

7535. Do you think in case of amalgamation that that portion of the Clones Union which now goes into the County Fermanagh might be left to the County Fermanagh?—Quite right.

7536. And that portion of Castleblayney which goes into Armagh might be left to Armagh?—Quite right.

7537. And the one workhouse in Monaghan might take in its own county and that portion of Castleblayney I think it could accommodate all.

7538. And you would make the County Monaghan a self-contained unit for county purposes?—Quite right.

7539. CHAIRMAN.—What would be the governing body?

Mr. Malleson.—The Guardians, with one workhouse situated in Monaghan town?—Yes.

7540. That would entail a reduction in the number of Guardians; you would not need the same number from each electoral division that now go to the other four unions of the county?—I should say the Guardians should be elected to represent dispensary districts, and I would also approve of the old dispensary committees electing the governors of the county infirmary, and you might have obligees of all denominations in the dispensary district on the committee.

7541. Do you think this amalgamation you suggest would lessen the tramp evil?—The distance, I believe, would lessen the tramp evil—the distance to travel.

7542. What is your view generally upon the tramp question?—My view would be that a tramp should have a ticket from a Guardian of the town to the dispensary doctor of the town, who would examine him and certify to the master that he was unfit for further travelling or work.

7543. Have you many tramps in the Monaghan Workhouse?—We have.

7544. On the occasion of markets and fairs, I suppose?—Yes; and on the occasion of fairs in the neighbourhood.

7545. Do you consider that the treatment of the sick and destitute poor in Monaghan is satisfactory?—I do.

Nov. 26, 1900

Dr. Hall

Mr. Patrick Kirkman.

Nov. 24, 1900.

Mr. Patrick
Kilman.

7551. And economical?—And economical as well. I think we are under the average cost of any other union in Ireland.

7552. CHAIRMAN.—You are the lowest in the country?—I believe we are.

7553. The high valuation has a good deal to do with that?—It is the weekly average cost of the inmates; they are very well treated; the doctor and the inspectors approve of the treatment.

7554. Mr. Muldoon.—The Monaghan Guardians would be unanimously opposed to going to Clonest?—They would, particularly the Guardians of the principal part of our county, which lies in distant districts.

7555. Clonest is an outlying district?—There are Guardians in Derragoola that have to go to the nearest railway station, which is Glaslough, over nine Irish miles, and to Monaghan it would be thirteen.

7556. And if you went there you would have to listen to Dr. Thurney's speeches?—Yes.

7557. You would not relish that very much?—I would not have any objection.

7558. The Clonest witnesses suggest that your union workhouse is only suitable as an auxiliary asylum; do you share that view?—I don't believe it would be in the interests of the poor of the county, owing to the central position in which Monaghan is. I won't say it is in the centre of the county, but it is in a central position, and has a house that can accommodate all the inmates of the county.

7559. What is your view about the treatment of hernial inmates; do you think the hernial inmates of other unions could be kept at the Monaghan buildings?—We have sufficient accommodation for them, and being in close proximity to our county asylum say that would be fit subjects could be transferred to the asylum.

7560. What is your view about the boarding out of children?—I am strongly in favour of boarding out children, for the reason that children, as a rule, reared in the workhouse become perversely all their lives, and know nothing of the world. I would pay liberally for the boarding out of them, and have them trained and schooled, and have the relieving officers see that they were cared and well-treated, and then you don't leave them perversely. Children reared in an institution of this sort, when they get out at a certain age, it leaves them wild; they don't know anything of the world.

7561. CHAIRMAN.—Not much use for work?—No use for work.

7562. Mr. Muldoon.—What would you say to the boarding out of inmates?—I would not approve of it; it might be abused. It does not appear to me to be workable; inmates would come in for the purpose of being boarded out again.

7563. CHAIRMAN.—You would be afraid of too many families trying to put their old people on the boarded-out list?—I would be afraid there would.

7564. Mr. Muldoon.—What is your view about outdoor relief?—I cannot see that we can get away from outdoor relief; but outdoor relief, I believe, should be given through the dispensary doctor, and that he would report such cases as accidents or sickness to the relieving officer, and in case where immediate medical relief was needed that he would have power, until the Board of Guardians met, to deal with that on his own responsibility, and at the same time the relieving officer would report to the Guardians.

7565. CHAIRMAN.—The relieving officer has that power at present?—Yes; and the medical officer in the case of sickness.

7566. You propose to give the relieving officer power as regards giving relief pending the meeting of the Guardians?—I do.

7567. That would be rather a new duty to put upon a medical man to make him inquire into the circumstances of families?—As a rule he visits these people.

7568. Do you think the medical profession as a body would like to accept that job?—I don't know that they should object to it; they get a red line for a sick person.

7569. Oh, yes; but to report whether they require outdoor relief?—The persons seeking outdoor relief are sick persons as a rule.

7570. The doctor would be quite willing to say whether a person was sick or not, but as to ordering relief for him, that is a different matter?

Mr. Muldoon.—Do you think the doctor's certificate might be confined to a recommendation for outdoor relief, there might be sick persons who were shamming, and would impose on the relieving officer?—My reason for giving the dispensary doctor as an authority on outdoor relief is he, as a rule, is visiting on tickets from

year to year, and knows the position of these people and their state of living more than any outside person or Guardian or representative.

7571. You think every such case of illness should be examined into by the medical doctor?—Yes; and ascertaining officer.

7572. What is the system of the Monaghan Guardians in giving outdoor relief?—Every case is required to go on its merits. First, a Guardian makes application to the board for relief in his district, and the relieving officer is asked to visit such person and report at the next meeting, and then the matter is principally decided on the report of the relieving officer.

7573. The amount expended by your union on outdoor relief is very small; how do you account for that?—It amounts to close on £9 at the present time.

7574. CHAIRMAN.—The last audited year was £127?—Well, it has increased since.

7575. Mr. Muldoon.—At all events do you stimulate the smallness of the amount to the strict supervision of the Guardians over every case?—I do; every quarter the list is revised, and parties who had been getting outdoor relief owing to being incapacitated for work, and had gone to work again, are secured off our books.

7576. What is the largest amount you give in any particular case?—In the case of a family of four or five we have given 4s. and 5s., and 2s. 6d., and to one person 1s. 6d. We are opposed to giving outdoor relief in the case of one person. We would wish, in the case of an old person living in a little house of their own, not fit for human habitation, that the relieving officer should have power to remove them, whether they like it or not, to the house, and under the care of a nurse.

7577. I believe before the Local Government Act there was sent to you outdoor relief given by the Monaghan Guardians?—None at all.

7578. You have related that to some extent?—We have.

7579. And I believe the tendency is with you to increase, specially in the winter time?—Yes. And there was a case with Dr. Crawford—the late board refused to give medical relief on the application of Dr. Crawford, and he paid it himself and appealed to the Local Government Board and made the late board pay him.

7580. The tendency has been to increase the amount of outdoor relief given lately since you have become chairman?—Yes.

7581. Did you know since you became chairman if any case of real hardship in which outdoor relief was refused?—Not to my knowledge.

7582. As regards the treatment of old married couples in the workhouse, do you think any relaxation of the present rules might be introduced?—I do; I would approve that there should be a place set apart for these old couples to live together where they are compelled to seek the shelter of the house by no fault of their own, the family having gone to other quarters, and they have no means and they are unfit for any labour or employment.

7583. CHAIRMAN.—You would give them the option of leaving altogether if they wished?—Yes.

7584. Mr. Muldoon.—And that an apartment in the house might be set apart for that purpose?—Yes.

7585. Have you any suggestion to make to the Commission about the employment of inmates in the workhouse?—In Monaghan I would suggest the female portion should get knitting and sewing; at the present time, I may state, that all the knitting for the board is done by the inmates, all the boots are mended by the inmates; they all get employment and are supplied with knitting, leather, and sewing; all that is done in the house. We have only four able-bodied men in the house altogether, and they work on the farm—do the cattle and pigs. I think the farm has paid very well.

7586. You think the Monaghan Guardians, in case of amalgamation, would be willing to appoint a night nurse?—I would suggest a night nurse.

7587. CHAIRMAN.—Do you mean to say you have not a night nurse now? Why should you want a day for that?—I approve of one being appointed.

7588. Mr. Muldoon.—Has there ever been a demand made for one?—None; the present nurse attends to any night calls.

7589. At present the nurses act in turn every night?—They do; and if there is a patient ill the worsted, of course, sits up with that sick patient and calls in a nurse when it is needed.

7590. But you think it would be an improvement if a night nurse was appointed?—I do.

7501. And the Guardians will be willing to do so?—
Yes.

7502. CHAIRMAN.—I hope you won't wait until our report comes out?—We will not.

7503. Mr. MURPHY.—Has the Local Government Board never pointed out the inadequacy of those arrangements?—I believe the inspector did.

7504. And the inspector having done that, what stood in the way?—I cannot say; I don't know that the inspector did report.

7505. CHAIRMAN.—Was it economy that stopped you?—It was not; we have an efficient staff, and heard no reports from the doctor or nurse that there was anything wanting in the treatment.

7506. Mr. Muldon.—I believe the nurse and ward-maid are in touch with the patient during the entire night?—They are.

7507. No complaint, at all events up to this, has arisen?—No.

7508. CHAIRMAN.—Except from the inspector?—I believe the inspector did.

Mr. Muldon.—Was it in his report or by way of friendly suggestion?

CHAIRMAN.—By way of friendly suggestion in his report.

7509. Mr. Muldon.—When was that report made?

CHAIRMAN.—How many reports were made?—I cannot say.

7510. Mr. Muldon.—What do you think should be done with women who use the workhouse for the purpose of giving birth to children; do you think they should be retained in one workhouse in the county?—I don't know that they could be retained in one workhouse.

The suggestion I made is that the hospital of the different unions under the supervision of the dispensary doctor and nurse should be sufficient for these cases. You might not have time to convey a person from a remote part of the district to a union a distance from them.

7511. About the water supply to the workhouse, I believe you are contemplating an improvement to that?—Our improvements to the present house in Monaghan have been adjourned in the event of an amalgamation scheme, and also the water scheme, which is now almost completed. We propose to make the house sanitary when we have the water; before this we could not do much; we had no water. There is to be a general improvement and a general renovation of the house when we get the water scheme.

7512. At present it is quite satisfactory to its needs?—Yes; at the present time we are spending a good deal of money.

7513. Mr. Dwyer.—It has not been in a quite satisfactory sanitary state up to the present?—It is satisfactory enough.

7514. You were speaking about the distance from Derragola—that is the most distant part of the union?—It is eleven English miles from Monaghan.

7515. And it is nine miles from Glaslough?—It might be more.

7516. And you said, I think, that it would be unreasonable to think that Guardians from Derragola would go to Clones?—I did not speak of the Guardians; I said it would be unreasonable to transfer a sick patient by the ambulance from the furthest part of our union to Clones—a distance of over twenty-seven miles.

7517. How far is the south part of Charlemacross from Monaghan?—I believe it is twenty miles from here to Charlemacross.

7518. Well, the furthest part would be considerably beyond that; do you think it would be convenient to take them from there to Monaghan?—The sick can be taken from any part of the county by ambulance—that is the alling sick. In the case of accidents or emergencies I say retain the hospital at Charlemacross and these other places.

7519. In the hospital at Monaghan what kind of beds have you; are I right in saying they are strong beds?—There are some of them, and we have iron mattresses.

7520. Mr. MURPHY.—Did you ever consider the question of county boundaries at all in taking up this matter. You have outlined a scheme that would necessitate a county rate?—Yes.

7521. How could the thing be managed if a portion of a Poor Law Union were lying outside your county; unless you got a county self-contained, how would you fix the per capita for the upkeep of the patients in the outlying unions?—I would leave each county to deal with itself.

7522. CHAIRMAN.—Would you have the whole County Monaghan in the new proposed union?—Yes; and let Monaghan and Armagh take its portion.

7523. Mr. MURPHY.—And you would have all managed by some central committee?—I would appoint a dispensary committee. I would suggest that the elected Guardians be elected from the dispensary district, reduce the number, and elect whatever number is necessary for the size of the dispensary district to represent it.

7524. Then you would make the dispensary district the area of management?—I would have a committee of management appointed as the governors of the asylum are—by the County Council, with outsiders.

7525. You would like to see the dispensary committee re-established?—They would be more in touch with their own districts.

7526. You think the management of the dispensary was more carefully looked after under the old arrangements?—I should think so.

7527. You would like to see them re-established again?—I would, in the event of Monaghan being amalgamated into one union.

7528. Is it your idea that there should be one workhouse in the county for the infirm and sick, and that there should be small hospitals for the accommodation of emergency cases?—Quite right; and all patients who are fit to be conveyed by ambulance to the one house would receive better treatment and nursing—proper nurses at night, and doctors, and every other care.

7529. Do you not think it would be disadvantageous to those outlying localities to have removed from their midst accommodation for the sick?—There would be those outlying hospitals that would take cases of accidents and emergency, and when their patients would become fit to be removed they could remove them to the county hospital.

7530. Why should they not stay where they are and be made well there; why should there not be hospitals in those localities?—It is a matter of economy.

7531. You might push economy too far?—If you use hospitals for keeping all these patients they might live there for years; we should keep up a staff.

7532. The speech of the building would not be so great; there are many ways of economizing without having a locality?—I did not mean to hurt a locality or hurt a patient either.

7533. Do you not think it would be better for the sick to have to come to a central point instead of being attended to in the neighbourhood of their homes?—I think they would be better treated in one house than to have them separated in the different unions.

7534. CHAIRMAN.—Leaving the local hospitals for some cases?—Yes, sir.

7535. Mr. MURPHY.—Outdoor relief seems to be cut down to a fine point in Monaghan; why do you wish to take the power from the Guardians and give it to the medical officer or relieving officer?—They would know the districts and the poor.

7536. Would not the Guardians know it?—The doctor would know their state of living better than the Guardians; the Guardians would not like to inquire into their state of living.

7537. Have the Guardians shown any neglect of the poor?—They have not.

7538. Why should you wish to take it out of their hands?—I only made that suggestion.

7539. You surely have not been extravagant in this union?—We have increased.

7540. You have increased from nothing?—Outdoor relief was nothing in the union until the Local Government Act was passed.

7541. You certainly have increased from the old arrangement when you gave nothing, but at the same time you are giving comparatively nothing in this union in outdoor relief?—We have increased it.

7542. Don't you think that the public money, when collected for a certain purpose, which is the relief of the destitute, should be distributed for that purpose. When the industrious poor get into such a condition that they have nothing to eat, don't you think that there should be some alternative besides the workhouse?—We have not refused any person brought under our notice.

7543. Have you many agricultural labourers in this union?—I could not tell.

7544. Because it is generally from that class that these recipients of outdoor relief come?—In our union they are quite aged persons.

7545. Do you not think that if boarding out was carefully managed that would be an economical and humane method of giving assistance?—I don't believe it would be workable.

Nov. 24, 1905.
Mr. Patrick
Nolan.

Nov. 24, 1865.

Mr. Patrick
Swansea.

7625. Are you not aware that the thing the poor sigh for most is a little freedom and intercourse with their own friends?—If you board out the inmates of the house the chances are you will not get people who will keep them.

7627. If you could get such people, and if some standard was provided that would guarantee no waste of public money, do you not think that that would be a very proper way of administering relief?—I am of opinion it would not be workable in our district.

7628. In the neighbouring county we found that although the treatment given in the institution was much higher than yours and far kinder, still the people, we are told, sighed to be outside?

CHAIRMAN.—People would rather get the spending of money than be fed and clothed in an institution?—I don't know that there are country farmers here would take an old person of seventy or eighty to board out at any price.

7629. Unless they were relations?—Yes.

7630. Mr. MURKIN.—In the case of a person of sixty or sixty-five, who could do little turns about the house, don't you think that class might be taken out, and it would lighten the life of the poor creature if something of the kind could be done, without adding to the rates?—If that class of person would go out, and if a farmer asked them to work for the treatment they were getting, they might object and come back to the house again. As a matter of fact we have a boy in our house now over fourteen; we had him twice out, and he came back. I am afraid these people if asked to work will come in again and leave the farmer.

7641. If that boy had been sent out amongst the farmers he would not have got such a love for the workhouse, and he would have stayed out?—In his youth if he had been boarded out he would have stayed out; he would not have come back to the workhouse. We had him out with a very respectable man, and he left him, and we put him serving his time with a shoemaker, and he left him.

7642. Is not that an example of the undesirability of keeping children a long time in the workhouse?—I would approve of boarding them out.

7643. How many children in your house?—Six.

7644. How many are boarded out?—I think two, and we have one apprenticed to the tailoring business.

7645. So you think on the whole it would be desirable that Monaghan was a self-contained county, that it administered the Poor Law system within its own area, and that the dispensary area would be a good one for administration?—Quite right.

7646. Mr. James MURKIN.—You propose to have only one workhouse?—Yes.

7647. At Monaghan. Is it not about ten miles from Carrickshannagh?—I think about that.

7648. And from that to the south of the county nearly sixteen more?—I am not quite sure.

7649. You object to go twenty-seven miles down to Clonsilla; would you not think it would be a hardship to go twenty-eight?—If you make it a county union. My reason for suggesting Monaghan is that we have the buildings there; you have not the buildings in other places, and cannot accommodate us worse.

7650. I think the Carrickshannagh Workhouse will accommodate 600—it was built for 1,042; but you think it would be too much to go twenty-seven miles?—Carrickshannagh is at the far end of the county.

7651. Is not twenty-eight miles an extreme length to transport people who are aged and infirm?—In case of emigration if you adopt any workhouse Monaghan is the most central for the county.

7652. Do you think that twenty-eight miles would be far to bring them?—I don't know, by ambulance, that you would have any difficulty in transferring the sick poor. You would retain your hospital there for the sake of accidents and emergencies.

7653. You don't think it would be a long distance for the aged poor?—Not with a proper ambulance; it would be far easier for them to be transferred with a proper ambulance.

7654. What do you propose to do with the district workhouse; do they propose to use any of them for an additional lunatic asylum?—I don't know.

7655. Which of the other three do you think would be most suitable in case Monaghan were made the workhouse for the whole county, and you were going to utilize one of the other workhouses for additional accommodation for lunatics?—I think I have stated that we have accommodation for all the harmless lunatics as well as the 471 patients, and if you board out children there will be more room.

7656. So you think if Monaghan were made the workhouse no additional accommodation would be required for lunatics?—No.

7657. Mr. MULFESS.—Have the Local Government Board actually asked you for an explanation of the figures of outdoor relief quite recently. Have you been present at a recent meeting of the board at which there was a letter of the Local Government Board asking for an explanation of the increase?—I have not; I don't remember.

7658. Mr. DRUMMOND.—Did the Local Government Board ask you for an explanation about the straw beds?—The Inspector's report mentions about the straw beds.

7659. You took no notice of that friendly suggestion either?—The Guardians referred it to their doctor, and we are prepared to deal with his suggestion, and his statement to us was that he had a number of patients there, and he had no complaints; they were all healthy, and in fact his patients were healthier on the straw beds, and if we adopted the principle of their maintenance he would be turning them out as refuse every week.

7660. Do you think a hospital with straw beds and no night nurse is a good model for the County Monaghan?—I approve of night nursing, but I leave the matter of bedding to the doctor.

7661. CHAIRMAN.—In the outdoor relief do you feel much difficulty in ascertaining whether the people who apply for it are really in need of it or not?—We go into that matter. We send the relieving officer, no matter how far distant it is; he sees the person, and even examines their beds and houses, and returns to us all he knows of the patient.

7662. Have you now a great increase in applications?—In the winter season we have.

7663. No outdoor relief was given before 1859, or very little?—I don't know any—very little, if any.

7664. Now do you find the number of applications increasing very much?—They have increased with us.

7665. Do you give outdoor relief to all that apply, or do you refuse some?—We refused some who are too creatures whom the relieving officer reported were in a very destitute state, without a house fit for human habitation, and not fit to care themselves; we have tried and got some of these people in.

7666. Does the relieving officer report that some people, in his opinion, are not fit subjects for outdoor relief, and you offer them the house as a last of desperation?—He does; but very few.

7667. How many relieving officers have you got in this large union?—One.

7668. Were you asked to appoint another?—Not to my knowledge.

7669. Is one relieving officer supposed to make a personal inspection and report on every application for outdoor relief in the large Union of Monaghan?—He has, and he got an increase of salary for that purpose.

7670. He did not get an increase of legs or motor power?—I think he got an increase to get a leggin.

REV. J. WALLACE TAYLOR examined.

Rev. J.
Wallace
Taylor.

7671. Mr. MULFESS.—Were you Chaplain to the Bishopscroft Workhouse for a number of years?—Several years, at a time when I was there as curate.

7672. Are you also Secretary to the Monaghan Protestant Orphan Society?—I was for a number of years.

7673. You are familiar with the Poor Law system of the county?—Pretty well.

7674. And with the geography and distances of Monaghan County?—Fairly well.

7675. Is it your view that the number of workhouses in the county might be reduced?—Certainly.

7676. How many would you say would be sufficient in the county?—I think one would be sufficient.

7677. Where do you think that one might be placed?—As near the centre as possible.

7678. Having regard to your knowledge of the county?—This place or Carrickshannagh—whichever place was found most advisable.

7078. You know the buildings of the Monaghan Workhouse?—Yes.

7079. Would they be quite suitable, in your opinion, for all the paupers that would come from the entire county?—My opinion is not much matter, but I should say it would.

7080. Have you any view on the outdoor relief question?—Yes; I should like to see it increased. There is no question as to all that the destitute poor will not go into the workhouse; my parish of Rergal is a great part of it; a mountain parish; there are 4,000 people, roughly, in it, and as a matter of fact it is only at the very last gasp they will enter the workhouse.

7081. Is it your view that heretofore in Monaghan Union hardship must have followed from the refusal of the Monaghan Guardians to give outdoor relief?—Most emphatically; if you wish for instances I can give them.

7082. I wish you would?—I know one case in which I went into the man's house, and there was no fuel—within half a mile of my own house, Errigal Glebe—there was neither fuel, nor food, nor anything else; the neighbours, certainly, had done all they could, but simply for the reason that what is every man's business is no man's to be neglected.

7083. CHAIRMAN.—what was the number in family?—There was one old man, and no one to take care of him.

7084. Would he not do better going to the workhouse?—When he would not get outdoor relief I proposed to send him to the workhouse, and so did the parish priest; we did our best, but he would not go, and I say he died in the house, although there was charity to provide for him to some extent.

7085. That is one case? There was another case—this case, probably, could have had outdoor relief if it had been known in time.

7086. That is the case you are about mentioning?—Yes; the man would not go to the workhouse; he was found to death, practically, in his own house.

7087. Did the people advise him to go to the workhouse?—Certainly.

7088. What age was he?—A man of about sixty.

7089. Indram; unable to go about?—Indram; he could go about a little; he could not work much. He had a brother with him who was rather feeble-minded, but still could take care of him.

7090. Do you think these are cases to justify enlarged giving of outdoor relief, or do you not think they are cases in which the local authority might safely ask for power to intervene and take them as bodily?—That is another matter.

7091. Which do you think most sensible to do. If you gave him 2s. 6d. a week how would he manage?—It is astonishing how much they could do with it.

7092. But these cases you mention are cases of men who could not light their own fire or do anything for themselves?—They would make a struggle to do it, and it is wonderful how they would succeed; you must remember there was no fire for them to light; no fuel.

7093. I don't suppose they could buy food and provisions with the sum allotted?—It is wonderful how well the poor can manage if they get a little assistance.

7094. These are individual cases?—I could mention more; they are chiefly individuals, as far as I can remember at present.

7095. Do you not think it would be a better thing with the poor people who are neglected and deserted and have no one to help them, do you not think it would be better to give the local body power to take them?—That idea did not occur to me before, but I think I would be inclined to agree with you; you must allow a little for sentiment amongst them.

7096. I think it is a terrible sentiment to give a man 2s. 6d. or 3s. a week where he cannot do anything for himself or care himself?—They were not just so feeble as that, but, of course, I quite agree with you that it would be much better to have them in the care of the workhouse, and in some institutions sadder where they did go they were very thankful they did afterwards, when I saw them in it; if they knew it was so good they would have been there before.

7097. MR. MURPHY.—Now, in the case of a woman with some children—a widow—how would it affect her; you would hardly like to see her compelled to bring her children into the workhouse?—Certainly not.

7098. Do you not think it would be much better for her and her children, and the parish, if she got some assistance?—Most undoubtedly, and what she could earn herself with wool; a very little help would tide her over the difficulties. I might venture to say I think the sum of £5 a week spent in the parish of Errigal would meet all the really destitute cases in it.

7099. Do you know any cases of widows with children being left in destitution?—No; there don't come so many of those under my ken, because in those cases we have charitable societies which take charge of the orphans.

7100. But still there might be without your knowledge?—There might, because a very much larger proportion are Catholics in my district.

7101. MR. MURPHY.—Your parish is Errigal Trough—a very poor parish?—Yes.

7102. Since the Monaghan Guardians began to give outdoor relief has any case of hardship come under your notice recently in which the Guardians refused to give relief?—Yes; this last case I mentioned to the Chairman; or, perhaps I am wrong, they might not have refused it; it may not have been brought before them.

7103. Your parish is a large one?—Yes.

7104. The remote part would be a considerable distance from Castleblayney?—It would—twenty-four or twenty-five Irish miles.

7105. How far would the most remote part be from Monaghan?—Twelve to thirteen Irish miles.

7106. Castleblayney Union, a great portion of it goes into Anagh?—Yes.

7107. In the event of only keeping one union in the county, would you seriously propose that one might be kept at Castleblayney; would not that be very hard on Clones that we hear so much about?—It seems natural to me that Monaghan would be the union, but that is a matter of detail.

7108. There is no doubt of its convenience in your case?—Certainly.

MR. PATRICK WHELAN, J.P., EXAMINED.

7109. MR. MURPHY.—Are you the Chairman of the Monaghan Rural District Council?—Yes.

7110. Are you also a County Councillor?—Yes.

7111. And a Poor Law Guardian, of course, of Monaghan?—Yes.

7112. Are you anything else—an agricultural committee-man, and so forth?—And a supporter of the co-operative movement and many other movements in this country.

7113. Have you considered the question of the amalgamation of unions in the County Monaghan?—I have.

7114. Have you come to the conclusion that four unions in this county are too many?—I think so.

7115. And you think some unions should go?—I think that one workhouse would be quite sufficient to meet the requirements of the poor in the County Monaghan, and I think that this could be managed by a Board of Guardians appointed from the different unions of the county, and I think also that there should be a local committee in every union that would look after the question of education of children—look after doctors',

and the duties of the officials in those unions and look after the necessity for outdoor relief in those unions.

7116. And that the representation of the local districts should be kept up in this way, but that one workhouse would be sufficient for the county?—Exactly; they should have fewer representatives.

7117. Where do you think that workhouse should be situated; what is the central town in your view?—I believe Monaghan would be the most convenient, because if we take the case of the Monaghan Workhouse and apply it to the Monaghan Union we find that the Monaghan Workhouse is fourteen Irish miles from some parts of the union. In the case of amalgamation I think it would not be too much to expect a little stretch in dealing with Castleblayney and Carrickmacross. As regards Clones I believe there would be very little inconvenience to the Clones people in coming to Monaghan. I would like to say a word with regard to the outdoor relief question that has been raised.

Nov. 24, 1895.

Rev. J. Wallace Taylor.

Mr. Patrick Whelan.

Nov. 24, 1905.

Mr. Patrick
Whelan.

7719. We will come to that later. Clones would not even be a suitable centre in case there were only two workhouses left in the county?—Most certainly not: it is situated in an out of the way place, geographically.

7720. You heard the Clones witnesses suggest that the union workhouse should be left there in case two were retained, and your workhouse could be turned into a portion of the asylum?—I believe that the asylum question should be worked out upon its merits, and I don't think that any of the workhouses in Monaghan are suitable for asylum purposes.

7721. To come to the outdoor relief question: first of all it is a fact that the Local Government Board have asked you for an explanation about the increase?—I have a distinct recollection of this question being asked from the Local Government Board once, and I think I could venture to say twice during the past three years.

7722. CHAIRMAN.—In connection with the fact of their being only one relieving officer?—Oh, no.

7723. I think you will find that?—Well, possibly; but as regards outdoor relief the Local Government Board have asked us to give an explanation with regard to the increase in one particular period of the year as compared with the corresponding period in the previous year.

7724. How many cases have you now on the books?—107 cases, and we relieve 180 persons, and so far as I am aware, and I have a very good knowledge of the circumstances of the people over the entire district, there are no cases of hardship at the present time existing in the union, and every case of outdoor relief or application for outdoor relief is very carefully considered. The Guardian of the district brings forward the application, and he gives his views upon the nature of the case, and the Guardians, before determining it, send out the relieving officer, who makes a very careful inquiry into each case, and comes back to the Guardians and gives his opinion, and the Guardians finally decide, but it is quite possible on some occasions, where a very strong case has been made, the Guardians agree at that very meeting to give it, provided that the relieving officer, when he goes out, says the parties are fit subjects.

7725. You say there are no cases of hardship now?—Not that I have heard of.

7726. And you most likely would hear of it if there were any?—I would.

7727. If you found that in the two years outdoor relief had doubled would that be a sign that destitution or poverty had doubled?—It would be a sign that some great change had come over the face of the country.

7728. Or over the face of the Guardians?

Mr. MURKHOUGH.—Or over the spirit of the Guardians?—All these things could take place. I was one of the parties who moved the adoption of the system of outdoor relief after the Local Government Act came into operation, and I found a very large number of people strongly opposed to the system being introduced into the union at all, and I believe, of course, that they held these views owing to the fact that no such thing took place, so far as I can recollect, at any time during the time of office of our predecessors.

7729. CHAIRMAN.—Do you happen to know the amount of relief they spend yearly in Clones?—I do not.

7730. Well, £37; you are £116; Carrickmacross is the next highest, £262; and at Castleblayney they spent £260; so you see there is a nice little step-ladder there; the valuation of Castleblayney is £20,000, and yours is £183,000?—But you must remember that every union should be dealt with on its own circumstances and merits.

7731. You believe there is no destitution in the union; if you find your relief has more than doubled in the next two years, what would the increase in outdoor relief be due to; would it be due to an increase in poverty or a change in the method of operation?—If it would be doubled in two years one of the possible causes would be that you dissolve our union and attach us to some other workhouse.

7732. There was no change made in Castleblayney?—As far as I know in Castleblayney outdoor relief existed for many long years; in Monaghan it was a thing that was not in existence until after the passing of the Local Government Act.

7733. Mr. Muldoon.—You inherited in Monaghan a system under which no outdoor relief was given at all?—Quite so.

7734. You changed that. Since you came into office have you refused the application in twenty that have been made?—Certainly not.

7735. Then if as a result the outdoor relief in Monaghan is smaller than in the others, it is not the fault of the Guardians who have refused practically no cases?—That is so.

7736. CHAIRMAN.—What is your test of fitness for outdoor relief?—That the party is unable to support himself or has no visible means of subsistence either by members of their own family or their own capacity to work for their livelihood.

7737. And you go directly on the lines of destitution?—Yes; and convenience of removal. I hold opinions of my own on that question; I hold it is absolutely unfair to force a poor old party from the home of their forefathers if we can by any reasonable means keep them living there during their life; I think old people will spend the end of their days more comfortably in the home of their forefathers than in a house in the workhouse.

7738. You would go so far as to say that in the case of a single old person living in a house, such as Dr. Taylor described, he should be left there?—If they had no one to look after them, I certainly, in the absence of evidence that they had some one to take care of them, could not see any way to advise them to stay there.

7739. Or give them outdoor relief?—I would give them outdoor relief if I saw they had any means of being cared.

7740. Mr. Muldoon.—I believe your relieving officer is a particularly active man?—He is very active and hard-working.

7741. An ardent cyclist?—Yes.

7742. And so far as you know, up to this at all events, he has been?—He has been quite capable of discharging the onerous and responsible duties attached to the position.

7743. CHAIRMAN.—Could he do the whole county, to you think, if he got the whole county in?—I think it would be impossible for a man under the present system.

7744. If he got a motor bicycle?—It is quite possible he would; but I don't say that a relieving officer could do the work of the county; such a proposition, in my opinion, would be absurd.

7745. Mr. Muldoon.—In the case of amalgamation and reduction of the number of Guardians it might be useful to increase the number of relieving officers?—Quite so.

7746. You yourself have not heard of any case of hardship following a refusal to give outdoor relief in the Monaghan Union?—Certainly not.

7747. As regards the bedding in the workhouse infirmary?—That question has been continuously before the Guardians, and the Guardians hold, and have always held, that it is advisable in the proper administration of the business, such as is entrusted to them, that they should follow the advice of their medical officer as regards questions affecting the well-being of inmates both in the houses and hospital, and they think if he is not capable of understanding what is best for the inmates and patients in his own house he ought not to be there, and consequently the doctor in the case has recommended the present system as quite satisfactory.

7748. And the Guardians thought he was as good a judge as anybody else on that question?—Certainly; he is a man of eminence.

7749. And if he should recommend a different system the Guardians would be perfectly willing to follow his advice?—At once.

7750. As regards the classification of inmates, have you any suggestion to make to the Commission?—I think it possible women who come into the house for the purpose of giving birth to illegitimate children should be kept by themselves, and I believe as well that some system should be put in force whereby men and women would not be separated when they seek the shelter of the workhouse in their old age.

7751. You have heard, generally, the evidence of Mr. Kiernan on the Monaghan Workhouse?—Quite so.

7752. And you agree with him?—I do.

Mr. JOHN TRAYNER examined.

Nov. 24, 1906.

7753. Mr. Muldoon.—You formerly were a Guardian of the Monaghan Union?—I never was a Guardian.

7754. You are Chairman of the Urban Council?—Yes.

7755. And you know the County Monaghan well?—Yes.

7756. Is it your view that one union workhouse would be sufficient for Monaghan?—I would say so, and I would say that Monaghan would be the most convenient place—best accommodation and best facilities.

7757. You think the buildings at Monaghan would be sufficient for the poor of the whole county?—I think so.

7758. You have heard Mr. Kiernan and Mr. Whelan giving evidence?—I have.

7759. And, generally, do you agree with the evidence they gave about the suitability of Monaghan?—I do.

7760. And you think any other centre would not be satisfactory or convenient?—Not so convenient or satisfactory, or with the same accommodation.

Mr. John Trayner.

Mr. BERNARD KIERNAN examined.

Mr. Bernard Kiernan.

7761. Mr. Muldoon.—You were for many years a Guardian of the Monaghan Union?—I was fourteen years under the old system and three under the new.

7762. And you are now a member of the Urban Council?—Yes; always have been.

7763. You are in favour of amalgamation of unions?—Yes.

7764. And you think one would be sufficient for this county?—I do.

7765. And you think it should be situated at Monaghan and not elsewhere?—I do.

7766. Did you hear the evidence which has been given by Mr. Kiernan and Mr. Whelan?—I heard Mr. Whelan and Mr. Trayner.

7767. And you agree generally with that evidence as to the suitability of Monaghan and Monaghan Workhouse?—Yes; Monaghan Workhouse would be able to hold the poor of the whole county.

7768. Will you tell us why you did not give outdoor relief formerly?—There never was outdoor relief given under the old Guardians, and when I got to be a Guardian under the new system I opposed it for a while until I saw there were deserving cases that should get it.

Mr. Muldoon.—I have no further evidence. I have some other witnesses who would corroborate what has been said, but repetition does not strengthen an argument.

The Sitting terminated.

Nov. 25, 1903.

SIXTEENTH PUBLIC SITTING—WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 25TH, 1903.

At the Workhouse, Castleblayney.

Present.—Mr. MICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. COREY BIGGER.

Mr. C. Lavery appeared for the Castleblayney Board of Guardians.

Mr. John McElveen (Instructed by Mr. D. X. Keenan) appeared for the Monaghan Board of Guardians.

Mr. James Augustine Murnaghan (Instructed by Mr. Grant) appeared for the Carrickmacross Board of Guardians.

Mr. Lavery.—Perhaps, sir, it is better for me at the outset to make some statement with regard to the position of the Castleblayney Guardians towards this question. The Poor Law Guardians of Castleblayney, after carefully considering the question of amalgamation, have come to the conclusion that the general principle of amalgamation is not desirable, and that the principle should not be acted upon in this county. I may also say they are of this opinion that if the principle of amalgamation could be introduced into the county with economy and without interfering with the comfort of the poor—the aged and pauper poor, and the infirm and sick poor—if it could be introduced into the county without interfering with the comfort of that class of persons, then I think the Castleblayney Guardians would be in favour of the principle of amalgamation. But they are of opinion that amalgamation of unions could not take place in this county without interfering with the comfort of the sick and pauper inmates, because amalgamation, in their opinion, means that some workhouses of the county must be wiped out and closed up and other workhouses must be retained. The result of that would be, in their opinion, to very considerably extend the area of the new unions so that the cost of the transit of the pauper residents of the county generally would be tremendously increased, and increased also to the prejudice of the comfort and of the proper treatment of the pauper residents of the locality. For instance, in this part of the county there are two workhouses; if one of them was closed—if the Carrickmacross Workhouse was closed—it would mean that all the pauper residents in Carrickmacross, except those who are sick—for it is admitted that part of the workhouses that would be shut up would be retained as hospitals or infirmaries—but the other portion of the pauper residents of the county would have to be conveyed a distance of sometimes seventeen or eighteen miles down to Castleblayney, because the upper end of this county above Carrickmacross is something like that distance from Castleblayney. If you shut up Castleblayney the same state of affairs would arise with regard to Carrickmacross, because it would be the same distance almost from the lower part of our union towards Carrickmacross, consequently in very severe weather, when there would be heavy frost, snow, or storm, if it became a necessity to remove any sick person or pauper from a distance as great as that it might not only interfere with their health and comfort, but endanger their lives sometimes, so that on that account they think it would be hardly right or practicable to centralise any of the unions in our county at present. But, of course, if there were effective, cheap means of transit from one of these places to another then it would be a very different matter, and amalgamation might then be carried out with considerable economy, and if that were so, and the principle of amalgamation could be carried out with economy, the Guardians of Castleblayney Union would be the first to applaud that principle. They are also of opinion that if the principle of amalgamation is carried out it would affect the administration of outdoor relief, inasmuch as according to the present system of administration of outdoor relief the Guardians of the different electoral divisions are really the persons who superintend the administration of outdoor relief. The old system of administration by dispensary committees has, of course, been done away with, and it is now administered, practically, through the relieving officer, by the different Guardians representing the electoral divisions,

and on account of the great distances that these Guardians would have to travel it is estimated and believed that the attendance at the different weekly meetings would not be so frequent as it would be if they had only to travel a short distance, as now. For instance, if our workhouse was closed our Guardians would have to go to Carrick, and if the Carrick Workhouse was closed the Guardians would have to come to Castleblayney. We are all human, and we know a man would be disposed to take a short journey far more frequently than he would be disposed to take a long journey, and, consequently, we think the supervision of outdoor relief would be thus impaired, for the Guardians of the different electoral divisions would not attend as frequently as they ought. The Guardians also think that if the unions were amalgamated the bodies would be swelled—they would be rather large. There are a great number of Guardians in this union, and also in the other unions of the county, so that if these bodies were thrown together—if the unions were amalgamated—the Guardians of our union think that the bodies would be altogether too unwieldy for practical work, and the work would not be done as effectively. Then the question of gratuities and pensions and increase in salaries also arises, and, having regard to all these things, the Guardians of our union believe the principle of amalgamation cannot be carried out with economy and in such a way as to reduce the rate of the district. But if the result of this Commission would be that they find after due inquiry throughout the whole country that the principle of amalgamation can be effectively applied to Ireland in such a way as to reduce the taxation of the country, as I stated before, the Castleblayney Guardians would be the first to applaud it if they thought that was so, without interfering with the comfort of the poor. At this stage I need hardly tell you that supposing that larger scale of affairs was brought about, that amalgamation would mean a reduction of expense without impairing the administration of the Poor Law, I think that we Castleblayney would have a very strong claim to represent not only our part of the county, but I might say the whole county if amalgamation of unions should take place in this county, and if, as I have stated in Monaghan yesterday, one workhouse is only to be retained for the whole county. With regard to Castleblayney Workhouse I don't think in the whole County of Monaghan there will be found, at least, a better workhouse; it will compare favourably with any workhouse in Monaghan. Within the last four years a sum of nearly £2000 has been spent on repairing the workhouse; that money has been spent on the infirmary, which is, I think, a credit to the Guardians, and if you inspect it you will find it is really all I say—very neat and clean, and a credit to the Castleblayney Board. That sum of money has been spent upon the infirmary—upon the aged ward—which is also very neat and clean. I was through it all yesterday, and I, as a Castleblayney man and a resident of this union, was proud of the state of the aged ward; it is very neat and clean, and they have had out very nice little gardens for it, and the aged and infirm could not possibly be better cared than they are in this house. They have lately erected two new convalescent wards, and I think that is a claim that cannot be made by any other union in the county; we have two wards lately erected, especially for convalescents, and properly equipped. On the drainage system they have spent a large sum of money; it has been constructed on modern principles, and covers the whole establishment with pipe drains and everything like that, so that the workhouse at present could not be better, from a sanitary point of view, both on account of the position and the drainage that has been introduced. Then they have a really good water supply with hot and cold water, baths and water-closets in connection with the infirmary; they have also spent a good sum of money on securing a first-class ambulance on the lines of the Dublin & Wick

Brigade, with four wheels and rubber tyres, and a good ambulance for the fever hospital equipped with stretchers. The surgery is also equipped with a cold and hot water supply, and the aged and infirm wards are very good too, and in fine order, and have movable baths on rubber wheels. The condition of the whole house, I might say, could not be in a more efficient state than it is at present, and I don't think there is any other workhouse in the county which does it very much. The site of a workhouse is a matter that ought to be very seriously considered; we are situated on a hill right above the town—not at all like some of the workhouses, actually situated below the level of the town—and if we are to believe in the laws of gravitation we must accept the theory that a lot of the sewage of a town thus situated must go down to the workhouse, and it cannot be a healthy site. But here the workhouse of Castleblayney is situated on the top of a hill, well-drained and very airy. We have also a detached building which could be used for either an auxiliary asylum or converted into an orphanage—a detached building that is not being used at all at present. We have one trained nurse and two assistants and two wardmaids in the infirmary; we have a trained nurse and a wardmaid in the fever hospital, and in the sick ward a male and female attendant. Dr. Wilson will tell you all about that later on. In the aged ward also there are several domesticities, a comfortable day-room, and all that, and if you think it worth your while to inspect the house you will find I have not exaggerated very much.

CHAIRMAN.—We have seen it—last week.
Mr. Loomer.—It was originally for 1,056, and last Saturday night there were only 196 in, so, in the matter of accommodation, I think we are in a position to accommodate all comers. We have ample room in the building we have, and ample room to build upon, for we have eight acres not yet built upon. The town, of course, is in a very central position. Castleblayney will become, I hope, in a year or two one of the most important railway centres in this part of the country. There is a new railway being constructed from Carrigrohane, and there is also a Bill lately passed through Parliament for the construction of the railway from Kinsale to Castleblayney, so that we will be able to serve nearly all the districts lying adjacent to ours. The station itself extends ten miles in every direction except in the direction of Carrigrohane, where it only extends four miles, but even at present we have a railway that could serve that portion of the district very well; there are two railway stations—one at Ollerville

and one at Inniskenny; both of them are in the Carrigrohane Union, and that line has direct communication with Castleblayney; ten or fifteen minutes will bring anybody down from that portion of Carrigrohane Union into Castleblayney, so with regard to the position of Castleblayney everything points to its being the most central place and the most likely and the best place for administering those districts, if you think it right to recommend the amalgamation of unions for this county. There are a number of important towns in our union as well; the Poor Law Union of Castleblayney comprises the towns of Hollyday, the town of Crossmaglen, and the town of Newtownhamilton, and I might also say that we are really the best place that the towns of Newtownhamilton and Carrigrohane could be served out of, because we are right in the centre, and in a year or two will become a railway centre that will serve all these districts, so that if the unions are to be amalgamated I don't think a better centre could be selected for the administration of the Poor Law than the town of Castleblayney. That can be more fully said in a year or two, when we have these two new railways constructed. There is another question that will be dealt with by Mr. Smith will refer to a matter that will perhaps weigh very much with your Commission, and that is a question of religious denomination. Mr. Smith will elaborate all that himself, but it is from his point of view and the point of view of the different religious persuasions in the county—a very serious religious question—which will be taken into consideration by you. The reason that the Guardians arrived at the conclusion that they did not want amalgamation was that they have a very fine workhouse; they are getting on very harmoniously together; there are never any quarrels at the board; they are very intelligent and business-like body; they don't usually come here to make a parade of their eloquence, but to do business, and the fact that they have done business is amply proved by these statements I have made with regard to the improved hospital and all that. These are matters that ought to be taken into consideration, and when unions are going to be changed I think a preference ought to be given to the best business people. I might also mention that without increasing the number of inmates in our workhouse we have reduced the outdoor relief by £240, and there is no corresponding increase in the number of inmates.

CHAIRMAN.—You have got the figures for this year just over!

Mr. Loomer.—Yes; the clerk will give them.

Dr. Wilson examined.

7708. Mr. Loomer.—Are you the Medical Officer for this union?—Yes.

7770. What way would you suggest that this matter of amalgamation should be approached yourself; what is your own view with regard to it?—I think there are too many workhouses in the county.

7771. How many workhouses would you think would be sufficient?—I think two would meet the requirements of the case.

7772. Would you suggest where these workhouses should be situated?—I would have one in the north and the other in the south, so as to catch both ends, and make them as central as possible.

7773. You would not agree with the evidence that was given at Monaghan yesterday by a battalion of witnesses that one workhouse would be enough for the county, and that that should be in Monaghan?—I think that would entail a great deal of hardship on the poor—the convenience of them during the winter time.

7774. Do you think that the distance from the upper end of the county, above Carrigrohane, to Monaghan would be too great?—It would be an utter impossibility in some cases.

7775. As a matter of fact that distance would be nearly thirty miles. With regard to our own house here, are you aware how much money has been spent lately in improving it?—Within the past four years, I was looking over the accounts, there has been over £280 spent, and there was £200 spent a few years before that on another building.

7776. Was that money spent to improve the infirmary and other wards?—Principally the infirmary and sick wards.

7777. Have you also constructed two new consumption wards?—We have thoroughly equipped them with all the modern improvements.

7778. And was some of that money also spent on the effective drainage of the establishment?—There was; the house is thoroughly drained with pipe drains.

7779. In your opinion, as sanitary medical officer, is it in a thoroughly sanitary condition at the present time?—It is; and there has been a marked improvement in the health of the old people since the drainage was completed.

7780. Have you noticed since the drainage was completed a marked decrease in disease that usually arises from defective drainage?—I have just stated that.

7781. Have you also introduced into the workhouse a good water supply?—We have a very good water supply now.

7782. And you have cold and hot water baths in the infirmary?—We have on both sides—male and female.

7783. Was a new ambulance lately purchased at a cost of nearly £200?—We have a very fine ambulance—four-wheeled with rubber tyres—from the St. John's Ambulance Society.

7784. Did you also acquire a new ambulance for the fever hospital?—Yes; a four-wheeled ambulance too.

7785. Is it properly equipped with stretchers?—It is.

7786. Are you, as medical officer, satisfied with the kind of surgery they have given you?—Yes; they have improved the surgery lately; there is hot and cold water put in, and a new operating room.

7787. You have a private ward, too, have you not, in the infirmary?—We have one private ward.

7788. Now, with regard to the staff, are you satisfied with the kind of staff you have in this workhouse?—Yes, I am fairly satisfied.

7789. How many trained nurses have you here?—Two trained nurses—qualified nurses.

7790. Have you any assistants?—We have three wardmaids.

Dr. Wilson

Nov. 25, 1901.

Dr. Wilson.

7791. You have, of course, a male and female attendant in the idiot ward?—A male and female paid attendant in the lunatic wards.

7792. I don't think I exaggerated much when I referred to the idiot ward; is it not in a creditable state at present?—The idiots are very comfortable; there were also two day-rooms built for them recently, which you did not mention.

7793. And they have very comfortable quarters as regards dormitories?—Yes. The whole hospital and the male lunatic wards are supplied with wire-mesh stretchers and hair mattresses; most of them in the infirmary now are Lawson Tait's Improved.

7794. And you supply very comfortable quarters to the nursing staff?—There have been two new dormitories built or fitted up for the nurses lately; they have three dormitories.

7795. And they are in a very good condition, and well kept?—They are.

7796. As all the other parts of the house appear to be. Taking for granted that this principle of amalgamation would be carried out, how would we be fixed with regard to accommodation?—The number of beds we have in the hospital is sixty-three; thirty-six of them are occupied to-day, and in the idiot wards we have twenty-six idiots; all the beds are filled but one. We have accommodation for five consumption males, with a thousand cubic feet for each patient, on the male side, and five on the female side; we have a thousand cubic feet on each side.

7797. How many patients does the fever hospital accommodate?—It would accommodate twenty-eight.

7798. How many does the infirmary accommodate?—Sixty-three.

7799. What about the infirm wards; I want you to tell us all you can about them?—We have sixty-three beds in the infirmary.

7800. How many could you accommodate in the consumption wards?—Ten.

7801. Apart from these wards, is there not a detached building that could also be used in case of necessity for increased accommodation?—Yes; there is a large detached wing that would accommodate fifty at least.

7802. And we have eight acres of land attached to this workhouse?—We have.

7803. That could be built upon?—If necessary. That large wing has not been occupied in my time; it would hold, at least, fifty people; there are three large dormitories in it; the reason that place was not occupied formerly was that we had no water supply for it; now there is a new water supply coming into the town.

7804. Does that water supply actually run past your gates?—Yes; that place could be utilized now at very little expense.

7805. Suppose the Government think well of introducing a Bill to do away with a lot of these workhouses, how would Castletown stand?—Stand centrally for the south division.

7806. And are they not constructing a new railway between Armagh and Keady?—Yes.

7807. And has there not also been a Bill passed for the construction of a railway from Kingsport to Castletown?—I don't know that it has passed.

Mr. Loneroy.—It has; Mr. Daly can tell us that?

Mr. James Daly.—That will cut two ways.

7808. Mr. Loneroy.—Since the infirmary has been brought up to date and modernized and improved, have not the small farmers of the locality availed of it far more than they used to do?—Yes; every day we are getting a better class of patients in; the small farming class are sending in their sick, and there has been no change for so far; the Guardians have not made a charge for so far.

7809. Our hospital here is not, unfortunately, one of these county-at-large charges, as at Carrickmacross, and Monaghan, and Clones; we have to pay for it ourselves?—The fever hospital is not a county-at-large charge; it is the only one in the county that is not.

7810. Carrickmacross can boast of that distinction?—It can; and Clones and Monaghan.

7811. By reason of our not being a county-at-large charge, how much additional expenditure does that entail here?—I cannot say; that would be a matter for the clerk.

7812. How many towns are there in this district; four or five, are there not?—Castletown is the centre of five towns—between six to nine miles.

7813. Just mention those towns?—Carrickmacross, nine; Greenanagh, six; Newtownhamilton, eight; Keady, eight; Ballybay, seven; it is the centre of the spider's web.

7814. CHAIRMAN.—Who is the spider?—Castletown.

7815. Mr. Loneroy.—And Mr. Daly is the fly. You could not tell us anything about the reduction of the outdoor relief?—I don't know that.

7816. Mr. Molloy.—In the event of this Commission reporting that one union would be sufficient for the needs of Monaghan County, would it be any advantage if that union were placed in the centre of the county?—It would certainly; it would entail less hardship in bringing the people from the outskirts.

7817. Yes; I agree with you. Do you know the relation of the portion of this union which extends into the County Armagh?—I do not.

7818. The railway facilities that your solicitor spoke of would also be very useful in taking patients and persons out of Castletown as well as bringing them into it?—It would.

7819. Mr. Loneroy.—Would it be to Monaghan?—Not to Monaghan.

7820. Mr. James J. McNamee.—Is Castletown in North or South Monaghan?—It is in the centre of the South; it is more nearly the centre of the county.

7821. So that if you were going to have two workhouses, in dividing the county, would it not be on the very dividing line?—It would be nearer than any of the others.

7822. It could not be the centre of the entire county and the centre of the southern part?—It is in the north of the southern part, but it is the most central town, I think, in the county.

7823. Ballybay would be in the centre of the county, and it is just on the same line as Castletown; is not Castletown on the dividing line; if the county were divided into two parts would not the line be drawn past Ballybay and Castletown?—It would, I think.

7824. So if you wanted to have a central workhouse in each part of the county would not Carrickmacross be more central than any other?—It would not.

7825. I think your spider sits in the corner of his web this time?—No; he would sit in the centre of the southern division to a large extent.

7826. Do you remember in 1800 the dietary in Castletown Union?—I do.

7827. What kind of a diet had you before 1800?—We had a middling diet.

7828. You changed the diet?—We changed the diet; we have a fairly good dietary at present.

7829. In 1800 was there any pressure on you by the Local Government Board to change the dietary?—There was some pressure, but the Guardians resisted it.

7830. Have you had any inquiries during the past number of years?—We had one.

7831. Only one?—One, as far as I am concerned; I don't remember any others; we had some within the last ten years; two, I think.

7832. Only two?—As far as I remember, only two; well, labourers' cottages, if you wish that.

7833. Was there any inquiry into the administration of the workhouse, of the staff, do you remember?—There were complaints made.

7834. Was there an inquiry held?—There was, and the staff was completely exonerated.

7835. Who complained of them; why was the inquiry started?—It was started by the wife of a deceased patient.

7836. There were several inquiries then?—I know of two, that is all.

7837. This proposed railway will run from Carrickmacross, won't it?—It will.

7838. And there will be a station at Carrickmacross?—Yes.

7839. Dr. RIDGER.—You stated that there were a better class of patients coming into the infirmary now?—There is decidedly.

7840. There is also the same class—that is the poor?—They are coming in still; but there is a class that did not come in formerly.

7841. By that you mean to show that the infirmary is serving a more useful purpose?—It is becoming better known, and the people are appreciating the skill nursing, and if the same workhouse could be done away with I believe we would get more in.

7842. You mentioned also that the Guardians had not charged for the treatment of patients?—They have not; they have never charged here except a few cases.

7843. Why should they allow better-off people to come in without paying?—It is to encourage them to come in.

7644. Would it not be a proper thing for the ratepayers and also for the patients themselves that they should pay and not receive it off the rates?—The Guardians have acted very generously in the matter.

7645. Do you think they are acting properly in the matter?—That is another matter.

7646. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose you would hardly like to give an opinion on that?—I would not.

7647. Dr. BROSSE.—With regard to operations, do you think that all small operations or all classes of operations should be performed in these hospitals?—I do not.

7648. What class do you think should be performed and what class should go elsewhere?—Special cases, eye operations a general practitioner should do.

7649. But large operations?—I think they are justified in performing them now—abdominal surgery and such matters.

7650. You would not approve of sending large operations to the county infirmary provided they were able to go, and not emergency cases?—I would not; only special cases.

7651. Don't you think their chance of recovery would be better there?—I don't think so.

7652. Better equipment of the operating room?—I think they would have just as good a chance here. There was a question about the classification, about the children; we have twenty-one children.

7653. CHAIRMAN.—Are you in favour of keeping them in the workhouse?—We have twenty-one children between three and thirteen years of age in the workhouse; of these twelve are orphans and deserted; the other nine are children with their mothers. I would make a distinction between those children. I think the twelve children should not be retained here. I have a very strong opinion, after twenty years' experience of workhouse children; I think they should be sent to a central industrial school with either one, two or three acres contributory to it.

7654. Mr. Lowry.—You are Vice-Chairman of the County Council of Monaghan?—I am.

7655. Suppose some of the workhouses in the County Monaghan were wiped out, how many workhouses do you think should be kept?—Well, you would require two at least, if you did not want to inflict a very great hardship on the aged poor and the infirm and sick.

7656. You don't agree with the Monaghan folk?—I certainly do not.

7657. Even taking it for granted that the Monaghan people were right, would you think that the Monaghan people should be allowed to keep the county workhouse as well as the county lunatic asylum and the county infirmary, and half a dozen other things?—I would not object to them having the workhouse for the northern part of the county.

7658. But you would object to having the workhouse for the whole county situated in Monaghan?—Certainly.

7659. Why?—Because it would entail a great hardship on the people living in South Monaghan to be taken there—the aged poor and sick.

7660. What do you think would be the most central place for the two workhouses?—I am not sure of the geographical position of North Monaghan, but the most central part of North Monaghan and the most central part of South Monaghan.

7661. Where do you think the workhouse for South Monaghan ought to be situated; we will let North Monaghan take care of itself?—The way we are situated at present Castleblayney is the most central place for South Monaghan, but it could be made more central if you built another workhouse in South Monaghan, but as it stands it is the most central.

7662. And you would be in favour of retaining the workhouse in Castleblayney?—I would.

7663. Mr. James A. Monaghan.—I just want to ask you about the location of Castleblayney; you seem to think it is in the centre of South Monaghan; how far is it from Castleblayney to Monaghan?—About eleven miles by road; the travelling from Castleblayney to Monaghan is very inconvenient by rail.

7664. How far is it from Castleblayney away down near Kingscourt, where the county goes to; is it not ten or twenty?—I think the Castleblayney division only goes three miles beyond Carrickmacross.

7665. Dr. BROSSE.—Or boarded out?—No; not boarded out. My experience is not favourable to boarding out children; I prefer an industrial school where they would learn something, and not turn up like a halfpenny every year, as they do when kept in a workhouse.

7666. CHAIRMAN.—What experience have you had of boarding out children that makes you have an unfavourable opinion of them?—Well, they very often come back here, even the boarded-out children.

7667. Can you give me instances of boarded-out children; are you speaking of hired-out children or boarded out?—I am speaking of hired-out children.

7668. We are not talking of that at all; have you had any experience of boarded-out children?—Not much.

7669. Do your remarks altogether apply to hiring out?—Yes.

7670. As regards boarding out, have you any experience of that?—No; not much.

7671. Have you had any at all?—I cannot say I have. We have two classes of aged and infirm here; there are some in the place for twenty years that I remember—people that came in here through circumstances over which they had no control; broken down in health and other causes—and then there are others here of the tramp class—wild-lands—they come and go; I don't think they should be classed together; I think these other classes who have no friends and relations should be sent to a central or auxiliary asylum.

7672. You would classify them according to character?—I would; and the tramp class the same. The porter tells me that of every thirteen tramps who come here ten of them are of the stigmatized class—the pickpocket class—and the three are down on their luck—honest tramps; ten out of every thirteen turn up here every three months.

MR. PATRICK DUFFY EXAMINED.

Mr. Patrick Duffy.

7673. How far is it from here to Carrickmacross?—Nine miles.

7674. How far would you make North Monaghan come down if you were asking a division of the county; how far north of Monaghan?—As the division is at present, I don't think you could make any change more suitable than it is at the present time if you have two workhouses for the whole county.

7675. You will have to divide the county into two if you propose two workhouses?—My idea would be to have a workhouse at Monaghan, as it is there at present, and everybody admits that Castleblayney is the most central in the southern division.

7676. I want to find out how far you would let Monaghan Union come down south of Monaghan town; is it not ten miles from Monaghan to the extreme north of County Monaghan?—It may be.

7677. Is it not ten down to Castleblayney?—Yes.

7678. Does not that just show that Monaghan is in the middle of North Monaghan?—Then why not give them the workhouse in North Monaghan?

7679. You said Castleblayney was not in South Monaghan at all?—I did not say anything of the sort.

7680. Monaghan is to be the centre of North Monaghan; how far are you going to let Monaghan come down south of Monaghan?—Down to the southern line of North Monaghan.

7681. How far is that?—I am not sure; I have not the slightest idea; the present union boundary.

7682. If it is central at all it must come down five or six miles; how far is it from here to Monaghan Union?

A Guardian.—Five miles.

7683. How far is it down to Kingscourt?—About twelve to fourteen miles.

7684. If it is five to the north and fourteen to the south Castleblayney cannot be in the centre?—Except you built a new workhouse altogether and put it into the south of South Monaghan I don't see how you could change it.

7685. How far do you go from Castleblayney to get to the County Armagh; about three miles?—There may be a short cut that three or four miles would bring you into it.

7686. So that Castleblayney is really on the edge, in a kind of corner of the south?—It is very easy to see that by the map.

Am. 28, 1905.
Mr. Patrick
Duffy.

7897. If you come to examine it it is not so centrally situated at all.—We are not considering that at all, but we are contending that as it exists it is more central than Carrickmacross to administer the Poor Law.

7898. When the railway comes down to Carrickmacross won't it be in the centre of South Monaghan?—I don't think it would, and I don't think you think it either.

7899. Is not Castleblayney just in the direct line between Dundalk and Monaghan; is not that the way the tramps go?—It is not indeed, I wish it was. We have to go to Clones and branch off to Monaghan.

7900. The tramps don't go by Clones to Monaghan?—What other way would they go except by road.

7901. A man that tramps usually goes the shortest way; he would not go to Clones if he was going to Monaghan?—If he goes by rail he must go that way.

7902. A tramp does not go by rail; Castleblayney is just in the direct line between Dundalk and Monaghan?—It is by road.

7903. So that is just a convenient resting place for tramps; would they ever go by Carrickmacross?—They could not possibly if going from Dundalk to Monaghan; but I suppose they would if they made anything by it.

7904. Mr. MURKIN.—Was this question of amalgamation discussed at the County Council meeting?—It was, but I was not present.

7905. CHAIRMAN.—What do you suggest should be done as regards part of the Cooteshill Union that is in the County Monaghan and the part of the Clones Union that is in the County Fermanagh?—I am reluctant to tell you I don't know sufficient about the whole thing to give you an answer; I have not studied it.

7906. Have you studied as regards the part of the Cooteshill Union that is in Monaghan?—I have not.

7907. Mr. LEWIS.—Don't you know the part of the country that lies a little beyond Ballybay in the Cooteshill Rural District?—I do.

7908. Where would that be most conveniently attached if amalgamation were carried out; would it be more conveniently attached to Castleblayney than Monaghan?—To Castleblayney.

7909. CHAIRMAN.—Clones or Castleblayney?—I think Castleblayney.

7910. Mr. LEWIS.—Is there not a railway station at Rocknure that serves that, and there is a train from Rocknure into Castleblayney?—Yes.

7911. Ten or fifteen minutes would take them from that district here by rail, and fully half an hour to go to Clones?—It would.

7912. Mr. MURKIN.—Are you a member of the Board of Guardians?—I am not.

Mr. JAMES KILLAGHAN examined.

Mr. James
Killaghan.

7913. Mr. LEWIS.—You are an engineer?—I am.

7914. You are Engineer to the Poor Law Guardians here?—Yes.

7915. Have you taken the trouble to look into the map?—I did.

7916. Will you throw some light on this much-contested centre?—I don't know.

7917. How far is it from the lower portion of Monaghan to Castleblayney?—It is twenty-three miles by furrows from the lower portion to the Monaghan Union.

7918. From the upper portion of Carrickmacross Union how far is it?—From the upper portion of Carrickmacross to the Monaghan Workhouse, twenty-six miles two furrows twenty paces.

7919. Would Castleblayney be a more central place for a workhouse, supposing there were two retained in the County Monaghan, than Carrickmacross?—Oh, it would.

7920. You were a Poor Law Guardian for a number of years yourself?—I was.

7921. But you would be of the opinion that Castleblayney would be the place for the workhouse for this end of the county. There have been a great deal of improvements carried out here in this county?—There have.

7922. And have not these repairs improved the workhouse very much indeed?—Oh, they have.

7923. You have not been a member of the Poor Law Board since the Local Government Act came in?—I have not; you cannot act in two capacities. As to the one workhouse, from the lower end of the county to Castleblayney it is twenty-four and a quarter miles, and from the upper end of Carrickmacross to Monaghan it is twenty-six miles, so that Castleblayney has two and a quarter miles of an advantage if there is only one retained—it is two and a quarter miles more central. Taking your union as it stands at present, if you retain the portion of Armagh, undoubtedly Castleblayney is far from central.

7924. Suppose there is a workhouse in Castleblayney retained, you think the Armagh portion of our union should be still kept on?—It would be very inconvenient to send them any place else.

7925. How far would it be to Dundalk from that end of the union?—Dundalk is not on this map; I don't know exactly.

7926. You are well acquainted with that district of Cooteshill?—Yes; I am the architect for the labourers' cottages there.

7917. Suppose there is a re-arrangement of unions, where do you think that part of Cooteshill Union should go?—The greater bulk of it should come here.

7918. Mr. MURKIN.—Did you ever hear of a place called Clones?—I did; I know it very well.

7919. How far is it from Castleblayney?—As the crow would fly it is twenty-one statute miles.

7920. And the furthest end of that near Roslea would be still further?—Oh, yes; it would be further.

7921. Do I understand you to have made Castleblayney the centre of the County Monaghan in case that only one union is retained?—It is the most central; twenty-four miles will bring you to the verge of the County Monaghan from Castleblayney to any part; whereas it will take you twenty-six and a half miles from Monaghan.

7922. That is a remarkable engineering feat—a perfectly astonishing result?—Well, I cannot help it.

7923. Mr. James A. MURKIN.—This place is in the centre of the county?—I did not say that.

7924. You said it was twenty-four miles from one end and twenty-six from the other; if it is the centre of the county and the county was cut in two it could not be the centre of the county and then the centre of another part.

7925. Mr. MURKIN.—The county cannot have two centres by any engineering?—I really don't follow you.

7926. Mr. James A. MURKIN.—If you were going to divide the county into two divisions would you not divide it near the centre?—I would not; if I was making two divisions of it that would necessitate two workhouses.

7927. If there were two workhouses, and you were going to have two divisions of the county, would you not just draw the line past Castleblayney?—I said I would do nothing of the sort.

7928. Well, if it was in the centre, and you were going to divide it?—Ballybay is the centre of the county.

7929. How far is Ballybay from Castleblayney?—Ballybay is seven miles from Castleblayney and eight from Monaghan; if there was going to be one workhouse in the county, Ballybay would be the place to build it.

7930. Is it not in the same line as Castleblayney?—It is, but I don't see that would help us in this inquiry.

Mr. EDWARD McDONNELL examined.

Mr. Edward
McDonnell.

7931. Mr. LEWIS.—You are the Chairman of the Board of Guardians?—I am.

7932. And the Guardians are against this principle of amalgamation because they think it cannot be economically carried out?—Yes.

7933. Suppose the powers that be don't agree with the Castleblayney Board of Guardians and carry out this principle of amalgamation, where would you think the workhouse should be placed?—I would say Castleblayney ought to be kept away.

7334. Why do you think so?—Well, it is the largest union; Carrickmacross is not much more than half of the value in the valuation.

7335. Do you know the valuation?—We could find it here.

7336. The population of Carrick is not near as large as any other?—Of course it is not.

7337. Do you think that it would be a wise thing or a good thing, or an economical thing either for that matter, to retain only one workhouse in the County Monaghan?—I don't think it would; the expense of transit would cover the saving, in my opinion.

7338. Then you would hardly know what to do with the white elephants left on your hands in the shape of giant workhouses?—No; I would not.

7339. Would it not be too far to convey the aged and sick and infirm poor in winter long journeys of that sort?—It would.

7340. You have effected very considerable improvements in the workhouse of late years?—Yes.

7341. Spent hundreds of pounds in repairing the place and putting it into its present perfect condition?—Yes.

7342. Supposing there was a re-arrangement of unions where would you think the County Monaghan portion of the Castletown Union should be placed?—It could come here.

7343. Would it be more convenient for it to come here than to any other part of this county?—I would; I suppose portion could go to Clonsilla too.

7344. Do you think the Crossmaglen portion of this union could be more conveniently taken on to another union than this?—No; except one portion at the lower end could be put into Newry.

7345. Mr. James A. MURTAGHAN.—When you sold the valuation of Castletown Union was about twice as much as Carrickmacross, you were not speaking from figures, were you?—Yes.

7346. You have the figures, have you?—I have them in my head.

7347. Do you know that the valuation of Carrickmacross is £55,000?—It is hardly that; the valuation of the union was £75,000 twenty-five years ago.

7348. About half of it is in Armagh?—No; about a third.

7349. Anyway, there is a large portion of Castletown in Armagh?—There is.

7350. And it is only £75,000 in valuation?—It was £75,000 twenty-five years ago, and it is greatly increased since; there have been more buildings done.

Mr. LORRY.—The valuation of Carrickmacross is £55,000 in last Thom's Directory.

7351. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—You say you are in favour of amalgamation, and you think it is necessary as well to retain all the workhouses in Monaghan?—I am not in favour of amalgamation, and I will show you why. I came in here as a Poor Law Guardian twenty-five years ago with a determination to knock down all the poor-houses if I could. I went through these hospitals, and, looking at the poor aged and infirm people there, I changed my mind. In those times that I speak about on the farm of land on which I was reared there were no cottier houses, and everyone of them had their turf-locks, and they would be only too glad to get a poor man or a poor woman to stop there; they let nothing by it. Now that is gone away out of the country; there are no hogs, no firing, and those poor people can get no shelter; there might be an odd person would keep them, but the majority would not.

7352. But you know things have changed a good deal since twenty-five years ago—the population has decreased very much?—It has.

7353. And the social condition of the country is not the same as it was twenty-five years ago?—It is not; they have not the means at their disposal to be social; the firing has left the country.

7354. Apart from firing, is not the condition of the people better than it was twenty-five years ago—not so very many poor people as then?—Well, I suppose there are not.

7355. And that being so, what was needed twenty-five years ago is not needed to-day?—Still, if there was no workhouses for them in the country, they would rather stay in it.

7356. In the four workhouses in this county—Carrickmacross, Monaghan, Clonsilla, and Castletown—there are only something like 400 inmates altogether; half of those inmates are sick, and would require some attention, perhaps locally?—They would.

7357. The children taken out of that would reduce the number of what you would call infirm or candidates for a workhouse down to about 200; do you not think that one workhouse in the County Monaghan could easily accommodate 200 inmates?—I suppose it could.

7358. And if some provision was made in different localities for the care of the sick, do you not think that it would meet the requirements of charity and humanity?—You could hardly establish these places without heavy cost too.

7359. Do you not know that the cost of keeping up a workhouse in the matter of fuel and staff is very great?—It is.

7360. Suppose you could do away with the staff and the fuel?—I don't think you could do away with the staff altogether without giving them pensions.

7361. A pension would be a disappearing charge?—I was taking for my standpoint of view the Monaghan jail when that was thrown off this county; I was a keen observer at the time, and I could not see that the county cost was anything cheaper; there was more charged for the conveyance of criminals from Bailly and Rockmore and Monaghan, and those places, with a policeman or two along with them, than would maintain them in the jails, and if those workhouses were done away with there would be as much expense for the conveyance of those patients, perhaps, as would support them a year in the workhouses.

7362. That is hardly a fair comparison; I don't think the county cost was responsible for that charge to a great extent?—It was.

7363. That was a small item?—It was a very big item in the County Monaghan.

7364. You could hardly get that in comparison with the condition of things at present with regard to the Poor Law; what I want to get from you, as a man of experience, is, supposing that three of the unions in this county were abolished, supposing that the firing and the upkeep of the institutions and staff ceased to be a charge on the ratepayers, do you not think that that would bring about a considerable reduction in the local rates?—It would; but what would you do with the houses; they would fall for want of firing.

7365. We would look after the houses?—You cannot do it without coal or firing.

7366. If the houses were abandoned you would have no need of firing?—Then they would fall.

Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Tell them to some enterprising neighbour to make an industrial home.

CHAIRMAN.—Or for a quarry.

Rev. R. H. SMYTHE examined.

7367. Mr. LORRY.—You are the Presbyterian clergyman for this district?—Yes; one of them. I am Chaplain of the workhouse.

7368. What do you think about this arrangement of the unions—the reduction of workhouses?—Well, I would be strongly in favour of amalgamation, and from the remarks made by this gentleman here (Mr. Murtaghan), more strongly now than ever I have been.

7369. That being so, where would you say the workhouses should be retained; how many would you keep?—Two workhouses would fully satisfy all the needs of this county.

7370. Where do you think these two workhouses should be placed?—Of course, looking at it from my own standpoint—that is the religious standpoint—I should say that if a workhouse be retained in South

Monaghan it should be at Castletown. Of course, I have many other reasons I could assign why this should be the workhouse retained.

7371. Just tell us what you think about it?—It is purely a personal matter with me.

7372. What is the reason why you would oppose the workhouse being closed here?—Religiously?

7373. No; give us the other reasons first?—On account of the equipment of the workhouse and its central position; these reasons have been given already.

7374. Now, on the religious aspect, what is your reason?—In this particular district the north-east and northern district lying around Castletown, and then the western district towards Bailly, there is a very considerable Presbyterian population, representing somewhere about fourteen congregations; in the town of

Nov. 25, 1903.
Mr. Edward
McDonnell.

Rev. R. H.
Smythe.

Nov. 22, 1862.

Rev. E. H.
Smythe.

Curriculum there is no Presbyterian Church and no Presbyterian minister nearer, I think, than at least three Irish miles, and I would consider that a very great hardship on Presbyterian inmates who might be taken from two miles or so beyond Newtownhamilton to Currimacross, a distance of sixteen or eighteen miles, and also within, I suppose, five miles of Monaghan; and also from Ballyear district and all round. We have only one little Presbyterian Church between this and Currimacross, eight miles, Broomfield; the Presbyterian population has largely on the other side of Castletown.

7975. You, of course, agree with the other witnesses that this would be more central than any other town in this part of the county?—Certainly, to any person who knows the geography; some people don't seem to have studied the geography of the county; they take an angle for a whole, which is a great mistake.

7976. CHAIRMAN.—As regards boarding out, have you had any experience of boarding out children?—We have not had any boarding out here; it has been suggested.

7977. Have you seen it?—I have not seen it, but I have been strongly recommended, and recommended by officials in connection with the Poor Law system, and strongly recommended to myself, but I have had to personal experience in places where I have been. It was not in force in places where I have been before I came to Castletown, and since I came here we have had no experience of it; but I would be strongly opposed to the system of hiring out children; and another thing I wish to say with regard to the workhouse system is the great necessity of having a classification of the inmates—I consider that to be one of the greatest hardships in connection with our workhouses—according to character, and another thing is the tramp question.

7978. Before you leave that part I want to ask your opinion about girls who come in to have illegitimate children in the home; would you be in favour of some arrangement that would exclude all girls in that condition from workhouses where they would meet other women in the same position?—Strongly in favour of that.

7979. It has been suggested by witnesses elsewhere that a good method of dealing with such cases would be by sending them to a central penitentiary conducted by religious bodies belonging to the various religions that these girls might belong to, and having them dealt with there with a view to reclaiming them after their

first lapse, and endeavouring to put them forward in the world in a more hopeful position in the future.—I would consider that one of the greatest acts of mercy that could be performed towards unfortunate girls is circumstanced; as if they were taken in hand very frequently at that particular period of their life they would be saved from a life of degradation and put under a good religious influence in connection with whatever denomination they belonged to.

7980. I am not aware that your religious denomination has any penitentiaries at present in Ireland.—We have none.

7981. But you think if there was a necessity for it—Of course there are houses—there is what is called the Edgar House where girls of that kind are taken up and looked after.

7982. Then you have them in that sense?—Oh, yes, in that sense; but we have none under Government.

7983. But if girls from a district were sent to you, and if the amount that they would cost in the workhouse were paid out of the rates to such an institution, do you see any difficulty?—There would be no difficulty whatever.

7984. You were going to pass on to some other subjects about the tramps, I think?—The tramp question I consider a scandal—to see able-bodied men and women tramping about from year to year.

7985. You refer now exclusively to those who are not bona fide seekers for work, but who are professional vagrants?—If there is such a thing as a bona fide seeker for work he is a very rare bird.

7986. We do meet them?—There are exceptions to every case, and that is, I suppose, a case to which there is an exception, but if you happen to have any key to make or potatoes to dig you would find him earnest to be in search of work.

7987. I mean men like tailors and shoemakers going from town to town, and masons' assistants?—Yes.

7988. Who are out of a job and go to another place to look for it?—Yes; but I have often seen them employed about Castletown, and they had got so accustomed with the tramp life that they would only work for a day or two, or perhaps a week. I have seen it again and again during the twenty years I have been here. I believe the tramp question requires to be looked after very carefully; they are a burden to the country and the rates, and the struggling farmers at the present time.

Rev Canon Wilson examined.

Rev. Canon
Wilson.

7989. Mr. Lecky. You are the Protestant Rector of the parish of Mechna?—Yes.

7990. How many workhouses do you think should be retained?—I think there ought to be two—one in the North and one in South Monaghan.

7991. Where do you think the North Monaghan one should be placed?—I suppose in the town of Monaghan.

7992. And where do you think the South Monaghan one should be placed?—Certainly in Castletown.

7993. Suppose the town of Monaghan people had their own way, and there was to be only one workhouse in Monaghan, because anything that is going in the county they must have it there, where do you think the one workhouse should be?—Castletown.

7994. You agree with the other witnesses that Castletown would be in a more central position for a workhouse for this end of the county than Currimacross?—I do.

7995. Are you well satisfied with the temporary arrangements in the workhouse here?—I think they are very good.

7996. Do you think the staff is efficient too?—I think the staff are very careful.

7997. You are aware, of course, that a great many improvements have been carried out in this workhouse?—Yes.

7998. CHAIRMAN.—You, perhaps, have heard the questions I put just now about girls who come in with illegitimate children?—I thoroughly agree with what Mr. Smythe said; I think it is a great pity to have them mixed up with the ordinary inmates here.

7999. Do you think the fact of such women being in the workhouse where there are women sometimes with three or four illegitimate children even in the workhouse, do you think that has anything to do with the great dislike that respectable people have to come into the workhouse—the knowledge that that class is there?—I am very sure it has, because they have often told it to me, and it has a bad effect and a bad tone on the general inmates.

8000. Mr. MURTAGH.—They have a great number of children in this house; do you know the reason why they never adopt the boarding-out system?—I do not; but I think the boarding-out system would be a very good one.

8001. You would approve of it yourself?—Thoroughly.

8002. Do you not think that one workhouse would be sufficient for the needs of Monaghan County?—I think it would be very uncomfortable.

8003. Supposing there was one workhouse and four places for the sick managed on a modest scale, is it not your opinion that that would come up to the needs of the county?—It might; but I think it would be better to have two.

8004. We find, on inquiring into the matter, that the inmates of these institutions stay there for a very lengthened period, and we also find that these aged people have very few friends that ever come to visit them, and it occurs to me, as a man who would like to bring about economy where it could be done without injury, that if one institution was devoted to the infirm of the County Monaghan and a few institutions be the sick of the various localities it perhaps might suit the needs of this county; what do you think of that?—I don't know exactly; a good many of the infirm have got friends, who come to see them, and I am afraid if you had it only in one portion of the county that they would be more desolate than ever.

8005. The general expression of opinion on the part of people who have been a long time in the house is that they are neglected by their friends—the sick are looked after and visited, but the old chronic cases are left to have no person to look after them. Now, if there was a home made for them in some central portion of the county, where there could be proper classification and proper supervision and better treatment of no more expense, do you not think it would be a desirable thing?—Certainly.

Mr. BERNARD FARROW examined.

Nov 26, 1908.

Mr. Bernard
Farrow.

8006. Mr. Lavery.—Are you a member of the Urban Council in Castleblayney?—Yes; Vice-Chairman.

8007. Have you thought over this subject of amalgamation?—Yes. My opinion is that a reduction of workhouses would be very good on the principle of economy and saving the rates.

8008. How many do you think would be sufficient for the County Monaghan?—I believe two would be sufficient.

8009. You don't think one would be enough?—Considering the extent of the county it would be very difficult to bring patients from the south and down to Monaghan if it was established there—for one workhouse very difficult—and it would entail an enormous amount of hardship on the poor and infirm.

8010. And admitting the necessity for two, where do you think three should be placed?—Castleblayney would be a very desirable centre, and I think it would be the most convenient for all parties for one, and Monaghan would be the place that would be suitable for another.

8011. Would you think that Castleblayney would be a more central place for the whole county, if there was only one workhouse, than Monaghan?—I do believe it would.

8012. As a matter of fact there is a bad railway service to Monaghan for the rest of the county?—Yes; very bad.

8013. There is no direct railway communication with this part of the county and Monaghan at all?—There is not; you would have to go round by Clones or go up by Dundalk to Armagh.

8014. And there will be a very effective railway connection with this town before long?—Yes; it is already in construction from Armagh to Castleblayney, and it connects with the Great Northern, so that you can get to any portion of the county.

8015. You took a great interest in the working of the infirmary when you were a Guardian here?—I did.

8016. Were you satisfied with the way the work was done there?—I was perfectly satisfied with the improvements that were carried out.

8017. In the whole establishment?—There was a considerable improvement. I was quite astonished to see the improvements that were carried out since I was

here before. The workhouse is in a most efficient state.

8018. What was done in your time when you were a member of the board?—There was introduced a new water scheme—a hot and cold water system—and trained nurses.

8019. Mr. Muldoon.—Monaghan is the Assize town of the county?—It is.

8020. It calls itself the capital of the county?—It may do so; no fault to it.

8021. Nobody calls Castleblayney the capital of the county?—No.

8022. The County Council meet at Monaghan?—They do.

8023. And the Asylum Committee?—Yes; but they were to have met at Castleblayney as well, but by some operation or some process, which we cannot understand—a bit of wirepulling in my opinion—they grabbed up the entire thing—books and system and all—and carried them down to Monaghan to the detriment of this district.

8024. And they have a railway into Monaghan now, but a bad service you tell us?—From Castleblayney they have not, unless you go round by Clones.

8025. You can go by railway from Castleblayney to Monaghan?—You can, and you can go by Armagh too, but the distance is great.

8026. I suppose the railway service is capable of improvement?—Unless you made a direct line I don't see how you can improve it.

8027. Mr. Lavery.—How long does it take you to go from Castleblayney to Monaghan by railway?—If you start from here at eleven o'clock, it would be three o'clock when you were in Monaghan.

8028. It takes you as long to go to Monaghan as it does to Dublin?—It does.

8029. Mr. Muldoon.—If you were coming from Monaghan to the new workhouse at Castleblayney it would take you a long time also?—No; you would come by road. We have an improved ambulance—none better.

8030. Castleblayney is a splendid town to get into, but nobody can get out of it?—I would not say that; it is a splendid town, and when you come to it you would like to stop in it because of the cleanliness—that is one of the things about it.

Mr. JAMES DONAGHY examined.

Mr. James
Donaghy.

8031. Mr. Lavery.—You are a member of the Board of Guardians and also a member of the Crossmaglen Rural Council?—Yes.

8032. Are you the spokesman of the Crossmaglen Rural Council?—You were sent here to-day by the Armagh portion of the Crossmaglen Rural Council?—Yes.

8033. How many years' experience have you as a Guardian?—I suppose I am twelve or fourteen years here.

8034. Is your portion of this union perfectly satisfied with the present arrangements?—Yes.

8035. You would not like to be cut off Castleblayney and added on to another of the adjoining unions?—No; the other unions are too far away.

8036. How far is Nerry?—About twelve Irish miles from the centre of the Crossmaglen Rural District.

8037. How far is Armagh?—About the same.

8038. How far to Dundalk?—About the same, and the same to Carrick.

8039. And this is the most convenient to you?—Yes; it is about six or six and a half miles to the centre of Crossmaglen.

8040. How far is it to Carrick?—It would be about twelve miles, Irish.

8041. You would not like to have to go to Carrick?—I would not; I would go ten miles of a road to avoid it.

8042. Do you think the number of workhouses should be reduced?—I would think two would be sufficient for this county; not to change Armagh from Castleblayney.

8043. Of course you would be in favour of retaining a workhouse in Castleblayney?—Yes; it would be a great disadvantage if our portion was taken from Castleblayney and changed to another place.

8044. Mr. Muldoon.—Do you know what the value of your portion is?—Castleblayney is £86,000 or £88,000.

8045. About half what Monaghan is?—I don't know what Monaghan is.

8046. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Was this question of the boundaries considered, do you know, in the County Armagh, as to the division of the counties?—Yes.

8047. Did the question come up at the County Council?—Not that I am aware of.

8048. You don't speak from a representative position, only just as a member of the community?—It was talked of at the district meeting, and they were satisfied it would not be touched.

8049. Was there any special notice sent out?—No.

8050. Was the matter considered?—There were two men appointed to come here.

8051. I want to know if there was any question as to the desirability or undesirability of the County Armagh being a self-contained county as regards Poor Law as well as other county work?—Not that I know of.

8052. And the expression you have given us to-day is just speaking for yourself?—Yes; I speak for the poor of the district.

8053. You can hardly say you speak for the poor when the matter was not discussed on notice of motion?—I am aware that the poor of the district come to this house, and their friends come here to visit them too.

8054. Are you aware that in other parts of the country there seems to be a desire put forward that the county should be self-contained, that the Poor Law system should be confined to the county itself, and should not extend into other counties?—I have read of that, but it would be very ungrateful if our portion of the county was sent away to Armagh or Nerry.

8055. CHAIRMAN.—How far are you from Armagh?—Crossmaglen is sixteen miles.

8056. Dr. BROWN.—How far from Nerry?—Thirteen or fourteen Irish miles, and it is nine miles to Dundalk.

8057. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—So Dundalk would be the

Nov. 25, 1903.

Mr. James
Donaghy.

nearest place for you?—If you took the centre of the division it would be longer; it would be twelve miles.

8058. The reason I ask you the question is the matter might come up when we get as far as the city of Armagh, and I just wished to know if any public body had given the matter consideration and come to a conclusion on the question?—Not that I am aware of.

8059. Mr. Lowery.—The matter was discussed twice by your board?—Oh, yes.

8060. CHAIRMAN.—But by the District Council of Greenagh?—Oh, certainly.

Mr. OWEN GARAHAN continued.

Mr. Owen
Garahan.

8061. Mr. Lowery.—You are also a member of the Greenagh Rural Council?—Yes.

8062. Is it not so that there were two meetings of the Council at which this question of amalgamation was discussed?—Yes.

8063. And is it not the unanimous opinion of your Council that the County Armagh portion of this union should not be cut off from this union and added to any other union in Armagh?—It is the feeling throughout the whole district from north to south.

8064. And is it not the opinion of the Rural Council?—Yes.

8065. They don't want to be cut off from Castleblaney Union at all?—They do not.

8066. And, as far as that is concerned, they are certainly against the Poor Law system being administered by counties?—Yes; we have the opinions of the District Council from both ends.

8067. You agree with Mr. Donaghy that the inconvenience would be too great if they are put on to

8061. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—And on notice of making seat out?—Oh, yes; certainly. I beg your pardon; I thought it was the County Council you were talking about.

8062. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose you will go to the county meeting at Armagh on the 1st of December. There are two gentlemen from our district that will go.

8063. Mr. James A. Murkaghan.—Were you appointed by the Council to come here?—Yes.

8064. Anybody else?—Yes; he is here.

Armagh?—Certainly; there is no railway communication whatever.

8072. CHAIRMAN.—It is on the way?—It would not be such as; it is not in our way.

8073. You would have to go into Castleblaney to catch the train?—Yes; or go to Dundalk. It is a mile almost to go to Dundalk as to go round by Monaghan.

8074. Mr. Lowery.—How far would you have to walk to Dundalk to catch the train from where you live?—To Coleraine is beyond two Irish miles.

8075. Then you would have to go away round by Dundalk to get to Armagh?—Yes; I very often had to go that way.

8076. How many hours would it take you?—You would leave about eight o'clock in the morning and be there about eleven o'clock.

8077. Mr. James A. Murkaghan.—Is this the Rural Council that sent you here?—Yes.

8078. Not the Guardians?—Not the Guardians.

Mr. JAMES DUFFY continued.

Mr. James
Duffy.

8079. Mr. Lowery.—You are a member of the Poor Law Guardians?—Yes.

8080. And you were a Poor Law Guardian for a great many years?—Twenty years.

8081. Do you think the number of workhouses should

be reduced in this county?—I believe two would be sufficient.

8082. Where do you think these two should be placed?—I believe Castleblaney would be the centre for South Monaghan.

Mr. THOMAS MURPHY continued.

Mr. Thomas
Murphy.

8083. Mr. Lowery.—You are a member of the County Council?—Yes.

8084. And the portion you represent is in this union?—Part of it.

8085. And part of it is in Carrick?—Yes.

8086. How many workhouses do you think would be enough for the County Monaghan?—It is the opinion of the County Council that the workhouses should be decreased, from an economic point of view; they have not considered where those workhouses should be placed. Personally, I think at least two should be enough for this county.

8087. Where do you say they should be placed?—I really have not considered that. I should say, from a geographical point of view, that, at any rate, Castleblaney should be retained if there were one for the county, but if there were two for the county I cannot say the effect of having one at Monaghan. I know from experience of the County Infirmary that is there—I am one of the Governors—that the poor and sick from Carrickmacross and round here won't go to Monaghan; it is so difficult to get there; if there was only one workhouse retained for the county it would be a mistake to have it in Monaghan; the infirmary people won't go there.

8088. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—What portion of the county do you live in?—Six miles from here in the Carrickmacross direction.

8089. You have no choice in the matter between Castleblaney and Carrickmacross?—None whatever; what would be the best for the respondents.

8090. Mr. James A. Murkaghan.—That is if there is one; if there are two you would not say it is not central than Carrickmacross?—I really could not say if there were two.

8091. Mr. Muldoon.—A good portion of Castleblaney is in Armagh?—I believe so.

8092. If that was sent into its own county under any reform that now takes place this would be a very small union?—Yes; but there is part of Castleblaney that could be sent in.

8093. There are seven divisions of the County Council Union and four are nearer to Monaghan than to Castleblaney?—I take it for granted that may be so.

CHAIRMAN.—To Clones.

8094. Mr. Muldoon.—Nobody dreams down here of continuing Clones. Did you ever hear of Clones?—Yes; by road it is seventeen or eighteen miles from here. I know we have a great delay there going to Monaghan.

8095. You know it is in a corner of the county?—Yes; I believe so.

Mr. PETER QUINNEMAN continued.

Mr. Peter
Quinneman.

8096. Mr. Lowery.—You live on the Cootshill side of the county?—Yes, sir.

8097. Where do you think would be the most convenient to put the County Monaghan portion of the Cootshill Union?—I believe there are three divisions that should go there—Lanny, Omeen, and I don't remember the other; they just lie alongside at the very edge of where I live myself.

8098. Would it not be more convenient to send all

the Monaghan divisions of Cootshill to Castleblaney than to Monaghan?—I believe it would, but those three divisions would be more convenient, even if the whole four unions are kept.

8099. CHAIRMAN.—Would Newbliss be more convenient?—Not if Clones was kept.

8100. Mr. Lowery.—But if Clones was closed up would the divisions lying towards Newbliss be more conveniently added to these divisions?—I don't know.

8111. Mr. Muldoon.—Do you know Luncheon and Abley; are not these near Monaghan Road?—Yes; I believe they would be more convenient to Monaghan, but the divisions I mention are on the very verge of where I am living.

8112. Is the event of Castleblayney being broken up, where would you like to go?—There is no fear of that.

8113. CHAIRMAN.—If that terrible catastrophe were to happen what would be your choice?—I would build a new one at Ballybay and knock the whole four; that place is central.

8114. Mr. James J. Murnaghan.—Which would you go to, Monaghan or Carrickmacross?—I would go to neither, and the cost of bringing the poor there would be more than their support here, not to talk of what misfortune might happen there on the way.

8115. CHAIRMAN.—But they would be well taken care of when they got there if they got over the road safely?—I am sure they would at Monaghan, but Carrickmacross is on the verge of Mouth; it is out of the question altogether; it is like Clonsilla.

Mr. James J. Murnaghan.—I appear for the Carrickmacross Board of Guardians, and as you have heard the evidence that has been given in the county already you will have plainly before you the questions that I will have to touch upon. The Carrickmacross Board of Guardians are of the same opinion as the County Council, that fewer workhouses would be sufficient for the county. They are also in favour of leaving apart from the County Monaghan those portions of other counties which are at present included in the county partially in this county. They think that if these portions were cut off and formed for Poor Law purposes part of the county in which they are situated the county could be divided into two portions—one north and one south—and they think one workhouse would be necessary for each portion. From the south of the County Monaghan is Monaghan town would be so far—almost thirty miles—they think it would not be at all meet the wants of the poor in the neighbourhood. They are in favour of having one workhouse situated in South Monaghan, and on the question of where that should be they don't wish to express any opinion. But they think that one workhouse being situated in North Monaghan, Carrickmacross is the natural and suitable position for any workhouse in South Monaghan. If you look at the map you will find that a division of the county made merely for the purpose of dividing the county into two parts—north and south—would cut across Ballybay, and on the same line is Castleblayney. Carrickmacross is situated ten or eleven miles south of Castleblayney, and the county extends for a distance in every direction. The proposed new line of railway

from Kingcourt through Carrickmacross to Castleblayney would make effective communication for all parts of South Monaghan to bring them to Carrickmacross. You will have evidence before you that the workhouse in Carrickmacross is quite a model one. I will not touch upon it now, because we will have it all in evidence, but the Carrickmacross Board of Guardians pride themselves that their workhouse is certainly the best in the county, and one of the very first in Ireland; they have a trained nurse and every accommodation necessary, and the workhouse is under the charge of the State. There has never been any complaint that the Guardians have not carried out the duties which were cast upon them. They have given outdoor relief, not extravagantly, but they have taken into due consideration the necessities of people who are suddenly left destitute to go into the workhouse; they have taken that into account, and have given them temporary assistance. They have also boarded out their children, and I think you will find that the experiment has been a great success. A workhouse to serve the southern portion of the County Monaghan should be somewhere near the centre of the southern portion of the county, and if there are to be two workhouses in the County Monaghan it is quite plain that Castleblayney is just on the verge of the two divisions. You will hear further of the advantage of Carrickmacross Workhouse and effective administration, and I need not go into that, but I think you will say that one workhouse would not satisfy the wants of the southern portion of the County Monaghan, the distance is so great to any other place that could be proposed; it would involve so much delay in carrying patients, and it would be at such a distance from persons who might suddenly require to get its assistance that it would be out of the question. But Castleblayney Union comprises a large portion of the County Antrim; we must have some unit; a person might say that the whole county should be involved in the one system and let the whole county pay per rate. The natural division is the county, the county interests, as a whole, go together, the interests of the County Council and the interests of the people of the county go together, and I think when you find in the County Monaghan that the county could be divided so naturally and the parties could be served so well by an institution at Carrickmacross I think it would be the most suitable place for the southern part of the county, and the fact that the Carrickmacross Board of Guardians have maintained such an efficient administration and have so carefully looked after the wants of the poor should be recognised, and I have no doubt that they would be capable of accommodating and carefully looking after any more inmates that may be sent to them.

Nov. 23, 1900.

Mr. Peter Connolly.

Dr. COLLIER examined.

8116. Mr. James J. Murnaghan.—You have known the Carrickmacross Workhouse for a long time?—I have known it for over twenty years, and I have been Medical Officer there for over thirteen.

8117. You know how the workhouse is administered?—I do.

8118. And would you say it is as fine a workhouse as could be?—I don't think it could be better; it is excellent in every way.

8119. The Guardians have taken a great deal of trouble in making the administration as efficient as possible?—The Guardians take the deepest interest in the well-working of the house and the well-caring of the inmates, and any reasonable suggestion that is directed to them they never fail to grant it.

8120. You have a good nursing staff and a trained nurse?—Very good, and a trained nurse.

8121. You have a good water supply?—There is good water in the house—born a pump.

8122. The place is in charge of the nurse?—Yes; there are six nurses there.

8123. And it is carefully looked after?—Most carefully.

8124. The Guardians have gone to some expense in providing apartments for the nurse?—They have gone to very considerable expense to provide suitable apartments for the nurse and also for the trained nurses.

8125. Do you know about the amount?—Really I could not say.

8126. Is fact the institution is a model one?—Yes, I would say so if I might.

8117. And no complaint has ever been made?—I never heard any complaint since I have been connected with it.

Dr. Collier.

8118. You know the number in the infirmary?—The average number for ten years would be about thirty-eight.

8119. What would you say of the diet?—The diet is excellent; the inmates are quite satisfied with it; indeed they are delighted.

8120. And the infirmary is sufficient for the requirements of the Carrickmacross district?—Oh, yes, and much more if we wanted it; we have any amount of space there.

8121. And the institution was built originally to accommodate a large number?—I believe up to 2,000; I am not quite sure.

8122. If the Union of Carrickmacross were enlarged by the dissolution of Castleblayney what means would you suggest for the proper care of the sick poor, having regard to the county infirmary being so distant? It is rather a long distance away?—My view is that there should be an infirmary where all unions are at present; there should be some place where acute cases and accident cases could be taken in and not have to undergo the torture and risk of going long journeys to places where they could be treated.

8123. In case Castleblayney was dissolved; would you be in favour of utilizing it for the purpose of housing and caring for harmless lunatics or cases of that kind?—Yes; it is my idea that a lot of space that is going for nothing at present in the workhouse could be utilized for a purpose such as you mention.

Nov. 29, 1905.

Dr. Callan.

8134. Castleblayney would be convenient to Monaghan?—Yes, of course.

8135. You think epileptic lunatics, and harmless lunatics especially, should not be kept in workhouses?—Decidedly lunatics should not be kept in workhouses, or epileptics either, in my opinion.

8136. You have had some cases in the fever hospital?—I have nothing to do with the fever hospital.

8137. Do you think that two unions would be necessary for the county; that one union would be scarcely sufficient?—It would be wholly insufficient.

8138. The proper care of the poor and sick would require two?—Certainly.

8139. You think Carrickmacross is conveniently situated?—I do.

8140. Mr. Lowry.—You could not give us any idea of how much money has been spent on Carrick Workhouse for repairs?—I could not indeed; I know a lot of money has been spent altogether.

8141. Could you tell us what repairs were effected?—A whole suite of apartments were prepared for the same and apartments were prepared for the trained nurse.

8142. Do you mean by the word "prepared" that brand new buildings were erected?—No; existing buildings were altered.

8143. Do you mean that unoccupied portions of the three buildings were converted into apartments for the same?—By structural changes the existing buildings were made to suit the requirements of these ladies.

8144. Is Carrick Workhouse as large as Castleblayney?—I cannot say.

8145. You have no drainage system in Carrickmacross?—We have a drainage system to be sure.

8146. Is it a pipe drainage system?—It is for a great portion.

8147. But not throughout?—Not throughout.

8148. Does not the workhouse of Carrickmacross lie very much beneath the level of the town?—It is below the town; I would not say very much below; it cannot, because the sewage flows from the workhouse through the back of the town.

8149. Supposing you were standing in the Main-street of Carrickmacross, driving into it, can you not see the workhouse down below?—I don't think so; you might see it, but I think, on account of the buildings, you could not.

8150. Is it not an incontrovertible fact that the site on which the workhouse stands is below the level of the Main-street?—It is undoubtedly lower.

8151. You have no thorough drainage system of the workhouse at Carrick?—We have. I could not call it thorough; there is some drainage going directly into a cistern and tanks we have there and some drainage going into the old river.

8152. Are not these old stone drains, mason's work?—Some of them are and some of them are pipes.

8153. You say you have no water supply?—We have a water supply within the house.

8154. From pumps?—Yes; when I was asked about the water supply I thought Mr. Murraghan meant the water supply of the town, which passes by the workhouse.

8155. And it has not been utilized by the business-like Board of Guardians of Carrickmacross?—Up to the present it has not.

8156. Have you any hot water in the house?—We can have a hot bath, but we have not a high pressure system; that is what I mean.

8157. Have you any hot and cold water baths in the proper sense of the term?—We have not.

8158. Have you taken the trouble of paying a visit to our infirmary?—No.

8159. I wish you did; it would get your eyes open?—I have no notion of it, I may tell you.

8160. How do you say the workhouse or infirmary in Carrick is a model one?—I believe it is a model for good management.

8161. Why do you say it is a model, when it has rotten drains?—I never used the word "rotten."

8162. I do. I say mason-work drains are not good?—I would not say anything of the kind.

8163. I thought it was an accepted sanitary principle that mason-work drains are bad?—There are different views on sanitary matters.

8164. It is open to me to ask you these questions?—Decidedly, but I don't want you to misrepresent me; I did not use the word "rotten."

8165. Don't misunderstand me or misapprehend me; I want to make as good a case for our side as I can, and I cannot do that without putting down your side.

You could not regard a large establishment such as Carrickmacross Workhouse as efficient if it was not properly drained?—It would be more desirable if it would be better drained.

8166. And you would not regard it as a model?—I don't properly framed?—I don't think it is a very model workhouse.

8167. It would be better if there was a good system of drainage?—I grant you that.

8168. And if there was a proper water supply?—Yes.

8169. And hot and cold water baths?—Yes, but if these things could be easily done.

8170. Have you a properly-equipped consumptive ward?—We have two of them.

8171. Is it old or new?—Bed apartments used by the purpose.

8172. Do they stand apart from the rest of the buildings?—They do; the patients are isolated.

8173. What way are you equipped with regard to waterclosets; have you any such thing in the place?—We have privies.

8174. You have not waterclosets in the place; is the infirmary?—No.

8175. You haven't them in the fever hospital?—I don't know anything about the fever hospital; it is outside my jurisdiction; it has a different staff and a different medical officer.

8176. But in any part of the workhouse there are no such things as waterclosets?—No.

8177. What kind of bedding have you in these consumptive wards?—Iron bedsteads, women's mattresses and hair mattresses, and feather pillows.

8178. How many women wear mattresses have you in the consumptive ward?—We have no consumptive at present but we have room for eight or ten.

8179. Have you eight or ten wear mattresses in the consumptive ward?—Yes.

8180. I suppose, of course, that this beautiful workhouse has good ambulances as well?—It has only one.

8181. What kind of an affair is it?—One-horse, with two wheels.

8182. Is it not the case that some patients are brought in in asses' carts?—People do that themselves; they are never brought in by my authority or the authority of the Guardians, but they do come in.

8183. And that is due altogether to defective ambulances?—No; it is due to the prejudice of the people.

8184. What sort of a two-wheeled conveyance is it?—It is very comfortable.

8185. Do you use that for the fever patients and for the ordinary patients?—Indeed we do not; there is an ambulance for the workhouse and an ambulance for the fever hospital.

8186. And the ambulance for the workhouse is only an ordinary ramshackle two-wheeled affair?—No such thing; it is a perfect affair.

8187. Have they given you a nice surgery?—I have a very nice surgery.

8188. Are there any of the buildings themselves?—Yes, part of the infirm ward and part of the infirmary.

8189. Did you see the building we have attached to this workhouse?—No; I don't know anything at all about that.

8190. How many trained nurses have you?—One.

8191. Are you aware we have two or three here to-day?—No, I heard, to-day, you had one.

8192. Have you any such thing as wardmaid?—We have.

8193. Do you make the paupers do the work of the wardmaid?—The paupers do nothing in connection with the patients, but the cleaning up of the establishment and scrubbing the place.

8194. CHAIRMAN.—There is no objection to paper inmates scrubbing?—None whatever.

8195. Mr. Lowry.—You think Carrickmacross is a more central place for a workhouse than Castleblayney for South Monaghan?—I don't think I said that exactly; I don't think I was asked.

8196. Which do you think is most central?—I think Carrickmacross is absolutely essential for the treatment of its own patients.

8197. That is for a hospital; but then if you have a workhouse in full working order, and supposing you had to wipe out one of these establishments at a workhouse, in which place would you think the workhouse should be placed?—I would not be disposed to wipe out Carrickmacross.

8198. Don't you think Castleblayney would be a more convenient place to put it?—I really have not given that attention; I cannot say.

Mr. B. O'BORKE examined.

Nov. 25, 1903.
Mr. B.
O'BORKE.

3139. Mr. James A. Murroughan.—You are Chairman of the Carrickmacross Board of Guardians?—Yes.

3140. You have taken a general interest in poor-house work?—I have.

3141. What is your opinion about the amalgamation of unions?—I would think that two unions in the County Monaghan would be sufficient.

3142. Where would you place those unions?—I would place one in the north and one in the south.

3143. In the south where do you think would be the most suitable place?—I believe Carrickmacross would be the most suitable.

3144. Do you know the general management of the Carrickmacross Workhouse?—I know it fairly well.

3145. Do you know about the expenses you want to in erecting apartments?—We want to considerable expense in regard to the nurse, £400 or £500, and about £20 in equipping apartments for the night nurse.

3146. The workhouse is in charge of the nurse?—The union is in charge of the nurse, and there is a sick master, and school teacher, and nurse in the hospital as nurses.

3147. Would one workhouse being about any economy?—I don't believe it would; in a short time it might become like the asylum, overcrowded; it would be necessary, in a short time, to have two.

3148. Would it be more efficient?—You could make a large workhouse as efficient as a small one, but I believe it would be very awkward to have only one to do the county.

3149. You know Castleblayney Union; there is a large portion in the County Armagh?—There is a large portion in the County Armagh.

3150. And your board is of opinion that it should go to Armagh?—I would leave each portion to itself; that portion might go to Newry Union.

3151. CHAIRMAN.—That would not be its own county?—Must be; Newry Workhouse is in Armagh.

3152. Its workhouse is in Armagh, but Newry is a very large union?—It is.

3153. Mr. Lacey.—If you send Crossmaglen to Armagh it would be a greater hardship than sending Carrickmacross to Monaghan?—I would send Crossmaglen to Newry.

3154. Newry Union is most in doubt?—The workhouse is in the County Armagh; of course, the town of Newry is in a very different union.

3155. Mr. James A. Murroughan.—They say Castleblayney is very central; would it suit the people of Carrickmacross and the people beyond?—It is a good deal out of the way.

3156. Would it involve hardship on the people?—I believe Carrickmacross is much more suitable for the south union. Our union goes about six miles beyond Carrickmacross.

3157. And portion of Castleblayney Union lies in the direction of Monaghan?—Yes.

3158. How far is it from Castleblayney to Monaghan?—About ten miles.

3159. So Monaghan Union comes down to within five or six miles of Castleblayney?—I would think about less than five miles.

3160. CHAIRMAN.—This question of distances and going into measurements is quite useless; we could not bar them in our minds; we will go into them ourselves afterwards; I think it is not necessary to spend much energy on distances. We will take the centre of population and look into it in that way.

3161. Mr. James A. Murroughan.—Would you be in favour of the amalgamation of workhouses or amalgamation of unions?—I would be in favour of having few workhouses undoubtedly, but it makes very little difference whether unions are amalgamated or not. In our case our standard rate is more than that in Castleblayney; therefore, if both were amalgamated we would lose a 10s; so I should think we should get the credit of the old standard rate in Carrickmacross if the unions were amalgamated.

3162. The Agricultural Grant?—That is in connection with the rural districts; I don't think they should be amalgamated; they should remain as they are. We would stand to lose also, as our Agricultural Grant is more than Castleblayney.

3163. You have heard it stated that the average number in your hospital was thirty-eight?—That is the average for the last ten years.

3164. What about your outdoor relief?—We have about 100 on outdoor relief.

3165. How does that number compare; has it decreased or gone up or remained stationary?—It is a slight decrease; it was 105 ten years ago; we spend about the same; we are fairly liberal with applicants; we give any we consider destitute 1s. 6d. a week; there are exceptional cases that we give 2s. 6d. and 3s.

3166. Mr. Bussan.—What do you think 1s. 6d. would do for any person?—It prevents them coming into the house; they are people living out in the country and have few.

3167. Would they come in if you did not give them 1s. 6d.?—Most likely they would.

3168. Have you known cases in which they have come in?—There are cases of people getting relief, who, when they become old, come into the house; if we ceased giving 1s. 6d. they would come in far sooner.

3169. Mr. James A. Murroughan.—You have always had about 100 on outdoor relief?—Yes.

3170. You have not had a sudden rise lately?—No.

3171. What is your opinion about tramps using the workhouse?—I think we should have more power to deal with them; they can come in and go out as they like. We often made an attempt to prosecute them, but we found it was too costly.

3172. CHAIRMAN.—In England they can keep them longer in the workhouse; do you think that is a good plan?—We tried to keep them until later in the day, and it had no effect. If the law was simplified, so that the Master could prosecute the tramps. At the present time we have to employ a solicitor, and get evidence from the neighbouring unions to prove that they were going from workhouse to workhouse, which is very expensive, and we thought it better to leave things as they are. I know there are two tramps at present in our union every week, and I believe they are continually going backwards and forwards from Castleblayney to Carrick. Carrick leaves it to Castleblayney to prosecute and Castleblayney leaves it to Carrick; every week the names are familiar to me on the books.

3173. They don't even change their names?—No; of course there are a number of genuine tramps that it would be a pity to deprive of the shelter of the house. The relieving officer tells me that the encous they have is that they could not get lodgings in the town. Where there would be a genuine case, and the relieving officer would charge them 4d. or 6d. for the night, it would ease the matter.

3174. Making them pay guests?—Yes; the same as former coming in; a number of them would pay, but the other people, the professional tramps, I would prosecute or do something else with them.

3175. Mr. James A. Murroughan.—I think you are in favour of the reduction of the number of Guardians?—If Castleblayney was done away with it might be a hardship bringing the Guardians up there; I think there might be meetings once a month, or, assuming that we were coming down here, the rates might be changed considerably to have the Guardians meet only once a month and appoint a visiting committee with a good deal more power and have few Guardians; that each division should be represented only by one instead of two; if Carrickmacross and Castleblayney were amalgamated you would have 100 Guardians.

3176. You have a number of returned paupers from Scotland in your union?—Yes; every month there are one or two turn up; we consider it a great hardship; it is nearly all from Scotland they come.

3177. Mr. MURROUGHAN.—Notwithstanding Mr. Daly's Act?—Notwithstanding Mr. Daly's Act; it only binds them when they are five years in one place.

3178. No; it is five years in the country and one year in a particular union?—In any case they make a declaration, and the Scotch authorities send them down to us; we tried to appeal against it, but on looking into it found we had no ground; we have to take them; we have a great number of them.

3179. Mr. Lacey.—You say two tramps turn up every week?—I think I would be safe in saying every week.

3180. That is a very extraordinary state of affairs; you don't think that is properly carrying out the Poor Law system. What kind of supervision do you subject the relieving officer to that allows that?—We have gone into the thing.

Yes; we are the pioneers of that movement. We have endeavored to send out the pauper children to thrifty, industrious people, and at the last return we had thirty-five boarded-out children, and I am pleased to state that the children that we have boarded out, as a rule, merge in with the people; they become useful members of society; they are boarded out with small tradesmen or farmers, who send them upon messages; they go to school, and they wear clothes like the country children wear, and the result is they grow up useful, industrious members of society. I have around myself small farmers that I recommended to take out these children, and it is simply wonderful how happy they are and how industrious they are, and if I wanted a servant to-morrow I could not take better than these children turn out. That is altogether due to the attention the Curricumacross Guardians have paid to these poor children. In sending them out to nurse we rescue them from misery.

2257. Have you any views on outdoor relief?—The rule in Curricumacross is that we give outdoor relief in a great many instances to keep them from coming in; we find that by giving a couple of shillings to a person we prevent the house being broken up; it may seem a small sum, but at the same time, when properly expended by the poor people, they can take more out of a couple of shillings in their own way of expending it than, say, a relieving officer would do, because he would have to go strictly according to the House laid down by the medical officer; and the person who gets outdoor relief can make the money stretch much further than if administered in kind.

2258. CHAIRMAN.—Do they get it in cash or by orders on shops?—We give it in cash.

2259. Mr. MURKIN.—It seems that the outdoor relief has not increased in recent years with you, as it has in nearly every union where it exists?—We don't refuse anyone, but we are economical in the way of giving an amount.

2260. It is rather remarkable that whereas it is about the same as it was ten years ago in Curricumacross, in the union in which we are at present it has increased very largely; could you give any explanation for that?—I could not; all I can say is we rarely refuse a case, but we don't give too much. If there is a case that we find is very bad we often give 3s. or 4s., or 5s., but it is not general. We make our relieving officer go round, inspect the applicants, and bring in his report as to the state they are in. Another thing that has brought down the outdoor relief is the purchase out of the Poor estate, which took place about twelve or thirteen years ago. I believe it has largely decreased the amount of outdoor relief in the Curricumacross Union. I only refer to it as a matter for consideration, because it does seem to me in recent years, where outdoor relief prevails, it has grown very largely.

2261. What I wanted to find out from you is how it is that you are able to so to preserve the outdoor relief that you don't follow the example of those about you?—We are very economical; we don't refuse any one; if we find any one wants relief we give them 3s. or 4s. this week, and we say to the relieving officer—"Go and make enquiries, and report to the board next meeting." Then to report whether there is fuel about the house, whether there is milk, whether they have the means of getting anything, and if we find there is a necessity for aid we continue it. Everything connected with the union has come down since the Local Government Act passed and since the people got the management of it. Our rates and the cost of everything have been reduced.

Mr. Leary.—The rates are the worst in the whole county about Carrick.

2262. Mr. James A. MURKIN.—Did you ever hear it suggested that the other unions were too close in the matter of outdoor relief? In Monaghan I think they have only one relieving officer?—I am not going to interfere with Monaghan or Clontarf.

2263. About the matter of tramps, do you agree with Mr. O'Brien?—I do. Now, if you want to prosecute a tramp it is hard to show that that man is a habitual tramp, and it is necessary for you to call officials from other unions to show that that man is a habitual tramp; that law should be modified in such a way that if the Master thinks he is a man that takes advantage of the workhouse and gets a night's lodging, power should be given to the Guardians to prosecute that man without going to extraordinary expense and without taking officials from these other workhouses.

2264. CHAIRMAN.—What would you make sufficient

evidence?—I would leave it optional with the Guardians if they thought well to prosecute any man taking shelter in the workhouse.

2265. What do you think ought to be the evidence; there is where the difficulty comes in?—Say a tramp will come to Curricumacross on a Tuesday; he goes out, and if he hears there is going to be a fair on Thursday he goes to Castleblayney or some of the villages round, and he finds himself on Wednesday night or Thursday back again in Curricumacross; that should be sufficient for a prosecution; we have often ordered prosecutions, but the Clerk of the Petty Sessions says it is not sufficient.

2266. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you think the English system of giving the Guardians power to detain them for two or three days in the house and making them work would be an advantage?—Yes; the Master has now no power to make them do any given quantity of work; if you give them stones to break they can keep tipping away at one stone until their time is up; there is not power given to Guardians to make tramps do a certain amount of work.

2267. CHAIRMAN.—That is the arrangement in a great many workhouses, to make them break a certain quantity of stones before breakfast?—I am informed that as long as they keep working and don't disobey the officers they cannot be prosecuted.

CHAIRMAN.—But the hour of breakfast depends on the time they are broken.

2268. Mr. James A. MURKIN.—What about additional accommodation for lunatics?—I think there should be a workhouse for that purpose; it would be a great relief to have epileptics and harmless lunatics in one central place.

2269. Do you think Castleblayney would be suitable?—According to Mr. Leary, Castleblayney is suitable for anything.

2270. Your workhouse is in charge of the nurse?—It is in charge of nurse, and we have expended something like £400 on buildings for the nurses; we have them as nurses in the hospital and as school teacher, and I attribute the splendid management of that house largely to the nurse, and also the sanitation and comfort it is to the poor. It would be a terrible crime to take the nurses that are in Curricumacross Workhouse, and have had the ministrations of these good sisters for a number of years, and send them to a workhouse that has not got them.

2271. This is the only one in the county?—The only one; we try to treat the poor well.

2272. As regards amalgamation of unions as distinct from amalgamation of workhouses, what would be your view?—That would be a matter of detail.

2273. Mr. Leary.—Don't you know that we are going to have the nurse in Castleblayney?—A prayer before death is worth two afterwards; you may make any promise now, but I never like a death-bed repentance, and your offer now is not good enough. There was a man once possessed by a ghost, and when he got inside the door he said to the ghost: "You are late." I am afraid you are late.

2274. You spent £400 for quarters for the nurse?—Yes.

2275. That is a boast of yours?—It is a fact.

2276. Would you have spent a single farthing as all in Carrick on repairs if the nurse had not come to it?—Oh, yes.

2277. Can you point to any single item of expenditure in Curricumacross but that?—I suppose you mean you have spent a lot of money in Castleblayney.

2278. We have spent £1,500?—I think you are very foolish, considering your duty to the outpatients, if the workhouse is closed.

2279. At all events you have not spent one single item of money except on quarters for the nurse; that you really had to do?—We have kept up our workhouse.

2280. Can you point to a single item of expenditure in repairing the drainage of the place?—Our drainage is excellent.

2281. Old rotten mason-work! Have you introduced ordinary modern lighting? Can you point to a single item expended to improve the house in any way except to provide some premises for the nurse?—We have, as much as possible, carried out all the regulations of the Local Government Board, and what more could we do?

2282. Did not Mr. Agnew tell you you should carry out an improved system of drainage?—He recommended it.

Nov 25, 1903

Mr James
Daly.

Nov. 15, 1903.

Mr. James
Daly.

8293. Do you think the Guardians of the Castleblayney Union have done a foolish thing because they have provided a place that unfortunate paupers can live in; do you think it is a good thing to have unfortunate paupers living in a poisoned atmosphere where gases are coming from defective sewers?—That is only a speech.

8294. It is not; it is a question!—I am after explaining to you that our sewerage system is perfect.

8295. Dr. Cullen said it was not!—He did not say anything of the sort.

8296. He says they are only mason-work drains!—He said there were some pipe-drains and some mason-work.

8297. If your drainage was perfect what is the reason Mr. Agnew recommended an improvement?—A Local Government Inspector must recommend something; he would not be wanted if he did not send in some reports.

8298. Did he ever ask you to supply an ambulance?—Yes; we have a splendid one, with a mattress.

8299. On two wheels?—On two wheels.

8300. Better than ours?—I did not see yours.

CHAIRMAN.—It is worth seeing; it is a beautiful ambulance.

Witness.—Is that the one you had the row about the payment of?

8301. Mr. Lowery.—No; that is not the one. I can tell you it would make you laugh on the other side of your face if you compared it with the Carrick one. Here you spent anything on the consumptive ward!—The doctor said so; I am satisfied with his opinion on that point.

8302. Did you spend anything on the infirmary?—Yes; it is comfortable—wire-woven mattresses, iron bedsteads; in fact everything we are asked to get.

8303. Are the infirm poor in Carrick Workhouse kept in cells?—No; we have them removed; they are in a splendid ward at the present moment.

8304. How long since?—Within the last twelve months.

8305. What sort of cells were they kept in?

CHAIRMAN.—We know the kind of cells; they are in every workhouse, and they are generally diseased now.

8306. Mr. Lowery.—You think the workhouse in Carrick is absolutely essential?—I think it is essential. I have given reasons. If you cut the county across at Castleblayney, let Arraugh keep its portion and Monaghan keep its portion, and draw the line across at Castleblayney, Carrickmacross cannot be done without. That settles the point!

8307. What kind of mattresses have you?—Hair.

8308. They are not sleeping on wire-woven mattresses!—Wire-woven, and hair mattresses over that.

8309. Do you see that map; you don't mean in my Carrickmacross is more central than Castleblayney?—Undoubtedly; the map will prove my case. You think people from Kingscourt should come seventeen miles to Castleblayney!

8310. Mr. Muldoon.—You would not seriously propose, in case one union was recommended for the county, to place it at Clones?—No; I am talking of two unions.

8311. The unexpected sometimes happens, and is the event of only one union being recommended for the County Monaghan, you would not seriously propose to place that one at Clones?—I won't interfere between Clones and Monaghan; they are each friends in other respects, I will let them fight it out.

8312. Dr. Rogers.—It has been mentioned here that there is to be a railway from Carrickmacross to Kesh?—The Bill was passed last session, and I would not be surprised but that at the next meeting of the shareholders of the Midland Great Western Railway Company they will put a scheme forward to get the owners of the shareholders for making the line; they got the Bill, and I think the line must be made within two years.

8313. Is it proposed it should join the Great Northern Railway?—Yes; I am informed it will join at Castleblayney.

Mr. Farnon.—They have running powers over the Great Northern Railway.

8314. Mr. Lowery.—Admitting one workhouse would be enough for this county, where do you think it ought to be placed?—I could not give an opinion.

8315. Suppose you were forced into that position that there was to be only one workhouse in Monaghan, where do you say it ought to be?—I decline to give an opinion; I think one workhouse would not be feasible, and that is the reason I won't answer the question. I am not satisfied; I think two workhouses would be necessary for the county, and I am so economical as any one; if I did not think there would be economy I would rather not see the workhouses closed. I think there should be a fever hospital and a hospital to treat emergency cases in any event. Therefore, I think it would not be right that the poor should have to go to any particular centre.

8316. Don't you think it would be out of the question altogether to put it at Monaghan?—I can't answer; I don't approve of it, and what I don't approve of I won't answer.

8317. Would you approve if it was put in Carrick?—I won't answer.

Dr. McCann examined.

Dr. McCann.

8318. CHAIRMAN. Will you kindly explain how the fever hospital stands?—It is one of the old hospital fever hospitals, and prior to the passing of the Local Government Act it was maintained by private subscriptions and contributions from the grand jury. The contribution from the grand jury corresponded to double the amount of the private subscriptions. After the passing of the Local Government Act the private subscriptions dwindled away altogether, and we have now no private subscriptions at all; what we get is £294, about twice the amount of the subscriptions in the standard year.

8319. Have you enough to work the hospital?—No.

8320. Do you get anything from the union for fever patients treated in the hospital?—Yes, in a day.

8321. Do the Guardians pay for every case that comes from the union?—Practically every case; we have accommodation for about thirty-two cases.

8322. If the hospital could be put on a better financial basis there are a great many things that might be done to improve it?—Oh, yes.

8323. It is not in proper condition for a modern hospital?—It is not.

8324. It would not take much to do it?—It would not. I have got the account book from 1875, and from the start the subscriptions have dwindled down. When it was started about 140 patients were treated in the year.

8325. You are not in as good a position as the hospitals at Clones and Monaghan?—I understand whatever they want they get from the County Council; we get nothing at all; we will have to close up. There

is an objection to its being a union fever hospital; patients have an objection to go to it as it is a union hospital.

8326. Mr. James A. Monaghan.—You know the workhouse?—Yes; I occasionally do duty in the workhouse.

8327. About these duties; was there ever a case of illness or any complaint about duties?—I have been doing duty in the workhouse for five or six years, and I never knew a case of illness arising from defective drains.

8328. CHAIRMAN.—No case of typhoid?—Not a case ever arose in the workhouse.

8329. When was the hospital built?—In 1862, by private subscriptions, and handed over to the committee.

8330. Who is in charge of it at present?—At the time of the passing of the Local Government Act these hospitals were in charge of a number of the old committee. The old committee was elected from the county subscribers; it was put in charge of a number of them and a number from the County Council—40% of each. We have lost all our guinea subscribers, and we have only three or four practically to attend meetings.

8331. Do they attend meetings?—They do.

8332. How often have you meetings?—We are supposed to have them every quarter.

8333. When had you a meeting last?—Last month.

8334. To bewail your insolvent condition?—Yes.

8335. Dr. Rogers.—Have you been in arrears with regard to the salary of your officials?—Yes.

8325. CHAIRMAN.—You have not got your own?—I have got some, and the horse is paid up to the last month; we owe for some provisions; if we had a great amount we would be all right.

8327. Dr. BIGGS.—Your hospital would require to be put in order. There are no baths or water supply?—No; but the water passes the door.

8328. Do you take cases merely from the union or outside?—The union always.

8329. From the nearest portion of the Castleblagny Union, would you take them?—We would take them from any place; we have very few cases of fever now; since the introduction of water into Carrickmacross

we have no typhoid in the town; before that we had a great many cases.

8340. You think they would go faster into the hospital than into the other hospital?—They always do; we were threatened with an epidemic of scarlatina; we got the cases into hospital and it stopped immediately, although it was rampant in the County Louth, five or six miles away.

Mr. James A. McSwiggan.—We did not think it necessary to bring more witnesses from Carrickmacross.

CHAIRMAN.—I think you have brought very effective testimony.

Dr. T. H. MOOREHEAD EXAMINED.

You wanted my evidence as to the sanatorium in Cootehill.

8341. CHAIRMAN.—It is a sanatorium on most modern lines for treatment of cases of phthisis?—Pulmonary tuberculosis, as far as I could make it. It was opened the 1st of November, 1901; since then twenty-one cases of pulmonary tuberculosis were admitted—ten males and eleven females. Four of these were in the third stage when admitted, and all have since died outside—they went home. Eleven were discharged with the disease arrested, and of these seven have entirely recovered, having no physical signs, and are following their usual occupations; six remain under treatment, in three of whom the disease is arrested.

8342. Considering the general statistics in sanatoria elsewhere do you consider that the results with you are very satisfactory?—I think they are very satisfactory; of course you will understand that patients are sometimes sent in who are not suffering from tuberculosis, but those are all cases in which I have verified the diagnosis by bacteriological examination. Unless medical officers are capable of carrying out bacteriological examinations themselves they have no means of getting it done unless they pay for it. I think a bacteriologist is just as necessary an officer of the union as an analyst, because there are occasionally cases of diphtheria occurring.

8343. Have you ever asked any public department to examine bacteria for you—the Local Government Board?—No, I never asked them. Then with regard to this general question dealing with tuberculosis, I stated in my evidence before that I thought the sanatorium should be local—certainly at first until the people get accustomed to it—Probably afterwards larger institutions might be set up over the country.

8344. What was the out you had to go to to establish that sanatorium at Cootehill?—None, whatever.

8345. Except those shelters?—That was by private subscription.

8346. What would be the cost of those about?—£13 a piece.

8347. That includes couches and everything?—The patients are out in them to-day.

8348. They are on a pivot and swing round so that they can be exposed to the sunlight or sheltered from the wind as desirable?—Yes.

8349. And each holds two patients?—Three; I have only room for eight patients in the sanatorium.

8350. Could you take in far more if you had space; are there people to come?—Oh, yes.

8351. Is there competition for admission?—We have enough for the union, but there are other places outside the union, that would want to come there.

8352. Do you think it would be a good purpose to devote a closed workhouse to it?—I don't think it would be suitable. If I erected a new one I would erect a wooden structure, because by the time the wooden structure had been worn out, I would have stamped out consumption, practically, as fever has been stamped out. But the main point appears to be to get the patients in and teach them, and when they have learned their lesson you can send them home.

8353. Except as regards open air. Will they ever be able to get the same open air treatment at home?—Two of my patients are at present, to my knowledge, sleeping in open sheds at home.

8354. Virtually byres?—One has put up a shed with a zinc roof; another has an open shed.

8355. That is, they have the roof over these three side walls, open in front?—Yes.

8356. Dr. BIGGS.—Do you follow up the patients that are discharged and keep in touch with them?—When patients go out they take with them a thermometer; they have learned the use of a sphygmograph and temperature charts, and I require them to send in their temperature charts every three weeks for examination, and if I think they are relapsing I get them back again, but I have had only one relapsed case.

8357. They are still under your treatment?—Still under my observation; practically the treatment is all; plenty of food and fresh air.

8358. How would you suggest to other unions that they should deal with consumption?—There seems to be no difficulty in the world—at the workhouses. There is another point that I want to call your attention to, that is notification. Until pulmonary tuberculosis is considered a zymotic disease, and notified compulsorily, and the house disinfected, I don't see how any effectual attempt is to be made to stamp it out. Of course the pulmonary form is only a very small portion. Consumption is saturated with tuberculosis and one never came here, but the doctor seems to have any number of cases of tubercular disease from Consumption.

8359. You think that by the stamping out of pulmonary tuberculosis one might hope to see much less of surgical tuberculosis?—If tuberculosis were stamped out ten beds would be sufficient for my union.

8360. What I meant was that the measures taken against pulmonary tuberculosis would also stamp out the surgical disease?—It is the spiritus of the pulmonary patient that produces the disease. There was another matter I wanted to suggest, that is that some of your inspectors should draw out instructions for medical officers showing the simplicity with which they can deal with these cases. I don't think they would be disinclined to adopt measures if they saw how easily they can be carried out; the tuberculous patients give me less trouble than any other.

8361. CHAIRMAN.—It is the only workhouse in Ireland so far that has adopted any active treatment as far as I am aware; we were very anxious to have an explanation from you; was there anything else?—There are the matters that I wish to bring before you: the sanitation—that is the notification of these pulmonary cases, the provision of disinfection for the houses—that is a matter I see to myself. I have the house disinfected with potato sprays and formaline; I always get the people to do that as soon as a pulmonary case is removed. The dispensary medical officer certainly should have the means of having the sputum of patients examined in an early stage, because that is the time you can deal with it successfully.

8362. Dr. BIGGS.—You said that you thought that the site of your building was suitable for the union, or enough?—Yes, I think eight beds would provide accommodation for the number of tubercular cases in my union.

8363. You don't mean to say that pulmonary tuberculosis in the early stage is limited to eight cases or forty-eight cases?—No; but the cases are not all in at once.

8364. Suppose you kept the eight in for two months, and less than that would not be worth much, even from an educational point of view, apart from the curative?—I think I have got in most of the early stages of tubercular disease in my union since I opened the hospital.

Nov. 25, 1902.

Dr. H. Cast.

Dr. T. H. Moorehead.

Jan. 25, 1908.
Dr. T. E.
Moorhead.

8365. CHAIRMAN.—You don't object to having the lower wards occupied by fever patients?—No, and it is well known that pulmonary cases are very refractory to symptomatic disease.

8366. Dr. BROWN.—What charge do you make to cases coming in for treatment?—The average cost is 5s. 6d. or 6s.

8367. That does not cover the cost?—No; it does not cover the food even.

8368. CHAIRMAN.—Because they have to be fed extra well?—Perhaps you would like to know how they are fed. For breakfast they get eggs and bacon, fat bacon especially, toast and tea. At 10 a.m. they get a quart of milk which they are expected to drink; that is given to them hot and they are expected to consume that before dinner. At dinner they get generally mutton, sometimes beef, sometimes fish, potatoes and whatever vegetables we have, and then a pudding. The pudding is a most important thing in these cases; after they have eaten a good dinner they can get down a pudding.

8369. Milk pudding?—Yes; in the afternoon they

have tea and bread and butter, and at night porridge and milk.

8370. They make a lot of weight on that?—They generally put up from 2 lb. to 3 lb. a week. I think, else, that is the ordinary sanatorium treatment.

8371. Mr. LIVERY.—Have you been through our workhouse?—I have.

8372. Have you been through the infirmary?—I have.

8373. You have some experience of a number of workhouses in the county. How do you think our infirmary would compare with the other workhouses?—The last time I saw it, it would not compare at all; I must say that there is a great change to-day. Within the last four or five months there have been great changes.

8374. Is it an efficient infirmary at present?—It is very nice.

8375. Would you call a workhouse that was drained with mason-work drains and had not a water supply an efficient workhouse?—An abomination; but we have no drainage in my workhouse; we have no drainage nor water.

The Sitting terminated.

SEVENTEENTH PUBLIC SITTING—THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 26TH, 1903. Dec. 30, 1903

At the Courthouse, Cavan.

Present:—Mr. MICKS, (Chairman), Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. COOT BODGER.

Mr. PATRICK M'MANUS examined.

3376. CHAIRMAN—You are the Chairman of the County Council of Cavan?—Yes.

3377. You are aware that there are three workhouses situated in the county?—Yes.

3378. And there are portions of other unions?—Yes—Enniskillen, Granard, Omeonia, and Cooteshill.

3379. Cooteshill Workhouse is in the county?—It is, but it has a connection with Monaghan.

3380. Have you any feeling in favour of or against amalgamating the existing number of workhouses, there being four in the county?—Well, sir, it is a matter I have given very little thought to; personally, I have not given sufficient thought to it to give a proper answer; I am, in fact, divided as to whether amalgamation on a wholesale scale would suit this county or not—that is to say that I believe it would be difficult to take a patient from the portion that is in the Enniskillen Union to this union.

3381. I was just going to explain that to you. If you found the result of amalgamation might be the closing of workhouses and the reduction of the staffs, while providing at convenient distant centres small hospitals where those who could not be moved easily could be treated, would you see very much objection to the amalgamation of unions if you could secure a very large saving in the rates?—I would go for a saving in the rates, but I am not convinced that there would be a great saving. If my memory is correct, I remember some years ago when the amalgamation of prisons took place, and I am not convinced that there was so much saving to the ratepayers as is asserted of that, and, failing that, I don't see—

3382. The prison had not a very large or expensive staff; you had a governor, who was not a very highly paid official, and a number of warders?—Yes; but those warders when they went out had pensions, and were nearly as expensive to the ratepayers as when they remained in office.

3383. A great many of these have dropped off?—A good many have.

3384. And the pension is a disappearing charge?—It is.

3385. Would your feeling be rather against amalgamation than in favour of it?—On the lines you have pointed out I would be in favour of amalgamation, but not on a wholesale scale.

3386. If cottage hospitals could be substituted for a workhouse, say, on the borders of the county, or here, or wherever found desirable?—I believe that it would be a very good thing to have amalgamation on a limited scale.

3387. For instance, wherever there is a workhouse now you might safely rely on having a hospital?—That is a portion that would be reserved for that purpose.

3388. Supposing that was done, say at Cooteshill, or any place where there was a workhouse; suppose an infirmary hospital was maintained to deal with really cases of sickness?—In that case I think the amalgamation would be of advantage.

3389. You have been connected with Poor Law administration?—No; never.

3390. Was there any question, in addition to those I have put to you, that occurred to you?—There is one point I have a very strong feeling on—that is the sweeps who go, from day to day, and from year to year, round the country; take the tallest-singer class, those who sell hoodies and other little things; they come in here the night before the fair, they go round the town, and spend what they get in drink, and then they go to the workhouse; then the next morning they may have

a few pence left, and one portion of the family will be begging, the other will be selling hoodies and other little things of the kind, and the result is that they are either brought to the police barracks or go to the workhouse again. I think some means should and ought to be devised to do away with that class of person.

3391. Do you see a good deal of that in the local courts?—Not so much in the local courts as on the evening before the fair or on the morning of the fair; they don't, as a rule, be brought before the police court, because they are a class you cannot get anything from; the only thing you can do is dismiss them with a caution to leave town before a certain time. I think some means should be devised to punish that class of person. I don't want to convey that they are all of that class, for there are many industrious tradesmen out of work for a time amongst them.

3392. You know there are?—Yes; I know there are from time to time. I don't mean that class of person, but I mean people that I know for the last twenty-five or thirty years coming into the town, and I think they certainly don't contribute to the character of the unions.

3393. Or the welfare of the country?—Or the welfare of the country either.

3394. Have you any opinion about whether children ought to be allowed to remain in workhouses?—I think not; I would rather see them out from the workhouse altogether. I think if I was any way in authority in the matter I would be inclined to pay almost double to have these children brought up outside altogether.

3395. Are you aware that it costs perhaps less than half to have them brought up outside?—I am not aware what it costs, but if it cost double I would be inclined to have these children brought up outside the workhouse altogether as soon as they would be able to leave their mothers.

3396. The law as it exists does not allow Boards of Guardians to separate children from their parent or parents; if the mother of an illegitimate child was, as in some cases they are, not a desirable person to have charge of children, who remains in the workhouse and the children with her; would you be in favour of an amendment of the law which would give to the Board of Guardians discretion to board out such children?—Decidedly.

3397. As regards how to treat women of that class, at present as soon as a poor girl gets in the family way she goes a few months beforehand, as a rule, to the workhouse—as soon as she can no longer remain out with decency she goes to the workhouse—and remains there until her child is born, and for months afterwards, and, unfortunately, experience shows that she very often returns to the workhouse with other children; would you be in favour, instead of receiving these women into the workhouse, of sending them to a religious penitentiary?—I would.

3398. Where efforts could be made for their reclamation?—I would be strongly in favour of it.

3399. And, as a ratepayer and as a county official, you think it would be a prudent expenditure of the rates to pay about the same amount in the penitentiary as these women now cost in the workhouse?—I would be willing to pay more as a ratepayer to have them removed from all source of danger.

3400. Would not that be likely to make the workhouse a hospital?—It would virtually become a hospital, an aged and infirm refuge—which would make it less objectionable to decent people to be in?—I believe so.

Mr. Patrick M'Manus.

Nov. 26, 1902

Mr. Thomas
McGovern,

Mr. THOMAS MCGOVERN, M.P., examined.

8401. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the County Council?—Yes.

8402. And Parliamentary representative?—Of West Cavan; and I am also Deputy Vice-Chairman of Enniskillen Union.

8403. And you are a member of the Bawnboy Board of Guardians?—Yes.

8404. You have heard the questions that I was putting in a general way to the Chairman of your County Council?—Yes; but I did not catch the answers in some cases.

8405. One question that I was speaking to him about was whether some workhouses in the county might not, with advantage, be broken up?—Yes; I consider so; I have a good general knowledge of Fermanagh and Cavan. Can I go into Fermanagh?

8406. So far as it relates to Cavan?—I wanted to give evidence at Enniskillen, but now I would wish to make a general statement. I am in favour of amalgamating a number of workhouses; I think there are far too many workhouses at present in existence, considering the number of inmates in them, and the only thing is that in some cases, although the inmates are very few, owing to the position of the workhouse, it would not be may to do away or amalgamate it with a neighbouring union. I am in favour, generally, of amalgamation; I consider that Bawnboy Workhouse should be turned into an auxiliary lunatic asylum if possible, in order to save the ratespayers of the county much expenditure in building a new asylum, but what I object to is this, that the contribution to the auxiliary asylum is only 2s. per head for each inmate, contributed by the Government, whereas it is 4s. in the ordinary asylum. I think that is very hard upon an auxiliary asylum, and I think that the law should be changed. I don't see the difference in supporting a lunatic in an auxiliary asylum from supporting him in an ordinary asylum, and I think the Government should contribute as much as an auxiliary asylum per head as they contribute at present to the ordinary asylum.

8407. You think that the smaller rate of contribution is likely to prevent people from taking full advantage of the provisions for establishing an auxiliary asylum?—I am quite certain it is, because they look to the cost and what they would lose by transferring these persons from ordinary asylums into auxiliary. But in case Bawnboy could not be converted into an asylum or any useful purpose, it would be a great pity to let the house go to waste; the site is very good, and I would be in favour of extending the bounds of Bawnboy Union and taking in that portion of Lisnaskea to the west of Lough Erne, the barony of Knocknagilly—that is all in Lisnaskea except four townlands—part of Cavan Union, Ardara Electoral Division lies near Bawnboy, and there are some divisions in the County Leitrim in the neighbourhood of Ballinamore that could be easily annexed.

8408. Now, in the Mehill Union?—Yes; and one in Carrick-on-Shannon—the district division of Castlefore; I think Lisnaskea Union should be amalgamated with Enniskillen and Bawnboy. I think it would be an advantage to the poor as the west side of Lough Erne to be amalgamated with Bawnboy, and I believe there are facilities enough; it would incur no hardship on the other side of the lake to go to Enniskillen.

8409. I asked questions in that point of view at Enniskillen to try and find out whether the transport of the sick across the ferries was attended by any risk or discomfort or danger; they did seem to think it was, and they told me it was quite impossible to remove the sick from Derrylin to Bawnboy; do you agree with that view?—No; they have the best of roads from Knocknagilly to Bawnboy.

8410. It is not as bad a road as the Glas Gap?—Not at all; it is quite a different country altogether. As you mention Glas, which is part of Cavan, the Guardians of Bawnboy Union are totally opposed to taking in Glas, and the Glas people are totally opposed to coming to Bawnboy, and I think it would be inconvenient for them to come to Bawnboy; Enniskillen is their proper market town. I think Cooteshill Union could be amalgamated; there is no necessity at all for it; the furthest part of Cooteshill is scarcely more than ten miles from Cavan Union. I am speaking in the presence of local gentlemen who know more than I do about the locality, but as far as I can see on the map there is no necessity for a union in Cooteshill, and

there is no difficulty whatever in bringing persons from Cooteshill to Cavan Workhouse. There are five divisions of Granded Union in this county; it is the unanimous wish of the people of those divisions that they should come here; at least they came before the County Council from time to time, and we passed resolutions in favour of amalgamating them. However, I am in favour of one union for the county being set apart for able-bodied people. I think those other unions should not admit able-bodied paupers or tramps; I think the tramps are a great nuisance, and I think the law with regard to them should be changed in Ireland to what it is in England. I have heard it stated, and I believe it to be true, that the tramps in an English workhouse can be detained for forty-eight hours or three days.

8411. According to the number of their previous visits?—I think that would be a very useful reform, because they are certainly a nuisance.

8412. That is, you would have the same law for this country as for England?—Exactly. I would be in favour of amalgamating Bawnboy, but it is a very long stretch of country from this to Enniskillen, and I am afraid, though you might amalgamate it, if it could be converted into a useful purpose it would be better; still, if you cannot, I would be in favour of retaining it and extending the boundaries, as I stated before.

8413. If you did break up the Bawnboy Union would you think it necessary to keep a hospital there?—Absolutely necessary in the interests of the sick poor. Then the question would arise as to where portions of the Bawnboy Union should go if we amalgamate; formerly part of it belonged to Enniskillen.

8414. You have already answered a great deal of that yourself by saying that all the able-bodied should go to one workhouse and a hospital should be kept there for the sick, so you would only have the women with illegitimate children and the lunatics, practically, to consider?—I think the law should be changed with regard to lunatics, and there should be no lunatics at all in the workhouse.

8415. Then about the women with illegitimate children; did you hear the questions I asked?—I heard some of them; I agree with your suggestions. It struck me it would be a very good idea to send them to a religious institution, where they would be reformed, and not to put them in a workhouse with worse characters than themselves.

8416. Then that would practically deal with all the cases you have here, the sick still remaining at Bawnboy; you would have the able-bodied remaining at a central workhouse and the women going to the penitentiaries, from which their children would be boarded out at the expense of the rate?—Yes; I am in favour of boarding out the children; we have followed it in Enniskillen and Bawnboy. I think there are only six or seven in Bawnboy, and I cannot say how many in Enniskillen, but in every case where it was possible to put out the children of late years they have been sent out to Enniskillen, and I think it is a very good idea.

8417. As regards tramps, would you do anything except assimilating the law to that of England?—I think it would be quite sufficient; they make these workhouses their lodging-houses.

8418. You would not go to what might be thought a rather rigorous remedy—for the police to put them in the lock-up every night. That has been proposed by a great many witnesses?—I don't think it would have much effect. I think tramps should only be admitted to one general workhouse for the county at Enniskillen for Fermanagh, and Cavan for Cavan, and that the Master should have power to detain them for two or three days; you would have very few of them, because they make it their stations going to fairs and meetings.

8419. What do you think would happen if they did not go into workhouses; do you think they would stop going round or betake themselves to farmers' haggards and outbuildings, and be perhaps more objectionable there than in workhouses?—I don't think so; I think the law would be able to deal with them so far as going into people's premises, and I think it would have the effect of reducing the number considerably in a very short time; it is in order to save money for drink that they go into these places. I was going to remark about the question of medical relief; I don't know whether it comes under your Commission.

Nov. 26, 1902.

Mr. Thomas
McGeer.

9423. It may come indirectly, but not directly?—I think the present dispensary districts should be rearranged in many cases, and as doctors are looking for such high salaries they should get more to do; I have just been looking over a return yesterday and I find it is wonderful the decrease that has been in the business of the doctors; I suppose you have this return yourself.

9424. This would hardly come into our Inquiry; if we let in such evidence as that we would have to let the doctors come up and explain how very insufficiently paid they are, and that is a subject that has been expressly withheld from this Commission, but there are some aspects of medical relief that do properly come in—the provision for curing the sick in hospitals, and perhaps establishing district nursing with a view of taking care of many sick people in their own homes, and so making it unnecessary for them to go to hospitals. That, in the opinion of a great many people, leads to economy. If you had a nurse in every dispensary district, as you have a doctor, she would go round and attend to the sick in their own homes, parlours and passages, or anything of the sort that has to be done under the doctor's direction, and that would often render it unnecessary for the outpatients to go to the expense of removing a patient and treating him in a hospital.—Yes, if we had such institutions in existence; but I thought it was your province to inquire into relief under the Medical Charities Act, and what I wish to call your attention to is the great decrease in the number of poor people attended by doctors as compared with what it was fifty years ago. I find it is 50 per cent. less, and they are looking for nearly 100 per cent. more in salaries. I would be in favour of giving the doctor a good salary, but I would be in favour of making him work for it.

9425. You don't want to have more people sick?—No; but it would be only natural to think that they should do more work if they want more pay.

9426. Dr. BURNER.—Don't you think there is a decrease in private patients and fewer people in the country?—I don't think so; I think the private practice of every doctor has increased instead of decreasing.

9427. Do you know that many of them don't get £50 a year from private practice?—I would be surprised to hear that.

9428. CHAIRMAN.—I could give you a long string of men who don't get £10, but that is in the extreme western districts—I would be in favour of paying a doctor what he could live on, but he should do more work.

9429. Dr. BURNER.—You would give him the same remuneration as he received twenty years ago?—I would give him more—what would enable him to live—but I would expect he would have a larger district to attend to.

9430. Do you know that many of the country doctors now have practically nothing except what they receive from their appointments?—I would not say that—not in the part of the country I am acquainted with; it may be in other parts.

9431. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose a doctor in a remote district like Glen would not pick up very much in the way of private practice?—It would depend upon what the people thought of him; if he had the name of being a clever man plenty of people would call him in; they are as well off in Glen, comparatively speaking, as in Glasgow; a good deal of that is in the hands of the country. I think they should be made pay something—just a guinea a visit. We made a state of fees in Burnside that was very moderate, and any poor man could comply with it without injustice to the doctors, and the doctors made in and agreed to it. I don't know how it is working.

9432. Dr. BURNER.—It is not working at present; it is given up!—The board agreed to it, and the parties and the doctors agreed to it, and I thought it was very reasonable; that was my idea.

9433. I don't know for what reason it dropped through, but it dropped through for some cause; the arrangement was a very good one—I think so; there are very few farmers but ought to pay less or more.

9434. And that would, at the same time, relieve the rates?—Exactly; I think it should be insisted upon, but I think the system of red tickets should be changed altogether, and there should be a small fee upon each ticket, where the person issuing the ticket considered that the man who was getting it was able to pay he should make on the ticket the amount of the fee.

9435. CHAIRMAN.—That is rather an invidious job?—I don't think so.

9436. Would you object to do it yourself?—I would not, but I am different from other people, you know.

9437. I would feel a little shy in doing that?—If you did it this way—make a certain scale for a certain valuation.

9438. You might know that a man had a big family?—You would have to leave it to the person issuing the ticket to say whether he should pay, and how much. You might meet a man with £10 valuation poorer than a man with £5; I admit that, but after all property has its duties, and you must make some rule.

9439. Mr. MURRAY.—Is your principal objection to an auxiliary system that it is more costly than a lunatic asylum proper?—Yes, that is my objection; that the asylum grant is reduced from 4s. to 2s., although it takes the same amount, practically, to support them and keep them there the Government only gives 2s.

9440. For instance, if the asylum was full, do you not think it would be as much in the interests of the ratepayers to take up one of these diseased workhouses and put the chronic cases and the harmless lunatics there as it would be to put new buildings to the existing asylums, even though the contribution from the Government is only half?—I went into the matter very carefully with regard to the very hot question at present before the ratepayers of Green and Monaghan, and when I made a calculation I found it would be as cheap, in my opinion, to put up new buildings as to take over the harmless lunatics and have the asylum grant reduced from 4s. to 2s.

9441. But you must take into consideration that some of these chronic cases won't be as costly—that they can be supervised at a lower cost—the number of attendances won't need to be so many, and, in addition to that, the advantages to these people to be separated from what you would call the more violent cases—that is a very great advantage on the ground of humanity?—Yes; but if you had proper asylums there should be a better classification like, and you forget that if you establish an auxiliary asylum you will have to pay medical officers, and the cost of attendance will be very little difference in the end, and when you are only allowed 2s. instead of 4s., the 2s. expended would more than pay for the expense of putting up the buildings, and I think that until the Government gives the same grant to auxiliary that it does at present to the ordinary asylums the advantages of establishing sanatoriums will not be availed of; that is my idea.

9442. CHAIRMAN.—You prefer building a little at the parent house?—It would be cheaper in the end; you would find it would. I have gone into the thing pretty extensively as far as I could; in my opinion it would be cheaper to build.

9443. Mr. MURRAY.—While it might be a little cheaper, do you not think it would be much better to have these poor people separated from the violent cases and kept somewhere by themselves, where they would not be disturbed by the noise and violence of the inmates who are really dangerous?—I think if the inmates are properly classified, even in the present asylum, they should not have them mixed up the way they are in Monaghan—they have not the place to classify them properly. But take it this way: supposing you have 300 patients in the asylum, that you could transfer to the auxiliary—that is £10 a week, that is £300 a year—you get less for those 300 patients than you would in the ordinary asylum, and when you look at it that way you see the cost overcomes the profit.

9444. Still with all, do you think it is a good thing to gather together a large congregation of these people?—No; I am totally opposed to that.

9445. CHAIRMAN.—You are nearly in favour of getting 4s. instead of 2s.?—That is my objection.

9446. Mr. MURRAY.—Perhaps you yourself might be able to make some impression on the Treasury and get them to change the system?—I am glad to see you on the Commission; you will be able, I hope, to convert Mr. Wyndham or some of the Lords of the Treasury to your view.

9447. You mentioned something about dispensary areas; now, the question has been raised in some other counties as to the area, not only for taxation, but for representation for Poor Law purposes; how would that meet your view—that is the dispensary district to be the unit for Poor Law management instead of the electoral division or the union?—I am totally opposed to any charge except on the union for Poor Law Relief, but for special purposes I think the present system is not the proper system; but that, of course, is a rural district question.

Nov. 16, 1902,
Mr. Thomas
M. O'Brien.

8445. You think in the Poor Law the electoral division is too small?—I do; it was most unjust to have a man on one side of the district paying 2s. in the 2 and a man on the other side paying 1s.

8446. Perhaps the man paying 1s. in the 2 was in a better division, with better land, and better-off people, than the man paying 1s.—I think union rating is the proper thing.

8447. Perhaps the man paying 1s. in the 2 was in a union amalgamation of unions that will mean the wiping out of unions in certain localities; how are those localities to be represented in the amalgamated unions; would you still continue electoral division representation or would a change to dispensary representation be more suitable?

8448. CHAIRMAN.—So as to have fewer Guardians?—I would have fewer Guardians; I would reduce them by one-half.

8449. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—It has been stated there would be great difficulty to get Guardians to go a distance to look after the interests of their particular place, and the suggestion has been made that instead of electoral divisions as a representative area it should be changed to the dispensary area, and have a certain number of Guardians; for instance, if you had three or five from that dispensary area looking after the interests of the poor, in the case of an amalgamation of unions, if there was only one in Caran, it would be very difficult to get a representative of each electoral division to come to Caran, and we want to get over the difficulty; and, from a man of your great experience, we would like to have some advice—I think there are far too many Guardians, and one, at least, would be quite sufficient for an electoral division; there are some of the electoral divisions under a certain valuation that should be amalgamated with another division; that is the way you would reduce them; but I would not go in for giving representation to dispensary districts.

8450. CHAIRMAN.—Dispensary districts are made up of a group of electoral divisions—I know they are; it is a very good idea.

8451. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—The suggestion has been made, and we would like to get opinions from men like you—I would approve of it, because it would be impossible to get men from Bawnboy or Ballyconnell to come up here regularly to Caran, as they should come; the idea is a good one to have representation by dispensary districts.

8452. It is only by sifting the corn we will get at the kernel—I have never thought over the subject before; what I thought over was to reduce the present representation and have only one Guardian for each division, and with very small divisions to amalgamate them; I would have no division less than £1,000 of a rating.

8453. Would you go on the question of rating more than of population, or would you take both together?—They generally go together in our union, because they are all small holdings of a uniform nature in Caran.

8454. And for rating purposes you would prefer union instead of dispensary or electoral divisions—that is for Poor Law purposes?—Oh, yes.

8455. How would it strike you to have a county rate for Poor Law purposes?—I think that is too wide; there ought to be some supervision. The great difficulty in the Local Government Act is that the County Council are the fiscal authority in the county; they have to strike a rate and make it, and they have no supervision, or they have no control, over the Board of Guardians in spending the money, as they cannot object to any money the Board of Guardians spend.

8456. Would you like to see the County Council having a control?—Yes; there should be some controlling power in its hands over the expenditure of the rates it strikes and levies.

8457. Then if a county rate was adopted the County Council would have it all in their own hands?—Yes; but I would not charge the poor rate to a county rate unless the County Council had power to supervise the expenditure of it.

8458. If there was any change the assessing body would be bound to have the supervision?—The County Council is the assessing body at present, and have no power.

8459. No; the Guardians are the people to make the demand; the County Council are simply purveyors; they give the money that is asked for?—They have to give it.

8460. It is the Guardians really who levy the rate; of course, the County Council collect it; but it occurred

to me to ask you would you go as far as a county rate for Poor Law purposes?—Not unless the County Council had some control over the expenditure.

8461. As it would be bound to have in some one change was made, would you then go for a county rate instead of an electoral division, dispensary, or union rate?—I think we would have more economical expenditure by having union rating. Now, for instance, what would a man at Swinburn know about what they were doing at Rathfriland?—It is further of Swinburn in one way than Dublin, because there is no direct communication with it. I think the people who strike the rate or assess it should know what it was for.

8462. CHAIRMAN.—Before you leave just that question you say you would leave the union rate to be administered by the union. We are hearing in mind your suggestion that there should be practically only one union for the county?—For shill-bodied inmates, I said.

8463. You would not have a Board of Guardians except for the management of small hospitals; would you enlarge the unions?—I don't see how you can do without some local management.

8464. A Board of Guardians?—Who would manage the hospital if the local board did not?

8465. That is exactly what I was wanting to come to.

Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Something like a dispensary committee?—Exactly.

8466. CHAIRMAN.—What I was coming to was committees under the County Council; if you had a county rate and had committees of the County Council, as you have now for the infirmaries, with power, as is suggested by section 90 of the Act of 1893 to have district hospitals with committees partly nominated by the representative bodies, say the County Council, and partly consisting of persons from the locally co-opted, would you approve of such management so that I would prefer to leave it in the hands of the elected bodies?

8467. Altogether?—No. I think there ought to be power to co-opt or appoint persons outside the elected body—representative people in the locality that would extend to the thing. I think it would be a great mistake to leave it altogether. I think these people co-opted are often the very best men on a body like that.

8468. Quite so; they are selected for their special fitness?—Yes.

8469. In the case of a county committee for an infirmary, is it your experience that that works well?—I have never been on the County Infirmary Committee; I believe it does. As far as I have heard I believe it works well in this county.

8470. You don't, from a democratic or other point of view, see any objection to such a committee composed of representative ratepayers with power to that committee to co-opt others?—I see no objection to that course; some of the very best people in the locality are often left out at elections.

8471. As regards the county rate, you are rather afraid that it would lead to expensive management, are you?—Yes; that is what I am afraid of; that it would lead to expensive expenditure in some places, because they would say, "What signifies it; it won't come on our district; it will come on the whole county."

8472. Take the far ends of Caran—the two distant ends—they know nothing of each other?—Well, generally, when the Guardians meet they are able to explain to other members that don't know the reasons for the course they are adopting in asking for relief or the like of that.

8473. Take the County Council, which deals with the whole of the county; the requirements of the employers or people who want public works done in one end of the county are not known by the County Council from the other end of the county?—What we do in this county is this: we leave that question to the councillors of the district.

8474. Could you not do that with the Poor Law?—Enough where there comes up some person to oppose the work, we pass that as a matter of course, but if there is a strong opposition or feeling against the work we hear the people from the locality at the County Council.

8475. Could you not do that with the Poor Law expenditure, being guided very largely by the views of the persons from the locality concerned?—You see the

district Councils have to bear the cost of the works in their district, and that is the reason we leave it to them.

6476. Would you think it would be a safeguard against profuse or careless expenditure if part of the expenditure, say half, were levied locally, and some-what in the same way that the old tithes and county-charge changes used to be done?—You would find that a rather complicated system; we are not enough as we are without adding still further complications to the system of county accounts.

6477. You would prefer the union rate. There is another matter. We have a large number of grants from the Government in aid of local taxation; do you approve of the present system of distribution of those grants; for instance, would you approve of a very large and wealthy union receiving a very large and heavy grant in aid, while a poor district in the extreme west of the country, with a valuation, say of £10,000 a year, maintained a workhouse and establishment on that sum, and got hardly any contribution from the Government; do you think that is a proper system of distribution—to give a good deal to the rich and very little to the poor?—I think the present system of contributions from the Treasury should be revised; I think there is a good deal in that very point; I have been thinking of it; some of the unions that want most get least; I think the law should be changed in that respect, but under the present law you cannot do it.

6478. It is a case of change of law, of course—a more equitable distribution of Government grants should be made?—That is my idea. For instance, unions in Meath and Kildare that require very little get far more than unions in the west of Connaught and in the mountains, and I believe it is worse in Mayo and Donegal.

6479. It is worse there; a union rate in Belmullet of 1d. in the £ produces less than 250 a year?—Oh, yes!

Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Whereas 1d. in an average union would produce £200; so that Board of Guardians has to pay 10d. for every 1d. the average union has to pay when it does anything.

6480. CHAIRMAN.—An increase in the doctor's salary of £50 would mean 1d. over the entire union; would you not think that some assistance to unions in that position, some more equitable apportionment of grants, should be made?—I am in favour of changing the present system; I think it is very unfair the way the Treasury is acting in regard even to the doctors' salary at the present time.

6481. I don't think the Treasury have been approached in that matter; they give a lump sum, and there was never any question of the distribution.—There was a question in the House of Commons, and they know very well that they are doing an injustice to the people of Ireland, as far as the medical charities are concerned.

6482. I am speaking of the grants in aid of Poor Law expenditure; it does not matter to the Treasury, they would never give a penny more; it would merely mean a shifting of the apportionment?—I think the Treasury ought to contribute under the Medical Charities Act what the law lays down, and not be standing to what the doctors got fifty years ago.

6483. Is it what they got in the year 1828—that is only a year ago?—Even so, a great many unions since that period have given more, and it is a great hardship on those unions if the Guardians think they are only doing justice to say they will get no recompense more than they have got hitherto. I think the Poor Law Commissioners are far more anxious to please the interests of the English Treasury than those of the Irish magistrates.

6484. You have not had the pleasure of meeting us very often?—I have had the experience of talking to you at a distance by letter, and I thought you were far more anxious to save the English Treasury than the Irish magistrates.

6485. You don't do us half justice?—I may be prejudiced against you, but I am only giving my views.

6486. You suggest one workhouse for the able-bodied; did you think at all of carrying that separation of workhouses according to classes; did you think of carrying that any further; did you think it would be possible; it has been suggested it might be possible to have in a county one workhouse for able-bodied, another workhouse for children, another workhouse for aged and infirm, and another workhouse, we will say, for lunatics; did you think of any such further extension of the principle?—I would be in favour of having separate workhouses for lunatics and children, but I

am in favour of boarding out the children, and I don't think there is any necessity for a workhouse for children. I am in favour of having those epileptics and harmless lunatics in one place if possible.

6487. If you get 4s. 1—Oh, certainly, if we get 4s. by all means; but I am also in favour of putting able-bodied inmates in one workhouse—there are very few at present in any workhouse. I think there would be no difficulty in a central institution charging the districts which those able-bodied inmates came from with the cost of them, and sending down a demand.

6488. If there was a county rate it would be simple?—It would be a different thing, but as I am not in favour of a county rate I am only talking from my own point of view; I think they could send down a demand to the union that these able-bodied paupers came from and make them pay the cost of their maintenance in a central establishment.

6489. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—"Able-bodied" seems to be a misnomer, because, really, as far as we have gone there are hardly any able-bodied inmates in houses except mothers of children; when we speak about able-bodied it is really old and infirm?—I would not be in favour of changing the old and infirm from the locality in which they were reared, or broken down in, because it would be very hard on them.

6490. If you did that you could not bring about any reform or any improvement without additional cost. How is that going to be managed unless you concentrate these people into one locality and get rid of the upkeep of the boarding?—I don't mean the aged and infirm; I made a mistake; the sick poor; I would not remove them, but the people who could bear the journey to Connaught, let them be removed.

6491. It is generally recognised that there should be some accommodation for the sick in the localities in which there is accommodation at present, or even that there should be accommodation provided in some localities where there is no accommodation at present. Do you not think that one institution in the County Connaught would be sufficient for the people classed as able-bodied but who are really old and infirm?—Yes; I think one institution would be quite enough.

6492. About the question of tramps, you seem to have a very clear idea on that point; do you think it would be necessary to do anything more than to have extended to Ireland the law as it exists in England, so as to give the Guardians the power of detention for a certain period, say three days, and during that time make them work?—If you abolish these small workhouses—Barnaby and Oxtelhill—you will have no workhouses from Enniskillen to Connaught, and in that case I think it would be quite enough to give them the same power as the Boards of Guardians have in England to deal with tramps, and you would find they would get very few and far between in some years.

6493. You don't see any danger in those people going into outhouses or sleeping on the way and frightening children?—Not a bit; the people in the country won't allow them to stop about their places, and the law is well able to deal with any crime or delinquency.

6494. You think that the fact that the tramps know they can be detained there for some time will prevent them coming?—Quite enough; they will avoid it.

6495. How do you administer outdoor relief in your union?—On the application of the party who requires it and the report of the relieving officer.

6496. Do you find it is a growing charge?—They have been giving, practically, the same amount in Barnaby for the last ten years. In Enniskillen it is growing a little, but they don't give relief there as much as they do in Barnaby, taking the size of the union and the number of inhabitants into consideration.

6497. Do you think it is a useful form of assistance?—In some cases, and in many cases it is abused.

6498. Would you like to see it done away with?—No; but the Board of Guardians should exercise some supervision, and not give relief in such an indiscriminate manner as is now done.

6499. How do they act in your union?—If there is a poor man in a certain district he will go to the Guardian before the board-day and speak to him to get him outdoor relief, or he will get up a memorial signed by the responsible inhabitants of the locality and send it into the board, asking for relief; then the relieving officer goes and makes a report; there may be temporary relief given, but the relieving officer is bound in every case to see the party and report at the next board meeting.

6500. And the Guardians next day decide whether the relieving officer's report should be adopted or not?

Nov. 26, 1863.

Mr. Thomas
McGovern.

Nov. 26, 1903.
—
Mr. Thomas
McGowan.

—Yes. In Enniskillen there was a rule that some of the dispensary doctors or some medical doctor should give a certificate that the person was unable to be removed to the workhouse, but that has not been adhered to of late years in Enniskillen.

8501. Would you approve of offering strictly to that? —Well, really, I think the Guardians should have a free hand, although they go astray in some cases and don't exercise proper supervision; these people come at the Guardians and put local pressure on them to give outdoor relief.

8502. Do you know the amount in your union?—It is about £200 a year.

CHAIRMAN.—It was £206 for the last audited year I have—for the year ended 31st of March, 1901.

8503. Mr. MCKENNAHAN.—That is not a large sum?—But our union is a very small one; they give small sums.

8504. Do you board out all the children you can?—Certainly.

8505. Do you find it a satisfactory system?—Yes; the children are much better; they become useful members of society, and if they are reared in the workhouse they are good for nothing; that is my experience of them.

8506. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose it would be very difficult to get any perfect system for administering outdoor relief under the present law—I mean if Boards of Guardians are to give outdoor relief?—If the Boards of Guardians are to give outdoor relief at all they should mean the power in their own hands. The question of whether the applicant is fit to be removed should be in the hands of the doctor.

8507. Would you think at all of the Boards of Guardians placing the responsibility of the law would so enable them—placing the responsibility on the paid officer—the relieving officer—of the Guardians, and leaving it on him: would not the result be that the members of the Boards of Guardians would then be put in the position rather of critics and scoundrels of the action he might adopt, and that they would censure either too profuse or too niggardly an administration?—I would not be in favour of giving any relieving officer full power to give relief as he thought proper; you would be going from a bad state of things to a worse one.

8508. He would do it with a full knowledge that wrong administration would mean the loss of his situation and a surcharge from a gentleman called the auditor?—That might have a deterrent effect on him; otherwise I don't see how you could control him at all when he would be master of the situation.

8509. He would be master of the situation just the same way as an engine has power to go ahead as long as it keeps on the lines?—Yes; but you would find that an auditor might have a difficulty in surcharging him where there were great abuses. I don't think the Guardians would wish or should wish to part with the power of spending their own money; they are very jealous of their powers.

8510. Unless they felt that owing to their only coming in once a week or once a fortnight, as the case might be, that they would not be in a position to consider and sift as thoroughly as applications for outdoor relief should be sifted, then they might say, "We cannot do this work ourselves, and we will put it on the shoulders of the man paid to do it, and see that he does it as far as our knowledge goes?"—But at present the relieving officer is bound to visit every case of outdoor relief.

8511. The responsibility is his, but the present system, as you have explained it, makes his position very little more than that of a paymaster?—I would not like to give authority to the relieving officer exclusively.

8512. Mr. MCKENNAHAN.—I suppose when the relieving officer reports the person is not destitute the Guardians refuse the grant?—Certainly; there is always a majority that will be swayed, less or more, by the report of the officer.

8513. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think he would like to go against a large section of the Guardians?—He is supposed to give a fair report; any Guardian can ask him

about the means of the person, and the Guardians present will consider whether he is a fit subject for relief.

8514. Do you mean a Guardian who brought forward an application for relief and was interested in it because he would rather receive an unfavourable report from the officer?—Quite so; but there is a good deal of independence among Guardians when there is a question of money; it touches all their pockets now.

8515. But still outdoor relief is going up—I do not think outdoor relief was increasing.

8516. It is increasing enormously?—There were some unions gave no relief until the passing of the Local Government Act, and the constitution of the Board have been so changed a good deal, and that would account for the increase in outdoor relief.

8517. I don't think that is so; really, we have been very much struck with the fact that in some of the workhouses we have raised in Ulster the relief was a little down?—I would not be surprised at all in Ulster, for heretofore they gave very little outdoor relief; there is a new social class of Guardians.

8518. There is one union in Ulster in which they give more than £5,000 a year in outdoor relief, and I don't suppose the house management would cost more than £1,500 a year?—These Guardians must be full of the milk of human kindness to give the money away that way.

8519. And it is one of the best manufacturing districts in Ireland?—I am surprised to hear it. I don't think it has increased so much in Enniskillen or Banbury; I don't think there has been any material increase; there has been some increase in Enniskillen, but not so much after all that you would wonder at it.

8520. Dr. BROWNE.—You mentioned you thought it was a desirable arrangement to have the County Infirmary managed by the County Council and a few co-opted members?—Yes; they have co-opted a number of members outside the County Council; there are only a certain number of the County Council on it; in fact I think they are in a minority upon the infirmary committee in Cavan.

8521. But still it was an elected body?—Oh, yes. 8522. Now, supposing Banbury and Oxted Infirmary were dissolved or amalgamated, and there were hospitals left there, would you think it would be a desirable arrangement to have these under the same body so that there might be an interchange of nursing staff, and so on?—I never went into details that way; I would be in favour of having an elected body and co-opted members joined with them; the County Council could do it.

8523. Mr. MCKENNAHAN.—You would want local bodies for these?—Yes.

8524. Dr. BROWNE.—Yes; two or three councils along with two or three others—I would keep them as far as possible county charges.

8525. There is portion of the County Council near Enniskillen, and at present those divisions are served by the Enniskillen Union.

8526. In case they remain as they are, would you think it a desirable arrangement that the County Council of Cavan should pay for poor patients sent from there to the County Infirmary in Enniskillen for special treatment?—I believe it is unfair to have patients from the Glen district treated in the County Infirmary, but they have a right to go to the union hospital, because they are part and parcel of the Enniskillen Union.

8527. For the very same reason that they go to the union hospital, but for some other cases it might be better they should go to the County Infirmary; would not the same reason hold good for payment to the County Infirmary?—The County Infirmary is a higher class institution than the union hospital, and I think that Cavan should contribute something to the expense of those patients in the County Infirmary; I think it would be unfair to make the Fermanagh people support them, because that is a county charge, and not a union charge.

8528. At present you are aware they cannot pay?—I know.

8529. But you would think it a desirable thing that they should be able to pay?—Yes; not only in Cavan but in every county in Ireland.

Dr. BEAN examined.

Nov. 26 1907.

Dr. Ryan

8531. CHAIRMAN.—You are anxious to give your evidence in order to get away?—Yes; I come all the way from Belfast, and we have to drive all the way; and, in the first place, I must beg a patient hearing, as my views on this question run more or less counter to the evidence you have already had. The general objections to amalgamation are that within the last ten years we have improved the condition of things in the workhouses very much, and, personally, I think it is rather a misfortune that the local bodies should be called upon to face so soon a fresh turning up of the arrangements that have been entered into.

8532. Sixty-five years ago?—I beg your pardon, no; I mean since the introduction of the Local Government Act; we have had new bodies and new administrations.

8533. We have nothing to do with that?—With the Poor Law portion of that.

8534. We are merely here in connection with the Board of Guardians which was established sixty-five years ago, and we don't propose, and have no power, in any way to revise or pull up or look at the arrangements made under the Local Government Act of 1888?—I think you misunderstand the scope of my observations. I simply say that the Board of Guardians, though you still call them a Board of Guardians, are quite a different lot of men under the Local Government Act, that they have done a good deal to improve the condition of the workhouses, and I think, personally, that it is a pity that the question of amalgamation should be started on them so soon; that is all I refer to on that subject.

8535. And as regards the County Council?—In particular.

8536. You don't think any workhouses in the County Council should be closed?—That is my opinion; the reason I advance in favour of that is that if you diminish the number of hospitals at all, no matter how well intentioned the result is, it will eventually in loss to the ratepayers or hardship to the poor—almost probably in both. It is quite possible that if we were building workhouses and hospitals now we might have a better arrangement and do with fewer of them, but if you are going to amalgamate the burden of poor law on those who say, given the hospitals and workhouses there are now, that any benefit either to the poor or the ratepayers will result from amalgamation. It is very easy to call the workhouses "dens of immorality" and "boarding-houses for the idle and dissolute," and "hotels for tramps and death-traps for inmates," and all that, but in my opinion you may as well abolish fever hospitals, because fever accumulates therein. In both cases I believe what you do is you spread the disease. Surely, if there is immorality it is better that half a dozen immoral people should be in the workhouse than scattered over the district. Then, with regard to the interests of the ratepayers, I think myself the idle and dissolute are very much better confined in a workhouse, where they are under official and even under police supervision, than that they should be wandering up and down the country. I was reading up the literature of this question, and I find that in 1842, reading the reports of the Poor Law Commissioners, that workhouses were actually built not for the poor but for beggars and tramps principally, and to get them confined in workhouses, and now after sixty-five years, having got them into workhouses, we are asked to keep them out of them; that is progress in a circle. In Kilmaleck Union the people were so infested with beggars and tramps that when the workhouses were opened they got all their poor to go into it by compulsion or persuasion, then the neighbouring poor or tramps came pouring in on them, and they found their last condition was worse than the first, because they had two sets of poor to support—one inside and the other black-balling outside—and they came to Kilmaleck Union and carried off their own poor in triumph to protect them from the inroads of the tramps from the surrounding country. And to such an extent did this nuisance of tramps exist at that time that in the various divisions—this is taken from the Blue Book—made and gave badges to the poor, authorizing certain poor people to beg in certain districts. The question really for the ratepayers is whether they are to support these classes inside or outside—the poor you always have with you, and the idle and the dissolute. To seek to get rid of the poor and idle by closing the workhouses is, to me, as rational as to seek to get rid of criminals by closing the jails. It is very curious

that whilst all manner and classes of people with the most philanthropic views are suggesting things for the material comfort of the sick and poor they have never asked the opinion of the poor inmates—the idea seems to be that if you feed and clothe a man better you have done everything for him; I don't think that is true. The people you have in workhouses are the very poor who are failures in life; life to them, no matter under what feeding or housing, is a better life, and it is my opinion that we have really gone in most unions far enough to meet the material wants of these people, and that if you really wish to make them more happy and contented the last thing you will do is to remove them from the unions and from the acres and the surroundings in which they have been reared, and in which they have lived for forty, fifty, or sixty years. And the most extraordinary thing to me is that this is urged in the guise of philanthropy. Take a poor man—he has fallen into the union—he thinks the world has treated him badly, and you take and say "I will give you a better coat in a union twenty miles away, and you will have more for your breakfast and more things for your dinner." You forget altogether that you take him from his surroundings; he will never hear a familiar voice or see a familiar face or a familiar scene; you may as well transport him, and not that alone, but when you have done with him you consign him to a pauper's grave in a foreign land. His friends will never come for his corpse. Now, as to the question of Irish workhouses being death-traps, I may tell you I take the credit of being one of the first workhouse reformers myself, and I take the credit for Curran that with Dr. Moorehead and a couple of doctors we were the first in 1895 to inaugurate an improvement in workhouse infirmaries by inviting the Local Commissioner, Miss Woods, to look at the Irish workhouses. At that time a number of very influential men proved that the death-rate in the Irish workhouses amounted to 250 per thousand, and they were denominated death-traps. Having a little taste for statistics I thought I would ask the clerk of my union to give the average age of death of people who died in Belfastborough Union outside the workhouse and also the average age at death of people who die within the workhouse, and I found that the average age of death of people who died in the workhouse was nearly twenty years over those who died outside. I invite anyone who wishes to live twenty years longer than anyone outside to come into my workhouse. No worth for statistics.

8537. Mr. MURKIN.—It might prove that more children are born outside and not many inside, and the death-rate is always higher among them?—Quite right; I assure you I was not as ridiculous as to draw such a conclusion from it, but the other conclusion was quite as ridiculous, because the sick, the sick, and infirm were in to die, and one conclusion was as ridiculous as the other. The general cry is there must be something done; granted, if the something is going to be better than what is, then we talk about the tramp nuisance. I would like to know from any gentleman what the tramp costs his union in the year. I have gone to the trouble of ascertaining what the tramps cost my union in the year; the average number of tramps in the union is about three per night; they cost about 4d. per night, that is 1s.; that is something less than £30 a year. Now one of those 300 or 1,000 tramps that would be out at night and accidentally or out of malice light a haystack in trying to get the shelter denied him in the workhouse, would cost the ratepayers of the union two, or three, or four times that amount. Or, again, let us take the same tramp, and let him steal a chicken, or a stone of potatoes, or a loaf of bread, and he would cost that individual ratepayer more than that individual ratepayer pays for tramps in ten years. That is the tramp nuisance. The workhouses being built to get rid of the tramp nuisance; now the workhouses are credited with the production of the tramp nuisance. Talking about the material benefit to the poor, my idea would be that we might turn a little more attention to their spiritual needs. After all, as I said a while ago, a workhouse life to the ordinary man is always hard, and unless you can impress on that man that there is another life in which the infelicitous that he either believes, or did actually occur to him in this life, will be redressed, and try to induce him to look forward to that, you will leave him still a hopeless man, even if you feed him better and clothe him better you do little for his happiness here, and nothing for him hereafter. I think the best guide to the future is the past. My

Dec. 25, 1900.

Dr. Ryan.

advice would be that for the happiness, and contentment, and material and general comfort also of those people that, as far as possible, they should be placed under the control of religious orders.

8537. CHAIRMAN.—You have been in the neighbouring workhouse of Carrickmacross?—I have. And, talking about Religious Orders, it is a curious thing that that Local Commissioner, Miss Woods, who came over here in 1895 or 1896 and went over nearly all the workhouses of Ireland—a great many of them, anyhow—

8538. About twenty out of 350?—I thought she did a good deal more; but the only workhouse of which she spoke with unreserved praise was the workhouse—

8539. Ballisborough?—No; on the contrary, she gave us as the second dirtiest place in Ireland. She came to me and let me know, but I let nobody know she was coming. I said, "I want you to paint us as we are, and enough extenuate or sugar coat down in malice." And she painted us as the second worst in Ireland, and we have got into the front rank since. No it was a workhouse near Dundora.

8540. Mr. MURPHY.—Ballisborough?—You are quite right. I made it my business to see that once when I was spending a short holiday at Dundora, and I think it deserved everything she said of it. It is under the care of the Sisters of Mercy—not only the sick, but the administration portion of it. Another argument against amalgamation is it must necessarily produce an increase in outdoor relief, and outdoor relief, whilst theoretically a most economical form, because you only pay one officer to distribute it all, is in practice, in my opinion, the most extravagant and demoralising manner in which the poor can be helped. And it also tends more to pauperism and the destruction of self-respect than any other system. The argument is made that it only costs 1s. 6d. for each pauper outside, but that if you bring him into the workhouse it will cost 4s. or 5s.; that argument is worthless. I would engage to support all the people on outdoor relief in my union or most unions—I would engage to support all above 10 per cent, who would come into the workhouse; I don't believe above 10 per cent of those on outdoor relief would come into the workhouse, even with the altered and improved conditions. Now, of course, all the arguments I state in regard to amalgamation in general apply a hundred-fold to any amalgamation or diminution of the number of hospitals in Ireland. In my opinion the number of hospitals in Ireland is not one too many, and I think it is a most retrograde step to contemplate in any way at all a diminution in the number of hospitals. By an increased expenditure on the material comfort of the patients, and in the nursing and medical and surgical appliances, we have got over, in a great measure, the objection of the poor, at least in a great many unions—I can say it for my own—of entering the workhouse hospitals, and when we have done that I think it is a most retrograde step to consider for a moment the abolition of any of these hospitals.

8541. CHAIRMAN.—Are all the parts of the country in your neighbourhood sufficiently served by hospitals, or do you think any additional hospitals would be desirable?—I have been thinking that matter over, but I think the question scarcely arises at this stage in my part of the country; we are surrounded by a number of small towns; we have Shercock, and Kingscourt, and Mullagh around us in our union, and I think the question may arise when we have settled this question and brought our present hospital up to the waste and demands on it, which I may say it is not because I have to refuse admission to patients at present. We had all the plans and specifications ready to go on with it four or five months ago, and the Local Government Board, in their wisdom, said "Wait until this Commission is over." So I hope the Commission will report soon. Now, with regard to the County Infirmary, I think it is a gross injustice to the taxpayers of the outlying portions of the county, which are generally the poor portions; I think it is a gross injustice that they should be obliged not only to support their own local poor and sick in their own hospitals, but at the same time contribute in the general county charge to the support of the County Infirmary. Now there are only two ways of removing that inequality—either level it up or level it down. I would be for levelling up; I would be for making all hospitals a county-at-large charge.

8542. The treatment of the sick?—Yes; a county-at-large charge.

8543. The tendency of that would be to bring into the infirmary as many of the aged and infirm as you

could reasonably manage, so as to get them off the local roads and put them on the county-at-large?—I think you may take it from me, as a doctor, that there is a very strong under-current and feeling in the part of medical men against having the infirm and old people in their hospitals, and I think that is a danger you can practically disregard.

8544. Not to have? Medical men object to have them?—Object to have them in the hospitals.

8545. But still the fact that they would be supported out of the rates of the county at large would operate, at all events, on some minds?—Of course I don't say that it is an absolutely groundless argument, but I think it is one of those arguments that, as they say in law, de minimis non curat lex, you can disregard as a small thing.

8546. In some workhouses we have seen less than twenty inmates, and in a workhouse studiously situated we have seen, perhaps, in the hospital fifty to sixty; that would be due altogether to the doctor's view of classification?—I don't think so; it is due to the doctor's view—unfortunately, in my case—of accommodation; if I had a larger hospital accommodation I would have some of my infirm poor in the hospital.

8547. How many have you in your hospital at present?—I think I have about forty in my beds.

8548. How many have you in Cootanhill?—Really, I don't think it is fair to ask me that.

Mr. MURPHY.—Twelve was the number last week.

8549. CHAIRMAN.—You see that it is due to the view of the medical men as to the qualification or as to the condition of the people whom he would admit into his sick wards?—No; I beg your pardon, I don't agree with you exactly. It may be one reason, but to say it is due to it altogether, or mainly, is in my opinion not so.

8550. Well, I would say the chief reason, I would fancy; but there are some wards actually with no beds in them that are used as day wards. You can understand that some unions would be getting a very big pall out of the county grant and others a very small one—I will tell you with regard to that too. I know it would take a very long time to right the injustice, because I have not met for twenty years ten patients from Ballisborough Union who have been treated in the Queen County Infirmary, and during my time I calculate that Ballisborough has contributed to the Queen County Infirmary a sum of £2,800.

8551. Dr. BROOKS.—Therefore you think it would be more equitable if your hospital or infirmary was kept up at the expense of the county?—Yes; and all the hospitals. There is another advantage from it, to which I wish to draw your attention; the poor would get an opportunity—of course, limited by distance—of selecting the doctor who would treat them. I would admit into those hospitals people from the whole county, as far as the limits of distance suited them, and in that way you would have a very healthy rivalry, and I think a desirable rivalry, between the various hospitals in bringing them up to date in every possible way—a rivalry you have not at all at present.

8552. CHAIRMAN.—Would you not be afraid there would be an undue rush to the dietary scale we saw the other day at Cootanhill—bacon and eggs for breakfast, and all that?—I am talking now of the sick poor; I don't think with the sick men coming in the important question—it is nursing, and medical and surgical treatment.

8553. Dr. BROOKS.—Do you think that would be desirable rivalry?—Yes.

8554. You don't think patients would go a long distance to their hospital unless there were good grounds for it?—That is my view. I don't think they would go for a good meal of roast and eggs.

8555. Their tendency would be to go to the nearest hospital where their friends could visit them, unless they want to get special advice?—Precisely.

8556. You mentioned something about keeping the infirm in workhouses?—I don't exactly mean that, but there they are, and it is much better you should keep them there than scatter them.

8557. Perhaps you did not hear the question the Chairman asked about allowing a woman with her first illegitimate child to go into some religious institution of the same denomination as herself?—I think it very desirable; in fact that is a better way of working out the idea in my mind that it is better not to scatter them.

8558. It is the same thing?—Yes; but does in what I consider a better way.

8592. CHAIRMAN.—Is there anything else you have a case of?—Having said so much against amalgamation in general, and as it is quite probable that my views against amalgamation in general will not prevail, I would be in favour of having these places that you close up converted into asylums for what are called harmless lunatics for the epileptic lunatics of our district, and for the schools. I am altogether in favour of the boarding out of children; I would even extend the boarding out of children to the children of persons in the workhouse, such as these unmarried mothers and others who are regular delinquents of the workhouse.

8593. Dr. BROOKS.—Under what safeguards?—I have not thought that out; I think it is very difficult to get the safeguard. Now, with regard to the boarding out of the aged and infirm, I am not in favour of that view. An old man is five, ten, or fifteen years in the workhouse; it is the only home he has; you put him out with strangers; I don't think his bodily comfort will be as well attended to. If you make a short residence in the workhouse a qualification for being boarded out it is quite possible that a number of people who are living with their friends now and assisting in their own support will be sent in to qualify and come out again with the qualification, and still assist their friends outside. In fact I regard this boarding-out question as a sort of side wind to get rid of the Old Age Pension and get on the local rates what we were told some time ago would be made an Imperial charge, and in fact it is simply outdoor relief with a tinge of Chamberlain in it. Now there are just two things that show the advisability of not changing merely for the purpose of change. There are two matters that have been changed by the Local Government Act in Poor Law administration that, I think, had much better been left as they were. The first of these is the chargeability of outdoor relief. At present—and the thing has not had time to develop to its fullest extent—you have an increase in the outdoor relief, that increase is bound to go on, because at present there is a rivalry between the various Guardians as to which district will have the most outdoor relief, and this rivalry, unfortunately, has been accentuated by the doubling of the number of Guardians under the Local Government Act, so that we have at present a system of outdoor relief which puts a premium on extravagance, and that comes with the other change that was made in Poor Law representation by the Local Government Act, and that is the doubling of the number of Guardians. This was done with some beneficent idea that the lion and the lamb would lie down together, but they did not; it is what you have got—a double dose of lamb and a double dose of lion in each electoral division.

8594. Mr. MURKHAM.—That is a mistake; the representation in the same as it was before the Act was passed—I quite agree with you; the representation is nominally the same, but it is really doubled, because out of the ex-officio not two in ten attended; you have the same number, but although they are nominally the same, what you have at present is you have a Board of Guardians composed of anything from thirty to nearly 100 individuals crammed into a room less than half the size of this, and if those men can economically or regularly and orderly discharge their business they must be a very superior lot of people.

8595. But, as a rule, the attendance is not one-fourth of the whole body?—Quite right; an extra reason for getting them down. There is no responsibility attaching to the position; one-fourth won't attend an ordinary meeting, but they will all crowd in next day if things are not done to their liking and undo it; there is no responsibility or dignity attached to the position. I am a democrat, and I have been going for local government all my life. I say for proper representation it is necessary you should cut down the number.

8596. The original idea was that there should be only one representative, and it was altered in the House of Lords?—Yes; I am quite aware of that. We have been going to a great deal of expense to improve the hospitals and make them attractive to the poor; all these improvements and attractions have cost money; there is one improvement and attraction that will cost no money—that will save money. I wrote five years ago about it, and got a question asked in the House of Commons about it, and what I wrote five years ago I could not do better than repeat—it is against making sick people wear the poorhouse garb. This was not in the original Act of Parliament; it was a general order of the Poor Law Commissioners; and by a stroke of the pen it could at any time have been done away with. You may make Poor Law infirmaries into little palaces,

you may give a nurse to every patient in them, you may diet them with champagne and chicken, but if, as soon as a patient gets his foot out of bed, he has to get into a pauper's dress he will not frequent the union hospital, and I sympathise with him, and think it most shameful that the one thing that stands between us and the pauperism of the people, self-respect, should be tried to be broken down, when they go with a festering leg or inflammation of the lungs into the workhouse hospital, and as soon as they are able to get about they must get into a pauper uniform.

8597. CHAIRMAN.—You are aware of the power of the Guardians to adopt a hospital suit?—I am, and it is just one of the remedies that people that know nothing about a thing adopt, just as if it was the quality of the cloth, and not the uniform to which objection is made.

8598. But it would be a very good thing that hospital patients should not have, as patients too often have, their own ragged and dirty clothes?—Could you not trust the medical officer to see that the clothes are clean?

8599. Perhaps we might, but when a workhouse is considered the second dirtiest in all Ireland it might be considered difficult, even in your own case!—That is a good ad hominem argument, and I don't mind if we discuss it that way for the next two hours. I think the very fact that I made that admission is proof of my sincerity when I go for the other. The officers of the workhouses are mostly at present the Consulting Sanitary or Medical Superintending Officers of Health; the Local Government Board have approved of our appointment, and they turn round and, through the mouth of their President in the House of Commons, say it cannot be done on account of infection.

8600. Do you see any objection to the people wearing a suit of serge different from the pauper uniform?—It is a pauper uniform.

8601. It is a hospital uniform?—It is a uniform provided by the Guardians at the expense of the rate, and I don't know what is a pauper uniform if that is not.

8602. Well, we have your opinion, and we have a note of it—I beg your pardon, if I spoke hastily; it means an increase of trouble to me, for whenever you have this reform you will have more people coming into the hospital, and I cannot say we are always remunerated in proportion to our work. But I really have felt it; it is five years since I drew attention to it, but the reform seems as far off as ever. This has been in existence sixty years, and I suppose it will be in existence when we are all in heaven, at the rate we are going on. With regard to paying patients, I think myself that so far as infectious cases are concerned no patient should be charged except he wishes to pay. When I got typhus fever in 1872 I went into hospital, and paid for it, but it should be perfectly optional. I regard the expense of treating an infectious case as being as much in the interest of the general taxpayer as of the individual himself; the general taxpayer may suffer by the spread of the disease, or getting it himself. Then with regard to who ought not to be charged in the infirmaries, my view would be that any person who outside gets medical attendance gratis should get it inside—the class of people who get dispensary tickets outside should not be charged for their maintenance inside. But those who would wish separate wards, if you adopt such a system, should pay the whole cost of maintenance, including nursing and medicine, and they should also pay an additional sum, such as would be calculated to recompense the Guardians for what, I hope, would be the increased salary that the influx of such people would necessitate in order to be fair to the doctor. I dealt with the tramp nuisance. I consider it is altogether an exaggeration, and it is a matter of insurance to the ratepayers that they should give these people a night's lodging. With regard to the nursing, I think our nursing has immensely improved, but I don't at all agree with those who exalt trained nurses above nursing orders. I really think the technical and manual dexterity of the nurse is only a small portion of her requirements as a nurse, and it is quite absurd to exalt a girl into a position of superiority because she spends two years learning a trade, and to contrast her unfavourably with the ladies who devote their whole life to the care of the poor, and who, though, technically, called untrained, are really very much better trained, because they have sympathy and charity and the spirit of devotion and self-sacrifice, which are so rare, and they can very easily acquire, and have acquired already, the manual dexterity and the technical skill which we boast of in trained nurses.

Nov. 26, 1905.

Dr. Ryan.

Nov. 26, 1903.

Mr. Patrick
Crumley.

Mr. PATRICK CRUMLEY EXAMINED.

3870. CHAIRMAN.—You were not able to give evidence in Enniskillen?—No.

3871. You have attended as a member of the Enniskillen Board of Guardians with reference to part of the Enniskillen Union which is in Cavan?—Yes.

3872. You think that part should remain with the Enniskillen Union?—I think it would be a great injury to the people of that part of the country if those divisions were taken away from the Enniskillen Union. I have been requested, on the part of the people of that district of the country, to come here to say to you that if possible these divisions should be retained in the Enniskillen Union. Some five years ago, after the Local Government Act was passed, there were one or two memorials signed by all the people of the whole district of all denominations asking that those eight divisions should still remain part of the Enniskillen Union, and I think the Local Government Board at that time assented to that course by allowing them to remain part of the Enniskillen Union.

3873. You think even if a hospital were put at Blacklins or some place in that portion of the County Cavan, even then you think it ought to remain as part of the union?—I think it should still remain part of the union.

3874. Some people from Down and that part of the union have to go twenty miles to Enniskillen?—Then it is twenty miles to Bessborough.

3875. Supposing a hospital were built in their own division at the expense of the Enniskillen Union at large, do you think that would be a good plan for dealing with the sick of the district?—Yes, for sudden cases, but in regard to the fever cases I don't think a hospital should be built there; it is very likely the Enniskillen Workhouse will be retained, because there have been a great deal of improvements carried out there.

3876. You don't think a fever hospital ought to be built at Blacklins?—I don't think so.

3877. But a cottage hospital, in which urgent cases might be dealt with—cases of diseased lungs and matters that make it rather difficult to take people long distances?—Yes; it would be very useful. There are not, I think, more than two or three fever cases at Blacklins come from that part of the country to Enniskillen.

3878. You have had a very large number of fever cases lately from Derryl?—There are more cases from Derryl district; there were two or three families that the disease set in amongst in those divisions; I think there were eight or nine people.

3879. Was there anything else you wished to mention?—Yes. If such a thing as amalgamation takes place, I have been thinking that all the imbeciles and harmless lunatics should be transferred to the asylum, for I look upon the mode of treatment in the workhouse of these poor people as simply barbarous. For instance, there is the pauper attendant—I am speaking of the Enniskillen Union, that I have done my best within the last twenty years trying to reform. It is a pauper attendant, who has had the misfortune of losing everything he had himself, that is attending the male patients. It is a woman, who has fallen by some misfortune or another, that is attending the female patients; those people have no regard for the patients, for their cleanliness or cure; if they wish they may lie in bed all day, and they are not taken out to the pure fresh air for exercise. I think that the Government should be thanked for the manner in which they have handed the asylums over to the County Councils, as a member of the asylum board I now speak—that it is a credit to the Government for having put these patients in the position in which they are; they are treated well, everything is cheerful and comfortable, the attendants take good care of them, they are well fed. The paupers are not well fed; these harmless lunatics and imbeciles are not well fed in the workhouse, nor are the aged and infirm poor.

3880. What would you suggest as regards the aged and infirm poor?—I would suggest that there should be classification, and that these aged and infirm poor who have lost respectable lives, and whose poverty has compelled to seek refuge in these homes, that they should be dealt with in a manner even better than the ordinary run of paupers. As regards the food, I have tried on several occasions to improve the dietary scale. On one occasion I lost the resolution by one vote, which I was sorry for. I intended, if the resolution had been carried, to give them meat, at least, three days a week,

which they don't get now. The idea of giving these poor people soup off a cow's head and eight or ten pounds of bacon boiled with that cow's head for two or three days a week, and stout for the other three days, I don't think is a proper treatment.

3881. You think there ought to be a better dietary?—I do.

3882. Has your Board of Guardians adopted the suggested dietary scale?—The doctor compelled them to make some little change for the better.

3883. It has not been adopted to the full?—It has not; the Guardians sometimes say these people are well treated, better than some of the ratepayers, but that, I think, does not follow because these people have been compelled to seek this place as a refuge or home in their old days. I think I would go in for an improved dietary scale, and, if possible, I would change the appearance of the workhouse wherever it exists, because they seem to me now to be nothing better than the inside of a jail—not as happy-looking as the inside of a jail. They should be placed on the same principle, if possible I would say by State aid, as the present asylums.

3884. A capitation grant?—If these imbeciles and harmless lunatics were transferred to an asylum you would receive the capitation grant, and it would cost a mere trifle more to keep these people in the asylums than it does in the unions; you get about £16 of a capitation grant, and about £20 odd is the average price, not including the buildings, of the cost of lunatics; the total amount per head would be about £33 odd; but taking the cost of buildings, the average cost in the lunatic asylum generally is something under £19, or £20 10s., and you get 4s. per head per week of a capitation grant, which amounts to £19 8s. in the year. And the average cost of aged and infirm, you may say three for hospital treatment, is, with 6s., 2s. 6d. a week, which amounts to 28 5s., and with £20 it would be £28, so that the country would sustain no loss by sending these people to the asylums. Then, in regard to workhouses, I think some of the workhouses should be done away with, but at the same time I think the Government should give the power to County Councils to raise money to start industries in some of the disused workhouses; that would do the country a service.

3885. By way of loan?—By way of loan or gift, if the Government thought proper; I think they owe us a good deal. Then, with regard to children, I have always advocated the sending out of children to be nursed from a very early age—even from six weeks old.

3886. As soon as the doctor says they may be safely let out?—Yes. I find girls, in particular, that are nursed in the workhouses, when they come to be free from the control of the Board of Guardians, go out on hire, and before twelve or eighteen months expire they return back into the house accompanied by more than themselves. I have known some of these young girls in the Enniskillen Workhouse to have had two or three children, and these only mere girls; they are in contact with those that have been unfortunate in the house; there is nothing good imbedded into these little girls' minds, but what is bad, and when they go out they have been educated up to the full standard of immorality. Then with regard to boys, too, I have never seen one leaving the house yet, that was retained in the house until fifteen or sixteen years of age, but was useless to those in the country. The Local Government Board have some stringent rules, which are useful, I am sure, for an orphan—that an orphan must be retained under the control of the Guardians, a boy until fifteen and a girl until sixteen. If a boy is hired out under fourteen years of age there is generally the condition made that the person who hires him shall pay a certain amount, which is to go for clothing him; also that he should get a certain number of hours at school each day, which is very useful, but very few farmers are willing to take them on those conditions; therefore they remain in the house, and when they come to be fifteen years of age they are no use; they are nothing but the walls of the workhouse. Then there is another question. I think that dispensary committees should be reformed so as to have supervision over the medical officers; formerly they met weekly in most places, and they had a great deal of supervision over the doctors; there are a great many kind and sympathetic doctors, but a great many dispensary doctors are sometimes rough, careless, and negligent in their duties. Very often people may complain to the Guardian, but

that Guardian, in all probability, does not wish to bring it before the Board of Guardians at their next meeting to discuss the conduct of this doctor last he would be called before a Local Government Inspector to render an account of what he had done. But in dispensary committees, as a rule, the tickets are examined each week, that is where the committee met, as in Kinnikillan; they examined all the tickets, the Guardians knew exactly where relief should be extended, and it kept the doctor in his place, but, at the same time, I don't say that you should return to the system of giving that power into the hands of a committee for the election of a medical officer.

3597. Would you prefer it should be in the hands of the whole Board?—I would prefer that of the whole Board.

3598. Just the power of supervision and examining the books?—Yes.

3599. That is a matter that is outside our reference; we could not make a recommendation of that kind; but a great many Guardians here, just as you have done, expressed in a few words that opinion; it will appear on the notes of the evidence, but we have no power!—Then, sir, with regard to outdoor relief, and then I am done. I have never agreed with the way outdoor relief was given with us, for this reason, that it was given with a very stingy hand. If a father of a family died and his widow was left with five or six children, who depended on him, and the relieving officer made an application, which I know has occurred in Kinnikillan, that this poor woman should get some weekly outdoor relief—some of these children were very young; I knew an instance where the last baby was only eight months old—a Guardian will rise up in his place in the board-room and say "Why should not this woman and her children come into the house; giving outdoor relief is a bad system." It may be a bad system, but the idea of a Guardian saying that these five or six children should come in at an average cost of 25s. a week to support them, whereas 5s. or 6s. a week given to these people would enable this poor woman to keep her children and her little home together instead of breaking it up. I think the Local Government Board should give more power to relieving officers or Guardians.

3600. They have the fullest power!—I know they have, but they are constrained very often by the Board of Guardians. Another thing, I don't think—it is possible that this Commission could recommend it—that outdoor relief should disfranchise the people who receive it; I think it is a grievance that prevents many persons who are in utter destitution from applying for outdoor relief, because they would be disfranchised. It may look simple in Carron where the people are divided, as in Fermanagh, politically, it is a great thing to us; we don't want to lose any power.

3601. Mr. MURKIN.—Still you do think that outdoor relief, when judiciously administered, and on a

liberal scale, is a good thing?—It saves many a home and saves the people from the cry of pauperism.

3602. You think it would be a crime to compel that woman to come into the house?—That woman would not do it. I happen to be connected with a charitable society, and I have known cases where it was necessary to relieve them, and I know them to be in utter destitution, and when the society I belong to could not give sufficient to enable these people to live the women would go out and beg for the little children sooner than enter the workhouse, and then the police come down on these poor people and summon them for begging.

3603. CHAIRMAN.—You have experience as a member of a charitable organisation?—I have. I wish you could give the outdoor relief into our hands too.

3604. You do administer a good deal of money in that way?—Sometimes up to £100 a year.

3605. Are you also the means of putting charitable people in contact with those who are suffering?—Yes, sir; very often. I make that statement at the board that I know of my own knowledge that these people are suffering from destitution.

3606. Yes; but I mean your charitable organisation, in addition to the money it spends, will be the means of introducing deserving cases to the notice of people who have money to spend?—When a case like this is mentioned by the relieving officer I can assist that case of my own personal knowledge.

3607. That is as far as the boardroom goes, but, as a member of a charitable organisation, does your charitable organisation assist in bringing the charitably disposed in connection with those who need charity? You spend £100 a year in your charitable organisation; what I wanted to find out was whether your organisation was not of still greater value, perhaps, in bringing those who were charitably disposed into connection with those who needed charity?—So it does.

3608. Is it your opinion that in Kinnikillan and the neighbourhood around you a great deal of the money is thus spent in charity?—A great deal.

3609. And, no matter what outdoor relief was given, charitable expenditure would, naturally, go on on the part of the charitably disposed?—Yes; and they are receiving it irrespective of religion. Then there is just one thing more, and that is in regard to tramps. I myself proposed a resolution at the Board of Guardians which has never been acted upon; it was carried unanimously. That is that each tramp coming there should be compelled to break a cart, of stones each morning before he got his discharge, and their wives should be compelled to go into the laundry and work a certain time, say, in scrubbing the floors. The Master has never put that into operation; everything is depending on this Commission; everything is adjourned until this Commission is finished.

3610. Mr. MURKIN.—Is it their custom to go in couples?—Oh, yes; they never go without their women.

Mr. THOMAS JOSEPH SMITH examined.

Mr. Thomas Joseph Smith.

3611. CHAIRMAN.—You are the Chairman of the Carron Board of Guardians?—Yes.

3612. What is your view as to the amalgamation of workhouses in the County Carron?—Well, I could hardly tell you whether it would be beneficial or not, but I think there are a great many alterations that are necessary to be made; that is, we have portions of our county going to Glasgow and there is portion of Cotehill Union in closer proximity to Carron than it is to Cotehill.

3613. Do you think it would be proper a question for the amalgamation of boundaries?—Yes.

3614. Have you any scheme or map prepared showing what boundaries you suggest?—I have not.

3615. Perhaps you would kindly undertake to prepare such a map?—Our clerk, Mr. Green, may be able to explain that.

3616. If you did send in such a map the Commission would be very glad to receive it?—The board were in favour of amalgamation, but I, personally, would not think it much benefit.

3617. You would not be in favour of closing up any workhouse?—I think it would not be any saving to the rates, because in the closing up of the jail here I don't think it saved any money. We had a jail here, and it was closed up, and I don't think the ratepayers gained any benefit by it.

3618. And I suppose it was a certain loss to the town?—Yes.

3619. As regards the different classes of people who are in your workhouse, would you be in favour of making any change; would you be in favour of keeping lunatics in your workhouse?—I think they would be better out of it, but still they are very well treated, and seem to be very happy under the supervision of the Sisters in our workhouse; they are kept scrupulously clean—so much so that I suppose you have seen the report of Dr. Courtney.

3620. We have seen them ourselves?—They all get sufficient food, and all seem to be happy, and I would like to hear testimony to the great eating and the great attention that has been paid not only to the lunatics since the Sisters came to the union, but to the whole house; they have created a saving in clothing and improved the general appearance and the general aspect of the whole house, and with regard to the infirmary—I have been in several hospitals in Dublin—and I think there is no greater attention paid to any patient in any Dublin hospital than there is in our own greater cleanliness, and any person who has gone through these speaks in the highest terms of it.

3621. Are you in favour of boarding out children here?—Yes; we have a number of them boarded out in our union; any that we can.

3622. Would you be in favour of having additional?

Nov. 25, 1903.
Mr. Thomas
Joseph Smith.

powers given to the Guardians, such as taking away children from unworthy parents and boarding them out?—Yes; in any case we could.

8612. You would, as far as possible, exclude all children from workhouses?—Some of them would be better cared; in every case it is not easy to get a proper person to take proper care of the children. The children are taken care of by the Sisters, who see that they are properly clad and fed, and we have a school teacher there that pays every attention to them.

8614. Have you found any difficulty so far?—In some cases we have ordered in children we had out on that account.

8615. And boarded them out with other people?—The parties that had them we gave them another chance, and made the relieving officer keep a closer supervision over them, and they have improved.

8616. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—You seem to have a large number of children in Cloran Workhouse; can you estimate that?—Not so very large.

8617. According to the last report it was thirty-seven?—That is not a very large number considering the extent of the union; our union is valued to £117,600, and I think you would not count that a large number of children.

8618. It is comparatively large, because it is as much as all the other three—Ballisodare, Barnaby, and Coochill?—But our union is one-third of the county, and 1d. in the £2 on the rates produces £460 7s. 6d. We often had twice as many children in the house as at the present time.

8619. Still, you do approve of boarding out children?—Yes; every case that the Guardians think judicious, and we have applications for more children.

8620. You would like to see the inmates and epileptics taken out of the workhouses and placed somewhere else where they could get a better treatment?—Yes.

8621. Does the question of tramps bother you very much?—Not very much; the cost of their supper and breakfast is only about 3d. or 3½d., and we get them to do a quantity of work in the way of sacking graves, clearing the house, and breaking stones, and I think it would be better, at the expense of 3d. a night, to have them there than to perhaps have them staying in a hazyard or perhaps burning it, and then a malicious injury claim coming on the district; it would be better to give them a night's lodging at that small expense.

8622. You would not believe in adopting any other methods in regard to tramps?—Keeping them working would be quite sufficient; having a certain amount of work allotted to them each morning before they leave.

8623. A power to the Guardians to keep them a few days?—No; I would not keep them only a few hours; we consider a few hours long enough; we generally keep them working in the morning until eleven o'clock; if you retain them any longer you would be compelled to give them their dinner.

8624. As a deterrent, would it not be well to have the Guardians so empowered that they could detain them for two or three days if they so desired, if they thought it would prevent them going to a neighbouring fair or having some festive enjoyment?—Some of them would be inclined to stop with you entirely after being there two or three days; they would get so used to the place they would not like to leave at all. Then the question would arise, when you once admit them and they tell you they are destitute, how could you remove them.

8625. Give them their discharge, as you do now; you would be in the same position, with larger powers; you might use them or not use them if you like; that did not strike you before?—Well, no. I think it would

be well in the case of those able-bodied tramps who never do any work, but with the helpless women and children it would be a very hard thing.

8626. We don't consider women and children as tramps?—They are generally the majority on that list.

8627. As a rule, when people speak of tramps they mean men who are strolling round; vagrants round the country?—When the men come they generally have a woman and two or three children, so I don't see how you can exclude women and children from the list. Of course it is seldom the men would go in and leave the women and children outside; it would be well if you could admit the women and children and exclude the men.

8628. Would it not be well for the local body to have some control over these children who are being raised as professional vagrants and take them away from their parents—the children of habitual tramps?—I think the cost would be very serious; if you take and send them to an institution and have to pay for them I would not approve of it.

8629. But, still, you would stamp out the occupation of vagrancy by that means, and as the long run it might become a saving instead of a cost?—I think if the Government would take other steps and prevent the thing of belied-singing and games on the streets, I think it would prevent the tramps from accumulating or going through the country.

8630. CHAIRMAN.—You think we have too much amusement in this country?—Too much of that class of amusement. I think it would stamp out tramps more than anything else. If they had not something to do at these fairs and races they would have no occupation in those places, and would turn their hand to something else more industrious.

8631. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Your house does not seem to be afflicted with tramps very much; perhaps you have a stalwart Master?—We have a Master second in none.

8632. How does he treat them?—Do you give them a bath?—No; they break stones.

8633. Dr. BARNES.—Do you believe that the sick poor in your workhouses are treated as well as they should be?—Could not be better treated in any hospital in Ireland.

8634. Are the arrangements all that you could desire?—Yes.

8635. What sort of an ambulance have you?—We have a new four-wheeled ambulance ordered.

8636. Have you any special treatment for consumptives?—Yes; we have a large fever hospital built to accommodate 124 patients, and when there come any consumptive patients we put them in portion of the fever hospital.

8637. Have you recommended it in any way?—It is not long built; it is one of the best in all Ireland for the fever hospital.

8638. Have you good ventilation?—We have good windows and good ventilation, and a splendid steam—yes of the best.

8639. CHAIRMAN.—You have recently improved the drainage of the fever hospital?—Yes.

8640. Dr. BARNES.—How short the infirmary?—The only thing we have recommended for the infirmary is a few additional iron beds with hair mattresses, which we intend to get under the late report of the Inspector.

8641. You are getting them now?—Yes.

8642. But the straw beds are still there?—Yes; but we have only just got the report.

8643. Have you baths and waterclosets?—There are no baths, certainly, all over the house.

8644. Hot and cold water?—No.

8645. Laid on to the baths?—No.

Mr. Robert H.
Jennison.

Mr. ROBERT H. JENNISON, A.P., examined.

8646. CHAIRMAN.—You wish to make some statement of your views about the amalgamation of unions in this country?—I may say I am in favour of amalgamation of unions; certainly so far as the County Council is concerned. I have been twenty years associated with the Barnaby Board of Guardians. I believe it would tend to reduce the rates of the county by amalgamation.

8647. Do you think any hardship would be imposed on the sick?—Of course in amalgamating the unions I take it the District Councils would remain. Then, of course, I don't think there would be any hardship to the sick poor so far as our workhouse is concerned; it is built to accommodate over 500 poor, and at present they number about sixty-two; and I would approve of

making some use of these workhouses that it would be considered advisable to discontinue, and I think the best use they could be possibly put to would be to use them as auxiliary asylums for harmless lunatics.

8648. How many would you break up in the County Council?—I would break up Coochill, Ballisodare, and Barnaby. I approve of one workhouse for the county, and that all the aged and infirm and general paupers would be accommodated there; I would remove the children entirely out of the workhouse and have them nursed out and cared out. I think that is the best system that could possibly be adopted. We adopt it in Barnaby as far as we possibly can, and find it is a great saving; it only costs half the money to keep

with, and the children are much better looked after and are cleared out of an atmosphere which we know is not very conducive to the children's education.

8640. Mr. MURKIN.—What would you suggest with regard to the children of tramps?—I think if it ultimately would result, as I think it would after a considerable time, in getting rid of this horrible tramp nuisance, I think it would be very well worth the expense to the ratepayers to put upon themselves the extra burden of looking after these children. One needs these tramps on the road with their children grazing after them, and it is a terrible disgrace to a civilised country to see these ragged children—brought up to the worst type of thieving and robbing, and it would certainly be a great move for the better caring of these tramp children. I know the objection to it will be raised that it will add to the rates; but, as a very large ratepayer, probably about the largest in the Bawby Union, I would willingly contribute whatever addition it would be to get rid of the tramp nuisance, and also have these children brought up on a proper system, which they are not at present.

8650. Is the class a numerous one?—I think it is fairly numerous; they are constantly brought before me; they are kept in the workhouse usually a night before the fair in Bawby; they come out to the fair; they have money enough in their pocket, wherever they get it, and they generally wind up by getting drunk in the fair, and they are brought up by the police to be discharged, as there is no advantage in summarising them. The Bawby Union is a very central place between Kinnickullen, Omea, and Melish, and they tramp that way.

8651. You would approve of a change in the law to enable Guardians to deal with them?—I would. Mr. McGovern gave a very good suggestion, that power should be given to the Master to retain them for three days if he thought necessary, and make them work during those three days. I think it would tend greatly to deter them from coming there.

8652. That might do as regards adults, but the children?—The children follow with the men; a man comes with his wife and half a dozen children, and if you get rid of the men I don't think the women and children would turn up in the workhouse; they generally keep together; they are generally either ballad-singers or people with roulette tables who attend these fairs. I think something should be done about the tramp nuisance. I don't agree with what Mr. Smith said that it would throw them out on the country and that they would do damage; the police have got power to look after these tramps and prevent them getting into people's premises. But I certainly think it would be advisable to get all the children in the workhouse sent out to be cared for. In our union there would be no difficulty in getting respectable people to look after them and care them.

8653. You think the distances between the workhouses and the fact that they would be detained for several days would be a deterrent to the tramp?—I believe it would; they make a convenience of it for one night before attending a fair or something of that sort; they make use of it. I am almost certain the Master of our workhouse does not make them work, and I very often have spoken of that at the board, and said he should do it. If they were detained for two or three days and made work I don't think they would come back again.

8654. In some places they do adopt that present?—Yes; in Omea I think they do; but Mr. Smith said they only kept them a few hours, and they cannot do very much work when they are detained for that time. They are a very great nuisance, there is no doubt of it. It has been suggested that if the workhouses were not designated the boundaries should be enlarged. I think that would be a very good idea too; but my view is that amalgamation is the proper system to work on if it can be carried out by turning these present workhouses to some useful purpose. The first thing should be that there should be district hospitals, and, where it could be practicable, to turn these into auxiliary asylums. The drawback, as Mr. McGovern has said, and quite rightly, in the ratepayers have an objection because the Government grant allowed for auxiliary asylums is only 2s. instead of 4s. for the regularity-occupied asylum. I think that is a great drawback, and if it was properly represented to the Government I don't see why they should not grant the same sum to auxiliary asylums, but if that was absolutely impossible to carry out I would still be of opinion that it would be advisable to turn these into auxiliary asylums.

8655. CHAIRMAN.—What would you do with the aged and infirm?—I would let them go to the county workhouse. I don't think there is that great sympathetic wave of sentiment amongst those aged and infirm that Dr. Ryan very laudably described. I never heard it expressed in our union that they would have any objection to go to Omea. I don't think that feeling would enter into the question at all.

8656. Dr. BROWN.—Do you think after they are in a workhouse for a few years that their friends visit them at all?—I don't think so; I don't think they bother their heads about it.

8657. So that they don't see the familiar faces and hear the familiar voices?—I don't think they do at all. I see that the Ballisborough Workhouse is probably worked on the most expensive lines of any of the workhouses in this county; the average cost is something like 5s. 2d., and Bawby is only 2s. 10d.; I think the Ballisborough ratepayers ought to be more inclined for amalgamation than even we are, judging from what they have to pay.

8658. Mr. MURKIN.—Is that the county rate you are giving us?—No; the weekly charge per head.

8659. CHAIRMAN.—Their rate is 1s. 4d., and yours is 10d. for Poor Law purposes, and there is not much difference in the valuation?—If the valuations were enlarged—I know a great deal about that Glen district; I was agent over a large property in Dowers for years; I know it very well, and I know the feeling of the people that they would not like to come to Bawby; we have discussed it often, and, geographically, they are perfectly right; they have to cross that very heavy mountain, over 2,000 feet above sea-level, Omea Mountain.

8660. You don't mean to say the road goes right over the top?—Not exactly; there is a gap; there is very often snow there up to the middle of May, and in winter time it is impossible to go through it. I have gone there myself and had to turn back. I think the people themselves would be very much opposed to going to Bawby on that ground. To Kinnickullen they have a railway at Belcoo, and a very good road from Dowers there. I think it would be a very good move to have a cottage hospital at Dowers or between Dowers and Blacklion. People that meet with accidents there or get sick suffer very much being brought to Kinnickullen. With regard to the women that frequent workhouses, I think it would be a great matter if they could be sent to some home; it is a very difficult matter, and very hard to know how to work out anything feasible.

8661. Mr. MURKIN.—You don't see any insurmountable difficulty?—I don't see it.

8662. The question has been raised in other places, and gentlemen connected with charitable institutions of the kind suggested don't seem to see any difficulty?—I don't think there would be any great difficulty myself, and it would be a very good idea if it can be worked out. Of course their children ought to be sent out with the others, and nursed and cared for. We suffer a good deal in Bawby from that kind of thing.

8663. There would be a difficulty about these girls going out afterwards and claiming their children?—I would say the present law should be altered; I don't think they ought to be able to claim a child again.

8664. Dr. BROWN.—Do you know of any cases that go from Bawby to the County Omea, Infirmary?—Yes; there are.

8665. Do you know what means there are for giving orders of admission?—I don't know really how they get orders of admission except from the committee of management.

8666. Are there any of Omea in the neighbourhood of Bawby who can give these orders?—No; I don't think so.

8667. Taking the last few years, do you know how many cases have gone from that neighbourhood?—I cannot say.

8668. Do you know of any?—I know of one or two.

8669. Why did they go when they could get into the workhouse?—There is a great objection to going into the workhouse.

8670. How could the workhouse be improved?—In the first place you would have to do away with the name of workhouse altogether.

8671. Separate the hospital from the workhouse?—Yes. Of course if you establish a hospital it would, I presume, be called some other name, such as district hospital; that would get over the great difficulty at once, but I know there is a great feeling of objection. I myself had a case of it where a servant in my house—I am only 100 yards from the workhouse—got scurvy fever, and the doctor ordered her to be removed to the

Nov. 25, 1905.

Mr. Robert H. Johnston.

Nov. 26, 1905.

Mr. Robert M.
Johnson.

workhouse infirmary, and had it not been that she was a good while in our service I don't think she would have gone there. She objected to go simply because she thought it was going into the workhouse.

8672. If there was a district hospital would the small farmers pay to go in there?—Oh, yes; they would pay.

8673. Mr. MURKHAM.—Have you any views on the question of rating; have you any preference for a large area or a small one? the question has been raised that the dispensary district should be the area for the Poor Law purposes; have you any views on that matter?—I think that would be a very good area to take.

8674. It is considered the electoral division is rather small and the union is rather big?—Yes; and really there is great congestion on those boards. I think the business would be much better managed and much quicker got through if the representation was smaller, and, of course, it could be done by extending the district for representation—that the dispensary district should return representatives. I think the ratepayers would be fairly represented by dispensary areas; that would be my view.

8675. We have been told that the dispensary district is pretty much coterminous with that of the parish, and the people living in the dispensary district have a community of views?—Quite so. I think outdoor relief is a thing that requires considerable attention. I think it is abused considerably, and I don't blame the Guardians so much over it. I myself have seen very difficult cases arising where the Guardians could hardly get out of putting people on these lists who they felt were not entitled to outdoor relief. I cannot say that they would object to the power being given to the relieving officer if they have confidence in him; he is their officer, and if he does not carry out his duties properly they can dismiss him. If I were a Guardian I would say it

would be the proper thing to do; it would relieve you a great deal of the cost of deciding whether a person was to get 1s. or 1s. 6d. in outdoor relief, or not get it at all. I did succeed on two occasions in having all the names struck out on the outdoor relief list, and I tried to have it carried out that they should only be put on a doctor's certificate that they were unfit to be removed to the house. It worked for a while, but fell back again. The Guardians are placed in an awkward position. Nowadays it is not the thing to take away the control of the expenditure from the man who is paying the rates, and that is the only objection to it; but certainly, I think, something ought to be done; outdoor relief is increasing very much.

8676. CHAIRMAN.—You are not absolutely opposed to outdoor relief in certain cases; for instance, if a widow were left with a few children, would you think she ought to have any outdoor relief?—I would rather give her outdoor relief. I am not absolutely against outdoor relief. I think there are cases where it is much more judicious to give outdoor relief, but it is terribly abused. I have been a Guardian for twenty years, and I don't think I have put the names of three people on the outdoor relief list during that time. I know that no person is left out who really is entitled to it, and I would support the applications of bona fide people entitled to outdoor relief. But I am very much opposed to giving outdoor relief to those who are not qualified for it, and ought to be able to work, and have got some land.

8677. Mr. MURKHAM.—They don't give it to people who have land?—I am afraid they do. I have known cases where it is being done. I think we have got some on our list at the present time where, if it was investigated, they have got land.

8678. CHAIRMAN.—It is given to a member of the family I suppose?—It may be worked in that way, but I don't know.

Dr. Teevan.

Dr. TEEVAN

examined.

8679. CHAIRMAN.—You are the doctor of the Bawnboy Workhouse?—Yes.

8680. If the Bawnboy Workhouse was broken up, in your opinion would it be necessary to retain some place for the treatment of the sick?—It would.

8681. How many sick have you in your hospital at present?—Twenty-six, and that is the average.

8682. That is in addition to the fever?—Yes; we have no fever at present.

8683. Dr. BROGAN.—Do you get many paying patients into the workhouse hospital?—We do; a few fever patients principally.

8684. But non-infectious cases?—No; I don't think we do.

8685. Have you any cases in your mind that you think would have been improved by hospital treatment that were not sent in?—No; I have not.

8686. You are the dispensary doctor?—No; I am not.

8687. If the hospital was separated from the workhouse would it be availed of by a larger class?—I think so; I find that they have an objection, and the only objection they have to going to hospital is the name of the workhouse.

8688. How could it be dissociated from the workhouse?—Except by doing away with the workhouse. If the aged and infirm were taken out of the Bawnboy Workhouse we would have none at all—no inmates at all. They are all infirm and old except the idiots and imbeciles and children.

8689. Regarding the cases that are in the workhouse—the old and infirm—do you find that their friends

visit them?—No, I do not; it is only worse cases that the friends visit.

8690. It would not matter then whether they were a Bawnboy or ten miles away?—I don't think they would mind at all; they don't, as a rule, receive any visits—those that are a long time in the house. It is only patients that come in—acute cases—that their friends visit. I think they would have very little objection to leaving it.

8691. Mr. MURKHAM.—Is there much consumption in your neighbourhood?—There is not.

8692. You have no cases at the present time?—I have one. We have no consumption ward, and in case this would be retained for a hospital we would require to have a fever hospital built; as at present we have no fever hospital, practically speaking; there are only two wards for all the fever cases we get, and we have no closets or water supply and no lavatories, so that the present fever accommodation is really only temporary.

8693. Dr. BROGAN.—But supposing the workhouse was done away with, would you not have plenty of buildings that could be converted into a hospital?—Even then it would require lots of alteration.

8694. CHAIRMAN.—Leaving the present infirmary for a fever hospital and removing the present sick to one of the front blocks?—Yes, the middle block, and turning the infirmary into a fever hospital. I think that would be a very good change.

8695. Dr. BROGAN.—More useful than having a workhouse in the district?—Yes.

Mr. John
Masterson.

Mr. JOHN MASTERSON examined.

8696. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of Grenada No. 2?—No; No. 1.

8697. That is in the County Longford?—But I come to represent the three districts.

8698. It is No. 2 we have before us to-day; what are the views of the people of No. 2 as regards the amalgamation of unions or the separation of portions of the union?—If you take away the five divisions it would mean 2d. in the 2 upon the remaining divisions.

8699. You are representing the views now of Grenada No. 2. They are in favour of coming to Owen Union?—They are in favour of retaining the five divisions.

8700. Of the five divisions coming to the Owen Union?—No; in favour of keeping them with Grenada No. 1.

8701. Are not the views of No. 1 and No. 2 in conflict?—I was sent to represent the union, meaning 1, 2, and 3.

8702. You were sent to say that in the opinion of the Guardians, as a body, No. 2 ought not to be allowed to come to Owen?—Yes.

8703. Is that the view of No. 2 itself?—It is.

8704. They recently applied to be joined to Owen?—They have changed their mind?—No, sir; five of the Guardians of No. 2 signed to be allowed to remain in

Gesard, and their reasons are that it would be a great inconvenience to the poor of Gesard that they should have to travel a great distance.

8705. If the hospital were left at Gesard?—If the hospital were taken away.

8706. If it were left at Gesard and the union broken up?—If the union were broken up it would mean a great inconvenience to the poor. At present the great distance from Cavan to Gesard would be shortest distance and the farthest distance would be seven miles. And then the farthest distance from Cavan would be fifteen miles and the nearest to Cavan would be nine miles.

8707. When the Guardians who asked to be transferred to Cavan are now in favour of remaining with Gesard?—I mean that five of them signed to be allowed to remain in Gesard. Lord Longford came into the union broken up, and after an inquiry it was found it would be more useful and more convenient to the general number of ratepayers to have it remain where it is. These Guardians, of course, being so far away from Cavan would find it difficult to attend, but being so near Gesard they find it quite easy to come in, and, consequently, if our union was taken away it would mean disfranchisement to these Guardians who would have to travel so far.

Mr. Brady.—I will answer for Cavan when my turn comes.

8708. CHAIRMAN.—I thought there was some difference of opinion?—Then it would be a great inconvenience to the sick poor to have to travel so far. A very large majority of our board in 1891 forwarded you a petition asking you to retain the union in Gesard, and the Catholic clergy of the Cavan divisions are in favour, and, of course, they should know the requirements of the poor, and they are in favour of leaving the union where it is. We don't like to lose the Cavan people or the Cavan Guardians.

8709. Mr. MURKIN.—Good people in Cavan?—They are.

8710. Good payers; high valuation?—The valuation is very good, too. Then I want to say this, that recently a Local Government inquiry was held in Gesard at the instance of the Cavan County Council to see if it would be desirable to take the Cavan divisions from Gesard Union and transfer them to Cavan, and the Local Government Board refused to do so on several grounds, and the same question was raised by Lord Longford lately, and with the same result.

8711. CHAIRMAN.—Not lately; surely there was no other inquiry?—No, sir; Lord Longford's was formerly. I must say for myself I was always in favour of amalgamation.

8712. With some other union?—With some other union, until one of our best financiers, Secretary of the County Council, and one of our largest ratepayers, Mr. Thomas Edgeworth, represented to us, when examined upon his oath, that our rates would be something like 6d. in the £ higher if we joined with any other union.

Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL FAIRBANKS CONTINUED.

8713. CHAIRMAN.—You are from Ballisborough?—I represent Ballisborough.

8714. You are one of the Board of Guardians; what is your view of amalgamation?—Dr. Ryan has so fully and exhaustively stated his views on the question, with which I am in substantial agreement, that I have hardly anything to add to that; but the feelings of the people and of the Council are most decidedly against amalgamation.

8715. On what ground; they prefer things left as they are?—They believe it would lead to increased expense, and they have already expended a considerable amount on improvements on the workhouse, and they don't like to see that going for nothing. In addition to that there would be considerable difficulty and expense in conveying patients from Ballisborough to Cavan, if Cavan were made the centre, and a certain amount of hardship inflicted upon the poor and infirm that would be conveyed there.

8716. Mr. MURKIN.—On the head of expenses, it seems that the rate in Ballisborough Union is 50 per cent. higher than in the neighbouring union of Bawnboy; if you were united with Bawnboy would not your rate decrease instead of increasing?—The consideration of amalgamating Ballisborough with Bawnboy is rather heated.

These figures to myself, as a ratepayer, hardly frightened me. I should not like to be paying 6d. in the £ more and travelling a greater distance to some other union.

8717. If you found it was the other way about, and you would save 6d., what would be your opinion?—If I found the rates were lower I would be very pleased to amalgamate, but I believe the rates would be higher.

8718. If the Commission here were able to make a scheme, having now the whole of Ireland to deal with, not one or two unions; if they were able to submit a scheme that would make a big saving rather than a loss, would that change your view?—If you give me figures that showed that I would go in for it, but Mr. Edgeworth went into it very fully.

8719. But he was only dealing with one union, not with a great scheme of change in the Poor Law system?—You know he is a higher ratepayer than I am, and when he is so anxious to keep away amalgamation I thought I should be, and then a number of ratepayers of value of £450 or £500 spoke to me and asked me to do my best to retain the union; they did not like the idea of changing it over when the ratepayers would suffer.

8720. Mr. MURKIN.—You did not examine the figures put forth by this gentleman?—No, sir.

8721. You don't know on what basis he made his calculations?—He went so clearly into them; I was completely myself for amalgamation until I saw how reasonable his figures were and how clearly he proved his case, and then I was turned against amalgamation. We have a little friction in our union, but when that is done away with it will be all right.

8722. It is, I hope, in a fair way of settlement?—It remains in your hands to settle it, if you can; it is quite easily settled.

8723. You would be an amalgamator if you were certain some economy would be brought about?—That word "if" makes a great difference.

8724. The recommendation would be hardly made by this Commission if there was not an absolute certainty that there was going to be economy; that is the essence of our anxiety?—I cannot possibly go beyond Mr. Edgeworth's figures.

8725. CHAIRMAN.—We hope to see him when we go down to your county?—Then, again, there was Mr. Telford, who came down there and clearly proved that the rates of Gesard would be far and away higher if we joined with any other union.

8726. Mr. MURKIN.—Is that due to the fact that Gesard is a rich neighbourhood and the rest of the county is poor?—I would not like to say the rest of the county is poor, but Gesard is a rich locality. I cannot speak for the rest of the county.

8727. Do you not think it would be a reasonable thing for the Cavan people to get their own county to themselves?—I would like to see them go if it would not be a sacrifice to the rest of the county, but I would like to see them remain if it was an advantage to the rest of the county and themselves.

8728. Amalgamating the unions in the county, I am taking a neighbouring union?—I am not able to offer an opinion on the subject; I have not gone into it.

8729. On the question of expense it is clear that if there was an amalgamation of Ballisborough with Bawnboy the rate in Ballisborough would be considerably reduced?—The increased rate in Ballisborough is largely due to the improvements we have carried out in the workhouse and infirmary, and also to the number of labourers' cottages we have built.

8730. CHAIRMAN.—That has nothing to do with it; this is the Poor Law rate merely; that has nothing to do with labourers' cottages. Any work you carried out in the workhouse did you get a loan for it?—Yes.

CHAIRMAN.—Then it would not come into the rate at all.

8731. Mr. MURKIN.—Besides the labourers' cottages, instead of being a cost in any county in Ulster, are an advantage, because so far as built that you are getting them for nothing, the grant is so much greater?—There are eighty-one in Ballisborough Union, so you think it is to our advantage and profit to build so many cottages?

CHAIRMAN.—You get them very cheap; you get a good many for nothing out of the grant.

Mr. MURKIN.—Up to a certain number it is profitable.

Nov. 26, 1903.

Mr. John
Masterson.

Mr. Thomas
Michael
Fairbanks.

Jan. 26, 1863.

Mr. Thomas
Michael
Farrelly.

8733. CHAIRMAN.—That that does not come out of the Poor Law expenditure. Your rate for Poor Law purposes only amounted to 1s. 4½d. for the year ending 31st March, 1861; that is a good deal the highest in the county. Barnaby is 10½d., Carran 12d., Cooteshill 8½d.—That is due to an improved scale of districtry.

8733. That was all sound—it did not seem to be carried out in Barnaby. I have not gone very fully into the matter myself.

8734. But you are clear the people of the neighbour-

hood are opposed?—Yes; that is what I am chiefly here for; besides, Dr. Ryan has pretty fully gone into the question.

8735. Dr. BROOK.—One of your objections to amalgamation was the amount of money you expended on the workhouse?—Yes.

8736. Was not most of it, or all of it, spent on the hospital?—Nearly all.

8737. Supposing the hospital was retained, would not that objection disappear?—It would.

Mr. Edward
Smith.

8738. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the Cooteshill Board?—Vice-Chairman, and I have been a Guardian for fourteen years.

8739. Are you a County Monaghan man or a County Carran?—County Carran.

8740. What is your view about the continuance of the Cooteshill Union as it exists?—We had a meeting some fortnight or three weeks ago, and by a large majority the Guardians decided against amalgamation; they decided we ought to remain separate as we were. The only people who opposed it were the members from Monaghan—one district, Roscrea—they would rather go to Monaghan. I think the idea of Monaghan is only to have two workhouses—one in Monaghan and the other in Charlestown—and they would have sooner gone to one of those, I understand.

8741. What were the figures; did it virtually mean a division between Carran and Monaghan some?—I think all the Carran men were in favour of keeping up the workhouse and the Monaghan men were in favour of breaking it up; I forget the exact number—I think it was something like nineteen to nine.

8742. Your hospital has been greatly improved lately?—Yes; and we have a sanatorium now—these outdoor homes for consumptives.

8743. That is doing a great deal of good?—I believe in it.

8744. We had the figures yesterday?—And we have done many other things in the hospital. I think it is as much up to date as any local hospital.

8745. But with very few patients?—We have twenty-three now.

8746. That is counting consumptive people; but in the hospital proper?—There are eight consumptives at present. But on the question of infirmaries, it was suggested here that it should be a county-at-large charge; that would meet with the approval of the Cooteshill Guardians. And as regards the infirmary, I have had a book of admission tickets now for over five years, but I have only given two for the County Carran infirmary, and I think at the rate we are paying, and everything, they are very expensive patients for us to send.

8747. Dr. BROOK.—Is the reason for that because you have got a good hospital of your own?—No; I don't think that has anything to do with it; people don't seem to care to go such a distance from home to charity. I have asked the local doctors about it, and they said they have often asked the people if they would not like to go into the county infirmary, and they have always answered "no." These are the only two cases I know of—one was a man in the workhouse and the other a farmer just outside of Cooteshill, who paid for himself, I believe.

8748. Is there any person in the neighbourhood to give lines for the county infirmary besides yourself?—I don't think so; I am not certain whether the parish priest does.

8749. CHAIRMAN.—Would Dr. Moorhead likely have got some people in?—I don't know; the two patients I sent came to me from the dispensary doctor, Dr. McQuaid.

8750. Are you at home the whole year?—I am eight or nine months of the year.

8751. Dr. BROOK.—Is it not possible that other patients might have gone in?—I think I would have heard of them, because I am a governor of the infirmary.

8752. Have you made any inquiries about it?—Not lately; but before that I did; and I found it did not average one a year.

8753. CHAIRMAN.—You would make the sick a county charge?—Yes, the sick; and, if necessary, call it by a different name—district hospital.

8754. If all the able-bodied and other classes of destitute were taken away it would cease to be a work-

house, and become a hospital, pure and simple?—Yes; but we don't consider it would be advantageous to the ratepayers of our district to send them to one workhouse, as was suggested at the beginning of the inquiry; we consider that if there must be amalgamation there ought to be at least one workhouse for each electoral division of the county.

8755. Mr. MURPHY.—That is a parliamentary division?—Yes; that is my own private opinion.

8756. CHAIRMAN.—Carran is pretty central for the whole county?—So would Cooteshill be for the east end, soon. Of course we have a good many County Monaghan people already in our union, and if Carran were cut up it would be very easy for us to take more of the County Monaghan people on account of the railway facilities.

8757. Mr. MURPHY.—There seems a desire on the part of some of the Guardians that the county should be self-contained; now Carran, Monaghan might want to take some of Carran?—If it could be done it would be a better system.

8758. It would be a better system to have each county an authority in itself?—Yes, I think so; that is my private opinion. I think it is very objectionable having a body of men on your councils who are opposed to all your financial arrangements.

8759. What were the grounds on which the Guardians decided there should not be amalgamation?—One thing was on account of the distance, and then they considered, on account of the size of our workhouse, it would be better to keep it going for that end of the county than to go to Carran. It is twelve miles by road to Carran. I don't know how many miles it is by train.

8760. The number of destitute poor in the County Carran is only something like 425 or 430; of that 65 there are a number of children; how would you receive the proposition to board out these children?—We do board out as many as we can.

8761. Still you have thirteen in your house?—I don't think we have more than five or six now, unless it went up the last week or two.

8762. You do board out as many as you can?—Yes; I think it is the best principle.

8763. What about the lunatics?—We have sent, I think, all our lunatics to Monaghan. I certainly would not keep lunatics in the workhouse; I don't think they are properly treated.

8764. If they were taken out and the children taken out then the number of destitute poor, including the sick, would not amount to much more than 380 in the County Carran; if there were local hospitals for the sick you would bring down the number to 200; that would not be too much for one institution?—The consequence would cost so much.

8765. These people are chronic cases that remain in the house for years?—I think there is a fair percentage that go out in the summer and come back in the winter; I think we have always a little chronic every year. Our chronic, I think, are all back again now.

8766. What about changing the area for raising ad-representative purposes from a small electoral division to a larger one?—I did not go into that question.

8767. You know if there is amalgamation there will be some difficulty in getting the Guardians to attend. Supposing there was a question of amalgamation, one thing would have to be done—that the meetings of the boards would have to be held less often than at present. Do you think that would meet the requirements of the case?—If you reduce the numbers on the amalgamated boards to reach the same numbers as you have on the separate boards, I don't think you could go on with the same number of Guardians; supposing you amalgamated two unions with the numbers you have at present you would have ninety or a hundred Guardians to meet, and you would have to build a special hall for them almost to meet.

Mr. EDWARD SMITH continued.

8765. If you enlarge the area of representation you will get out of that difficulty; if the dispensary districts was taken as the area, and four or five representatives elected for that?—That would be the only way to do it.

8766. Do you think that would be fairer than leaving it in the hands of the County Council to appoint members? Do you think that would get at local feeling better?—Certainly.

8767. The suggestion is that the County Council should appoint committees, similar to those for the sanitary and county infirmaries?—I would not like to see the County Council having the power. I have noticed it in the case of the asylum; it is the County Council here select the representatives to go to Monaghan, and I have seen growth in the paper from other divisions, complaining that they have no representation.

8768. We, in Omagh, who are shrewd suspicious, are blamed for monopolising all the positions on the local boards, so I thought we could get rid of that objection by having a larger area from which to elect?—I suppose that would do; I did not go into that particularly.

8769. Would you have a county rate for Poor Law purposes?—I think the union rate is working all right.

8770. You would see no objection to that?—I do think there ought to be more uniformity in the administration of the Poor Law; for instance, I think there ought to be a uniform dietary in all the unions of Ireland, and not have one union spending more than another. I think there ought to be a uniformity given to the inmates, and there should be a uniform dietary through the country; you get one place giving a splendid dietary to the other.

8771. Are you bothered much with tramps?—We get

about a thousand a year; we don't give them any work, but keep them in until one o'clock in the day, which prevents them trampng on to the nearest union; Ballinborough and Monaghan are twelve miles each, Castleblagney is seventeen or eighteen. I don't think the ratepayers would care for keeping the tramps for two or three days.

8772. Don't you think the tramps themselves would object to being kept confined; it would keep them from the house again?—It would depend on the weather; they might not mind it in this sort of weather.

8773. Would you adopt some other method, such as sending them over to the police?—Yes, if they become chronic visitors; if the same person comes back inside of two months I should treat him as a vagrant.

8774. And have him presented?—Yes.

8775. Do you not think that Cooteshill would be a very suitable place for an auxiliary asylum for Carran?—I have had that opinion, but the people of Carran do not seem to see it in the same light as I do; I think it would be a very good place for an auxiliary asylum.

8776. The treatment of patients is very good?—Yes; and our doctor takes a lot of care with them; the dietary in Cooteshill, I think, is much better than in most; we are always changing it whenever he suggests anything.

8777. It is a little monotonous, but very liberal?—We are changing it to a dietary of fish. A certain amount of sanitation will have to be done if it is decided to keep Cooteshill on; we ought to have done it before, but in consequence of the inquiry we are keeping it hanging on. The Guardians are quite prepared if it is retained in its present situation to go to some expense in improvements.

Mr. BERNARD McMAHON, Banboy, examined.

8781. CHAIRMAN.—Is the feeling of your Guardians in favor of an amalgamation?—They are in favor of amalgamation, supposing the union was enlarged, or that the workhouse would be made an auxiliary asylum, but if the workhouse, as a workhouse, were closed they are not in favor of that, owing to the way the rate is this year compared with rates in other unions, and the average cost in other unions.

8782. You find yourselves lost?—Yes.

8783. And you think you could not save anything by amalgamation?—Yes; that is the feeling of the board.

8784. But you would like to get some portions of other unions added to your union?—Yes; we considered the Lismashan part, owing to their having so close the lake, and its being nearer to Banboy than to Lismashan, and the Ardara part of Carran; we considered it would benefit by going to Banboy.

8785. Would the Ardara people themselves object?—I don't know.

8786. Is that mainly what you wish to tell us?—That is mainly what I wish. But there is another point with regard to representation; I don't agree entirely with some of the gentlemen here. Formerly, the Guardians had only the poor to look after; now they are generally District Commissioners as well, and they have a great deal of the money of the county to deal with for roads and works, and they are more in touch with the people than even the County Council, and I would certainly say to make the area very large,

and the representation small would not meet the views of the people in general, for I believe they were very thankful to England for giving them that much Home Rule to let them make their own laws and spend their own money.

8787. You would rather have the matter managed by District Councils than by committees?—Yes; because they are the chosen representatives of the people, and committees often are not.

8788. Mr. McMAHON.—If the houses are done away with there will be great difficulty in getting Guardians to go a long distance—often or twenty miles—I know that; where two are appointed, when one could not get perhaps the other would go, and if I could see they are doing any harm I would be opposed to them, but they are not, so far as I see.

8789. Nobody suggests they are doing harm, but the convenience of representative men must be considered, and what the Commission wants to know is the best way to outline a scheme to give satisfaction to the public at large, and not to be a burden on the ratepayers—I know that is true; but with regard to outdoor relief, when it is a union charge it is rather abused; one man will say "I will put such a person on outdoor relief," knowing it won't come much on the district he represents.

8790. Would you wish to revert to electoral division rating for outdoor relief purposes?—I would.

Mr. THOMAS SHANNON, Banboy, examined.

8791. To cut matters short, I quite agree with the evidence Mr. McGovern and Mr. McMAHON give you, except that there was one part of Mr. McGovern's evidence I did not agree with. I would approve of the rateable area being a dispensary area of charge instead of a union or electoral division charge; I would think it would be better and more suitable, being a minimum area. Then somebody mentioned about the County Council having some controlling power over the Guardians' expenditure.

8792. CHAIRMAN.—No; but supposing the Guardians of the union were swept away, and the hospital remaining, that that hospital should be managed by a committee composed partly of County Councils and partly co-opted people?—Then would it become a union charge or a rural district charge?

8793. It is recommended by some it should be a union and by some a district charge; what would be

your opinion?—I would rather it would be a rural district charge and managed by the rural district. Then there is another matter about children. I would certainly approve of sending out children from workhouses; sending them to some industrial institution, where they would be made of some benefit hereafter.

8794. You think that is the best way to make them of benefit hereafter?—I do.

8795. Do you not think they would be more likely to be a benefit if reared in the homes of people in the country?—If sent to some industrial institution they would get a trade.

8796. Do you think that is the best way of making good citizens of children to send them into an institution?—Yes; an institution that is properly controlled.

8797. Do you think that would make them every-day citizens?—I do; living in an industrial institution.

8798. Do you think they would get into the ways

See 26, 1666.
Mr. Edward Scott.

Mr. Bernard McMAHON.

Mr. Thomas Shannon.

Nov. 26, 1933.
Mr. Thomas
O'Shaughnessy.

of life far better boarded out in a small farmer's family?—They would learn, of course, rural life and agricultural labour.

8798. Is not that what they ought to come to eventually?—If they got some kind of a trade it would be more beneficial to them.

8799. Is there not a great dearth of labourers in the country?—There is in places, but labour is not very well paid in this country at the present time, or any time.

8800. Mr. MURPHY.—Do you think it would be right that the children of the poorhouse should be put above the children of farmers?—I would not.

8801. That is what you propose when you propose to make tradesmen at the expense of the farmers?—The rates will be paying for them in any case.

8802. But can the farmers afford to make tradesmen of their children?—In some instances they can.

8803. But still you would ask these farmers to put the Poor Law children in a better position in life than their own children?—I don't think the extra tax on the rates would be very much.

8804. Do you not think it would be better to put these children out with farmers to learn how the work on fields is performed?—In some instances it would be, but they are not very well treated.

8805. CHAIRMAN.—We are not speaking of hiring out, but boarding out?—I would board them out to nine or ten years of age.

8806. But you would not bring a child who had been out in a farmer's family until eight or nine; you would not, after that age, bring them into the institution?

Mr. James
McGovern.

I am the Clerk of the Bowney Union; I have merely to hand in a resolution (produced); I may state that the Ballinamore District Council expressed strong views on Monday last against the amalgamation; they would rather extend in the direction of Mehill, but they could not see their way at all to break up the hospital accommodation.

Mr. JAMES MCGOVERN examined.

Mr. R. W.
Strathmann.

8812. CHAIRMAN.—You are from Enniskillen?—I am Vice-Chairman of the Rural District Council of Enniskillen—the Fermanagh part.

8813. Is your evidence in favour of amalgamation?

—Yes.

8814. What would you do as regards Enniskillen No. 2?—We would prefer for the county to have its own—our workhouse in our county, and have all the county.

8815. You would prefer to give it to Cavan?—Yes.

8816. It never was with Cavan?—No.

8817. You would wish now to make it a county board?

—Yes.

8818. That is not the opinion of the Board of Guardians of Enniskillen as a whole?—It is the opinion of the minority of the Board of Guardians and of the majority of the Rural District Council—we are very poorly an even body. We think our workhouse would do our county; it is built to accommodate almost double the number of the paupers of the whole county.

8819. But the Cavan people wish to remain with you?—I believe they do; we are very cheap; our union is worked cheaply; I think that would be about the reason.

8820. Enniskillen is their market town?—It is their market town, although it is farther away from them.

8821. Mr. MURPHY.—Did you hear what Mr. Johnson said on that account?—I did.

8822. With regard to the impracticability of the roads?—I did not agree with him; I rode a bicycle over every inch of the road; I would call it a good road.

8823. He was very strong on the point that that portion of Cavan should still continue in Fermanagh?—He is the majority of the people of the district.

8824. CHAIRMAN.—It would be too bad if none of the unions wanted Glenties?—It would have to be a little union of itself, for Enniskillen does not want it.

8825. Mr. MURPHY.—You heard what Mr. Johnson said about the condition of the road in winter time?—It is not as bad as Mr. Johnson would lead you to believe; I would call it a good road in a mountainous district.

—I would bring them into the institution, because paupers sent out that way don't do very well in the locality; they are known; they would come all the way to the army or Scotland, and perhaps turn out badly, and seem to be inmates of the workhouse again.

8827. Mr. MURPHY.—We have had evidence to the contrary, no later than yesterday, that when these children are sent out to the farmers they mingle with the population and become respectable members of society?—They may, in a way, but still they don't get the same respect, and are looked down upon, and that situation has a bad effect on them; whereas if they got some kind of trade or calling it would be quite different, and in any locality they could get a portion.

8828. Do you not think the locality would be doing its full duty by providing for these children a home when they are small, and then when they get a proper age sending them out amongst the farmers, and when they get thoroughly grounded in them shift for themselves?—I would approve of giving them some kind of trade, and would think that was providing for them hereafter.

8829. Don't you know that by doing that you would be taking away from the country the labour it needs—the labour of the agricultural hand so much necessary?—From my knowledge of any paupers that have been sent out on hire they will stop on hire until they are fifteen or sixteen, and then leave the country altogether, and either go to England or Scotland.

8830. They will do so still more if you make tradesmen of them?—They need not; they have a way of living.

8831. CHAIRMAN.—Do they wish to keep on the union?—Yes; they say they prefer coming to Bessborough to going to Mehill, where they must go, of course, 2 Bessborough is broken up; it would be too far for them to go to Carrick-on-Shannon.

8832. Still these large mountains intervene?—The road is made in a valley between the mountains; I would call it a good road in a mountainous district. With regard to the outdoor relief system, a great number of the Guardians in Enniskillen think there should be a test—the test of a certificate from the doctor that the pauper is not able to be removed to the workhouse. We think the system of outdoor relief is very much abused.

8833. CHAIRMAN.—It has not very much in your own union?—There is about four times as much outdoor relief as there was.

8834. Mr. MURPHY.—What do you think is the reason of that?—The Guardians apply for outdoor relief for people without a certificate from the doctor, and it is got in cases in which it should not be got.

8835. Did you hear the statement of Mr. Crumple?—I did; I did not agree with it.

8836. He instanced one or two cases?—If I went into particulars I could instance a case in which it was abused.

8837. CHAIRMAN.—In what way?—I have known a party getting outdoor relief—a tradesman, with four children hired earning from 4s. to 2s. the half year, and only four children with him, and he was able to earn 15s. a week at his trade.

8838. Was he earning at the time he was getting the relief?—He was able to be earning; I saw him in Enniskillen the day he had for a week granted to him; he appeared in as good health as I was.

8839. You called the attention of the Guardians to that?—I opposed it, but the Guardians of the district went for it, and it was got.

8840. Mr. MURPHY.—If you had drawn the attention of the auditor to that there would be some further questions?—I did not do that.

8841. Every Guardian, and in fact every reliever, has the right to draw the attention of the auditor to everything that is illegal?—I think the auditor has a right to draw the attention of the auditor to everything that is illegal?—I think the auditor has a right to draw the attention of the auditor to everything that is illegal.

Nov. 28, 1909.

Mr. R. W. Stansbury.

3336. CHAIRMAN.—On what ground was the outdoor relief given?—On the ground that the man had a large family and his trade was gone down.

3337. That he was permanently or temporarily disabled?—It was that he was not able to earn enough to support his family.

3338. It was not that he was prevented from earning by infirmity?—It was said he was in delicate health; they could not have a certificate from the doctor, because he was not exactly sick.

3339. How long did that relief continue?—For about four months; it was reduced from 6s. to 4s., and then it was dropped after a bit.

3340. About how long ago is that?—It is about six months ago—last winter.

3341. Is that an altogether isolated case; is that the only case you know?—There were other cases of people in the town of Elmkill, that I thought were well able to be removed to the workhouse, where they got outdoor relief.

3342. This other man was in a country district?—Yes.

3343. How far was he from home when he came into Elmkill?—Thirteen statute miles.

3344. Did he walk it?—I should think not; I should think he came by train; he was a cooper by trade in the country.

3345. In Elmkill there is some laxity you think?—I think in Elmkill, as the people have an objection to go to the workhouse, there is outdoor relief given to them where it should not be given—where they are able to be removed to the workhouse.

3346. Do you think if they were offered the workhouse they would go?—They would prefer not to go if they could get outdoor relief.

3347. Do you think it was a case in which they were so really destitute that they would have to get outdoor relief or go to the workhouse?—I don't think so; I think they got outdoor relief when, if they did not get it, they would manage without it. They were old people, and some of the family would have given them help if they did not get outdoor relief.

3348. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Take the case Mr. CHAIRMAN instanced, a widow with four or five children; do you think it would be proper to reduce outdoor relief to her?—I think that was an exceptional case; I would give her outdoor relief.

3349. Might it not be in the case you instance that on closer examination it would be found, on the relieving officer's inquiries, that she was in absolute need, and a little temporary aid would tide him over?—I don't think he was.

3350. Does not the relieving officer inquire into all these applications?—He is supposed to do so.

3351. Does he not make a report?—He makes a report.

3352. How do the Guardians treat that report?—Sometimes they give money and sometimes not, according to the vote of the Guardians. Up to lately it was a rule not to give outdoor relief without a certificate of the doctor, and after that was dropped it increased immensely, and giving that reliever other charitable applications. I think they don't give as much as they would give if there was not outdoor relief.

3353. You think that is a sort of grant in aid in place of charitable donations from those associations?—I think it is a thing that is allowed in giving it where it can be done without; there should be a test of some sort for outdoor relief.

3354. That may apply in towns, but would that apply in the country; these charitable organizations don't exist in the country?—No; they don't come so much to the country.

3355. CHAIRMAN.—But in Fermanagh there generally would be a section of the community, whether landowners, or wealthy merchants, or clergymen of various denominations; in most parts of Fermanagh there would be people of a charitable disposition, and who do give a great deal in charity?—Certainly; but there are very few papers from the country in Fermanagh.

3356. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—It principally comes from the towns?—Yes.

3357. CHAIRMAN.—It is in towns the poor people find it hardest to get along?—Yes.

3358. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—These poor people in the towns have come from the country in most instances?—Most of the people in the workhouse have been reared in the workhouse; if they are reared in the workhouse as children they will come back to it, both male and female; if they are reared in the workhouse they are little or no use when they are sent into the country.

3359. That is a sermon in favour of boarding out; is it not a fact that the poor in town are largely composed of people who have had to leave the country in consequence of want of employment?—There is no such thing as want of employment in the country.

3360. When a man gets aged a farmer does not want his services?—I find it is not the old people that go to the towns; it is the young people.

3361. Don't you know the farmers, as a rule, won't employ men advanced in years to do farm work?—They employ them as caretakers principally.

3362. CHAIRMAN.—You think the old people remain in the country?—They do; I think the children should be boarded out—every one. I would not go so far as to take the children from their parents.

3363. Even illegitimate children?—I don't think so.

3364. If the law were amended to give the Guardians a discretion to take away children from unworthy parents, would you approve of such a law?—I would not approve of it, for this reason—I think it would only give an inducement for immorality and to get rid of the children too early.

3365. Is there not a difficulty, on the other hand, that if the children were allowed to remain with them the children would most probably grow up evil members of the community?—Well, generally, the younger people get rid of the children by hiring them out.

3366. And then run regularly every day to collect their wages?—To get a share of it at any rate.

3367. Is that a good system?—No; but I don't think you could take the children from them forcibly.

3368. Unless by a change in the law you could not?—I don't think it would be a good thing to do, because it would give an inducement to get rid of children.

3369. There is that difficulty, undoubtedly, but the other difficulty is obvious too—the difficulty of having them with bad parents?—I think if there was amalgamation and the workhouses were turned into local hospitals a great many people, not paupers, who would be able to pay a little for their keep, would go to the local hospital, because I think there are a lot of people that are thoroughly well attended by a doctor but not properly nursed; they would go to the local hospital and pay a little.

MR. JAMES HANFORD EXAMINED.

3370. CHAIRMAN.—You are CHAIRMAN of the Cootskill Board of Guardians?—Yes.

3371. What is your view about the continuance or breaking up of your union?—We had a vote taken of the Guardians about three weeks or a month ago, and they were in favour of maintaining Cootskill Union, by two to one of a majority.

3372. The Monaghan men wish to leave you and you wish to keep them?—Quite so.

3373. If the workhouse were broken up, do you think it would be quite necessary to keep the hospital for the sick?—Oh, yes; I think so; that would be a great thing for the sick and infirm to be kept there.

3374. Dr. BROOKS.—It is well thought of in the district?—Oh, yes; the doctor is very well thought of; in fact I think it should be a county-at-large charge.

3375. CHAIRMAN.—Especially when you are taking up Mr. JAMES the treatment of consumption in the way you are?—Monaghan. Yes; and we treat our patients very well.

3376. Dr. BROOKS.—Did the Guardians discuss that matter at all?—Yes.

3377. Was that their opinion that it should be a county hospital?—Yes.

3378. That is one of the matters that you have to bring before the Commission?—Yes.

3379. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—What did they say about amalgamation?—There would be some in favour of it if they thought it would lessen the rates.

3380. It was only a question of cost they considered?—Quite so.

3381. And if it could be shown it was an economy to do away with some of the workhouses without hurting

Nov. 24, 1893.
Mr. James
Macdonald.

the service to the sick you think the Cootchill people would not raise any objection?—I think they would be in favour of cheapening the rates.

8882. Your rate is not very high at present in Cootchill?—No, sir.

8883. Are the Guardians willing to do anything the doctor asks them?—Oh, yes, quite willing; they are most attentive to the doctor; he is a general favourite with the sick.

8884. He is of a very sympathetic nature?—Yes; the sick think it a great boon to get under his care. There was one time that paying patients were dis-

allowed there owing to a resolution of a certain gentleman on the board; everybody got annoyed, and there was a resolution rescinding it, and they were allowed to go back as paying patients.

8885. No such over-arc as regards the consumptive cases?—No, sir; nothing publicly about them, yet.

8886. Chairman.—It is doing very good work there?—It is. I know myself that the parties who have got in under the care of the doctor are getting on splendidly there; I generally see them every Friday; people that come there almost dying; they are getting strong there.

Mr. James J. HENNESSY examined.

Mr James J.
Hennessy.

I am the relieving officer for Cootchill, and I was appointed to come here to give evidence.

8887. Chairman.—What is the amount of outdoor relief in your union?—The weekly amount at present is £12.

8888. Is there only one relieving officer?—Only one, but before the passing of the Local Government Act the weekly amount was £20. Then there is no corresponding increase in the number of the recipients.

8889. Is the amount that has been increased?—It is the amount that has been increased, but not the number on the relief list—it is 99 to 120—and I believe that is altogether due to the change in chargeability from divisional to union ratings.

8890. Mr. MURKIN.—You think the widening of the area diminished the scrutiny of the Guardians?—I do. I believe there was far more caution exercised by members of the board when we had divisional ratings.

8891. Does that apply to any other thing in the service except outdoor relief?—I think it does; there is a general increase in the expenditure of that union all over under the several heads.

8892. Chairman.—In maintenance would be largely increased by the adoption of the new dietary scale and the improved treatment in the infirmary?—Yes, sir.

8893. That has been all over Ireland you may say?—But the increase is not altogether due to that.

8894. What is about the average amount that you give to people on outdoor relief?—The average amount would be £2 weekly to a single individual.

8895. Where you would have two or three in the same house?—From 2s. 6d. to 3s. or 4s.

8896. That is where the bread-winner is incapacitated; how many have you on outdoor relief?—120 cases and 156 persons. Before the passing of the Local Government Act there were ninety-nine cases and 128 persons.

8897. Two shillings is not too large a grant in aid to any person unfit to work?—No, sir; but there should be some uniformity in giving relief; take two cases in a particular division in similar circumstances—one gets 2s. a week and the other receives double the amount.

8898. Is that owing to the vote of the member?—To influence brought to bear on the member representing the division in which that person lives.

8899. Mr. MURKIN.—What is the method in regard to the granting of outdoor relief; is the application first made to the Guardian of the division and then referred to you?—In some cases it is made by the Guardian of the division, except where I have a medical certificate.

8900. And then you inquire into the matter?—Yes.

8901. And you report?—Yes; and they act on my report, but in a great many cases they are influenced by the medical certificate.

8902. Do you ever report in an opposite direction to the medical certificate?—Yes, sir; and the Guardians are more inclined to favour the opinion of the medical officer than of the relieving officer.

8903. The medical officer asks for the relief, and you think it is not necessary?—He recommends it, and some of the certificates are faulty in my opinion; they go on to state that the bearer is not able to earn

a livelihood. I think that is a thing for the medical officer.

8904. When you come to deal with such an application, what would be the nature of your report?—In a great many cases I would report that the person would not be entitled to it.

8905. Was not that said?—I won't say that, but I would say they were not permanently disabled from labour. A person might be able to work two or three days in the week.

8906. You think the Guardians lean more to the recommendation of the doctor than to your report?—Yes, where a certificate is forthcoming.

8907. What condition of things do you consider necessary to recommend outdoor relief?—I think the medical officer should be instructed not to give a certificate except he is called in to a dispensary patient. At present I know persons in Cootchill; they apply for a dispensary ticket for the purpose of procuring a certificate from the medical officer that they are not able to earn a livelihood, and then when they are strengthened with this certificate they have no day in getting relief from the Guardians.

8908. Chairman.—The certificate you are complaining of is not one certifying that the person cannot be removed, but a certificate as to the want of means?—Yes.

8909. You consider that your business and the condition of health be business?—Yes; and I hold this in interference with me unduly in the carrying out of my duties. For instance, a great many cases have occurred in Cootchill where tramps coming into town was to get into the workhouse, and they are told to go to the medical officer and to get a ticket to me, to place them in the workhouse, instead of coming to me in the first instance. I think that most objectionable.

8910. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you live in Cootchill?—Yes; and these people know that. As regards the boarding out of the aged and infirm, I cannot see how that would work in our union.

8911. Chairman.—You think it would be unobjectionable under another name?—Quite so; but there would be no accommodation for boarding out the aged and infirm; I know of no houses in the district.

8912. I suppose a great many of the aged and infirm that do come into the workhouse have some relatives outside?—Yes; the greater portion of them.

8913. Would not their relatives be very glad to have them for the outdoor relief amount?—Yes; but all the relatives are then as well as they are cared for in the workhouse; the first consideration with the union would be the weekly allowance more than the comfort of the old people; the old people are far more comfortable inside than outside.

8914. Which would they prefer?—There was a change in our dietary scale in 1887; at that time there were only thirty-two aged and infirm in the house, and since the change the number has gone up to sixty-three; it is due to the change in the dietary.

8915. Mr. MURKIN.—Do these old people at all feel the restraint of the house?—I don't think so; there was a resolution I was asked to hand in as regards workhouse amalgamation (proposed); the clerk was not able to come over.

Mr. PATRICK O'REILLY, Cootchill, examined.

Mr Patrick
O'Reilly.

8916. Chairman.—You have heard the evidence of the relieving officer?—Yes.

8917. Do you think there is a good deal in it?—I may say I quite agree with it, and more particularly with regard to the latter portion about those old and

infirm people. I don't believe they could be boarded out as comfortably as in the workhouse, even at an additional cost.

8918. You say that altogether in the interests of the old people themselves, because if they were boarded

out they would cost far less?—I speak from a knowledge of the district I come from; I don't know anyone who would take one.

8923. Their own relatives would be the only persons.—Yes I know three old people between seventy and eighty years; I don't know a relative at all that would keep them.

8924. Dr. BRONER.—Have they relatives at all?—No near relatives—distant relatives.

8925. Is that your experience, generally?—Yes; I speak of those I have a thorough knowledge of.

8926. CHAIRMAN.—They are the last of the generation?—Yes; they have no one near them; besides they are such a length of time in that workhouse—two of them, at least—that they would prefer ending their days there.

8927. Mr. MURKHAM.—There are others not so long; if in a week was given to their relatives to take care of them, do you think they would not be kept comfortably for that?—The first consideration, I am afraid, is to secure the money, and, besides, in the ordinary run of farmers' houses there is no accommodation except what is sufficient for the families.

8928. These people would know that as much was given to their relatives, and if they did not like their treatment they could get changed to some other place?—It is to the relieving officer they would complain, and he would be increasing his duty, and, probably, you would have to increase his salary.

8929. Your relieving officer does not mind work?—He does it efficiently to the satisfaction of the board.

Mr. MICHAEL BRADY examined.

8930. CHAIRMAN.—Now we would like to have your views on what ought to be done with the Owen part of the Granard Union?—My views are known twenty years ago before this great man, Balfour, wanted to have this dissolution. I think it is the brightest act of his life—that and the Land Act.

8931. What is your opinion about the Granard Union being broken up?—I don't interfere with the Granard or Longford people, though at the Inquiry it came out that I wanted dissolution there. I did not want that; I only wanted the five divisions to come to their rightful place.

8932. You wanted them taken away from the Granard Union and put with Owen?—Yes.

8933. Is Owen your natural market, or Granard?—Granard has no market; this is the great market town.

8934. You have no big village in your parish?—None at all; Killybeg is all—a little village.

8935. How far is that from Owen?—About nine and a half miles.

8936. And about five from Granard?—Not so far from Granard; a mile less.

8937. Do you think there would be very much hardship in moving the sick; they have to go further from other parts of the Owen Union?—I think there is a great advantage for the sick, unless infectious cases, because we have a train in the centre and of the division and a station at the upper end—Ballywillan and Brumlowa. You can get down two days in the week for 1s. and 10d. any other day in the week, and ever since I was on the County Infirmary committee I never was asked to get any one into Granard; all come to me to get into the county infirmary.

8938. You have a great number of applications?—Oh, a great number; and they all come down accompanied to us. There was a man beyond at Granard that he had all as one as killed him, and in place of going into Granard they brought him to Brumlowa, put him on the train, and brought him here, and he was dead next day; that shows the faith they have in this place. We had a meeting last Wednesday week—one from Warranstown, and a man from Longford, and one from the five divisions, and the three were unanimous for dissolving the Granard house.

8939. Mr. MURKHAM.—You don't think it would be too far to come to Owen?—Indeed I don't; they showed that they thought the hospital should be kept in Granard.

8940. That would be sufficient?—Oh, quite sufficient, they allowed. I don't be after them; I have no wish to go there from the way I see things going on there.

8941. CHAIRMAN.—You don't care for comfort?—Well, indeed, you would not like to be there; I think everything is managed very bad there. I know men; I will give you the names—you will not find me and a

and credit to himself. With regard to the boarding out of children, I would be in favour, as far as possible, of having them boarded with the farmers.

8942. You would not agree with the witness from Brumlowa?—To give them trades? I would not; it is country people who are required, and probably they would become farmers themselves some day, or farm labourers.

8943. CHAIRMAN.—That is the only position for them to occupy in an agricultural country like this?—There are no other members of the community so much required at the present time. Considering the position of Cootehill, I don't believe it would be to the benefit of anyone to have it cut up into three or four aliquots and take it to other unions; there is no railway communication except one line of railway into Monaghan.

8944. You would rather remain as you are?—Unless there was proof of a pretty large saving effected.

8945. Without hardship to the sick or poor?—Yes; you could neither reach Ballyborough nor Carran except by road—no train accommodation at all.

8946. Mr. MURKHAM.—Now far is it from here to Cootehill by road?—Twelve miles. I presume it is much the same to Ballyborough; some parts of Cootehill Union are much further.

8947. Dr. BRONER.—What is the nearest portion of Cootehill to Carran?—There is one electoral division that is nearest as is near as Cootehill—Brumlowa. It might be five miles; that would be adjoining Red-hill.

He together—a man of the name of Maguire; he is dead now; he was getting outdoor relief, and having 230 in the bank.

8948. The relieving officer did not know that?—I don't know whether he did or not; he could not but know it. We had a man of the name of Brady in the workhouse that had 230 in the bank. I proposed in Granard that the union part be put on him, or, if not, the board, because he would go out each day into the town and enjoy himself, and he left at once. About outdoor relief, that is considerably abused; people get it that should not get it; there are plenty of deserving cases.

8949. Mr. MURKHAM.—You think the deserving should get it?—Oh, indeed I do.

8950. CHAIRMAN.—How is it that the people who don't deserve it manage to get it?—Last Saturday week when I was there I asked was there a person of the name of Mrs. Brady wanting to get outdoor relief?—I heard she had six names there—and the clerk said no, she did not get it. But next day I heard she got into the house. She was down here the week previous to that—herself and her nephew—with Mr. Kennedy. This nephew offered her 25s for a plot of land she held; she had as good a house as any farm of land in the parish I am living in; she was to have that house free; she took in her son, and now she is in the poor-house.

8951. Did the son turn her out?—I cannot tell you that.

8952. The son is in and she is out?—She is in the poor-house and the son is in the house. I don't think that is a good way of going on with the business.

8953. Mr. MURKHAM.—What about the children; you would like to see them all boarded out?—There are not many of them there, but I don't see the need they are in the house, because there is a girl there thirty-three years, that was born there, and last May I proposed to send this girl down to the town of Carran the hiring day; no, she would not leave where she was; she was at home there, and she has her three children there.

8954. CHAIRMAN.—A married woman?—Oh, no. She was put out in a few weeks after to service at 25 or 27 for the half year; she was in the house again in a couple of months.

8955. Mr. MURKHAM.—Is she an exception?—Indeed she is not; there are children there with their fathers living outside the town with severity of the best acres that ever a crow flew over, maintained at our expense. If you want names I will get them.

8956. Where are those children?—In the house.

8957. Can the Guardians not do anything to stop that?—They don't stop it anyway.

Dec 25, 1901.

Mr. Patrick O'Reilly.

Mr. Michael Brady.

Nov. 28, 1902.

Mr. Michael
Brady.

8954. Dr. BRODER.—How was she hired out if she had three children in the house?

CHAIRMAN.—Did she take the children with her?—
Oh, no.

Mr. Patrick
Sheridan.

Our union is in favour of amalgamation.

8955. CHAIRMAN.—Are you in favour of breaking up your own union?—I think not; the lower end would be very far from my union—fifteen or sixteen miles from Kells and sixteen from Owen.

8956. How far does your opinion in favour of amalgamation go; what unions ought to be broken up?—I would not like to say that.

8957. Would you think that the idea of having four workhouses in the county is a good one?—Very good.

8958. But owing to the particular circumstances and position of Oldcastle it could easily be broken up?—It would be very hard on us; we are very far away from Kells and Owen.

8959. What is the nearest workhouse to Oldcastle?—Kells. Of course, if it would be broken up, they are in favour of retaining a cottage hospital and sending the infirm or aged to some place where they could be maintained at the cost of the district. They are in favour of boarding out children as far as possible.

8960. Have you many boarded out in Oldcastle at present?—I think something over twenty.

8961. Are you satisfied with the way they are managed?—Well satisfied.

8962. As regards the area of rating for Poor Law purposes, are you in favour of the continuance of union rating?—I think dispensary rating would be better; it would be looked into better—more close inspection.

Mr. Thomas J
Naght.

8971. CHAIRMAN.—You are also a Guardian of Oldcastle?—Yes; Vice-Chairman of the Board from the Owen part.

8972. You have heard the evidence of the last witness?—Yes.

8973. Do you agree with him generally?—Certainly.

8974. Is there anything you would like to add that he has not mentioned, or anything in which you differ from him slightly?—I don't differ with him in any-

Mr. John
Gilligan.

8975. CHAIRMAN.—I think you are Chairman of the Urban Council of Owen?—Yes.

8976. What is the opinion of the Urban Council?—The opinion of the council is in favour of amalgamation.

8977. How many workhouses would do for the county?—One, I think.

8978. What would be the proper situation for the workhouse?—I would say Owen.

8979. How much of the county would you put into the new union of Owen; would it be the whole county?—Yes; I would put in Basenby and Ooteshill.

8980. Would you put in the part that goes to Kinnihilan?—Down?—I did not come to a decision on those portions; they are very far away; I did not know whether it would not be more economical to send them to other unions.

8981. Speaking generally, you would take all the rest of the county; would you take in that part of Oldcastle?—I think so, and part of Granard.

8982. And you would close up Ooteshill and Ballyborough and Ballyboy?—Yes, except the hospital accommodation.

8983. What would you do with the workhouses you closed?—I would turn them into technical schools or places for harmless lunatics—some useful purposes—or perhaps hospitals if there was not a sufficient hospital.

8984. Is there anything else you would like to mention?—I am in favour of boarding out children, and I would be also in favour of boarding out men who could do a little—old people that could supplement the outdoor relief they get with work for the farmers.

8985. You would not be afraid that would spread too much and make younger people anxious to get the Guardians to enter into that sort of an arrangement for all the old people of the county?—I would not be afraid of that.

8986. Or for a good many of the old people?—There are a good many of the old people would be very useful for farm work about the yards.

Mr. PATRICK SHERIDAN, Oldcastle, examined.

In fact divisional rating would be a closer inspection still, but it would be more complicated. I think dispensary rating is the better of the two.

8964. Would you care for that for all purposes, or only for a few purposes?—A few purposes.

8965. Would you care for it for anything else except outdoor relief?—For the maintenance of the cottage hospital.

8966. What would you gain by having that area of charge; the sick are bound to come in, no matter when they come from?—Some of the sick might go to the county infirmary.

8967. You would have to pay for them then?—Yes.

8968. Do you see any way by which you would be able by making in maintenance a dispensary rating?—I don't see any way of gaining by it, but you would get by outdoor relief.

8969. Yes; you would have a closer inspection of every case, but for the sick it is a case of sending them as a matter of course, so that the Guardians exercise no discretion as regards the number of sick?—No.

8970. You would be in favour of changing some little sum to anyone able to pay, giving the Guardians no reason to make that charge if you thought people were able to pay even a little?—Yes; but it is hard to get the people to come in as long as you maintain it in the form of a workhouse; there is a prejudice against it.

Mr. THOMAS NUGENT examined.

Our reasons for amalgamation was with regard to the payment of officials. The committee of the Guardians met three or four months ago, and reported by the audited accounts of the union that the average cost of each inmate was £15 some shillings, and we found then that when the item of salaries was added to that it amounted to over £25.

8975. That was a very accurate and proper way of making the calculation?—That is all I wish to add.

Mr. JOHN GILLIGAN examined.

8988. The old women to mind children?—Yes; I know some in the Owen Union for twenty years, and they are active and well able to work, and in work a good deal about the house—very handy people. I asked some of those boys why did they not live with farmers; they said they had better times in the house, and no slavery.

8989. Are you on the county infirmary committee?—Yes.

8990. That does a good deal of the hospital work?—It works well; we have twenty governors—some nominated by the County Council—and then there are a certain number of life governors.

8991. A number of these are elected on the committee?—Yes.

8992. Is there anything you would suggest about that?—There is no suggestion I could make, the thing is working so well.

8993. You have spent a good deal of money on it lately?—We did; it is in fine working order and well equipped.

8994. There are a few things to be done yet?—We are going bit by bit.

8995. According as the money is handy?—Yes; we have made great improvements in the last three years; you would not know the house; I live in the town and have a good deal of communication with the patients and seeing tickets for those deserving, and I make inquiries of the patients leaving, and they all give the report that they are well treated, and have no complaints.

8996. Dr. BRODER.—Are you limited in the way of income?—I think we get about £200 a year from the County Council.

8997. Is that sufficient?—There is some paid in by the life governors.

8998. Some of the county infirmaries have as much as £1,500?—I don't think we have as much.

The sitting terminated.

EIGHTEENTH PUBLIC SITTING—TUESDAY, DECEMBER 167, 1903.

Dec. 1, 1903.

At the Court-house, Armagh.

Present.—Mr. MICEE, (Chairman), Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. E. COBY BIGGER.

Mr. Guach (instructed by Mr. Gardien) appeared for the Nerry Board of Guardians and District Council.

Mr. Charles Lanerty appeared for the Castleblagney Board of Guardians and Crossmaglen District Council.

Mr. JOHN FERRIS examined.

9088. CHAIRMAN.—You are one of the Lurgan Guardians?—I am.

9089. Has your Board of Guardians considered whether it would be desirable to make any changes in the number of Poor Law unions in the County Armagh?—Well, I think it is the general impression that it would not.

9090. Your Board of Guardians would be against breaking up the Lurgan Union?—Certainly.

9091. There are a large number of inmates there?—Yes; including the hospital, we have nearly 400.

9092. What are the reasons why you think Lurgan ought to be allowed to remain?—Owing to only two workhouses being in the county, I think it would be very inconvenient if one was done away with. I think it would be almost an impossibility to suit the convenience of patients, for instance, if the Lurgan hospital were done away with.

9093. If any change were made about the able-bodied, or inmates, or children you think it would be absolutely necessary to have a hospital in the town of Lurgan?—It would be a matter of very great necessity.

9094. Do you think it would be essential?—I think so.

9095. Do you see any objection to sending away some of the inmates you have got there; take, for instance, first, the females, would you be in favour of sending away the inmates from the workhouse?—I am under the impression I would.

9096. Either to the lunatic asylum, if it was able to receive them, or an auxiliary asylum?—I think it would be a great advantage.

9097. Then, as regards the children in the house, you have a considerable number of children in Lurgan?

9098. We have not, taking into consideration the population, such a large number, because the boarding-out system is adopted.

9099. Do you board out nearly all you can?—Yes; in fact all orphans are boarded out.

9100. Would you be in favour of an extension of the law enabling Guardians to take the place of parents of illegitimate children in the house and deprive the mother of the custody of those whom you thought it advantageous to the child and the community?—In many cases it would be of considerable advantage, for sometimes the mothers are not fit to have charge of those children.

9101. Then you would be in favour of an extension of the law giving Poor Law Guardians a discretion to take away a child from a parent?—I certainly would under certain circumstances.

9102. A discretion, I say, then they could exercise it or not, as they thought fit?—I think it would be a matter of very great importance if the Guardians were so empowered.

9103. You have been for a long time a Poor Law Guardian?—I have been for many years.

9104. You have noticed, I dare say, that the same woman comes back with additional children—that a woman has one, two, or even more than three illegitimate children?—It often occurs that when once a woman falls there is a repetition.

9105. Have you thought of any plan for trying to fight against that?—It is a very difficult matter.

9106. It has been suggested to the Commission in other places that it might be well that a woman, when she was about to have a child, should be sent to some religious penitentiary according to the religion she professed—to some institution managed by the same religious body to which she belonged. That if she was sent there with a view to reclamation, that some arrangement could be made for the boarding out of the child, and receiving some contribution from the mother?—I think the system would be a good one, because when a girl is unfortunate in that way and comes in and is confined in the workhouse, her self-respect that should be encouraged—

9107. She loses that when she gets among women of bad character?—That is so, and I think it is a pity to see young women, when they have a misfortune of that sort, when they go into the workhouse they cease to have friends; they are cut off entirely, and become reckless of consequences; if there could be a helping hand given to that class there could not be a greater charity.

9108. At the start on the downward grade?—Yes.

9109. The obvious objection to that is that it might possibly act as an immoral incentive if the woman felt the children could be got rid of easily and her own shame could be staked in a way?—I think if there was an institution that would receive them and try and raise that self-respect which has gone down, and place them where they could get a trial for some time in a house of that sort, and could then be placed in a respectable position, it would be a great advantage.

9110. You would be willing to try that?—I think in a great many cases it would be successful; there may be some exceptional cases, but in the large number it would be successful.

9111. After her first lapse she feels the sorrow and the terrible position in which she has brought herself, and would be glad of a chance of pulling up?—So she would if she got the opportunity, I think, in many cases. I have a great deal of experience of the workhouse myself, and coming in contact with women of that class, and I don't know more pitiable objects; there is no one to give them a helping hand; when they go in there they look upon themselves as in for life almost.

9112. You would be in favour of closing the workhouse against women with illegitimate children and sending them to penitentiaries. Then, as regards the children, do you think that practically the workhouse may be closed against that class, the majority of children being illegitimate?—The large number of them are; it is only in cases where they are orphans they are boarded out; there are some exceptional cases, but very few; that is, if the father dies and the mother is not looked upon as fit to look after the children; in some cases the Guardians have sent them out to nurse.

9113. If the discretion of the Guardians were enlarged the children would be excluded from the workhouse?—I think it would be a great advantage; in fact it is a considerable loss to keep them in it.

9114. They come back again?—The Guardians of Lurgan have adopted a system of sending children out to school, except the orphans, and they have not made the clothing uniform, so that when you went into a school you would not know a workhouse child from any other.

9115. That is done in both the workhouses in the County Armagh, but don't you think it would be a greater advantage still to have no children at all in the workhouse?—I think so.

9116. If you take away those three classes—the inmates, and children, and mothers who come in with illegitimate children—you have practically the only classes

Mr. John Ferris.

Dec. 1, 1904
Mr. John
Fleming.

left the aged and infirm and the sick, with the exception of a very rare case of a handy able-bodied man who would seek relief or a tramp?—The fact is in Lurgan Workhouse we have no able-bodied men; it is entirely confined to the patients in the infirmary and aged and infirm in the workhouse.

9027. Then the Poor Law system for infirm would come to two classes—the sick and aged and infirm. You would have, you may say, the inmates of an almshouse and the inmates of a hospital only to deal with. That would make workhouse administration much more simple; you would not have that difficulty of classification that exists now?—It would be a considerable advantage if carried out, at least that is my opinion.

9028. Now, as regards the question of hospital accommodation in your union, how many hospitals have you in your union?—Only two—Armagh and Lurgan.

9029. In your union?—Only one.

9030. What towns have you in your union?—Portadown and Lurgan and several villages.

9031. Portadown is a large town, now increasing rapidly. It has no hospital?—It has none at present.

9032. It used to have a hospital some years ago of some sort?—I am under the impression it was built in 1847, but it has never been in use much.

9033. Is there any demand now for hospital accommodation in the town of Portadown?—No doubt there is.

9034. I mean there is a claim being made for it?—I understand the Portadown people are anxious there should be one.

9035. What do you think of the claim?—I don't know; the working expenses would entail a good deal, but I have been thinking that if such a thing was established in Portadown as a hospital the nursing staff could be supplied from Lurgan at times when it was necessary.

9036. Lurgan or Armagh; supposing later on it was seen to be economical to have a county system of nursing, say with headquarters at the County Armagh Infirmary, and that all the hospitals in the county should get their nurses from the County Infirmary?—At present we have a training system at Lurgan that they have not in Armagh; it is splendid, and working well; we have at present somewhere about thirteen nurses in Lurgan.

9037. Do they stay with you when they become qualified?—Some of them do; but I don't know of any that have been trained in Lurgan that have not got into good situations after they have left.

9038. Where do they go?—Some are in England and some in Ireland, the greater portion in Ireland, but any that have been trained in Lurgan Hospital have been most successful in getting situations, and, I believe, have turned out very satisfactory.

9039. And you have no difficulty in getting a sufficient number of probationers?—Not the slightest; there are more applicants than are wanted.

9040. Coming back to the Portadown claim, do you think it would be a fair and proper thing that there should be a hospital in Portadown?—Taking into consideration the population of Portadown at present, and the number of patients that generally come from Portadown to Lurgan, I would not say but it would be advisable.

9041. A very large proportion of your cases do come from Portadown?—A great many do.

9042. A great many accident cases?—I don't know that there are such a large number of accidents, but there are some.

9043. And they have to be brought a distance off?—Five miles.

9044. I suppose they have to telegraph for your ambulance?—They do.

9045. They have to wait until an ambulance goes to them and then takes them back?—That is so.

9046. I suppose if a hospital were started at Portadown you consider the area of charge should be the union-at-large?—I am not just prepared to give an answer to that; some one of more experience than I should answer that; it requires some consideration.

9047. Now, as regards paying patients, you do get into the Lurgan Workhouse paying patients?—We do.

9048. And about what rate do they pay?—It depends entirely on their circumstances.

9049. You take, really, what payments you think they can afford to give?—Yes; it is discretionary.

9050. Do you happen to remember what is the lowest payment you take?—I think 3s. 6d. a week.

9051. Going up to 5s. or 10s.?—Yes; a tradesman who has to support his wife and family outside is charged the lowest rate.

9052. Take the case that often happens in fever hospitals—Derry and elsewhere—where people in good circumstances go into an infectious hospital to be treated, what arrangement do you make about a day of that kind?—Dr. Darling will be able to answer that question.

9053. Do you think it would be a good thing to take even much smaller payments than 3s. 6d. a week; now, for instance, to go as low as, I think, they do in the Keshmille County Infirmary; I am not sure whether it is 7d. a week or 1s. a week; Dr. Kidd, the surgeon of the infirmary there, thought it a very good plan, and it has brought them in a good deal of money; where they get nothing but outside they have managed to get about £500 a year towards the cost of the hospital by taking as small payments as people could afford. Supposing the child of a working man is brought in, that child would cost at home, at all events, a penny a day, and the father could pay that without any hardship, for that would be paid to the parent by the child's earnings?—I do believe it would be an advantage, and not only that, but it would keep up self-respect, and they would feel they were not going in as paupers to the hospital.

9054. But you would do that all round with all classes of sick as far as you could?—I certainly would; we have not adopted that system, but I think it would be a good one.

9055. Now, the only other question I have to ask you about is the tramp question?—The tramp question is a difficult one to solve. My impression about tramps is that the word "tramp" includes many respectable men; I myself know cases; I sometimes go to the casual wards at night and get into conversation with the tramps, finding out where they are from and their circumstances, and I find in many cases respectable tradesmen that for want of work are driven sometimes to go to look for employment; a man of that class would be ashamed to beg. It is only the week before last I was up in the casual ward and I met with a painter—a respectable, decent man; he and his wife had come in for lodgings; they had walked from Belfast, and had not a farthing on the way; they would not beg; they were in a most deplorable state; it is very difficult to know how to deal with these people. There is another class who deserve no encouragement; if they can steal on the way they are quite prepared to do almost any act to get money. But there is one class I look on with great pity, that would starve before they would beg, and they are forced to come to the workhouse for their supper, bed, and breakfast.

9056. Then you would not be disposed to draw the line much more tightly than at present; if the Master knew a man was really a tramp, who spent his life in going about the country begging and not in search, really, of employment—what we know as an ordinary tramp—would you be in favour of keeping him, so the English system allows, in the workhouse for one, two, or three days as a sort of punishment?—I don't think it would do any harm, but it is a matter of indifference to that class where they are. Being a magistrate, I have them brought before me from time to time, and I find they would just as soon go to the jail as to a workhouse.

9057. They have not that impulse for moving on that we associate with a tramp?—No; when they come into a town of an evening they go round to every house almost, where they can obtain anything, and the result is they get drunk before night and go up to the workhouse for a night's lodging; their chief object seems to be to obtain money to spend in drink.

9058. The amount of outdoor relief in your union is about £1,000 a year?—I think it is about that.

9059. £991 for the last audited year, and chiefly in the towns?—There is a good deal given to the country.

9060. Is there anything you would wish to tell us about the administration of outdoor relief; do you think it is on satisfactory lines or that some change might be made either with regard to the area of charge or any other way?—I am not in a position to give an answer to that question, but I believe it is a system that does immense good.

9061. What classes chiefly get outdoor relief from you—the class that you have in your mind chiefly now where hardship is avoided?—The class that generally gets outdoor relief is where the father comes into

Dec 1, 1904.
Mr. John Fleming.

hospital and the mother is left with a family of small children; in every case they get outdoor relief unless such cases where the parent recovers.

9052. Do you ever give outdoor relief to a house out of which considerable weekly earnings are coming?—Oh, no.

9053. You would not approve of that case?—I would not.

9054. If a son were earning, and his father and mother were in a house, permanently disabled, and therefore eligible for relief, you would not be in favour of giving outdoor relief?—No; in no case, unless they were deserving objects of charity.

9055. You would not think that a deserving object?—No. It is through the relieving officer the application is generally made, and he is supposed to make all inquiries as to the position of the family and their earnings, and he informs the Guardians as to the amount of the earnings going into the house, and if the Guardians come to the conclusion it is not necessary they don't get it.

9056. I don't suppose you have compared your expenditure on workhouse inmates with the expenditure here in Armagh?—I think not.

9057. I see Armagh spent £6,000 on her workhouse on Poor Law purposes, and you have spent £7,740; you have spent £1,600 more than they did; you seem to have nearly double the number, yet you are only £1,600 in advance?—It seems we are working on a more economical scale.

9058. You are not keeping them short in food in any way?—Not at all. I think, as far as the dietary scale is concerned, there is no objection to be made to it. I think Mr. Agnew would bear me out in that.

9059. I have got the dietary scale here?—It has been considerably improved.

9060. This is the dietary scale of 31st December, 1903; I am afraid this cost refers to the old dietary scale; was this a new dietary scale in December, 1903?—Yes.

9061. Then the cost I have is the cost under the old scale; that would explain it. No; I see this scale was adopted in February, 1903?—That is since the new was introduced.

9062. Yes?—It entailed a little more expense, but there is no doubt it is a great improvement, so far as diet is concerned.

9063. Do you think that your officers' rations are adequate?—I don't hear any complaints; the only thing is, I think, they complain of the want of variety.

9064. Great monotony?—Yes.

9065. Did you ever consider the question of giving an allowance in lieu of rations to those officers specially who need greater variety in food; nurses, for instance?—I believe it would be a great advantage to the officers of the house if they got money in place of rations.

9066. There is an objection, which you can understand, in giving it all round, but to those officers who are not in charge of stores, in the case of nurses for instance, from the nature of their employment their appetite is such as requires to be tempted very often?—That is so.

9067. And giving the same little lump of beef or mutton every day without variation is not stimulating to the appetite?—It is not; I think it is a disadvantage; and it is not fair to the nurses to be left that way. I think it should be left discretionary on their part to purchase whatever food they require.

9068. You have a resident medical officer, too?—Yes.

9069. This heading "Officers' rations"—apparently under that they all would get the same rations?—I think the resident medical officer is treated the same as the nurses.

9070. Would she be treated the same way as the man who takes charge of the kitchen boiler?—I don't know that.

9071. They are all here on the same scale apparently?—The man who has charge of the kitchen boiler is an inmate.

9072. Well, the man who has charge of the steam arrangements?—He boards out.

9073. Take the paid wardmaids?—We have no paid wardmaids.

9074. What is your lowest class of paid officer?—Porter.

9075. Would the medical officer have the same dietary as the porter?—I don't think so.

Dr. Darling.—She has.

9076. Don't you think that is distinctly a matter?—I think it is a matter that requires reformation. I think it is a shame.

9077. It is an oversight very likely?—I don't know that it is, but perhaps too much economy prevailed. I don't think it is a thing that should be.

9078. Mr. MURKIN.—The Resident Medical Officer is rather a novelty in workhouses in Ireland?—I don't know whether we have been the first departure.

CHAMBERLAIN.—I think you have been the most gallant—the first to appoint a lady, but there are resident medical officers elsewhere.

9079. Mr. MURKIN.—Have you considered at your Board of Guardians the question of the amalgamation of unions for the County Armagh as a whole, or simply with reference to your own particular union?—I don't think so; as far as any conversation that I had with the Guardians, they seemed to be under the impression it would be almost an impossibility.

9080. It was merely a conversation; you never had the matter discussed?—No.

9081. Then you don't speak as a representative of the body but simply as a member expressing your own views on the subject?—That is so.

9082. Considering the size of Armagh and the railway facilities in it, and the number of inmates, do you not think that one workhouse in this county would be sufficient for the infirm destitute of the county?—I think that if there were only one workhouse in the county there would be a greater amount of inconvenience.

9083. Your union is on the very edge of Armagh County?—Partly so.

9084. You know the object of this Commission is to bring about a reform for the benefit of the ratepayers and the benefit of the sick, and our desire is to get from the local men some knowledge not of their own facilities but of the county as a whole for the interest of the ratepayers, and what I would like to know from you, as a man of business, is would it not be possible to have one workhouse for the infirm of the county, which would number about 300 or 400 people altogether, where you accustom the children, when you exclude the females, and the mothers of illegitimate children, and the sick, it would leave you only about 200 that you might class as eligible candidates for the workhouse; do you not think that any house in the county would be sufficient to accommodate these 200?—That might be so.

9085. Which workhouse now in the county is most central?—I don't think I can surmise that question, because I am more or less selfish, and I might not be correct in the statement.

9086. CHAMBERLAIN.—You might think Lurgan was the centre?—I am not going to say so.

9087. Mr. MURKIN.—Have you ever considered the question, for instance, if any of these houses are amalgamated and abolished, have you ever considered the question of rating or representation; would you have the present union rating, or would you desire to extend it a little wider and make it a county rate for Poor Law purposes?—I think it is more satisfactory as it is.

9088. It certainly would be more satisfactory to the pockets of the people of Lurgan to have it extended to a county rate, because your rate is 11d., whereas the Armagh rate is only 6d. If that was thrown into the common purse you would make 2d. in the £ by the change; would not that appeal to you as a man of business?—I don't know. As far as my own selfish interests are concerned I would be guided more or less by it, but I think as it is it is in a more satisfactory way.

9089. You think the workhouse system of Ireland is so satisfactory that no change could be made of a beneficial character?—I would not say that.

9090. But suppose now there was left at Lurgan a hospital—a hospital better than the one you have got—an up-to-date hospital that would satisfy all the requirements of the locality, with an annex for emergency cases—for instance, of some poor people that were suddenly left destitute—supposing that was left there, do you not think that these chronic inmates of the house could be sent as far as Armagh without any detriment?—I have no doubt that they could.

9091. That question of tramps does not seem to be a subject that troubles you in Lurgan; there are none now on this sheet before me?—We have always a large number of tramps; we would have as many as twelve or fourteen of a night.

Dec. 1, 1905]
Mr. John
Fleming.

9102. Do you make them do anything in the house?—They are always occupied in the morning before breakfast either cleaning windows or some other occupation. Stone-baking was tried, but the regular tramps would not break stones; they always broke the hammer-shafts.

9103. Do you think if the Guardians' power was enlarged to detain them from three days to a week, do you think that would have a deterrent effect on them?—It might have; they don't like the confinement. I think it would have a good effect if they are kept for three days before they are liberated.

9104. Some people think that by shutting the workhouse to these tramps that perhaps damage would be done to the furnishings of the locality?—I have no doubt but it would; I think a great many cottages would take place that do not at present. I would be very much afraid of it.

9105. Still, would you believe in giving the Guardians a little more power to try the detention policy if they thought it desirable?—I certainly would.

9106. CHAIRMAN.—With reference to the tramp matter, I see you have a little more than four times as many workhouses in Lurgan as in Armagh; can you give any explanation of that; do they make things particularly pleasant for them in Lurgan and unpleasant for them in Armagh?—It is the direct line from Belfast to the south; they very often call at Lurgan and go on in the direction of Dublin.

9107. All round Lurgan there are high figures; for instance, the collective number of days for tramps are: Lurgan, 1,775; Dungannon, 2,447; Monaghan, 1,322; Castleblayney, 1,601; Newry, 6,997; Banbridge, 2,469; and Armagh, 4,307.—They come from Belfast to Lurgan, and then to Dungannon, and right to Derry; they don't touch Armagh.

9108. Would it not be on the direct road from Belfast to Monaghan where there are such very large numbers?—I don't think so.

9109. How would they go to Monaghan from Belfast?—I find very few tramps go in the Monaghan direction.

9110. Loughrea is a great centre for tramps?—So it is.

9111. And Banbridge and Newry; they seem to avoid Armagh for some reason or other?—It is not on the direct road to any particular place.

9112. It is on the direct line between Lurgan and Monaghan; it almost looks as if they were able to make a day's march from Lurgan to Monaghan?

Mr. MURKIN.—It is a point in favour of continuing Armagh that it is out of the way of tramps?—So it is.

9113. Supposing one workhouse in this union was closed, how far any profitable use to turn the disused workhouse to?—I think it would get into a state of ruin.

CHAIRMAN.—A doctor in Fermanagh recommended that they should be turned into quarters as long as they lasted.

9114. Mr. MURKIN.—Could they not be used for some educational or industrial purpose?—No.

9115. CHAIRMAN.—It would not suit for a factory or spinning place?—No.

9116. Mr. MURKIN.—It would not do for an auxiliary asylum?—No; the formation they are in at present is so different from what asylums are.

9117. They generally have exceedingly good sites and spacious grounds?—The site is right but the construction is bad.

9118. Do you not think that some good public purpose could be accomplished with them?—I don't think so; the only thing that the Lurgan Workhouse would be likely to be used for would be a factory, which it would not suit at all; it might, with alterations, be made an auxiliary asylum for lunatics.

9119. Did it ever occur to you to adopt the policy of boarding out inmates?—I don't think it would do; one thing would be very objectionable—the want of cleanliness. I think an old man or old woman sent out, for instance, to be boarded with their relatives would not get the attention in the way of cleanliness that they would get in the workhouse.

9120. We see people of sixty and sixty-five years of age who sigh for freedom; do you think it ought not to be made possible to let these old people get out and have fresh air and a chat with their neighbours if it could be done without any detriment to the public interest?—I believe it would meet their own wishes, but whether it is—

9121. It is one of the matters we have to inquire into, and it is a matter worthy of consideration by the Guardians to see if there could not be some system of

the kind adopted?—Any party that is in the habit of visiting the houses of the poor and seeing the state they are lying in and comparing that with the beds of the indoor people in the workhouse, there is no comparison.

9122. Do you not think it would have a beneficial effect for the relieving officer to go round and inspect these houses where these people would be boarded out?—I think it would be almost an impossibility to get a great many women to have that beds and desire for cleanliness they should have; no law could have the desired effect.

9123. You will never spread the idea by keeping these people in an institution like the workhouse?—As far as I can see the indoor people in the Lurgan Workhouse are very comfortable. I was one of the Guardians who went through to inquire how many of them would be inclined to go out if they got this in a week; a large number of them preferred stopping in the house to going out.

9124. Dr. BROWN.—You mentioned you had a very good system of training nurses in Lurgan?—I think so.

9125. You have a staff of how many?—Fourteen.

9126. Did the Guardians ever consider the desirability of putting their hospital in a proper state?—I don't think they would object if it was not for the expense. There is no doubt whatever that the hospital requires some change.

9127. Did you ever think of boarding the floors and plastering the walls?—So far as I am personally concerned I think it would be most necessary.

9128. And connecting the infirmary to make it one institution with the hospital; would not that tend to economy in the staff?—I think it would.

9129. Are those matters the Guardians have ever discussed or taken into consideration?—I think not.

9130. Has it not been before them?—Yes; but a great number are country Guardians, and object to any outlay.

9131. Is it not a large manufacturing town?—Yes; there is another thing very much wanted—that is a convalescent ward.

9132. But these other things are more or less absolutely necessary; would it not be better to do absolutely necessary things before going to some of the other desirable things but not so urgently required?—I don't think there is anything in connection with the hospital wanted more than a convalescent ward.

9133. You would want a consumption ward?—There is a ward got up specially for consumption.

9134. It has not modern ventilation; is it not at the third story; patients cannot get up and down?—No doubt there are many requirements in connection with it.

Mr. CURR.—I should like to ask a few questions on behalf of Newry Union. Before asking the questions I should say that I appear for the Newry Guardians and also one of the rural divisions in the County Armagh. The Guardians are of opinion that three workhouses are necessary, and the Rural Council are of opinion that two are necessary.

CHAIRMAN.—Newry Workhouse is actually in the County Armagh.

Mr. CURR.—It is.

CHAIRMAN.—That is under the recent order?—Mr. CURR.—Always was.

CHAIRMAN.—It never has been counted in the County Armagh in the statistical returns.

9135. Mr. CURR.—Three Lurgan Union, to which you belong, is, I believe, situated in three counties?—Yes—Down, Antrim, and Armagh.

9136. Is the Armagh portion the biggest portion of the union?—Oh, yes.

9137. From the map here it does not appear very extensive; do you mean in area or population it is the biggest portion?—Population.

9138. That is on account of Lurgan and Portadown being both in Armagh?—Yes; and the country districts are very thickly populated about Lurgan.

9139. Is the proportion of inmates of the workhouse from Armagh proper very high?—I am not in a position to answer that question.

9140. Would there be any possible objection to sending the infirm sick of Lurgan to the Armagh Union?—I think there would be.

9141. What possible objection would there be?—I think the distance itself—thirteen miles—for a sick person would be most unreasonable.

9142. You think there would be no advantage in amalgamating the Armagh portion of Lurgan with Armagh Union?—I don't think so.

9133. Does any large proportion come from Antrim or Lurgan Union?—There is a small portion of the County Antrim in the Lurgan Union.

9134. How far is the Lurgan Union Workhouse?—Thirteen miles.

9135. How many miles is Armagh on the other side?—About the same distance.

9136. On the Down side, what is the nearest union?—Banbridge.

9137. So Lurgan is at the junction of three counties and surrounded by three workhouses at about a radius of thirteen miles from it?—Quite so.

9138. I believe you do charge some small sum for paying patients?—We do.

9139. Has it ever happened with you, as with us in Newry, that the paying patient has refused to pay?—There have been cases, and proceedings were taken, but it was found to be unworkable.

9140. Mr. Cusack.—We took proceedings against some of these paying patients, but Judge Orr held we could not make them accountable for more than the average cost. CHAIRMAN.—What is advocated now is a change in the laws.

9141. Witness.—Yes; they get it, and some of them refuse to pay, and it is unworkable.

CHAIRMAN.—In Enniskillen they get them to sign a document, and not being a lawyer, I don't know whether that is legal.

9142. Mr. Cusack.—We have done that in Newry now after the decision of Judge Orr, and we hold them to it.

9143. Mr. Lavery.—You are opposed to amalgamation?—Under certain circumstances.

9144. Are you opposed to the theory of amalgamation because you think it will not be a saving to the ratepayers?—I am not opposed altogether to the theory. I say under certain circumstances there are unions in which amalgamation would be a great saving, but I believe in Armagh it would not.

9145. Don't you think even in Armagh if one of the workhouses was done away with there would be additional expenditure necessary. Supposing you abolished Lurgan, you would have to pension off some of the others?—We would.

9146. Would that be a desirable thing?—I don't think so. I think if everything was taken into consideration it would make no change in Armagh.

9147. Would you not also have to contribute increased salaries to the selected centres?—There would be considerable increases both in salaries and accommodation, I believe.

9148. And would there not be increased expenditure on the conveyance of the infirm and sick and pauper inmates from one part of the county to the selected centres?—No doubt that is another objection; the conveyance of the infirm from the extremity of the union would entail considerable expense.

9149. And in any of these selected centres, when enlarged to the extent of meeting the requirements of the county, would there not be increased expenditure also necessary for lighting and heating?—There would be no need to increase expenditure.

9150. Suppose these philanthropic notions of establishing auxiliary asylums and penitentiaries for unfortunate women, and all that sort of thing, were carried out, would not that mean increased expenditure?—I would not think of establishing penitentiaries, for I think there is sufficient accommodation already.

9151. Would you think it a desirable thing to send them out of the workhouse?—I would.

9152. Would you select a particular centre for them?—No; but any place where there was a vacancy in the asylum to receive these unfortunate women, where they could be treated as they should be to have their character restored; there would be no difficulty in finding places for them to meet the requirements.

9153. Would you not have all the same class of women concentrated in these establishments, and would not the reputation of these establishments become as unsavoury as the workhouse?—I don't think so.

9154. Who is it does all the working and cleaning in the workhouse?—There are paid hands.

9155. Does not this unfortunate class do that kind of work?—Yes.

9156. And is not that a saving to the ratepayers?—I don't think their interests should be sacrificed for the ratepayers.

9157. If these women were concentrated together perhaps the last state of affairs might be worse than the first?—I don't think so. I have been in some of these establishments, and found where a reformation has taken place, and they are sent out to respectable situations; I look upon it as one of the greatest advantages; the reformation of a woman should be a matter of some importance to us all.

9158. Would you not have to contribute largely to these penitentiaries?—No; because they work for themselves.

9159. And you think the penitentiaries would throw open their doors to all the women who are now relieved in the unions of the country?—I know institutions in Belfast where the work of these unfortunate women maintains them. I know of many that went to the Good Shepherd Convent, Belfast, and came out as good servants.

9160. When you put all the unfortunate women of the country into penitentiaries, what kind of congested condition will these penitentiaries be in; would you not have to build new ones; could the present penitentiaries possibly accommodate all that would be sent into them?—I don't know.

9161. My point is that it would mean an additional expense?—It may not.

9162. Then this theory of amalgamation is one that is founded on financial saving?—That is the intention.

9163. If all these women are thrown out of workhouses and put into penitentiaries, must it not follow that there must be some penitentiaries erected?—I would look upon it as only temporary.

9164. You would admit that there would be a great additional expense necessary for the establishment of auxiliary asylums if this reformation is desirable; if you want auxiliary asylums, you will have to pay for them, and it will mean additional expense?—They have to be supported where they are.

9165. Mr. Cusack.—Which do you think would be better for the ratepayers—three half empty houses, with staffs attached to each, or one full house with one staff, or two full houses with two staffs—now, for the ratepayers?—I cannot speak of other unions.

9166. I am asking you that simple question; do you think it is better for the ratepayers to have three half-empty houses with full staffs or one full house with one staff?—Common sense would lead anyone to know that it is a considerable and unnecessary expense to have a house and support a staff of officers half employed.

9167. What was Lurgan Workhouse built to contain?—I don't know.

9168. How many does it hold at present?—There are about 400 in it.

9169. I suppose it would hold three times as many?—I don't think so; if there were three times as many it would not have the necessary accommodation.

9170. Would it hold twice as many?—I don't think so; I think it is taxed every winter.

9171. Mr. Lavery.—How much could you save in Lurgan if it was shut up?—I don't know.

9172. Nothing is paid for them, but their families bring them tea and sugar.

9173. Do they often visit them?—They do; some pretty regularly; but I believe that class would be kept at home to a large extent—many of their families would support them—if they had to send them to a distance, I would provide the greatest comfort possible for the really friendless and needy ones.

9174. You would put the aged and infirm in Armagh?—Wherever was wanted the most convenient centre.

9175. There soon will be railway communication right through the lower half of Armagh from Keady?—Yes, of course, I think there might be a good deal done

Dec. 1, 1900.

Mr. John Fleming.

Dr. DARLING examined.

Dr. Darling.

9176. CHAIRMAN.—What is your view about the number of workhouses in Armagh; do you think any reduction could be made in the number?—I think so.

9177. How would you propose to carry it out?—I would do away with all the workhouses in Armagh as workhouses except one, and have that a comfortable refuge for the friendless aged and infirm. I believe that as things are at present there are a great many—too many—of that class who might be properly maintained by their families; for instance, I know in Lurgan there are a great many of them who could be quite well supported by their families.

9178. And still they are friendless as far as their help goes?—Nothing is paid for them, but their families bring them tea and sugar.

9179. Do they often visit them?—They do; some pretty regularly; but I believe that class would be kept at home to a large extent—many of their families would support them—if they had to send them to a distance, I would provide the greatest comfort possible for the really friendless and needy ones.

9180. You would put the aged and infirm in Armagh?—Wherever was wanted the most convenient centre.

9181. There soon will be railway communication right through the lower half of Armagh from Keady?—Yes, of course, I think there might be a good deal done

Dec 1, 1868.
Dr. Darling

in reducing the numbers in the workhouse altogether. I would like to see in every place—Postdown and Lurgan—a little row of almshouses in which decent couples or decent folk that would be looked after a bit—would be housed. I would give them the house and a ton of coals and 5s. a week from the rates on condition that the church they belonged to, or friends or ladies interested in them, would find another 2s. 6d. a week.

9185. That would be a very heavy expenditure!—For two people?

9186. You would have a row of houses!—I would only have half a dozen; there would be very few of them.

9187. Do you think there would be very few applicants?—There would be many applicants, but very few suitable cases. I am sure the ladies who look after the boarded-out orphans would quite willingly take the supervision of such, and it would do away with a considerable number of those who at present have to seek refuge in the workhouse.

9188. Is that proposal in order to provide for the destitute of good character and antecedents?—Exactly; the decent folk that it would be a real hardship to treat as paupers.

9189. There is some such arrangement in England!—There is, I understand.

9190. It is a wealthy country!—I don't think my idea would really increase the rates; it is only 5s. a week.

9191. There would be the cost of building the houses!—If it was done on the labourers' cottage system it ought not to cost more than 30s. or 40s. a week—the interest on the money spent. I would have a two-room house and just enough garden to enable them to employ themselves a bit. And where there were old couples or couples that had not such a direct claim on the family I would give a small money allowance rather than bring them into the house. I would do very little to enable sons and daughters to get rid of the support of their parents.

9192. Do you think the remainder would be a large number of aged and infirm?—No; you would reduce the number, I believe, by one-third by the way you would filter them out.

9193. But two-thirds would be mainly composed of those you would board out!—Yes; I don't think there would be many in Lurgan Union with a dozen of almshouses.

9194. As soon as the men die what would you do with the women?—I am afraid if she had no friends you would have to put her in a home; I would rather call it a home than a workhouse.

9195. As regards the lunatics!—I would certainly get rid of them.

9196. And the children!—We have no children in Lurgan except the children of sick people who are in the infirmary at the time, and the illegitimates.

9197. What do you think about what we were discussing with Mr. Fleming?—I would extend the law as far as taking away from the mothers as far as possible the custody of the children. After the birth, not before the birth, I think, of the children, I would send the mothers, or give them the offer of going, and even one penny if the law allowed it.

9198. You would not send the women away before the child was born!—No; because I believe the hospital is the proper place for them.

9199. Don't these women, as a rule, come to the workhouse one, two, or three, and even four months before their confinement?—Not in Lurgan; a month or six weeks.

9200. They come in for a considerable time, and during that time would they not be associating with obnoxious classes?—Not in Lurgan, because in the case of a girl who has made her first slip I keep her in the infirmary always.

9201. In the infirmary do you ever happen to have a case of specific disease in the ordinary ward?—We have no lock ward, if that is what you mean, but we have a skin ward.

9202. You have a case of specific disease!—Yes; in what we call the skin ward.

9203. In which there are children and unmarried?—No; there are no children.

9204. Sifting them, at all events?—They mix a bit about; that is all.

9205. Do you think it is desirable that a woman coming in to have a baby should be there?—They are never in that ward.

9206. Is there not in that ward a woman awaiting her confinement?—I know the case you refer to, that

woman is quite a respectable woman; we do not put the obnoxious class there at all; that is where the personal factor comes in. I always make a distinction between a girl who has made her first slip and a woman who has come in for the third or fourth time.

9207. What I really doubted was whether you could put her among suffering surroundings in the workhouse!—They are certainly better than she has been accustomed to in many cases.

9208. She may have been a servant girl!—I think she is in as good surroundings as she had been in.

9209. But not elevating?—The contents and elsewhere won't take them except under a heavy capitulation.

9210. When I was asking Mr. Fleming if he had the idea that they would take them free; I had the idea they would take them for the average cost of maintenance!—A very heavy capitulation if you sent them in to the hospital. In Dublin, the practice is to send them to the lying-in hospitals.

9211. That is the way the difficulty would be got over; they would be there for nine days, and come out, but they would be in the penitentiaries for weeks, when they would not be going about at large, and then they would be in the hospital, and then they would go back to the penitentiary; do you think that system good?—I think it good and infinitely better than sending them to concert, during the time they are waiting, with bad characters.

9212. On the whole, would you think it better to send these women before, as well as after, the birth of their child to be under good influences?—I do. There is another difficulty that comes in. If you send all these away to one place you will have an outcry in that place if they are sent to the hospital there. There would have to be a payment; I don't think it would be an economy, but I don't think it would be a very distant expense.

9213. Would you not look forward to seeing that class very greatly reduced?—I would; to see it reduced.

9214. You have women who come with three or four or five, and I have known women with six children!—Yes; but the great difficulty is that more than half of these are imbeciles—that is of the members coming in again and again; they are a hopeless class.

9215. But some of them are really lusty, vigorous women!—Yes; and I don't know what you could do with them.

9216. As regards the children in the workhouse, nearly all your children are illegitimate, and if the illegitimate children were boarded out, or arrangements made for their maintenance as soon after confinement, as possible, then that class would disappear, naturally, from workhouses!—I hope so; in places where you see get them boarded out it is the ideal system; in other places they would be better in schools under the religious orders.

9217. Another class, I don't know whether you would be glad to see them out, would be those suffering from pulmonary phthisis; would you be in favour of having a special institution for a certain county or counties?—I certainly would have that, but you will always receive a very considerable number of cases unwilling to go away a distance from their friends, and we ought to have in every hospital proper consumptive wards, and we have no pretence of any in our hospitals.

9218. You would have some central institution!—I would.

9219. Possibly some diseased workhouse might be adapted for the purpose?—With a very large expenditure many of them would; they would have to be gutted.

9220. Some little saving might be effected; there would be the site free?—Yes; a nice suburban site, as a rule, and enough ground with it.

9221. You think even if such an institution were started consumptive wards would be necessary in general hospitals, such as yours?—I do; to that that consumptives would go in large numbers to those resorts is a mistake.

9222. We had interesting evidence from Dr. Moorhead that the Guardians of Cheshill have started a little sanatorium adjacent to the workhouse; where the people come eagerly, and there is always competition for admission; a great number of people even try to get away to Newcastle, County Wicklow; he does not find any unwillingness to go a considerable distance when he assures them that a cure is possible!—I have had great difficulty in persuading intelligent young men and women to go to Newcastle, even when I could get them selected. I believe a nice proper consumptive ward in our hospital would act as a feeder for that.

when they find themselves improving, and we would not then there, and not send out felicitous cases or cases of hemorrhage, but they will not do it at all.

9222. Dr. Moorhead suggested that any buildings that should be put up should be of wood on the ground that if consumption were finally grappled with we might expect its entire disappearance from the country in a short time, and it would be useless going to any expense in permanent structures?—In new structures I would make these of a temporary nature.

9223. He has very sanguine views about the stamping out of consumption?—We all have, more or less; but is a big *anyway* you cannot have it all wood, or you would have Colney Hatch over again.

9224. I suppose you meet with a great deal of consumption in your practice?—A great lot.

9225. Surgical as well?—Yes.

9226. Do you think it is really one of the most urgent and pressing reforms that could be carried out?—I do, sir.

9227. It is now two times as bad as fever?—Oh, yes; of course, I believe a great deal can be done either by little hospitals, such as that you spoke of, or if the Guardians won't do it I hope it will be done from another source altogether, but I believe hospitals could, at the expense of a few hundred pounds, have nice little isolated wards for them; we could treat a large number of cases in our hospitals.

9228. It did not cost the Guardians at Coothill, or even the people who helped them, much at all; the expense was trifling?—I calculated, and Mr. Cowan was good enough to go through it with me informally, that about £250 at each side in Lurgan would give us wards for fifteen or sixteen at each side.

9229. With open air and revealing shutters?—No; but a big open verandah, with jalousies that could screen the sides.

9230. These revolving things cost only about £13?—We have no ground that we could easily use for that; my idea would be to use this as a feeder for the central place.

9231. If only sick and fever cases were left at any workhouse that might be closed; what would you propose should be done with the rest of the buildings; do you think they ought to be knocked down or that they could be converted to any other purpose?—I don't see what you could do with our buildings; perhaps they could be used for technical purposes, and I don't see why they should not.

9232. You would use the entrance block as your hospital?—Yes, taking the whole thing right across; that would give us enough for a long time to come.

9233. But you would continue the fever hospital?—Yes.

9234. There are a great many buildings in between that would be useless?—If they were found necessary, as technical schools, they could be used.

9235. It would not be a very good arrangement to have technical schools going on between a fever hospital and another hospital?—I would build them off absolutely—completely—as could be done with us.

9236. So that if there was a demand for any institution of that sort you think the Lurgan building could be used?—It is not central for an auxiliary asylum or any such purpose.

9237. Would you be in favour of giving Guardians and their medical officers powers to make discretionary charges for patients?—In practice we do it; we get about £2000 last year from patients.

9238. Was that largely in the fever hospital?—Quite half of it; we have small wards; I use them in practice as pay wards, and we charge up to 10s. a week in them quite regularly, and find people very willing to pay it.

9239. They understand they will get good nursing and good medical attendance?—In the town of Lurgan there are a great many clerks and apprentices that it would be an awful shame to put into a pauper ward, and they are quite willing to pay from 5s. to 10s.; we never treat them as paying patients unless they pay it.

9240. Or 5s. 6d., Mr. Fleming mentioned?—Oh, no; we allow those to wear their own clothes if they pay 5s. up, and in other cases they get the ordinary treatment and are charged the average cost.

9241. Have you got any different clothing for the inmates of the hospital?—No.

9242. That you could have; the Guardians would not object to that; it is merely a question of blue serge instead of grey frieze?—We have bed jackets, but when they are up they have to wear the ordinary clothes of the house.

9243. I suppose a good many people when they come in have not suitable wear?—I don't think you could let any but the paying class wear their own clothes.

9244. Would you like to have a hospital uniform?—I would; I would like to separate the workhouse absolutely from the sick, and not have any workhouse taint on the hospital.

9245. Are the medical officer's notions, as a matter of fact, the same as the porter's?—Absolutely the same, and the Guardians on two occasions have, by resolution, refused to improve them.

9246. I was hoping it was an oversight?—No, sir. These officers' notions are most unsatisfactory; there is enough given to feed them, but the Guardians won't consider any change, and they are so monotonous that some of them are absolutely wasted; that could be changed without any cost; it is a disgrace. About this whole question of hospital accommodation I think that you want one uniform scheme to take in all the hospitals of the whole country; I would embrace in that cottage hospitals and little endowed hospitals; I would take them in as far as I could. In the West of Ireland, where I spend my holidays, I am constantly struck with places thirty or forty miles from anywhere—Faldarna, for instance. I would begin at the lowest rung of the ladder and have a district nurse there with a residence and a couple of rooms that could be used for a serious accident case, bad maternity case, or some such emergency. Then I would grade up from that according to the population and requirements to a large central hospital; but I would not bludge down to a county area at all; I think it would be the greatest mistake to make county infirmaries the summit of the scale; many of them are in most inaccessible places, and many of them too small.

9247. And many are a little bit backward; many are behind the workhouse?—I would use them wherever possible. In Armagh I would do away with the workhouse hospital and utilize the county infirmary. It is ridiculous to have two hospitals in a town like Armagh.

9248. But they both seem to be pretty full; you have got the more infirm cases in the county infirmary, and you have got the ordinary cases and chronic cases in the workhouse?—Yes; but I think a great many of those chronic cases could be dealt with in the way we spoke of earlier. I would make the county infirmary large enough to take in all the proper cases; it would be more valuable to the nurses—a better training school when that was the case.

9249. You don't see any reason why there should be two hospitals in a place like Armagh?—In any one town. I believe Portadown ought to have its own hospital, but it ought to be subsidiary to Lurgan, which is only five miles from it, and nursed from it.

9250. Named as part of the common system?—But then I would not expect that all those smaller hospitals would have high class surgeons and all that kind of thing; it is too much to expect. I would grade up to one or two in each county that ought to be kept up to a high standard, they being a training school for nurses, and ought to have the very best nursing staff, and I would make the superintendent nurse of the hospital have a general superintendence over all hospitals nursed by her nurses.

9251. You don't mean that she should be a travelling inspector of nurses?—Only for her own staff.

9252. Don't you think that would be certain to lead to friction?—I don't think so if she is supplying the preceptors. My idea would be to make the staff as simple and inexpensive as possible, and instead of having a big staff of clerks in these hospitals I would have them under their hand nurses, who would be also matron if it was small enough, and have a very inexpensive and simple staff.

9253. Then the dispensary doctor in the smallest hospital would be the doctor in charge of it?—Yes.

9254. And when you have got it to the higher scale than the medical officer would be appointed by the governing body?—Yes; and then I would get to the highest hospital of all, where there ought to be some special restrictions to ensure a first-class man being appointed to it.

9255. Are you looking to a hospital at a centre like Belfast?—To what I think Lurgan ought to be made or Armagh ought to be.

9256. You don't look to some larger hospital occupying a position in the shambles?—No; I think the county unit is large enough. To compel the sick from Lurgan to go off a long distance would be very cruel. My idea is that these central hospitals ought to be largely in

Dec. 1, 1901.

Dr. Duff.

Dec. 1, 1903.

Fr. Dooling.

dependent of geographical boundaries; it ought to be freed to suit the population and convenience of the area to be served.

9252. Some doctors think that with the existing motor ambulances there are some countries quite a revolution?—We have a nice good ambulance, but ask a man with a broken thigh or pneumonia what it means even to come six miles in it and they will all say it is a very painful experience.

9253. Do you think such a case would object to go from Lurgan or Newry to Armagh?—Oh, it would be cruel; a great many could do it. I think about the nursing there ought to be a great change in the Local Government classification. Personally, I would do away with wardmaids; do what you will, they will be an inferior grade of nurses.

9254. Are you speaking of the hospital of the future, where there will be no class such as women with illegitimate children to do services for you; where there would have to be paid servants; would you object to a paid servant in your new hospital?—Certainly not; but wardmaids are a permanent appointment under the Local Government Board.

9255. There was a special reason for that?—Well, except by a sworn inquiry, she could not be got rid of.

9256. There would not be much difficulty in changing that name, but at the time there was an absolute reason for it?—I would like to see these paid servants in it instead of wardmaids. I think the distinction between qualified and trained nurses should be absolutely done away with.

9257. You are aware of the reason why the two grades were appointed; it was for the purpose of the Parliamentary grant, and that there never would have been a two-fold distinction if it had not been for that purpose?—I am aware of that. A girl trained for two years has not experience to take up a high charge post—the maternity of a hospital. What I would do here would be, I would insist on a uniform and good standard of training, then I would give to every class at the end of two years—

9258. They would not all have the same experience. In a hospital like the Royal Hospital, Belfast, she would necessarily receive more experience—I think not; I would only recognise those better class hospitals as training schools. All the trained nurses from the North of Ireland come from Belfast Workhouse, and all the other trained nurses in Ireland from St. Steven's Hospital.

9259. I cannot confirm you in that?—Well, to meet the difficulty of a higher class for an important post, I would at the end of two years allow every class to go in for an extra certificate, partly by examination and partly by inspection of her work, the manner in which she kept her wards, and the ability she had shown in the meantime, and when she got her higher certificate I would enter her on your register.

9260. As eligible for recruitment?—I would make all the higher posts.

9261. A sort of post-graduate course?—Yes; and enter her on your register that she might be appointed to any post that was vacant. In Lurgan we train qualified nurses, but no matter how clever, able, or industrious that girl may be she can never rise to a better standard, whereas the most indifferent trained nurse must always have a status higher than her's, because no one would deny that the trained nurse may turn out inefficient, but she is always of a superior status to the best her; give them a chance of rising.

9262. After inspection of their own work?—Yes, and a further examination to show that she is studying and keeping up to her work.

9263. You have no suggestion of the sort about the doctors?—I think that is a very difficult question to answer; you ought to make a standard for the doctors of these superior hospitals. I have had a talk with Dr. Thompson, of Omagh, about it, and I think we were pretty much of the one opinion that some method ought to be taken of selecting a high-class man; I would give him a high salary and insist on his only taking consulting practice.

9264. You think it would be unfortunate if in a hospital that had been brought up to a high pitch of efficiency, such as Dr. Thompson's hospital, an appointment was made on the ordinary lines of the gentleman who had most influence?—I think the whole thing would have to be changed; the appointment of a man because of his religion or politics or anything except his qualifications, is an anachronism altogether; there ought to be some change. I would like to see the

County Councils have charge of the whole thing; it would greatly do away with it. No one man can have sufficient votes and seats over a whole county to influence it.

9271. Mr. MURKIN.—Have the appointments made lately been of such a class that you think the Guardians are not trustworthy of making selections?—That is perhaps hardly a fair way of putting it; a man is not chosen if he is not influenced by religious and religious and politics, and if you have an area so small that that will tell to a very large extent, it is inevitable that it must, especially as Guardians, in my opinion, are the worst governors of a hospital that could be; they are really elected to manage the work, and not for any reason that makes them capable managers of a hospital.

9272. Still they have been doing the work for half a century?—Have they done it well?

9273. I would like to know that from you?—No.

9274. I would like to know where have they done it all; take your own case; did they make a bad selection in Lurgan?—Every improvement that has been made has been made in the face of the greatest amount of odium to me, personally, and at a very heavy cost to my pocket. I was told when I began the work for the improvement of the hospital, and told by one Guardian after another, "If you do this, and put us to expense, your pocket will suffer for it."

9275. Really this and on the part of the profession to take the appointments out of the hands of representative men seems to be open to very considerable inquiry. I would like to know if the Guardians, as far as you know, have made any improper appointments from a professional point of view?—I know appointments that I believe were made purely on the question of religion or politics.

9276. Were they not made so before under the old system?—But I am speaking of the whole system.

9277. Won't they be always made so as long as men is man?—I would say, raise the class of representative. Perhaps I ought not to say raise the class. We have in a small union sixty-six men out of a very small area, whereas out of the same area there are eight County Councilors; they will be a bit superior in education, and probably better business men and more capable, and from the fact that they will be more evenly balanced as regards religion and politics will make the appointments better appointments.

9278. Still the Guardians are the representatives of the people who pay the doctor his salary?—That is where the question comes in; they are all too subject to pressure by the small ratepayer, and have gone in pledged to resist all expenditure.

9279. They are expending as much as they did before, the work of the doctors is less, the number of people greatly decreased?—My work is doubled.

9280. Are these Guardians not rather to be viewed in the light of watchful Guardians over the interests of the ratepayers than as trying to do the opposite?—I know that every proposal that has ever come up for the improvement of nursing, for the improvement of the dietary—I need not speak of structural improvements, because they have all been successfully resisted—has every other improvement has only been brought about as the result of the most persistent strife; the nursing was only improved by bringing deputations from all the respectable people all over the place into the Board of Guardians and forcing their hand.

9281. The Lurgan dietary is very liberal; they get a quart of sweet milk every day; does every house of a farmer's house get a quart of sweet milk?—I am not speaking of our dietary.

9282. I thought you were making an attack on the general administration of the Poor Law by the Guardians?—I say it would be better to have the appointments in the hands of a body that would not be so subject to outside influence.

9283. A smaller circle?—No; a wider circle. My system would be that each of these hospitals would be governed by a joint committee—something the way the county infirmaries are done now—by a joint committee composed of the local people and half of the County Council, and that would give, I believe, quite sufficient representation of local interests to make sure that no appointment would be made hostile to local interests.

9284. How could that small committee of from eight to ten to twenty-two men look after the whole work of the county as regards medical officers?—By being combined in each place with an equal number of local persons.

Dec. 3, 1904.
Dr. Delling.

5235. Then you would want to re-establish dispensary committees?—Perhaps in a measure, if you like. I would have five or six County Councils and a corresponding number of local persons in the area to be served, and let them recommend the appointments to the County Council and have them confirm, and in that way do away with any idea of jobbery.

5236. In the county there are a large number of dispensary areas, and the County Council would be representative perhaps of only two, so he could hardly look after the interests of the dispensary areas—I believe that could be met by the appointment of a certain number of local men.

5237. Do you mean appointments or elections, which? Do you mean the ratepayers should select the men?—These local committees, composed partly of County Councils and partly of local representatives, would select and pass on the recommendation to the County Council for appointment.

5238. Are you not aware that these county committees meet only twice a year and that the Guardians meet fifty-two times in the year?—Four times too often.

5239. Not for supervision; of course, if you want to leave the medical officer and the officials of the Poor Law system entirely to manage the business you need have no meetings at all?—Oh, no.

5240. But is there any better way of getting the work properly done than by careful and frequent supervision?—My difficulty is the Guardians don't supervise; there is not half a dozen Guardians out of sixty in my board, except they have a ploughman that they want to award, or put a foot in the workhouse.

5241. Your Guardians are very liberal in Lurgan; the rate is high?—Our cost is 3s. 11d., and in Armagh it is 4s. 10d.

5242. The Armagh rate is 6d., yours is 11d.; that is due to the large valuation of Armagh and the small number in the workhouse, whereas you have a large number in your workhouse—twice as many—and your valuation is not as high?—Lurgan has a large manufacturing population, and there must be a large number coming into it on account of that; but I am fully of opinion that these hospitals, if they are to be a success and made really good hospitals, ought to be separated from the workhouses and separated from the management of the same body.

5243. That is quite right, but do you think the ratepayers of Ireland could establish any fancy system, such as you outline, without a very great increase of their present burdens?—I don't think it would cost as much. I believe if you separate the hospitals from the workhouses you will distinctly diminish the cost. At present we must take every corner boy that gets a cut head, and we must take in all sorts of undesirable people. If they were separated there are a great many of those we would not touch, and there would not be the drift from the workhouse into the infirmary that there is. I believe we could considerably diminish our numbers of the chronic and undesirable class if we had hospitals under a different system.

5244. You say the number of females with illegitimate children is largely recruited from the imbecile class; if these people were removed to the auxiliary system would it not do away with that danger?—Most of these are hardly imbecile enough to be certifiable.

5245. CHAIRMAN.—They were never in the workhouse?—No; they are those girls that are just "thick." What Mr. Murnaghan asked me about was those that keep coming back and back; those are largely of the "thick" class.

5246. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—But there are women in the imbecile or imbecile class that do have children in the house?—Yes; but they are not certifiable, as a rule, for an asylum. There is one matter that I believe is the crux, except the Government will give a large free grant for structural alterations to these different hospitals to put them into proper order it is out of the question; they won't be done. It would cost a very considerable sum to put the Lurgan Workhouse into a fit state structurally; it could be made very decent indeed with £5,000 or £6,000.

5247. CHAIRMAN.—Armagh Infirmary cost £10,000; don't you think it would be better to build one than try to patch the existing one?—Not unless they could dispose of that to advantage; I think the front part could be improved.

5248. You could never make it into a modern-looking hospital?—I think you could; it is well situated as regards light.

5249. Would the structure admit of good walling?—I think so; take the ceiling out of that square ward and throw it into the attic above. If you take those stone mullions out and put good windows in it you would make that a good ward.

5250. You would have a great deal of waste room in it?—There is a ward upstairs above that. Throwing these two into one and knocking the masonry out between the narrow windows, you would have a fine surgical ward.

5251. As regards the closets and bath-rooms, and other appliances?—There are the places there for them; we have modern closets in them, but they are susceptible of a great deal of improvement, and we could put baths in. If somebody gave me £5,000 I think I could improve it.

CHAIRMAN.—What did it cost at Newry?

Mr. CROCK.—£5,000; but the walls were there. If I was—I think we could, by the expenditure of £5,000, take in the clerks' office and the master's office, and put in bath-rooms and proper appliances.

5252. In your opinion, special terms would be desirable from Government?—I think the Government ought to give half the money necessary on a proper estimation, and give the other at a small rate of interest; I think they ought to give a more liberal subsidy than they do at present; reequipment for one nurse is a very small thing; we are a very poor country.

5253. Dr. BROWNE.—You mentioned about the three in coming severe cases of accident; would it be desirable to have a hospital at Portadown which has a large population?—I think so, distinctly; a small hospital.

5254. Enough for the needs of Portadown?—I would certainly make it subsidiary; to establish a new hospital with a large staff would be very costly.

5255. Which would be the larger one?—Lurgan. The exact acreage of the whole union is 30,000 acres; of that there is 40,000 acres in the County Armagh and the rest in the other two counties.

5256. Would you make the charge a county charge or a union charge?—I have thought over it a lot; I think you would have to have a charge over the area that was to be covered by the hospital.

5257. CHAIRMAN.—Would you not make it a union charge?—Yes; but I think it would have to be assessed on the county; I think a great deal of Banbridge Union ought to be taken into Lurgan.

5258. Dr. BROWNE.—Supposing it was assessed on the union at large, would you allow patients from any portion of the union to go to either hospital they wished?—I would certainly. What I think would result in practice would be that the ordinary sick people in Portadown would go into the hospital there, and if there was a serious case they would either get help or send it to the larger hospital.

5259. Would you have the doctor at Portadown on a fixed salary so that he could assist at Lurgan, or the Lurgan doctor assist at Portadown?—My idea would be that the men in any of these central hospitals ought to be paid good salaries, and then on a settled fee become the consultant for any hospital over a certain area. A man could be made consulting officer of a number of them at a salary.

5260. Mr. CROCK.—Would your theory of one workhouse for one county be applicable to all Ireland, or only for the County Armagh?—I think it would be applicable to most of Ireland; there might be more needed in some large county.

5261. Taking this one central workhouse, did you take into consideration South Armagh, Jonesboro', and Forkhill, where there is no railway communication?—There will be railway communication; the classes I speak of are those that can be quite easily moved.

5262. You think the particular circumstances of Armagh would be suited by one central workhouse? For the greatly reduced class that I believe would only need it.

5263. You are an advocate of the boarding out theory, but your boarding out is confined to almshouses; did you enter into any calculation of the cost of building these almshouses; take Newry, how many almshouses would you want with 12,000 people?—Six or eight.

5264. Do you think six or eight would be quite sufficient for all the deserving poor of the town of Newry?—No; but the deserving couples that it would be undesirable to separate; I am fourteen years in the workhouse, and I know how few they are.

5265. You think they would be confined to five or six?—You could shoot others when the vacancy occurred.

Dec. 1, 1903.

Dr. Darling.

9316. Mr. Lavery tells me there are twenty in Castleknock—I don't know where they come from.

9317. Have you ever found any trouble with paying patients after they had been treated in receiving the payments?—There has been trouble; there was one man with twenty-seven acres of land that the Judge of Assize decided need not pay because the man went into a large calculation of how much it cost him to keep his farm.

9318. You would advocate that people who can pay should be made to pay?—Certainly.

9319. How many acres of the Lagan Union that are in Armagh are covered by Lough Neagh?—That I cannot answer.

9320. Mr. Lavery.—You want to put these unfortunate women into penitentiaries?—After the first fall.

9321. When they would get it to move you would put them into penitentiaries?—As long as you don't expect the penitentiaries to get up a great hospital.

9322. After they get out of the union hospital you put them into the penitentiary; would you suggest they should be reeducated there; in your opinion is the word penitentiary an equivalent for jail?—I don't think the law will ever sanction their being forcibly confined.

9323. CHAIRMAN.—Supposing they had no place else to go, and were not admitted into the district hospitals?—In Austria they compel them to stay in these places for nine months until they have done nursing their child, and get what work they can out of them, and then they go out and come back in twelve months with another child.

9324. That is a sort of State prison?—It is under the best management.

9325. Is it under religious influence?—The few months I was in Vienna the number of illegitimate cases for the second time coming into the maternity wards was very great, but then the great poverty of the people accounts for it. The illegitimate births in

Vienna when I was there were 43, 44, and up to 45 per cent. of the total births.

9326. That is not instructive for this country?—It is the mere matter of these great institutions for putting the women into.

9327. Did you ever see the inside of any of these institutions?—No.

9328. You don't know under what management they were?—I was told they were under very nice management, the very best they could get for them.

9329. Mr. MURPHY.—But they have got in the States a community known as the Good Shepherd, who take care of such a class as this, and where the women are kept under restraint; you are not aware of how that system works?—The difficulty of doing anything in this country that is regarded as interfering with the liberty of the subject is so great I doubt that Parliament could be got to pass such an Act, but some might be obtained to pay for them if they would go.

9330. CHAIRMAN.—Are most of the midwifery cases you have in the workhouse illegitimate?—Perhaps as much more than half; since the hospital has been improved quite a number of poor married women do come in.

9331. Then if you had a district hospital there ought certainly to be a lying-in ward?—Oh, most important.

9332. You think that would be used very largely if that ward were not attended by the objectionable women coming in and using it?—It would be used by the poor married women, and with great advantage.

9333. It is very difficult for these women to be confined in their own houses with any regard for decency?—The number of infants that are lost is very great; we must always keep our training material.

9334. You would not object to let the mothers of illegitimate children go away as training material if you thought you would get in the more respectable class to take their place?—Quite so.

Mr. GUSSE.—Mr. Ball tells me they were giving in Newry relief to upwards of 200 old married couples.

Dr. Samuel Agnew.

Dr. SAMUEL AGNEW examined.

9335. CHAIRMAN.—You are the Medical Officer of Health for Lurgan?—Yes. First, with regard to the workhouse hospital and, of course, the workhouse itself, I think the hospital should be entirely separated from the workhouse proper and brought up to date, and at the present time the workhouse hospital is a cross between a workhouse and a hospital, and is neither economical nor suitable for the work of either. So far as regards the present workhouse the children should be housed out and the epileptics and harmless lunatics should also be removed to a central place suitable for themselves, and the workhouse literally restricted to what it was originally intended for—the infirm and the debilitated. I would agree to a certain extent with Dr. Darling about not separating the married couples, and I think one means of doing that would be by the provision of a certain number of almshouses in a central position.

9336. What they call cottage homes in England?—I have often thought it would be a good thing to have a number of those in connection with our own union for aged married couples whom it was a pity to separate. In connection with the establishment of district hospitals, I think the present workhouse hospitals and the county infirmaries should be put on one footing and made district hospitals, and governed in much the same way that county infirmaries are. I don't think the provision in the Local Government Act for the appointment of a committee by the Board of Guardians would be a good one at all to work with. I would prefer the committee should be selected mainly by the County Council. With regard to sanatoria, I believe that each county should have its own.

9337. Some counties would be too small?—Well, so far as this county is concerned, I expect everything would be modified more or less by circumstances, and you could not lay exact lines down for each county, but on an average there should be one for each county, and in the control and charge of the County Council, whether governed by committee itself or by a committee the same as the asylum. I would not go in for altering materially or making consumptive sanatoria in connection with the new district hospitals. I would suggest—

9338. You would have just observation wards?—It is quite right that there should be an isolation ward

and ward for the reception of consumptives, and I think there is really more in the treatment of consumption than open air; it requires constant supervision and a resident medical officer on the premises, and all that that they would not get in a district hospital; they require supervision in their food and feeding, so that it would be rather disadvantageous that they should be encouraged to stay in district hospitals when their time would be spent more profitably in properly equipped sanatoria where there would be a resident physician. In district hospitals if cases come in it would be the duty of the doctor in charge to see that they did not mix with the other patients and communicate the disease; there should be a ward apart for such cases. With regard to the fever hospitals, I think they should be done away with, and fever hospitals in charge of the sanitary authorities provided as intended by the Local Government Act.

9339. Would you take away the fever hospitals from the Poor Law administration?—From the Poor Law administration.

9340. But if you took away the ordinary medical and surgical hospitals from the Poor Law administration and transferred them to a county committee, what would you do with the fever hospitals?—I would do the same. If the county authority was made the sanitary authority, I think the County Council should be the sanitary authority for the whole county, and if that was done I would have no objection to their remaining under the supervision of the committee of the County Council, but if not, isolation hospitals for infectious diseases should be in charge of the sanitary authorities as intended by the Public Health Act.

9341. Dr. FISHER.—Would it not be more economical to have all the hospitals under one administration?—You could do that, and it would agree with my opinion with regard to County Councils, for I hold a strong opinion that the County Council in Ireland should be the sanitary authority, as in England.

9342. A good many of these fever hospitals are empty; could not the nursing and be used in the infirmaries and interchanged more readily?—They could, but at the present time, with the enforcement of the provisions of the Public Health Act with regard to isolation, the hospitals are quite unsuited; with regard to patients the Lurgan hospital is tolerably so. As

far as the nursing or officers are concerned, I don't think any much could be said, but the building is quite unsuitable for the reception of patients, and especially patients who are able to contribute, and who, at the same time, are forced to seek admission for the purpose of infirmary.

8343. You are speaking more as the sanitary authority?—I am here as the representative of our sanitary authority.

8344. Mr. MURKIN.—Would you do away with the Guardians altogether?—Almost.

8345. What work would you give them?—To look after the restricted workhouses.

8346. What would they have to do with the restricted workhouses; do you put that forward as a joke?—I do not; I am serious, and can give you reasons for being serious. So far as our Langan Guardians are concerned, I suppose they are as intelligent as most Guardians, and there never has been a single improvement yet; we have nothing that has not been forced out of them—dragged out of them.

8347. No improvement in connection with the fever hospital?—It is not two years since they were absolutely forced to provide disinfecting apparatus, after years and years of pressure.

8348. They have done so, I think?—Yes; after years and years of pressure.

8349. When people have done so, even after years of pressure, are there not some people who do not advance at all?—There are, and should be done away with.

8350. Who would look after the doctor of the dispensary district if the work of the Guardians was not done?—You might leave it to the county committee.

8351. The doctor is not such an immovable character that he does not need supervision?—He is well supervised; especially when he looks for an increase of salary.

8352. Since the dispensary committee were done away with he has nobody to look after him?—Oh, yes.

8353. The Local Government Board?—Yes; and the Local Government Board Inspector. As far as our duties are concerned in relieving the sick, no Board of Guardians or the others could look after them any more than they have done, because if there is any complaint regarding the action of the doctor he has plenty of crimes on every board to hunt it up.

8354. If these boards were done away with the doctor would have no one to look after him?—As far as the Guardians are concerned these would not be, but I don't mean to say that the dispensary medical officer should not be supervised; he certainly should; I would not return the Guardians for the sake of looking after the doctor alone.

8355. Is not the Poor Law system an improving system?—Very slightly; I have said that the Langan hospital is tolerably fair. I have been in connection with that hospital as house surgeon for thirty-two years. I know it as intimately as my own house. Up to the last eight or ten years I invariably did better than there, sometimes for months at a time, and I know what fighting we had to do between Dr. Darling's predecessor and the Guardians to get anything done, and the condition in which it is in now it would have been in twenty years ago if the Guardians had been doing their duty. It has only been brought up to date a few years ago.

8356. CHAIRMAN.—Do you consider it to be up-to-date now?—I do not; it is twenty-five years behind time yet. To give you another example of how the Guardians do their duty, I got my Council unanimously to pass a resolution pleading with the Guardians to provide a suitable ambulance; the other was something like the remains of an old bread cart. The Periodical Council joined with the Langan Council in the appeal, but it was scouted; that was within the last three years. Another thing they did a short time ago—to give you an example of how our intelligent Guardians act—they hailed up Dr. Darling for using too much soap and disinfectants in the fever hospital.

8357. Mr. MURKIN.—They seem to be fairly liberal; they are spending a good deal of money?—They were asked to spend a good deal of money twenty-eight or thirty years ago.

8358. Why did the doctors not make an assault on them then as they are doing to-day; was it because they were then half ex-officio and half elected?—It was not; if it were not for the ex-officio we would have got very little at all.

8359. And you are sighing for the ex-officio again. I doubt if that sentiment on the part of the doctors will do them much good?—And now we could not get any-

thing but for the labour representatives. There were some cottages provided in part of the Langan Rural District; there was a demand made to get a second batch for another part of the district; the Guardians who had got the first lot in their own district voted against the labourers in my district, and voted against the scheme to a man; that is the way the Guardians do their work.

8360. Under your new scheme, what method of management would you have; would you leave it all in the hands of a committee of the County Council?—Leave it in the hands of the County Council, because I suspect the committee would be revised every two or three years.

8361. Don't you think these outside areas would require some one to look after their interests?—I don't think it is impossible to look after the interests of outside areas, as far as I have looked into the matter.

8362. How would you manage these district hospitals?—The district hospitals would be governed by a committee consisting of local men and a number of County Councillors.

8363. Partly nominated and partly elected?—The County Councils would nominate, say half, and if the Government are very lavish about the amount of money I think the Local Government Board should nominate a certain number of local representatives, as are done on school committees.

8364. What do you mean about the Government being lavish or liberal; do you think the Government ever give anything?—Oh, yes; they pay two-thirds of some expenses.

8365. They take it out of one Irish pocket and put it into the other?—If you wish to go into the Financial Relations question.

8366. This is an Irish question solely?—I hold that in these cases the Government are entitled to deal with local boards very lavishly, and in one respect I will mention—the question of the Labourers Acts the time for repaying the loan should be greatly extended, so that the cottages can be put up at a cheaper rate.

8367. What I would like to keep you to is the management of these hospitals; you say it would be well that this Treasury, that is so generous and gives money out of the British chest; I suppose that is the way you look at it?—Oh, no.

8368. Don't you know that if you get money for your new district hospitals in order to enable the central body to have some voice in it, don't you think you will be taking it from some other source equally deserving?—Leaving the ultimate source out of the question, if a certain sum of money is provided from the Local Government Board for local purposes.

8369. There is no fund that they can touch?—The Customs and Excise.

8370. That is an Imperial fund; you won't get at that?—We have got at it.

8371. I don't think so; what you have got at is simply an Irish fund alone that is applied to Irish purposes, and what would happen if you got a grant from the Treasury would be that you would take it from some other Irish purpose?—I think our local representatives have more influence than that.

8372. Do you not think it is only a reasonable idea on the part of those men who have to pay for the upkeep of these institutions that they should have the management of it, and any money the money was to go to?—The County Council would have to pay very considerably for them, and they would also, I believe and hope, receive contributions from the Exchequer, and in return for the contributions that would be received from the Exchequer.

8373. Don't you think the local men would want to see what was being done with the local money?—I was going to add—it was about the construction of the committee we were—I think if a very considerable contribution is made from the Exchequer it would be no harm for the Local Government Board to have the power to nominate a certain number of the committee from among the local residents.

8374. That is supposing the British Treasury would, out of the Imperial funds, give a contribution?—Yes; or even so as they are going now.

8375. They are giving nothing Imperial, but simply shifting round from one Irish fund to another?—That is the fruit of our local representatives in Parliament. I think we should be treated on a similar basis to what they are in England; a very large amount of money goes to local sources out of the exchequer, and we should get our proper proportion for similar local purposes in Ireland.

Dec. 1, 1908
Dr. Samuel Agnew.

Dec. 1, 1903.

Dr. Samuel
Agnew.

9376. And, failing that, you still leave the management in the hands of the local men who had to pay?—If they were not able I would not leave it, and, so far as I know, they are not able.

9377. In what respect?—I have given you several instances. To move at all you have to move at the rate of twenty-five years behind the times.

MR. JOHN F. SMALL EXAMINED.

Mr. John F.
Small.

9380. Mr. Cusack.—On this amalgamation question, have you formed any views at all with reference to the County Armagh?—The alterations we propose in Newry principally refer to the County Down.

9381. You have formed no idea about the alterations in the Armagh Union?—The Board of Guardians have formed an opinion; they propose to amalgamate that part of Castledilany—the Armagh portion—with Newry.

9382. Is that portion in your Coroner's district?—Yes; the greater portion of it is.

9383. And you know the needs of that district fairly well?—I know the country very well.

9384. You think it would be advantageous to get that portion added into Newry, if there is a dissolution of Castledilany?—My personal opinion is that it would be rather inconvenient; but it is the opinion of the Board of Guardians.

9385. You had better give your own opinion?—My own opinion is that the Armagh portion of Castledilany Union is rather far from Newry, and there is no railway communication with it.

9386. Then you think it is better to let it remain as it is?—If Castledilany be retained I think the Armagh portion of Castledilany should remain with it, but if Castledilany were dissolved then I think the Armagh portion of Castledilany should come to Newry.

9387. There is a very important matter in which you have taken some interest, that of paying patients?—

Yes. There was one particular instance which we looked upon as a great scandal; there were several other cases that were quite bad enough. There is a hospital in Newry called the Newry Fever and General Hospital; it retains the name of fever simply as a matter of continuity, for it does not admit any fever cases; all fever cases must either come to our hospital or be sent away to Armagh or Downpatrick; under these circumstances we have not seen our way to refuse admission to people who otherwise would not be entitled to relief.

9388. CHAIRMAN.—In the interests of the public health?—In the interests of the public health we don't see our way to refuse admission to people who would not be entitled to the benefit of the Medical Charities Act, and therefore we admit people of a superior class on many occasions to the fever hospital, and we have not got a very good return from some of them.

9389. Such admissions are done all over Ireland?—I don't know on what terms they are admitted in other places. There were several cases in which we received very bad returns from the friends of people who were able to pay.

9390. Mr. Cusack.—In a superior class of life?—Yes; people who, if pressure had been brought to bear on them before their friends were admitted, would have paid any amount of money—perhaps £5 a week—and afterwards the same people offered to pay 3s. 6d. a week.

9391. There were contagious cases?—Typhoid fever. 9392. You went so far as to sue these people, and were beaten at Quarter Sessions?—In one case, perhaps the worst case, we sued a gentleman in Newry for the maintenance of his daughter; he offered 3s. 6d. a week; the case was defeated before the County Court Judge on the ground that we made no contract with him. Since that we have drawn up an agreement and have asked that some responsible person should sign the agreement before the admission of the patient, but even that has not worked out well.

9393. CHAIRMAN.—But you get of better now?—Not very much better yet; there is a great deal of evasion practised; it has surprised me how people who at first were very anxious to get their friends in afterwards showed no gratitude or interest.

9394. Mr. Cusack.—Do you know the Local Government Board have warned the Guardians they had no power to charge these fees?—There was a letter saying we had no authority to charge more than the cost of

9395. Have you not been moving right along?—No, no.

9396. In Lurgan you have a good ambulance and disinfecting apparatus that cost £250, and a liberal dietary; you certainly are moving in Lurgan?—Unfortunately, since we commenced to operate for that two doctors have died, and Dr. Darling is the third practitioner.

maintenance; then the question arose, what was the cost of maintenance; was it merely the patients' food, or did it include part of the establishment charges for keeping the hospital up. Mr. Bell said he thought that if we did that it would come up to about £1 a week. There were two points of view presented—was that we could not admit these people on any terms, another point of view was that if we did admit them we could not make them pay more than 3s. 6d. a week.

9397. CHAIRMAN.—That was not with respect to any particular class, such as soldiers and policemen?—No; in the case of policemen there is a statutory obligation on us, but in the case of soldiers there is not; but we never refuse admission. The cases in which this question arose was a respectable merchant in town and people to whom it was a great consideration to get their friends removed out of the house. There are some people whose food would cost far more than the sum they were asked to pay us, not to say anything of the medical attendance, nursing, washing, removal from the house, and prevention of contagion.

9398. Mr. Cusack.—Mr. Bell tells me some of these patients require the attendance of two special nurses. Yes. We have passed a general resolution that paying patients, except where otherwise ordered by the board, should pay £1 a week, but since that some patients have been admitted at 10s. a week—patients that, I think, should not have been admitted at that figure at all.

9399. Have you formed any opinion about this theory about boarding out?—What particular class of cases do you refer to?

9400. Old married couples in almshouses; would you advocate that from your knowledge of Newry?—We have not many married couples there, but I would be in favour of removing all classes from the workhouse that could be removed. We have adopted the boarding out system as far as possible for children, and it has worked favourably; of the children boarded out very few returned to the workhouse. I have only known of one case that has not turned out well, and as far as I am concerned I would be very willing to extend it to a good many classes—married couples and harmless lunatics.

9401. CHAIRMAN.—And you would extend the law to enable you to board out illegitimate children?—Yes, there was an Act passed in 1899 very much extending the powers of Guardians, but that has remained a dead letter.

9402. It is adopted in a good many cases?—It seems to be unknown in Newry, or ignored. I would extend the boarding out principle to married couples and harmless lunatics.

9403. Mr. Cusack.—Would you advocate the building of almshouses?—I think there are too many buildings at present. I would utilize the existing buildings as far as I could. I would board out harmless lunatics and married couples.

9404. About the tramp question, I believe you take a particular interest in that?—I do; we are on the main road from Dublin to Belfast, and we are greatly favoured by the presence of tramps.

9405. From Banbridge to Newry is a nice day's walk?—Yes; and then to Dundalk; in the summer time they go by Kilnab.

9406. Have you formed any idea as to how that nuisance could be diminished?—I considered that question very frequently. I have seen the objects of that very few of the tramps are bona fide objects of Poor Law relief; there are very few tramps of persons on the look out for work on the road. I think tramps should be divided into two classes—the very few deserving objects of charity, that is tramps in search of work, and the undeserving ones, whom I would turn over to the police.

9407. Do you think detaining them in the workhouse would be worth much?—I would desire to get rid of them as soon as possible.

9406. CHATELAIN.—Mercy with a view of seeing less of them in future, would you keep them a little longer over?—I don't know that. If you keep them in a sort of lock-up place or in charge, but I would not have them in the workhouse.

9407. Mr. Cusack.—I believe you do give them some work to do in Newry?—There is a rule that they should break a certain quantity of stones before leaving, and I believe they do break stones, and it keeps them until eleven o'clock; they don't get as early on the road as they wish.

Mr. Bell.—We find the numbers have increased during the last two months; Newry is too well situated for them to avoid. What I suggested was that if we made that place not so very comfortable they probably would come round by Armagh.

9408. CHATELAIN.—Armagh seems to have the best of the deal so far?—Yes; because we are on the main road from Dublin to Belfast. You meet a man and ask him where he is going, "I am going to Belfast." You see him again in a fortnight and he is going to Dublin. It is a promenade up and down. If the workhouses were further from each other they could not walk from one to another in a day. I don't wish to be considered inhuman, and I would not be hard on these *fide* travellers.

9409. Men really looking for work?—Yes; but I have come to the conclusion that they are very few in number. They always give you creative notions when you ask questions.

9410. If Rathfriland were removed, would it not be an advantage to Newry?—It would; they would have to go as to Lurgan.

9411. Newry Workhouse was burnt recently?—Yes; three and a half years ago; the greater portion of the front of the house was burnt down, and in rebuilding it we took into consideration that the character of inmates of Irish workhouses has changed very much since workhouses were built, that they are now almost entirely infirmaries and hospitals, so we turned the front of the house, which had formerly been the able-bodied portion, into an infirmary, and built the house with large wards the whole depth of the house. I am not able to make a comparison, because I am not a medical man, but I have heard people who could make the comparison say they considered the wards compared favourably with some of the metropolitan hospitals. We have practically no able-bodied inmates, but I think some portion of our infirm ward buildings will require considerable improvement in the back portion of the house.

9412. The house is by no means full?—It would accommodate a much larger number than we have at present; I should think the space given to each bed is far greater than would be required even in a metropolitan hospital.

9413. And the present staff could attend to a much increased number?—I think it could attend to an increased number. I would not wish to see it very much increased. I wish to say that I think the Board of Guardians are too large in number.

9414. That is an opinion we have got before?—I formed that opinion before I saw it expressed in print anywhere; it would conduce very much to the proper management of the Poor Law business if the number were reduced. A clause was inserted in the House of Lords with the altered idea that the ratepayers when they were electing members would return one man to nullify the vote of another, with the result that the boards are unnecessarily large; we have fifty-nine elected Guardians in Newry, and they might have occupied six, which would make sixty-three. There are fifty-eight in Banbridge; I think either the number should be reduced or the power of the house committee should be very largely increased so that a good part of the work could be done by the committee. I think weekly meetings are too numerous.

9415. The committee might meet weekly?—Yes.

9416. And the full board?—Monthly would be quite often enough.

9417. If you halve the number of the board?—I think even one-third would do better. It would be very desirable if the duty of looking after the roads and the poor were a little more separated than they are; there is an affinity between the two things.

9418. Do you think it would be better to have the Rural Guardians and the Guardians entirely divorced from each other?—I think so.

9419. Would you go so far as to say that some of the witnesses said to-day, of leaving the roads and county work with the Rural District Councils; would you transfer the Poor Law to committees of the County

Council?—I would not agree to that at all. In my opinion the Poor Law work could be very well done by a reduced number—a Board of Guardians reduced in numbers, reduced proportionately, or by a committee or a board appointed by secondary elections, but on the same franchise as the present Guardians.

9420. Mr. MURPHY.—How would the dispensary divisions for the purpose of representation strike you instead of electoral divisions?—That is a question I did not consider; as far as I go it would be almost the same, to my mind, if the present divisions were retained with a reduced representation, but I daresay it would be an improvement to take the dispensary district as the electoral unit.

9421. Sometimes the electoral divisions are very disproportionate; would you like to equalise the electoral divisions with regard to population and valuation?—I would; there is a provision in the Local Government Act that each division should return two members; that did not take into account that some divisions already returned two; the result was that those who had only one got two and those who had two before returned the same number only. Cumberagh only returns two, as it did before.

9422. Mr. Cusack.—And it has the village of Bensbrook?—Bensbrook is not a unit for Poor Law purposes; it is contained in three townlands. And I also wish to say that we have no investigation of dispensary books in our union.

9423. CHATELAIN.—The Guardians neglect their duty in that respect?—They do so deliberately for that reason, they could exercise no supervision over the books. It is absurd that the Newry Guardians should be expected to understand about Rathfriland or Poynters. I don't say the doctors require any supervision, but, assuming they do require supervision, it should be exercised in some different manner. We say there is no use bringing the books in, because we could know nothing about them.

9424. Mr. Cusack.—Would you be in favour of removing the workhouse tenant from the hospital—the workhouse hospital?—The hospital that stands apart is the fever hospital.

9425. Would you have it removed altogether from the workhouse and not known as a workhouse building?—That would raise the question of paying patients in another form.

9426. CHATELAIN.—The idea is that it should be called the district hospital instead of the infirmary?—In our place the infirmary is the house.

9427. I thought you were particularly favourably situated for that purpose, because there is your district hospital with direct access from the county road?—I would be in favour of making it a district hospital, but you would have to build a workhouse somewhere else. The fever hospital could be separated in any way you wish by building a wall round it. What is called the infirmary is really the hospital, and what is called the hospital is the fever hospital; there is a confusion of the terms. We could separate the fever hospital, but our infirmary is our house; I don't see what we could do there. I did suggest some time after the new board came into existence that we should turn it into a district hospital, and they did not receive the suggestion favourably, because, as well as I remember, they said it would bring in confusion as part of the governing body, and they did not wish to have any confusion brought in.

9428. Mr. Cusack.—Personally, you don't regard that as any objection?—No; but I would certainly object to have any interference with the rights of the people.

9429. Mr. LEWIS.—You are distinctly of opinion that it would not be convenient to add the portion of Castleblaney Union that is in Armagh to Newry?—Assuming Castleblaney Workhouse is retained, I think the people of the Armagh portion would be more conveniently served there than in Newry.

9430. I don't think you gave us your views on the question of amalgamation generally; are you in favour of reducing the number of workhouses, even at a loss to the ratepayers?—I am in favour of it.

9431. Even if it resulted in a loss to the ratepayers?—The first consideration is the administration of the Poor Law for the benefit of the sick poor; I don't think the interest of the ratepayers the first consideration; I consider it an important question, but not the first question.

9432. For the proper and efficient administration of the Poor Law system, do you think the number of workhouses should be reduced?—I do. I am not in favour of throwing the present workhouses into disuse; my

Dec. 1, 1905.

Mr. John P.
Small.

opinion is that they should form a union of unions, and specialise the different buildings contained within that area. Kilsheel is a most beautiful site for an industrial school or consumption hospital.

9433. Would it not be more convenient to retain the workhouses we have in the County Armagh for the administration of the Poor Law than to do away with any?—There are only three in the County Armagh.

9434. Would it not be better from the point of view of the comfort and welfare of the poor to retain these three workhouses, even if it were necessary to reduce them in extent?—I have not proposed the abolition of either Armagh or Lurgan.

9435. Did you propose the abolition of any in this county?—I don't suggest that; I don't think Armagh, being the county town, could be abolished, but the Rural District Council No. 2 in Newry passed a resolution that Lurgan should be abolished, but I thought they were travelling rather far afield, because Lurgan is twenty miles from us, and part of Banbridge inter-views.

9436. Supposing there was an saving to the rate-payers, don't you think the Poor Law system could be very well and efficiently administered by retaining the present number of workhouses throughout the whole country?—I don't think so; I think there is a waste of force in it.

9437. Don't you think there could hardly be any

waste of money in it, having regard to the increased expenditure on pensions and gratuities, increased expenditure in salaries at the workhouse kept on, increased expenditure in the conveyance of the sick and aged, and increased expenditure on buildings; if you equip auxiliary asylums the present buildings would not suit, and then increased expenditure on heating and lighting these contracts—I have not considered this matter primarily on the ground of economy; I don't belong to the school of economists; I prefer the proper administration of the Poor Law. I have already stated that I think the present buildings ought not to be retained; I don't approve of erecting new buildings in one place and throwing large buildings at another place into disuse; the existing buildings should be utilised; and I am not in favour of the system on a charge of superannuating and pensioning all the officials and appointing a new staff with fresh salaries. I think the services of the old officials should be utilised for the new system. As regards the other points, I have not considered them. I wish to mention, with regard to consumption patients, that I don't think they should be kept in our hospitals at all; they should be kept in a different place; we have very good consumption work in Newry, but I don't think they should be kept there at all.

9438. Mr. Cunneen.—That is the reason you advocate Kilsheel being utilised?—It would form a beautiful sanatorium.

Mr. M. P.
Rice

Mr. M. P. Rice examined.

9439. Mr. Cunneen.—You are a representative from Newry No. 2 District Council?—Yes.

9440. Have you formed any view on this amalgamation question of the different unions in Armagh?—No, I have not.

9441. Have you formed any idea about the alteration of the boundaries of the different unions?—No, I have not.

9442. Has your council formed any opinion about either one or other of these questions?—Yes; they have.

9443. Are those the replies they have sent in already to the Poor Law Commission?—Yes.

9444. If Castleblayney Union be abolished what would be the most convenient place for the Armagh section of Castleblayney to be added to?—Carrickmacross.

9445. There is a portion of Castleblayney Union in Armagh; where would you add that—the district of Greenanaglan and Oulshanna; would it be more natural to add it to Newry than any other place?—Yes, if Castleblayney were dissolved. If Banbridge were dissolved there is portion of it in Armagh.

9446. Would you add any portion of that to Newry?—Yes.

9447. Have you formed any opinion about the tramp question?—It would be hard to devise a means to abolish the tramp nuisance. If you would adhere to the stringent rule—there may be weak and invalid persons who would not be able to perform the necessary work—in these cases I would not like—

9448. CHAIRMAN.—You would leave it discretionary with the master?—Yes; but in some cases you might find the master negligent in doing his duty or you might find a master of a naturally harsh temperament.

9449. Mr. Cunneen.—Would you make any rule at all in the matter?—I would leave it to the discretion of the resident doctor.

9450. CHAIRMAN.—Whether he was fit to work or not?—Yes.

9451. Mr. Cunneen.—Do you think the suggestion that these men should be detained two or three days in the workhouse would have any deterrent effect?—I cannot say.

9452. Do you think confinement in the workhouse would be any punishment to a tramp?—I don't think so.

9453. I suppose confinement in the county jail would have a greater effect on him?—I think so; then confining him in the union.

9454. Your District Council has passed resolutions in favour of expenditure being a divisional instead of a union charge?—Yes.

9455. While the Guardians are of a contrary opinion?—I don't think they are, for I am a member of the Board of Guardians, and I got no notification of the meeting at which the resolution was passed.

9456. CHAIRMAN.—You think it was done at some small meeting?—Yes; without a special notice. I am a rural Guardian, and there have been resolutions thrown on the rural Guardians for not doing their duty, but I think the town Guardians are rather too quick in doing what they consider their duty.

9457. Mr. Cunneen.—Mr. Small is a town Guardian?—Yes.

9458. What are your reasons for having this a divisional charge?—The rate has gone up in the union since it has been a union charge as regards outdoor relief, though I know that in my division it has decreased, and, of course, if there is a deserving person in my division I am satisfied at a special meeting that I am summoned to attend by these town Guardians.

9459. CHAIRMAN.—You think they have too much of their own way?—After their dinner they can go up to the boardroom, and in the electoral divisions of the town all their poor friends are on the outdoor relief.

9460. Mr. Cunneen.—You think the town expenses are thrown on you unjustly?—As long as they are enormous charges.

9461. CHAIRMAN.—What is your division?—Jansboro'.

9462. Mr. Cunneen.—Have you formed any idea about this boarding out question?—Yes; I am in favour of boarding out children.

9463. Are you in favour of boarding out old and infirm people?—I am not.

9464. Would you be in favour of almshouses for old married couples?—I would not; it would increase the expenditure, and the gentlemen who gave me evidence with regard to that question said nothing detrimental to the interests of his profession. With regard to the nursing question, it has been mentioned that they should be under the control of the dispensary doctor, but I am inclined to think that the dispensary doctors would be applying for an increase of salary, and if these almshouses were taken into consideration it might be more expensive than any friend who gave evidence to that effect might imagine, though he seemed to be of a liberal frame of mind and wished to see the work of the district carried out in a judicious and economical manner, but I don't think it would work that way.

9465. Mr. Cunneen.—Don't you think economy can be carried out by abolishing some of these unions and amalgamating them with others?—I believe so; I would like the greatest comfort to be given to the aged and infirm at the least possible expense.

Mr. R. MONTAGNA examined.

Dec. 1, 1903.

Mr. R.
Montagna.

9406. Mr. Cusack.—You are a representative of No. 2 Rural District Council?—Yes.

9407. And you are a member from the County Armagh as well?—Yes.

9408. You want to confine your remarks altogether to the outdoor relief system?—I have been a member of the Nerry Board of Guardians for about three years. When I entered that Board of Guardians three years ago, so far as my memory serves me, the amount which was expended per week on outdoor relief was, at the most, £37 a week; that was when it was confined to what we would call electoral charges; at the present time it is £47 a week, and I might say that very recently it was about £55 a week, and I would say that if it was made what we need to call electoral divisional charges that it would bring down this outdoor relief business. While I say that, I am not opposed to outdoor relief as the least, because I believe it is the proper manner in which to distribute relief to the deserving poor; I only speak as a farmer, as a rural Guardian—a much maligned man. Take a labourer on a farm, the most that he can really have on that one is about 5s. a week; say that man goes and marries, he keeps a wife and family, and, no matter what economy he can have used, his ultimate cost must be either the workhouse or outdoor relief. And I think in a case of that kind if, when he comes to about sixty-five or seventy years of age, that man is unable to work or derive any salary for his work, he should get 2s. or 3s. a week. But since these things went from electoral divisional to union charges, although we have been getting nothing more for the country districts, the outdoor relief has gone up.

9409. CHAIRMAN.—In the town?—I don't wish to say anything in the absence of parties who represent the town, but I believe outdoor relief has gone up in the town.

9410. Mr. Cusack.—You would advocate going back to the old system of divisional rating instead of union charges?—Quite so.

9411. CHAIRMAN.—For outdoor relief only?—Outdoor relief only. It leaves it to the elected representative of the electoral division to recommend the party who gets the outdoor relief, and I can say that any elected Guardian knows the party whom he recommends to get outdoor relief.

9412. Mr. Cusack.—It would cause better supervision?—I believe so.

9413. CHAIRMAN.—You are an elected Guardian, and have your voice in the giving of outdoor relief to the town rates; do you dissent from any?—Often.

9414. In what class of cases do you dissent?—I might say there is another aspect of the question in the town; it is nothing for the Nerry Guardians to come up there and stay at the Board of Guardians almost every day; it is a very important matter for a man who has to travel, say twenty-eight miles, and leave his own business; and if a case in the town comes up they are almost always there; the rural Guardians may not be always there; they can carry their case, whereas the rural Guardians have to voice at all.

9415. I am speaking about the cases that are ruled upon when you are present; what class of cases get outdoor relief which in your opinion ought not?—I always, when I am there, take the recommendation of the relieving officer.

9416. Do the Board of Guardians, as a body, sometimes act in opposition to the advice of the relieving officer?—Well, the Nerry Board of Guardians I say up, in general, do not.

9417. What class of cases do you differ from the Guardians and relieving officer in thinking are not subjects for outdoor relief?—The point comes up in this way—if I would have a case I considered deserving of relief I would go up there—

9418. I understand that, but I am speaking of a case that somebody else has; if a town Guardian has a case, and you are there; you say there are some cases in which relief is given where you don't think it ought to be given; what class of cases are those?—I would always go on this supposition that if a town Guardian recommends that that party should have relief—I know nothing about the case at all; this gentleman recommends it, so it is only a recommendation of divisional relief after all.

9419. And you are not acquainted with the circumstances of any of those cases that come forward?—Exactly.

9420. Mr. Cusack.—I believe you particularly object

to outdoor relief being given to a house where there are people bringing in money?—Most decidedly.

9421. In some of the town cases do you know that has been done?—Very often; I have always objected to it.

9422. You don't object to outdoor relief as a whole?—No; I think it is the best way of giving it.

9423. And you think some of the Guardians vote on rural relief that don't know anything about it?—I am afraid so.

9424. Have you formed any opinion about the tramp question or the boarding out of paupers?—In connection with the children, I have formed an opinion that I believe all children in the workhouse, that are born in the workhouse, should be removed from the tent of that place; they should not even have it sent up to them in later days that they were born in the workhouse; they should be boarded out.

9425. Would you apply that to the old people?—There is a difference between old people, who are resident in the workhouse; there are some old people who have worked very hard all their days, and at the latter end of their days are there in no respect for them only the workhouse; it is very hard in classification to have these classed with the tramps, or the casuals, or the outcasts of society; there should be classification at the very least.

9426. You would separate the old decent people from the other class?—That is my opinion.

9427. Could you not have that classification itself in the workhouse without boarding out?—Yes.

9428. Mr. MONTAGNA.—In regard to outdoor relief did you ever adopt the system of having one special day in the month, for instance the day that the finance business of the Guardians is earned on; if you adopted one day in the month for the consideration of the outdoor relief cases, would you not give the rural Guardians an opportunity of considering all the cases?—During the time I have been a member of the Nerry Board of Guardians that has never been adopted.

9429. But it could be?—Yes; and would be a very wise arrangement.

9430. Suppose you get up at the next meeting of the Board of Guardians and give notice that the question of giving outdoor relief should be only considered on one day in the month—means a day, and that would bring in a large concourse of people; would not that do away with the difficulty you refer to with regard to the country portion of the board?—I never heard the suggestion thrown out before.

9431. I may tell you it is in existence in a union in the North of Ireland, and is found to work satisfactorily?—I will consider the advisability of giving a notice of motion to that effect.

9432. Have you ever considered, in the event of one union being chosen for Armagh, where that union should be?—Well, sir, I have.

9433. From a broad point of view, not from any narrow local view?—I have; but I am afraid, considering Armagh geographically, that Armagh is cut out for two unions—that is for Nerry in the south and Armagh in the north. Now Nerry is a very important union; it is about the third or fourth most important union in Ireland, and we have splendid buildings, most recently erected, and Armagh is a very important union, of course. But it would be utterly impossible to bring Guardians, supposing there was only one union in Armagh, it would be utterly impossible to bring Guardians to represent Forkhill and Jonesboro' to Armagh.

9434. No matter what you go to do there will be an obstacle in accomplishing reform, but could you not imagine a system of representation—dispensary areas or so—that would meet the difficulty with regard to Guardians; lessening the number and widening the area of representation?—It would lessen the number; I really could not think that on the present franchise you could get a person from Forkhill or Jonesboro' to come to Armagh for a weekly meeting.

9435. Supposing the meetings were monthly, or a visiting committee had the duty of attending to minor matters and the Guardians had only to attend once a month, could they not come to Armagh as well as they do to the County Council?—If you limited the number to thirty.

9436. How would that strike you as a feasible proposal?—It would not strike me that they could represent the poor; the paramount duty of a Guardian is to represent the poor, and he could not know the poor if he took in the district of a dispensary doctor.

Dec. 1, 1905.
Mr. S.
Monaghan.

9497. Could not these dispensary members regulate the work of the poor in their own dispensary district?—If you put it in that way, perhaps they could.

9498. That is one way of getting round this trouble of representation. It is quite plain that to expect all the Guardians of this county to come to Armagh once a week would be out of all reason, but if some system like that was adopted do you not think it would get over a good deal of the difficulty?—Considering the buildings we have at Navry and the expense we have gone to these last two or three years—some £3,000—it would seem preposterous that these buildings would not be utilized in connection with the poor.

9499. Suppose there were two unions in Armagh, would not the system I have tried to outline recommend itself to you?—Yes; I really think there are too many Guardians.

9500. Have you many tramps in your house?

Mr. Bell.—About 115 in the week on an average.

9501. Mr. Monaghan.—Don't you think if power was given to the local bodies to detain those tramps for three days it would have a restrictive effect on them; usually they come for a lodging in the house the night before a fair or market, and if they were detained three days they would lose their fair or market?—As long as human nature is as it is we will always have tramps; we have endeavored to bring in the stone-breaking business in Navry, and it has no effect in making them a lesser number.

9502. You have heard what the doctors said with regard to Guardians, with regard to their unwillingness to do what is necessary to bring comfort to the poor; do you agree with them?—I entirely disagree with the whole statement.

9503. You think the doctors overdid the subject—so far as our union is concerned, we are in complete accord with our medical officers, and I don't think they stretch much, so far as has been said in this witness box.

9504. And any reasonable reform asked for?—The Guardians consider it on its merits, and have almost always concurred with the recommendation of the medical officers.

9505. You have no friction in your union?—No.

9506. Mr. Cusack.—If there was one central workhouse do you think the expense of the Guardians travelling from the extremity of Armagh to that central workhouse would prevent them going?—They could not attend at all.

9507. You are a County Councillor?—Yes.

9508. And you know the expense you are put to attending Armagh; do you know that the Councillors from the southern end of the county hardly ever attend?—That is so.

9509. You think that those two unions would be sufficient for Armagh?—That is my opinion.

Mr. Cusack.—That closes my case for Navry.

Mr. P. MCCONVILLE EXAMINED.

Mr. P.
McConville.

9510. Mr. Lavery.—You are Chairman of the Crossmaglen Board District Council?—Yes.

9511. And your Council is decidedly against this idea of amalgamating workhouses?—Yes.

9512. And is it not the fact that Castleblayney Workhouse has been recently extensively repaired?—Yes.

9513. And how £1,100 have spent upon it?—Yes.

9514. Could you give us some idea of what proportion of that was contributed by you?

Chairman.—We had that already.

Mr. Lavery.—Crossmaglen contributed about 3d. in the £ of that; are you of opinion that if this idea of amalgamation was carried out it would be rather a loss to the ratepayers than a gain?—Certainly.

9515. Is that on account of increased expenditure?—Yes.

9516. Do you think there would be increased expenditure in superannuating the officers, for instance?—Yes.

9517. And increased salaries also at the selected centres?—Yes.

9518. You think if two or one workhouse was done away with the salaries in the selected centre would be increased?—Yes, I think it would overbalance any gain.

9519. Are you also of opinion that there would be heavily increased expenditure over the conveyance of the sick, infirm, and pauper inmates to the selected centres?—Certainly, and a great hardship to the poor, too.

9520. We have heard a great deal at this inquiry and in Monaghan about auxiliary asylums and orphanages; do you think it would be possible to equip these auxiliary asylums and orphanages without enormous expense?—I think a greater expense than the present system.

9521. And when they would have all these pauper asylums constructed don't you think the amount to be incurred for upkeep would far and away exceed of the apparent saving by abolishing the asylums?—I believe the rates would be higher than at present.

9522. The District Council you represent is overwhelmingly Catholic in religion?—Yes.

9523. It has been suggested you should be tacked on to Armagh or Navry?

Mr. Cusack.—Navry.

An Armagh Guardian.—We would not take you.

Mr. PATRICK McSHANE EXAMINED.

Mr. Patrick
McShane.

9537. Mr. Lavery.—You are a District Councillor for Crossmaglen?—Yes.

9538. You have heard what Mr. McConville said?—Yes.

9539. Do you agree with his views?—I do.

9524. Mr. Lavery.—You don't want to be parted from Castleblayney?—No, it is the unanimous feeling of the whole district.

9525. Suppose some unfortunate train of circumstances brought you to Navry, how far would you have to travel?—Almost eighteen miles.

9526. Would you not also have to go over an impassable mountain barrier as well?—The worst road in Ireland.

9527. Are not some of the hills between Crossmaglen and Navry as high as 1,800 feet—Crossmaglen?—It is up to 2,000 feet.

Chairman.—And the road goes right over the top of it?

9528. Mr. Lavery.—Yes don't want to go to Navry, and think it would be highly inconvenient for the administration of the Poor Law system—I think so; a poor person brought in an ambulance from the farthest part of our district to Navry I don't believe would be alive when they got there.

9529. Mr. Cusack.—Don't you go four times a year to Judge Richey in Navry?—The sick people don't go there.

9530. Mr. Lavery.—Of course, this idea of amalgamation could not be carried out without interfering very considerably with the principles of the Local Government Act of 1898; it would have to be repealed—I think so.

9531. Mr. Cusack.—If you must go to any place, where would you go to in the County Armagh?—We could not go to any place only to Navry, in the County Armagh.

9532. Mr. Lavery.—Is your district a very poor district?—Very poor.

9533. If there was an ambulance sent to take all the sick and infirm people there who now go to Castleblayney it would almost add half the present rate again?—They go in carts and conveyances of their own.

9534. And the workhouse at Castleblayney is filled very largely by the poor inhabitants of your district?—Yes.

9535. Don't some of the farmers go into the hospital there?—Yes.

9536. Mr. Cusack.—Navry is your County Court town?—Yes.

9540. Do you think it would be a definite disadvantage to be sent to Navry?—I am sure it would.

9541. Having regard to the nature of your district and the poverty of it, are you of opinion it would be impossible to administer the Poor Law system pro-

perly if it was tacked on to Newry—I think it would be hard on them.

9542. Do you think Armagh completely out of the question—I would not like to hear about it at all; it is too far away from us, twenty miles; Newry is still worse, it is a worse road.

9543. What about the people of Crommagscross?—I would not agree with them at all.

9544. Mr. Cusack.—Have you ever been to see Judge Kirby in Newry?—Never.

9545. A lot of Crommagscross people do come to see him. If the Commission does shut up Candelbryne Workhouse where should the Armagh portion go to?—I don't know; it would be a very great hardship.

9546. Where should it go to; would not Newry be the most reasonable place?—I don't know; Newry has a bad road.

9547. Would you go to Armagh in preference?—Indeed I would not go to Armagh at all.

9548. Where would you go?—I think it would be better to have it remain as it is.

9549. Mr. Lowry.—Tuberculosis is very common in your district?—It is.

9550. You are a member of the Poor Law Guardians; have they not equipped two new consumptive wards?—They have, and spent about £1,000 lately, and it cost our part of the union about £700.

Mr. JAMES ORR examined.

Mr. James Orr

9551. CHAIRMAN.—What are you desirous of saying?—There are just four points I want to call your attention to. First of all, with regard to the harmless lunatics in workhouse, I am strongly in favour of asking the Government to apply the capitation grant, and if they did so, I believe, the Guardians could provide better accommodation for them. I don't think the harmless lunatics ought to be taken out of the workhouse; there would be a most enormous expense in adding to the existing asylums, and there would be greater economy if they were kept in the workhouse, and better accommodation could be provided. But I don't think you can persuade the Guardians to do that unless the Government can see their way to give a capitation grant.

9552. CHAIRMAN.—Would you approve of taking a deserted workhouse as an auxiliary asylum?—I would, but at the same time I think the Government ought to be pressed to give this capitation grant, the same as to asylums.

9553. For all lunatics, no matter where they are?—Yes. Another point is divisional rating. I am strongly in favour of returning to the old divisional rating. I think this union rating has been a great mistake. Take any Guardian belonging to a division. It is that Guardian's interest to look after the welfare of the division, and see that there is no waste, and that the pauper in his charge is properly looked after. But see a Guardian, when he knows that there is union rating, has not the same interest in the division that he would have otherwise. I don't believe these divisions looked after by Guardians are looked after in the same way as when there was divisional rating; the interests are the other way.

9554. Do you mean both as regards attendance at the workhouse and interest in incurring expenses?—I won't say so much about attendance at the workhouse; but take a Guardian who has a number of applications for outdoor relief; he knows it comes out of the union, and it is not chargeable to his own division at all; and some Guardians look upon it as their interest to get as much out of the union as they can. I am in favour of outdoor relief, but don't approve of the abuse of it; and I think the cause of the abuse is this union rating.

9555. Can you tell us in what way exactly the abuse comes about; what class of cases are they lax about? I think it altogether hinges upon union rating. A Guardian of the division naturally will say: "This is charged on the union, not on my division; therefore, it is a mere hospital on me."

9556. You think that leads them to give relief in cases in which relief ought not to be given out of the workhouse?—Yes; and in cases where relief ought to be given I don't think it gets proper attention; it cuts both ways.

9557. Mr. MURKHAM.—It may deprive some divisions that really do need relief from getting relief?—I don't say that.

9558. For instance, an electoral division that was very poor and had two or three cases on it already, might not the fact that an additional charge would be entirely paid for by that particular division prevent the Guardians from giving relief, although it might be absolutely necessary?—That is one way of looking at it, undoubtedly. And then another disadvantage; I myself am in favour of divisional rating; but another disadvantage of electoral division rating is that a poor division has to pay for its own upkeep, and a rich division may have no poor at all, and it escapes.

9559. The burden, therefore, is unfairly borne, and by enlarging the area you distribute the burden?—I have thought of that, too, and as I say there are arguments on both sides; I have come to the conclusion that it is a mistake to have union rating. The next point I wish to call your attention to is with regard to hospitals, not workhouses. I think the abolition of hospitals, not workhouses, would be a great mistake. The hospitals have been greatly improved in all the union workhouses, and I think there is a difficulty about admitting paying patients. A great many patients are admitted to the hospitals in the workhouses, and they don't pay according to their means. There is some difficulty, I believe, about admitting these patients. It is done to prevent infectious diseases spreading; although I understand it is not a recognised thing, but at the same time the guardians look upon it as a case of necessity; infectious diseases must be stamped out; they cannot be allowed to spread over the country. In the infirmary here in Armagh they don't admit infectious cases at all; they have no wards for it; and if an infectious case turns up, there is no other place to send it to except the workhouse hospital, and the workhouse hospitals, I believe, are very well managed at the present time, greatly improved in the management, and any interference with the workhouse hospitals, I think, would be a very serious mistake.

9560. CHAIRMAN.—You admit that something more might be done for improvement; you don't look on it as having reached a pitch of perfection?—I don't believe there is such a thing as perfection in this world.

9561. You think enough has been spent on them?—I think there has been a very great deal of money spent; I know there has in Armagh; in the last three years there has been more money spent than in twenty years before, so that at the rate we have been advancing we have not been losing any time in spending money. I don't say that proper accommodation ought not to be provided, but at the same time you must consider the ratespayers, and they have so much to bear at the present time as they possibly can. My experience of the Armagh Guardians is that they are quite willing to provide proper accommodation, but not any waste.

9562. Mr. MURKHAM.—There is no unwillingness on the part of the present-day guardians to give what is considered comfort and all due attention to the requirements of the sick poor?—I don't believe there is.

9563. You heard what the doctors said this morning?—No; I was not present.

9564. CHAIRMAN.—What is the next point?—There is one other point I want to refer to, and that is the amalgamation of workhouses. This matter has been very carefully considered by the County Council, and we have come to the decision that it would not be wise to amalgamate any workhouses in this county; because we have carefully considered every workhouse in the county, and have come to the conclusion that it would be very unwise to amalgamate any workhouses in this county.

9565. Owing to the hardship to the sick?—Yes, and the position of the workhouses.

9566. Mr. Cusack.—Geographical position?—Yes. Armagh Union in point of area is the largest in the union. I don't think it is the largest in point of accommodation. I don't think anyone would imagine you could do away with Armagh Workhouse. It is in the most central position, and Lurgan is a most

Dec. 1, 1902.
—
Mr. Patrick
M'Quinn.

Dec. 7, 1903.

Mr. James Orr

excellent institution, and they have a very fine hospital there, and I don't think from the evidence I have heard that it would be wise to interfere with Castleblayney.

5557. Mr. MURKHAUGH.—Suppose the workhouse for the future would be only a place for the destitute and infirm, who are not ill, do you not think that one house of that description would be large enough for the 400 of such a class in this county, provided that in the various localities suitable hospital accommodation was provided for the sick?—I want to explain it in this way, that that is a matter that has not been brought before the attention of the County Council or of the Board of Guardians, and I don't think it is a matter that any witness that has come here, or will come here, has considered sufficiently—that is one of the very things that ought to be brought before us.

5558. That is the very first query that local bodies are asked on the chest of queries. "Whether any Poor Law unions could be dissolved with advantage to the ratepayers, and without hardship to the sick and destitute poor; and if any such dissolution be deemed desirable, what arrangements, by amalgamation of unions or otherwise, should be substituted therefor?"—The question you ask does not come in there at all. The question you asked me was this: "Provided that they were retained for the sole purpose of the poor and infirm. Now, no one under that query could imagine for a moment that he was going to be asked a question of that kind."

5559. That is the question I would like to put to you now. If there were in the various localities—Lurgan, Portadown, and Newry—hospitals for the accommodation of the sick, do you not think that one workhouse in the county would be sufficient to accommodate 300 or 400 of the old and unfit for work class which the county has at present?—In answering that question I might say the accommodation would be sufficient, but it would not be expedient. I don't think it would be a wise thing to follow a course of that kind owing to the geographical position of the workhouses.

5560. Do you think it is well, economically, or from any point of view, to keep up houses that are half-used, and altogether unsuitable for the purpose?—I quite agree with you; they are unsuitable.

5561. Do you think it is well to keep up three or four of these houses when one could fulfil all the necessary functions of the county?—I don't understand your question in that way. That is a very broad question, that would need to be considered from all sides. You put it to me in this way: Do I think that one workhouse would accommodate the poor and infirm, and that class alone. There might be sufficient accommodation for that class in one workhouse, but I don't think it would be a wise thing to do. You would have to go further, and say what are you going to do with the harmless lunatics and old people.

5562. Supposing the lunatics were put into an auxiliary asylum and the children boarded out, and the mothers of illegitimate children sent to some reformatory institution, you would have nothing left but the sick and infirm?—That is another point I could not agree with you in. I would be heartily glad to see all the children boarded out, and I think Mr. Agnew will remember that I was the means of getting a resolution passed boarding out the orphan children in the Armagh Workhouse. But, would you take away the illegitimate children from the mothers, and allow the mothers to go out and, perhaps, bring in another batch of illegitimate children in a year or two.

5563. That would be a question for the legislature; it is for us to consider the desirability of such an arrangement?—You put a question to me that would have to be answered half-a-dozen ways. You would have to begin and take the different classes in the workhouse, and see how you would deal with them.

5574. What would you do with the lunatic?—I think the workhouse would be a suitable place, but the guardians should get the capitation grant.

5575. Don't you think they ought to be put into an institution apart from the ordinary class and give them special treatment?—I do; but I think you must be very careful; you can go too far. The ratepayers have been paying a lot of rates, and you can go too far in taxing them in the future. My experience of the board of guardians has been that they are willing to do everything necessary for the comfort of the inmates.

5576. The question I put supposes that it would be for cheapness, on the side of economy, if such a change was made, supposing it would not increase the cost, do you not think it would be better for those afflicted people to be in an auxiliary asylum than to remain as they are in the workhouses, where they are only half looked after?—I do; provided there could be a saving in some other way that could make up for the additional cost. If there was any, I would be in favour of that.

5577. Do you not think the upkeep of these large institutions in the amount for repairs and fuel is a large item?—Yes; but I don't see how you could clean any workhouse in Armagh. In some counties, where any workhouse could be done without, by all means amalgamate them, and use them for the purposes you suggest.

5578. Why should a principle that is good elsewhere not apply to Armagh?—I considered the question carefully, and so did the County Council, and we have come to the deliberate conclusion that no workhouse could be done without in the County Armagh.

5579. Dr. Broome.—Was it the unanimous opinion of the County Council?—I believe it was.

5580. Mr. W. Shaw.—I think the County Council of Armagh have passed a resolution recommending that an infirmary or hospital should be allowed for Portadown?—Yes, that is so; I raised the question several weeks ago. I asked the chairman's ruling, supposing that this auxiliary hospital or infirmary were built in Portadown would it be a union ruling, and the chairman was of opinion that it would, and, under the circumstances, I voted for this resolution.

5581. Mr. Lowry.—With regard to union ruling, has the expenditure on outdoor relief increased in Armagh?—I have not the figures before me.

5582. Would you be surprised to hear that in Castleblayney Union they have reduced outdoor relief by £240 a year?—I would not be surprised.

5583. Mr. Ousack.—Do you think if you had one workhouse in Armagh, had the lunatics in one place, the mothers of illegitimate children in another, the aged and infirm in another, the sick in another and boarded out in another, would that bring economy?—I would not be for that at all. I don't think you could do with fewer workhouses in Armagh.

5584. Mr. MURKHAUGH.—My question was simply this: That if we leave in the county hospitals in different localities, a hospital that will meet all the requirements of the locality for the sick; if we take away the mothers of illegitimate children, very few in number, only eight or ten in Armagh, get them sent to a reformatory institution of some description, which has been strongly advocated; if we take away the children and board them out, a thing that everybody advocates; if we take the lunatics and put them into auxiliary asylums, which everybody approves in theory, then you have nothing left but the infirm and destitute; would not, in that case, one house for the county supply the needs for that particular class, that is the point?

Mr. Ousack.—Do you think that would mean increased economy?—I don't think so.

Sir JAMES HENRY STAGGON, Bart., continued.

5585. CHATELAIN.—You are a member of the County Council?—I am, and also of the Board of Guardians, and I was asked to attend on behalf of both bodies to state their views generally on these queries. As to the idea of suppressing one or more of the workhouses in the county, the County Council was unanimously against it, and it was, I think, on my proposition they voted against it. The reasons I gave there were that

the Union of Armagh, which is the one of which I know most, is really a large union, and it does not follow that because in other counties small unions could be amalgamated, a large union like Armagh should be dissolved; fir, in my opinion, the affairs of a union are better looked after when it is of the size that the union of Armagh is; and if we had any more districts added to us the distance from these

Sir James
Henry
Staggon.

district might be too great, and there would be less economy, because the broader the back of which the rates are levied the less attention the guardians pay to it. If we had a larger board it would not at all diminish the passage of business—there probably would be a good deal more talk and less work done. And I think that a union of the size of the Union of Armagh is probably quite large enough for the despatch of business that comes before it. Since I have been in the court, partly from what Mr. MURTAGHAN said, I see it as intended we should read into this query a number of things that were not on the face of it. We are supposed to express an opinion as to whether unions might be suppressed, supposing that this and that various other things were taken away from them, the business that they at present administer; these questions never came either before the Board of Guardians or the County Council, and I have no power of forming the least judgment of what the view of those bodies would be on a question of that sort. But, personally, I must say it has come upon me more or less by surprise; but if I were asked my own opinion I think we are better as we are. Better give the Guardians something to administer or do when they come together. When they have plenty to do it is more likely they would attend regularly, and do their work well; and I very much doubt whether the poor or anybody would benefit by taking away a large number of their functions from them, and summoning them together merely to consider the remaining questions. I am not inclined to think that on the first blush it would be an advantage, and I think economy is, perhaps, not the most important thing. I very much doubt whether there would be any great economy in establishing all these different branch establishments and restricting the Board of Guardians to the mere administration of the relief of the poor. As to whether the question was considered by the Board of Guardians, there was a committee considered a few, and they were of opinion that it would be better that part of the Banbridge Union that is in Armagh should be added to the Armagh Union, but when the board met there was a division on the subject, and the majority of the Guardians were against taking in the Banbridge portion, and at the County Council the representatives of that district were again being included in Armagh. As to the second question, the Board of Guardians thought that if the first was answered in the negative there was not very much to be said in answer to the second.

5636. Not.—When they came to No. 3 (d) both the County Council and the Board of Guardians were decidedly of opinion that the existing powers of boarding out children should be extended, but at the Board of Guardians the question was raised that there might be difficulties. Supposing parents came to the house to remove with children, and you boarded the children out, and the parents got employment and went out again, were you to withdraw the children at once from the place where they were boarded out? That struck them as a difficulty, but still their opinion was that it would be advisable, to some extent at all events, to extend the power of the Guardians in the matter of boarding out. Where there was something against the character of the parents there must be some cases in which it might be advisable to board the children out.

5637. Giving the Guardians additional discretion?—Yes, it would be an advantage, but they did think there was some little difficulty, and it would require further consideration whether that discretion might be limited. Then, as to No. 4, both the County Council and the Board of Guardians were in favour of returning to electoral division rating instead of union rating.

5638. For what purpose?—They thought it was better looked after for all purposes.

5639. Induce as well as outdoor?—Yes; they thought generally cases were better investigated, but, of course, at the Board of Guardians it was not unanimous, although a considerable majority were in favour of returning to the old system, they were not absolutely unanimous about it. I personally, do see that it is rather hard on poor districts that they should have to bear the whole burden. I don't know whether there might not be some compromise; some proportion of the cost might be spread over the whole union. I mainly do think that there was more careful scrutiny of each case when the area, which it was

charged upon was limited. The really deserving cases were attended to; there was less chance of imposition. I never saw it proved that cases were admitted which ought not to have been, but there were suspicions of it, but outdoor relief increased, and your board called our attention to the increase when the new system came in. And now the Guardians have reverted to the old, stringent test, and require a doctor's certificate that the applicant is unfit for removal before they give outdoor relief. They have been obliged to return to that somewhat severe test by the fact that outdoor relief had increased, but I have never seen it proved it was absurd.

5640. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Have they returned to that test?—They have, for the present.

5641. Do you know that test is illegal?—So I have heard it said, but I have never seen a legal decision on the subject; but I know the Local Government Board told us that if anyone who refused to come in died we should be held responsible for the death. I was Chairman of the Board of Guardians at that time, and owing to that decision we relaxed the rule immediately, and there was a very large increase, until the Local Government Board took the other side of the question, and called our attention to the large increase of outdoor relief. Now we have reverted to the old rule, and I suppose in a short time they will again call our attention to the fact that we will be responsible for the death of someone, and I suppose we shall go on fluctuating from one extreme to another—perhaps some medium may be found, but it is very hard to hit it. With regard to No. 5, there was a decided opinion at the County Council that there was a want of some hospital at Portadown, especially for passing surgical cases; and there was a question as to how it was to be supported, and what it would be charged upon. I don't know that we went very deeply into that. Mr. Orr gave some evidence on the subject; my own idea was that it should be more like the county infirmary, quite apart from the Poor Law, having nothing to do with the workhouse, and be more a branch of the county infirmary. It was in my mind that possibly the people of the County Down would subscribe to some extent, like to the county infirmary, and that it should partly be supported by a grant from the rates, and be more on the lines of the county infirmary than a union infirmary, the distance between Armagh and Portadown being easily enough managed. As to No. 6, both bodies thought there should be the same capitation for lunatics in workhouses as in asylums; and if that were done the Government might insist on Boards of Guardians making their accommodation for lunatics thoroughly up-to-date, and there seems to be an idea that they could get everything that would be required more economically in the workhouse, if the Boards of Guardians were encouraged to supply them, than they would in the county asylum. Whether that is the case or not, I am not presently in a position to say. One thing I should like to say on the subject: I think the reason why our accommodation for the nursing has not been improved farther than it has is, it has always been thrown out that something would be done in the way of providing a central place, and we thought it not wise to go in for a large expenditure of money when the whole thing might be abolished next day. I think the Government ought to make up their minds as soon as possible what should be done about the lunatics. That has always been our answer—we are waiting to see what is going to be done. I understood the Inspector of Lunatics was not dissatisfied with the accommodation provided, except in minor particulars, that could be very easily remedied, and probably will be remedied now. As to No. 7, about paying patients, we are distinctly of opinion it ought to be encouraged, and, in fact, it has been done. We manage to do it to some extent in Armagh, but we should like to be put on a regular system, and given more power to do it. I have not heard of our having lost by doing it; but it is evident there is danger of the money not being recoverable. Then, as to the vagrant post, the County Council said they ought to be made to work, and, no doubt, that is right; but I understand that has not always been very easy to do; but in Armagh we are not much troubled with tramps, and I understand it is, because wherever we have the opportunity of prosecuting them as vagrants we prosecute them. It is not always easy to do that, but I cannot help thinking it might be done sometimes.

Dec. 1, 1900,
Jas. J.
St. James
Henry
Strang.

Dec. 1, 1908.

Mr. William Wilson.

The Portadown Urban District Council appears before you in a different capacity to the witnesses who have already given evidence. We are not so much interested in the union workhouses.

9592. CHAIRMAN.—You are merely confining yourself to the hospital accommodation in Portadown?—Yes; at a meeting held last week, it was proposed by Mr. John Acheson, J.P., seconded by Mr. David B. Bell, and unanimously resolved:—"That we are of opinion that the town of Portadown, with a population of over 10,000 people, should have a hospital or infirmary. Portadown is ten miles from Armagh and five from Lurgan. Serious accidents are of frequent occurrence, and the removal of patients such a long distance is very painful, and often has serious results." With regard to the sheet of queries forwarded to us—

9593. I don't think you need mind going into the query sheet. I am sure you could give us much better what the Portadown people feel and think about this hospital accommodation?—This matter has been fully considered by the Council, and they have come to the conclusion that it is an absolute necessity that Portadown should have some kind of an infirmary or hospital.

9594. There used to be an hospital there in old days?—There was one built in 1847, but it was never used; it is being used now as a technical school.

9595. Who owns that at present?—It is vested in the Town Council as trustees.

9596. Will they give that as a hospital for the future?—I could not really say.

9597. They have not added that to their resolution?—No, they have not.

9598. That they will place at the disposal of the proper authority this hospital which they now own?—No, they have not added that to the resolution.

9599. You don't know who it was built by?—By public subscription.

Mr. William Wilson examined.

9600. And it was vested in the Town Council?—At that time trustees, four or five.

9601. Dr. Hancock.—For hospital purposes?—Yes, I believe it was built for a fever hospital. The Town Council only got it into their hands about ten or eleven years ago; by pressure brought to bear on them from the Local Government Board, they spent £20 in putting it into order for an auxiliary hospital.

9602. CHAIRMAN.—Told us how it came to be used for a technical school?—It was lying there, a white elephant on the Town Council's hands, and when the Technical Grant Act came into existence, they thought the best thing to use it for was a technical school.

9603. Did they spend money on it?—No.

9604. They are merely allowing classes to be held in it?—Yes.

9605. Did they submit it?—They did not.

9606. The people could be turned out on reasonable notice?—They could, if thought desirable. Portadown has a working population of over 10,000 inhabitants; serious accidents occur from time to time at the mills and factories there, and they have to be taken on to Lurgan; at the present time they have a very good ambulance, not like the old breed out, but in case of serious accidents it is a considerable time before they can get there.

9607. In some cases have people to stay in Portadown and not be taken; have any accidents occurred that made it impossible for the people to be removed?—I don't know of any; there is a witness following me who does know.

9608. At all events, having a population of 11,000 people, you naturally think you ought to have a hospital?—Yes, we do.

9609. You might mention to the Town Council that you were asked here whether they would put the hospital at the disposal of whatever body would support an hospital?—With pleasure I will do that.

Mr. John Acheson.

I have no evidence further than Mr. Wilson has given. The urgent need we have for a hospital we see it every week. During the last few weeks we had two serious accidents, one in which a lady died in the Lurgan Hospital after being removed from Portadown. And there was a case that happened in my own place in one of the sheds. Two doctors took an arm and a head off a girl. We really should have a hospital and infirmary, no matter who puts it there.

Mr. Wilson.—Mr. Acheson is the head of a large factory.

Mr. John Acheson examined.

9610. CHAIRMAN.—I think, Mr. Acheson, a member of the Council brought it forward there?—Yes.

9611. Did they pass a resolution about what the area of charge ought to be?—No, we left that entirely for the Commission.

9612. What is the view of the townspeople?—We want an infirmary or hospital.

9613. What about the area of charge?—That is a varied question; let us get the hospital first.

Mr. Joseph O'Leary examined.

Mr. Joseph O'Leary.

I have been sent to represent the Urban District Council of Portadown; we are greatly in need of this hospital accommodation. It is a long way to either Armagh or Lurgan when an accident requires treatment. We have grown up in recent years into a considerable area of a place, and we find very much the want of this, and the people think it ought to be supported from some fund, as a county hospital. We pay our levy of the rates demanded off us, and we are placed at the disadvantage of not having the use of these institutions.

9614. CHAIRMAN.—It will be a difficult question?—We did not like to suggest that we would have this met by taking away institutions from other places, although one of the witnesses to-day suggested that one hospital would be sufficient for Armagh; we did not wish to take up that position, although it would be a reasonable one, because we have a larger population than Armagh, and have no hospital, while they have two. That would be one thing the Commission might think of. That is simply all we have to say in the matter, that we would be glad your Commission would take our position into account.

9615. You may rely on our doing that?—We thank you; and before this Commission was appointed, we put our case before the Local Government Board, and, therefore, when we noticed the Commission was appointed, we thought ours was a fit case to be considered. With regard to the present hospital there, I am afraid the local authorities would hardly think it

would be suitable for what was required. We would like an institution on more modern lines. As regards the area of charge, it is a question for your Commission to do what is equitable, but if it was made one of a county institution, Portadown is well situated for railway accommodation; and the question is, might it not be a county-at-large charge, and let the county-at-large send cases for special treatment.

9616. Please like Crossmaglen and over at Clontarf would not like to have to pay for your hospital?—If they had a special case that required special treatment where are they going to get it treated? We contribute towards the Armagh Infirmary, and don't get much benefit of it.

9617. There is not an instance, as far as I am aware, of a second county infirmary?—Well, we find ourselves without accommodation, that is the difficulty.

9618. Whereas you do find three or four hospitals in a union sometimes, and then they become union-at-large charges?—The people of Portadown will be satisfied with whatever line of charges the Commission think equitable for the situation. The only other suggestion I have is—I am not a member of the Board of Guardians, but I have carefully kept an eye on what is going on generally, and I think the Poor Law institution is splendidly managed all over, taking it as a whole; and the only matter that strikes me, as a business man, is that either the clerk or the master ought to have such an interest that he would act in

the capacity of managing director, so as to bring matters before the Guardians that require attention.

9628. For the hospital you would consider the managing director ought to be a doctor?—The two would not work satisfactorily.

9629. You could not make a master who was a man with no more acquaintance with a hospital than with the Royal Mint—you could not make him the managing director of a hospital?—Possibly not in the medical aspect, but in the aspect of the general utility

and carrying on the whole place. I am afraid one of the difficulties in public elected boards is that there is no person who takes a special interest in the management of the institution as a whole. Some doctors complained to-day that the Guardians did not take a sufficient interest; the Guardians do very well, but they are elected, and liable to change. That is only my view on the matter.

9630. Dr. DISNEY.—Have you known cases of accidents to come to the county infirmary here?—Yes.

Dec. 1, 1903.

Mr. Joseph Collier.

Mr. THOMAS COLLIER examined.

I am a member of Tandragee Rural Council, and I happen to be one of these unfortunate Guardians we have heard so much about of Banbridge. I am on my own responsibility, as far as the Guardians go. I was put on a committee to consider this question, and we never met. I was sent here by the Rural Council. I would not be in favour of doing away with any of these unions at all. I don't think it would work well; but if there were any of them to be done away with I would see them for the lunatics or imbeciles.

9632. CHAIRMAN.—You would like to break up some of the unions?—I would not; I am more interested in Banbridge. Every workhouse should be dealt with on its own ground. We give outdoor relief to everybody.

9633. Not to the Guardians?—No; we give £2,500 outdoor relief.

9634. I think it is over £5,000 now?—I think it is, and there are over 500 receive it. What I was proposing to do—

9635. We would rather not go into the Banbridge

outdoor relief just now; we will have a sitting at Banbridge for that purpose?—Then I am done. I would like to see the rest of the people getting outdoor relief, and about the place up only for a hospital. It is a great waste to be keeping the institution up and nobody in the house.

9636. You would not cut down the outdoor relief?—No, I would give all those in it outdoor relief, and it would be better than sending them to any workhouse.

9637. Would you like the Tandragee portion to be thrown into Armagh Union?—If Banbridge is done away with I would.

9638. Mr. M'CALLAN.—The rates are very low in Armagh, 6½d.—They don't give so much outdoor relief.

9639. Don't you think the Poor Law system of the county should be confined to the county where it can be done without any great hardship to the poor and sick?—I think so; it is a natural thing.

9640. It is a good ideal if it could be properly carried out?—It is.

Mr. Thomas Collier.

Mr. J. R. MAGNAN examined.

I am Vice-Chairman of the Tandragee Urban Council, and I am come here fully prepared with all the force I can convey to you that we wish to be attached to the Union of Armagh.

9642. CHAIRMAN.—To break up Banbridge?—Yes; I believe there will be no difficulty in dissolving Banbridge, because, as already intimated here, if there is a central place for the destitute poor there will be no expense entailed or inconvenience, as far as I can understand. The Banbridge people give outdoor relief to that extent that there is very little work for the officials, and we have probably half the rates devoted to officials. We, as a district, would rather go to Armagh, and if there is any necessity, we will use every effort in our power to get that accomplished. Because, in the first place, the Government four years ago gave to Ireland 600,000 pounds towards helping to pay half the poor rates. Very good; but our division benefited nothing whatever by that, because our own poor rates were in some cases 2s. and in some cases 6d., an average of 3s. Probably in the last twenty years the Poor Law expenses of Tandragee did not exceed 500, now it is 11d. and is, consequently we are punished by the Government allowing this money. We believe that divisional rating is by far the better way to do it, because, as already stated by some of the witnesses, when it is a union charge *I

will get as much as I can for my own," whereas if it was a divisional charge, every man will not give it, because he is giving it out of his own pocket.

9643. Are you a Guardian?—I am an Urban Councillor, not a Guardian.

9644. Do you know whether there is much outdoor relief given in Tandragee?—There is a good share; a good many people are receiving it that have not the slightest chance to get it. There are probably set of the family servant girls getting large wages, and their fathers and mothers are getting outdoor relief, and they themselves can ride on cars, and probably be better dressed than those who have a stated income. That is the reason why, if it is made a divisional charge, every person will feel their own pinch. If we get transferred to Armagh we are satisfied; and if we cannot get that done, we seek in the second place divisional charges, and we would be satisfied with both.

9645. That is, you would like to go to Armagh and have a divisional charge afterwards?—There is a very large giving out of dispensary tickets.

9646. We have nothing to do with the Medical Charities Act?—If the Commission would wish to have any additional influence or help we are quite ready to call a public meeting of the Urban Council to sign a petition.

Mr. J. R. Magnan.

Mr. W. J. M'NEELY examined.

9648. CHAIRMAN.—You are also a member of the Urban Council?—Yes.

9649. You have heard Mr. Magnan's evidence?—Yes.

9650. Do you agree thoroughly with what he states?—I do.

9651. You prefer going to Armagh?—Yes, from a financial and a geographical point of view.

9652. You would rather have divisional rating than union rating?—Yes.

9653. And you think outdoor relief is excessively given at present?—It is.

9654. In the way he describes?—Yes.

Mr. W. J. M'Neely.

Mr. JAMES M'CALLAN examined.

9655. CHAIRMAN.—You have been in one of the chairs of the Armagh Union for a long time?—Yes; I am Vice-Chairman.

9656. And you have heard the queries that have been asked by this Commission discussed?—Yes.

9657. What is your opinion as to whether any

union should be broken up in the County Armagh?—I speak now on behalf of the majority of the Guardians, that we prefer remaining as we are.

9658. You don't want to enlarge your union in any way, not even by taking in Tandragee?—No; I have a personal objection to take in Tandragee for this

Mr. James M'Callan.

Dec. 1, 1903.

Mr. James
McMahon.

reason: We are giving no outdoor relief, and the two witnesses who have been examined wish to get into Armagh—

9547. So as to stop it?—Exactly, in my opinion. I am always in favour of outdoor relief when judiciously administered. We had outdoor relief for some time after union relief was established, but some of the Guardians in the heavy divisions attending our board objected, simply because they had very few poor in the division in the house or seeking outdoor relief, and they objected to pay for the poor of other divisions, so I am for divisional relief for this reason, that the poor people at present in the divisions are being supported by the charitable poor farmers, who don't like to see them starving when they refuse to come to the workhouse, and, therefore, they are a burden to charitable people.

9548. You don't think the poor rate ought ever to make charity unnecessary?—I would not go that length.

9549. How far would you go in that direction? Where do you think poor rate ought to stop and charity come in?—I think where there is an old man and woman living thirty or forty years together. Last week an application was made before our board for outdoor relief for them. The hands of the Guardians should not be tied up by any resolution of the board not to give relief in a case of the kind.

9550. They cannot tie your hands?—We have a resolution on the books by which our hands are tied; a resolution that no outdoor relief shall be given except on a medical certificate from the doctor. That (passed) is the form on which outdoor relief was granted in our place. These queries had to be answered, and it had to be signed by two of the Guardians representing the division, the medical officer of the division, and five of the largest ratepayers, and it then had to come before the board, and the whole matter was discussed. We took every precaution, and met every quarter, and revised the whole of the outdoor relief list, and where there was any information that the person's circumstances had altered the relief ceased.

9551. This seems to be a very good form?—Yes; it was got up by a committee of our board.

9552. You have the circumstances on record that led to the Guardians giving the relief whenever challenged?—Yes.

9553. Mr. MURKHAHAN.—And notwithstanding all these precautions the Armagh Board of Guardians thought fit to pass a resolution that they would give no outdoor relief except in the case of a doctor's certificate that the patient could not be removed?—The majority of the board. We had a case last week where a letter was written to us by a gentleman in Dublin, a Mr. Mullin, who wrote to us about the case of an old man and woman between seventy and eighty years of age. He was formerly a respectable farmer, who had gone down in the world, and had to sell his farm,

but they retained the right to themselves in a house and garden to live in. The few pounds they had left after they had paid their debts gradually dwindled away, and these gentlemen, knowing their poverty, wrote to our board, saying it was a good case in which we should give outdoor relief, but owing to this resolution on our books it could not be granted. The case was adjourned for a week that the Guardians in the division should inquire whether this letter stated the facts of the case. The two Guardians for the division both were there, and both confirmed the letter in every particular, saying that everything stated in the letter was true, and still our hands were tied, and we could not relieve these people. The consequence will be that they are thrown on the charity of their friends, and I think that is unfair.

9554. CHAIRMAN.—One of the Guardians of the Armagh Union seemed to say that that resolution was adopted in consequence of some letter?—He is perfectly correct.—Mr. Orr—we had several letters.

9555. Merely calling your attention to it with a view to your overhauling it, but it never was suggested for a moment that outdoor relief should cease?—There must have been some error in writing the letter, because had the Local Government Board known the precautions we took they would not have written it.

9556. Can you not understand that it would have been a reasonable thing to call your attention to any sudden increase in a head of expenditure. Calling your attention to it does not mean that the expenditure is excessive, but that they would like it to be looked into. Was it taken as more than that?—It was that we should be even more exact and particular than we were.

9557. Has your Board of Guardians been always so very ready to listen to suggestions from the Local Government Board?—You have personal experience, sir. Once or twice we did not act as suggested, or obey even a Scaled Order.

9558. Mr. MURKHAHAN.—Was there any great sudden increase that would call for such a letter?—Not to my knowledge. I heard it stated by some of the Newry people that it was in consequence of their town being in the way of troops coming from Belfast that they had so many of them, and Armagh being out of that time we had so few. To my own personal knowledge the numbers have decreased lately, because we have a very efficient master, who had been a head constable in his time and knows most of these people, and they have got afraid to come to us; really deserving people who want a night's lodging have no fear, and consequently they come.

9559. What does he do to make them avoid the place, does he persecute them?—Sometimes he does.

9560. Is it the result of conversations he has with them?—Exactly, that is it. I think, sir, that is all I wish to say. I cordially agree with what Mr. Orr and Sir James Stronge said.

Mr. T. H. HARDY examined.

Mr. T. H.
Hardy.

9561. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the Armagh Board of Guardians?—Yes; I have been asked to come here by the board. I was on the committee appointed to consider the questions sent down by the Commission, and the committee decided that they could very well take over the Armagh portion of Banbridge Union provided the Commission thought it was necessary to shelve Banbridge. They went into the matter carefully, and they came to that conclusion, but the Board of Guardians reversed that.

9562. So that there is a good minority on your board in favour of taking the Banbridge part?—Yes, there is. As a matter of fact, I think before the opinion of the Board of Guardians was expressed that the Armagh portion of Banbridge Union did not want to come to Armagh, but now they appear to wish to come. I was surprised to hear the evidence here to-day, in the face of what had taken place before the County Council.

9563. Is there any other change you think might be made; do you think the Crossmaglen part is too far from you?—It would be rather far away. As a matter of fact, our part of the union lying up in that direction is far away at the present time.

9564. What is your most distant point in the union?—It would be nine miles.

9565. NEWTOWNHAMILLION, I think, is in Crossmaglen?—It is.

9566. I believe it would be about half-way between Keady and Newtownhamilton?—Yes; the Armagh portion of Banbridge Union is much more convenient.

9567. Is it a thickly populated country between Keady and Newtownhamilton?—I don't think it is.

9568. Then, as regards the Newry part, you don't contemplate any breaking up of Newry?—No; Newry would be rather out of the way from us. We are not particularly anxious to get the Banbridge portion, but we could take it and work it advantageously with Armagh. Of course, I am speaking now generally.

9569. Could you take in the County Armagh part of the Lurgan Union; it only goes probably to Lurgan?—That would be very far away from us, twenty miles. We are all of opinion that we could not do away with either Lurgan or Armagh. Lurgan is sixteen English miles from here, and it goes ten or three miles on the other side.

9570. Mr. MURKHAHAN.—But the facilities for travel are very good?—Yes; but our experience is that no way accommodation is very little use for removing sick or infirm people; they have to be removed by ambulance.

9571. This question does not apply to the sick?

Even take the infirm people; the railway accommodation is not very good for removing the infirm people.

0672. The class of men up at your house, 55, 60, and 70 years of age, could they not very well travel on a train?—Some I think not.

0673. CHAIRMAN.—There are very few that could not. If you go up to your own wards to-day there are very few of your aged and infirm, except those who are in bed, that could not take a railway journey to Lurgan?—As a rule they must come in when they are in a very low state of health, and they recruit a good deal when they do come in, and get stronger. With reference to the outdoor relief, I am strongly in favour of outdoor relief, but I cannot agree with Mr. McMahon that there was no sudden increase. I drew the attention of the Local Government Board to it, because immediately after union rating there was a sudden increase; it troubled in a few years. I am strongly in favour of outdoor relief myself, and did all that I could against the resolution being passed.

0674. Mr. MURPHY.—The amount of outdoor relief at no time was very large in Armagh Union, considering the valuation?—I think it runs to £700 or £800.

0675. £700 is not a very large sum on a valuation of £240,000?—There was at one time practically none at all.

0676. You may evade the thing in the way of

economy?—I think if there was divisional rating it would not be so great. There is a tendency in the different divisions to try and get on as many poor people as they can.

0677. You see, this question of outdoor relief in the Armagh Union never reached 1d. in the £ to the rate-payers, only a little over 1d. A penny in the £ would bring £2,000; it never reached £700; it was barely 1d. in the £ at any time?—That is quite true; but, all the same, it increased a good deal all at once.

0678. It may have been properly increased?—I did not say it did not; I am strongly in favour of it. My own opinion is that it is abused when it is union rating.

0679. CHAIRMAN.—And you think if it was divisional rating there would be less difficulty in the way of deserving people in the electoral division getting it; the Board of Guardians as a body would not interfere with a representation of the work of the Guardians of that division?—Exactly so; because they would come to the conclusion that unless it was a deserving case the Guardian of the division would not bring it forward.

0680. Mr. MURPHY.—Divisional rating would strike the towns very hard?—I don't know that.

0681. Because it is in the towns, especially the large towns, where there is a great amount of poverty?—I think divisional rating, as a rule, strikes the poorer districts.

Dec. 1, 1905.
Mr. T. M. Hardy.

Mr. JAMES McMAHON further examined.

The applications that we receive from the City of Armagh for outdoor relief are very few, and that is in consequence of the several charitable societies of different denominations in the town who relieve the deserving poor themselves of their own charity; but from the country, where they have not societies of that kind to relieve them, we have a large number of applications, but, unfortunately, as we are situated now, we cannot do anything for them, except they come into the house. With regard to old married couples, I think it is a great hardship they should be separated, and if there should be such a thing as any

workhouse that would not be required after your decision in the county, I think it would be well to keep it for that purpose; not alone for the poor that would be in any one workhouse, but to accommodate old married couples that would be all over the whole county.

0682. CHAIRMAN.—I don't know whether you are aware that that has been tried in England, and the married couples, as a rule, prefer the general society rather than the society of their partners for life?—That is not my experience here; the English people may differ from us.

Mr. James McMahon.

Mr. R. LEWIS examined.

0683. CHAIRMAN. You are a member of the Armagh Board?—Yes.

0684. What is your view about breaking up any of the workhouses in or adjoining this county?—My view is what has been expressed already—that it would not be an advantage from the situation of these workhouses to break them up, but we could amalgamate portion of Tandragee with Armagh, though at our board, when a vote was taken, there was a majority of two against amalgamation. And, as regards the site of Armagh Union, it would not make it any larger than it was previous to the Local Government Act being passed. At that time we had a portion of the County Tyrone, Colinton, that was connected with Armagh; we lost that, and it has gone to Dungannon, so that adding Tandragee to this district would not make it any more unwieldy than it was before the Local Government Act; and I think it is even more the market town for the Guardians of the district comprised in the Banbridge Union.

0685. Do you think the other districts are too far away, such as Crossmaglen and Newry?—Yes; there is no connection with Crossmaglen except by road or very roundabout by train by Clones.

0686. And you think the County Armagh in the Lurgan Union is too remote?—I think it is from our time; and I don't think the Armagh Guardians would like to be bothered by the doctors after the evidence I heard to-day. We would prefer to keep by ourselves.

0687. In Armagh you would rather have the doctors?—If the doctors are right the Guardians must be very timid about their duties; it seems the Guardians know nothing about hospitals. Here in Armagh every Guardian knows the state of the house; every Guardian is taken by the master to every portion of the house; five of a committee are summoned in their turn alphabetically.

0688. Do these five Guardians attend regularly?—

They may not all attend every day. I have been at a committee where the whole five were there, but sometimes there might not be more than two or three.

0689. Is there always a committee formed?—A committee formed for every Tuesday.

0690. Is there always a quorum of that committee attending?—There is no quorum; but if two attend or one it goes round.

0691. You have often been round; where do you go first?—Into the stores, and examine the food, the milk and the bread and the beef. We then go through the kitchen, and we see the cookery as it is in progress; we then are taken through the old women's ward and the nursery, and on through the infirmary and through the lunatic department, right round the house, and finish up with the old men, and we examine all the wards, and are taken to see all the beds and everything, and that is gone over every week.

0692. How long do you take at that?—About an hour, or almost an hour.

0693. Dr. ROBERT.—Always on a Tuesday?—Always on a Tuesday morning, from 11 to 12.

0694. CHAIRMAN.—That gives the Guardians an opportunity of seeing things very clearly. Do you have the doctor round with you then?—No; the doctor and nurses are in the infirmary; we see them as they pass occasionally.

0695. Do they make any suggestions to you?—Any suggestions are brought forward by the master. I presume they are suggested to him.

0696. The master has nothing to do with the infirmary?—He has not anything to do with medical treatment, but with any alterations that would be made.

0697. He has nothing to do with the infirmary at all. He is just responsible in a general way for any discipline, if he knows anything is going on wrong. Do you mean to say the doctor would make his views known through the master?—

Mr. R. Lewis.

Dec. 1, 1903.

Mr. E. Lyons.

9700. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—He does, if he wants blinds for his windows, the master enters it on his report.—Yes; and if the nurses wanted anything for their department.

9701. CHAIRMAN.—Yes, that is a little thing, or blue or starch or soap, but I mean any serious reform; does the doctor consult with you about that as you are going round?—No, he does not; he would write it on a report, and send it into the Guardians, and perhaps on that day week's committee it would be referred to them.

9702. And then you would see the doctor, and talk it over with him?—Yes. And also the question that arises here to-day. The Guardians are unanimous that we have accommodation in the Arnoagh Workhouse for three times the number of people that are in it at present, and they could fit up wards if they got this capitation grant for the lunatics, and keep them a good deal cheaper and as well as they could do at the asylum, because they would be kept at work and associated with sane people more or less; it helps a little.

9703. Dr. BROWN.—You think the lunatics are fairly treated?—We have not regular lunatics; unbedden; yes, they are very clean and well.

9704. Sleeping accommodation good?—I don't know whether that can be improved; the sleeping accommodation seems to be better through the general part of the house than it is with them; some of them.

9705. Did the committee ever think of improving it?—They have been talking about it, but they did not want to spend money on this department until they would know whether this scheme would be carried out or this would be taken away from the workhouse. Is that matter of outdoor relief it rose from 1880 30s. a week to £15 a week, now it is £20; it certainly seemed a big rise.

9706. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Is it possible in this extensive union it was only 30s. a week.—Yes, in 1880; and the Local Government Board and the auditor drew attention to the increase, and the Guardians brought on this rule that Mr. Murtaghan and we all more or less complain about, and it has kept it at a stand since then.

9707. No matter how deserving the case, they must either come into the house or do without relief.—Well, the question of deserving—if they are not completely bedridden they have to do without relief.

The Sitting adjourned.

NINETEENTH PUBLIC SITTING—WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 16TH, 1903. Dec 16, 1903

At the Courthouse, Belfast.

Present:—Mr. MICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. COFF BIGGEE.

Mr. T. J. Campbell (instructed by Messrs. P. and J. Boyle) appeared for the Ballycastle Board of Guardians.

Mr. E. M. Greer appeared for the Ballymoney Rural District Council.

Mr. Murphy (instructed by Mr. P. McGinn) appeared for ratepayers.

Mr. J. S. F. McCANER examined.

9706. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the County Council?—Yes, sir.

9707. Now what resolution did the County Council come to on the question of amalgamation of workhouses and unions?—We answered your queries categorically. The position in which the matter stands with regard to the Antrim County Council is that about a year and a half ago a committee was appointed to take the question of the amalgamation of workhouses into consideration, and they presented a report. That report was adopted by the County Council by a very large majority, and that report I can hand you a copy of. That report was sent up to the Local Government Board, and nothing was done upon it pending your inquiry, which they told us was to be held at an early date, and that report was practically reaffirmed in answer to your questions the other day. The answers we gave were, with regard to the first question, that we recommend the dissolution of the Ballycastle and Antrim Unions wholly. Owing to the seaboard situation of Ballycastle and the small claim at present upon its resources, and the proximity and means of access of the outlying districts of the union to the Unions of Ballymena and Ballymoney, we recommend Ballycastle and Antrim Unions should be abolished, and that part of the Union of Belfast outside the county borough of Belfast and in the County of Antrim should be amalgamated with the Unions of Larne and Lisburn for union purposes. Of course, those are two rather small rural districts lying contiguous to those two unions.

9708. Do you know what the view of the county borough of Belfast is on that?—No; not of the county borough of Belfast. The rural districts, I believe, is in favour of it, but the city of Belfast I don't know whether they have ever taken it into consideration. It is a very small question for them—the valuation is trifling for them.

9709. What is it, do you happen to remember?—£20,000. It is quite a small thing, and it lies touching on Lisburn and Larne, and, of course, to those two unions it would be most suitably attached. The answer to the second question, whether in the event of any union or unions being dissolved and the workhouses thereof being no longer required, such could be taken advantage of for an auxiliary asylum or other purpose, we do not recommend, but we consider it would be worth consideration the utilisation of Larne as a branch asylum to the existing asylum, which is situated about a mile from that. We think it could be worked as a branch asylum in connection with Antrim, and as we think that probably additional accommodation is now required at Antrim, it might be more economically obtained by that method; but we have no plans prepared for the purpose, and, therefore, could not say how it would work out. With regard to the Ballycastle Union Workhouse, there was a resolution passed by the Council at their meeting as an amendment to the report of the committee that it would be a very suitable situation for a school for poorer children.

9710. The County Council did not consider that?—They did; the County Council passed that as their resolution.

9711. They would prefer to keep the children in an institution instead of boarding them out?—They would prefer to keep those children that have to be kept in the institution; they would prefer them gathered away from existing workhouses.

9712. Did they consider the question whether the law might not be amended?—No; they did not touch on that question as to the advisability of boarding out.

9713. What do you think would their view be if they were empowered to board out all the children in the workhouse?—I think they would be in favour of it.

9714. As against putting them into an institution?—I think they would.

9715. There is a railway direct to Ballycastle?—There is a railway direct from Ballycastle; to Ballycastle it is a single gauge line, there is no railway communication from Ballycastle to Cashendall.

9716. That is in their own union?—Yes; except that there is railway communication all over the county.

9717. Did you consider the question of making a sanatorium for consumptive patients?—It was not considered by the County Council at all. Personally, I have very strong views in favour of it.

9718. That would be your personal view?—Yes.

9719. Now question three. Whether with or without a dissolution of any union it would be possible?—Our answer is, we are not in favour of any arrangement which would transfer inmates from their present districts to another district. The committee of the County Council had a feeling that they would prefer as far as possible that the aged and infirm should remain in the district where they had been born and bred up.

9720. There is no question about it, the sick would have to remain?—The sick would have to remain, but the able-bodied and aged people who had friends in different districts, the Council would object to any classification of them which would remove all the respectable old people into one establishment.

9721. Say into Ballymena?—Say into Ballymena. That they would object to that because their friends could not go to see them, and they would feel further from home, and other reasons.

9722. Have you made any inquiries as to the extent to which these old people receive visits from their friends in workhouses?—I have not.

9723. If you found on inquiry that the number of visits to the sick was considerable and the number of visits to the aged and infirm was gradually all, would not that affect your judgment?—I am sure that would affect the County Council; as far as my own view is I would like to see them very much dissipated.

9724. Now as regards chargeability, query No. 4, whether in the event of an amalgamation or combination of unions being carried out or any other arrangements being made for the relief of the destitute poor any changes in the law procedure as to administration and in the chargeability of relief would be desirable?—The Council think that outdoor relief should be charged to the electoral division in which the person relieved resides, and not to the whole union.

9725. Is that with a view of making the responsibility more keenly felt?—I think so; bringing back

Ms. J. S.
F. M. CANER.

Dec. 14, 1902.
Mr. J. S.
F. McCann.

the old state of affairs, that more responsibility would be upon the district in which the people were to be relieved.

9726. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—That would hit the towns very hard?—It would unquestionably; but at the same time it is a very strong feeling that it has led to a great increase in outdoor relief, the recent change in county unions.

9727. CHAIRMAN.—With what part of the country are you immediately connected?—I reside between Belfast No. 1 Rural District and Lisburn Rural District; I am in both.

9728. Well, outdoor relief in Lisburn is pretty high? Is it, very?

9729. And in Belfast practically nil?—Practically nil; and in Lisburn rural district it is very high, and increasing, as far as I know.

9730. Do you see anything of the actual administration of outdoor relief in Castlereagh district and in Lisburn?—No, sir, not personally.

9731. You cannot speak with any knowledge as to the way in which it is done?—No, sir; I am a member of the Lisburn Board of Guardians, and I have every reason to believe that it is most carefully examined into, but I am not a member of the committee, and cannot tell you.

9732. Is the outdoor relief worked by a committee?—I believe all the work of the Lisburn Union is done by committees before coming before the board, but, of course, it is always examined afterwards.

9733. And notified by the board?—Yes, always notified.

9734. The practical outdoor relief is in the hands of the committee?—I believe so.

9735. And you don't think that in this county there is any further hospital accommodation necessary?—No, sir; we have a very fair County Antrim infirmary situated in Lisburn, and a good deal of money has been spent on it recently in bringing it up to date. A bazaar was held, which realised a considerable amount of money, and new operating arrangements were put in, and everything. It has been brought up to date. A certain part of the county has an idea that it is too much in one place. Of course, that will always be with a county infirmary—it cannot be everywhere.

9736. I suppose the people of Ballycastle feel that it is a little bit of a hardship to have to pay for a hospital that they don't derive much benefit from?—Yes; although we have serious cases sent to the infirmary from all the districts of the county.

9737. Would you be in favour of making the maintenance of the sick a county rate all over the County Antrim outside the county borough of Belfast?—Do you mean putting all the union hospitals on one rate?

9738. Yes. Here you have the Lisburn Hospital getting its contribution from Ballycastle; would you be in favour of Ballycastle getting its contribution from Antrim?—As far as the County Antrim is concerned the amount granted to the county infirmary is £600 per annum. It is a comparatively small amount compared with the cost of the maintenance of the Lisburn Infirmary; and the argument of the southern end of the county against those who say that Ballycastle does not get sufficient benefit, is that the difference that the local subscriptions to the infirmary contribute makes up any extra advantage that the locality receives.

9739. I am not saying anything at all hostile to the position of the infirmary?—I know. I am not speaking as a Lisburn man, but giving you the position of both sides. One side say the benefit derived is not in proportion to their payment, the other side say that their personal subscriptions and the local assistance they give to the hospital more than counterbalance any extra advantage they receive from its proximity.

9740. Taking the main fact that the county infirmary at Lisburn is a county charge, established from times before the Poor Law was started; now, having regard to the possibility of a change in chargeability and rating, do you think it would be a fair thing to put the sick, and make the payment for the sick, a county charge all over Ireland, not merely in Antrim?—I would personally prefer that they should be kept on their own areas, and I think it would be a great deal for the benefit of the outlying districts that they should be; but I would be afraid there would be an increase in the rates against the poorer districts.

9741. Do you know what the rates are now for Poor Law purposes in the various unions of the county?—I can give them to you in a moment.

9742. Antrim is 8d.; Ballycastle, 9d.; Ballymena, 1s. 0d.; Ballymoney, 9d.; Belfast, 9d.; Larne, 7d.; Lisburn, 8d. This is for Poor Law purposes only. In this county, with the exception of Ballymena, there is not very much between them?—No.

9743. It would not really in this county make very much of a difference if it was made a county charge?—It would not in this county affect it very materially.

9744. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—That is, provided the management would be the same in the future as it is now?—Yes; but, of course, there is always a tendency where the spending authority is not the taxing authority to increase the cost.

9745. CHAIRMAN.—The Lisburn valuation goes up to £200,000 nearly, Ballycastle is only £40,000; it is rather difficult for a place valued at £40,000 to keep up an infirmary with only that much to pay for it as compared with a place with a £200,000 valuation?—That is so; but, on the other hand, the requirements of the district are not as large as the requirements of the other district.

9746. No, they are not, but they must have a certain staff, that costs about the same amount—the nurses and doctors?—That is so, in proportion you must have a larger cost to the smaller area; that is, solely for hospital purposes.

9747. Did you consider that question of a county rate for the sick at all?—No, sir, not in public. I have personally considered it.

9748. And your personal opinion would be against it?—It would; for the reason that I always prefer chargeability and responsibility to go together.

9749. Then, what would you do about all the county-at-large expenses you have got. Take the county infirmary?—Well, the entire county is represented on the County Council equally, and they are the responsible party.

9750. If the hospitals had the same sort of an arrangement like that would you object?—If the management of the hospitals as put in the hands of the County Council, through committees or any way you choose, that would affect my view of the matter certainly.

9751. Then, would you be in favour of their being made a county charge?—I think it is possible that I would. My opinion would be altered then; I think I would have no objection to its being a county-at-large charge.

9752. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—But, then, don't you think that these outlying districts, whose requirements would be few in comparison to places where the population is large, would have to pay an undue proportion of the upkeep?—I still think it would be against the interest of the outlying districts, as far as taxability goes; but so far as efficiency goes, I think it would increase the efficiency if it was all under one control, provided that control was a responsible control and taxing.

9753. CHAIRMAN.—Don't you think Ballycastle would have to pay less as a union charge?—I do not; because I think that Ballycastle people managing their own hospital would be far more likely to keep down the cost than the county-at-large would.

9754. If with the county-at-large for each hospital there was a local committee?—We have the same position in a great many other things in the county at present. Take, for instance, the School Education grant, which is managed by committees, and the tendency of those committees is to be far more extravagant than elected Guardians, for the reason that they have not the direct responsibility. Whenever you go the direct responsibility.

9755. Whenever they have to face their constituents and explain?—They are more careful.

9756. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—And wherever the field is large there is less care in the cultivation?—That is so.

9757. CHAIRMAN.—Now, as regards paying patients?—No. 6. No, I don't think we touched on that.

9758. The County Council does not answer that very judiciously. We have been discussing it under the head of the sick already?—The orders are to take the insane out of the workhouses and put them into the asylums. My personal view is that that has been a very great additional cost to the ratepayers. A great many of the asylums are overcrowded, and it means additional buildings being built in the asylums;

and our asylum, although a new asylum, built for 400, has a population of 470 in it, and we still have a great number of workhouse patients to take to the asylum under the orders; that will mean additional buildings at the asylum, and leave our workhouses empty.

9758. In calculating the cost per head at the asylum you take in, of course, the instalment for repaying the loan?—Certainly.

9759. Are you aware what a lunatic costs per annum in the Asylum Asylum?—Cost over all, including loans and everything, I believe, from memory, about £31.

9760. What do they cost in the workhouse—take Ballymena Workhouse, for instance?—The maintenance costs—

9761. That is the smallest part of it?—Of course it is. The Asylum Asylum has a certain number and the Belfast Asylum, of patients in the Ballymena Workhouse.

9762. Take the cost of a lunatic in an ordinary workhouse?—The cost of there is 7s a week, and the Ballymena Guardians certainly cover all cost on that.

9763. Mr. MURPHY.—That means £19 a year?—Yes; board, maintenance, and everything else.

9764. CHAIRMAN.—Take the cost of an average inmate at Lisburn, what is it?—I could not tell you.

9765. Do you think it would be much less than £25 a year?—I would be greatly astonished if it was £25, unless you include in it—

9766. I would include everything that the lunatic asylum people include—interest on borrowed money and everything?—Are you including the charge for the establishment of the workhouse?

9767. If you calculate the cost of an inmate in the asylum, taking everything into consideration, when you come to calculate the cost of an inmate in the workhouse you must do it on the same basis?—Certainly not, provided the law requires us to keep a staff of officials in the workhouse that are doing nothing, or only doing half what they should.

9768. I don't think you can say that a workhouse patient costs only 7s a week; that is not the case?—The Ballymena Guardians at the present moment making money on the 7s a week. I have a table here before me. The actual cost, including establishment charges, in the Lisburn Union, is returned by them as 5s 9d.

9769. Per week?—Yes.

9770. Mr. MURPHY.—That is about £16 a year?—That includes everything. Ballymena is 5s 4d, and we are paying 7s, which we are fully aware is more than sufficient to cover all the cost of the lunatics, and, of course, they are differently looked after.

9771. CHAIRMAN.—Then, from the £31 a year, you have to take 4s a week capitation grant?—Certainly. The average cost of our lunatics in the asylum is, without the capitation grant, somewhere about £31 15s between £22 and £33.

9772. So, you see, there is not really such a very big margin between the two, and if legislation were to enable you to get the same capitation grant for an auxiliary lunatic asylum that you do for the head lunatic asylum do you think there would not be an advantage in getting them out of the workhouse?—I would most certainly wish to see them personally collected into one workhouse or one place under one supervision with a little more comfort than they have at present in the workhouses, but not with the expense of the really dangerous insane lunatics. These cases are more imbecile, infirm intellects than lunatics, and they should be made comfortable, and well clothed and properly fed, but they should not require the expensive caretaking of the others; should not require the same proportion of wardens and the same expense of doctors and so forth to look after them. Therefore, I would have them in a separate institution, with a very much reduced item for establishment charges.

9773. You would like to see a good capitation grant going for that?—But we must get the capitation grant first.

9774. At present you have a capitation grant of 2s a week only?—Yes.

9775. Mr. MURPHY.—Even if the capitation grant remained as it is, do you not think that, considering you have the buildings already prepared, and considering that the attendance wouldn't be so expensive for an auxiliary asylum it would be still advantageous to adopt the auxiliary asylum plan?—It entirely de-

pends on the requirements that would be laid down by the Board, which sits in secret and sends down inspectors in public.

9776. The Lunacy Board or the Local Government Board?—It is the Local Government Board.

9777. CHAIRMAN.—You are not sure which?—It is both; I will give them both the credit. They send down inspectors to examine the buildings, and tell you that you are to lay out £10,000 or £12,000 to put it into order before you put a lunatic into it.

9778. Or sometimes not to lay out £10,000?—As a rule it is to lay it out; our experience is the other way.

9779. In Belfast?—Yes, and Antrim; they are always urging additional expenditure.

9780. Now, as regards the children in workhouses, what do you think?—I think the general feeling in the County Antrim, as far as I am aware, is to board them out if possible; we would like to see the workhouse lately removed from them.

9781. I don't know whether, in considering this question, the County Council tried to see how far workhouses could be relieved of classes with advantage?—No, they did not.

9782. The classes in the workhouse at present are the sick, the infirm, the lunatic, the children, and the able-bodied. The sick must remain locally to be treated, then you have the aged and infirm, which you have dealt with already. If you can send away the children and the lunatics, that makes it almost an infirmary and almshouse, with one exception—than is the case of women who go in to be confined?—Yes.

9783. If you could get rid of the children and the lunatics, and the women who go in for that purpose, then you would have none to deal with except the sick and the infirm?—What are you going to do with the most serious graveyards of all, the numerous gentlemen who walk round?

9784. We will come to that; it is the very last question?—Of course the sick must be attended to locally; there is no question.

9785. The children?—We would board out if we could, but if we could not we would prefer that they were gathered into some one place where they would be away from the taint of the workhouse, and trained almost as in an industrial school.

9786. As regards the women who go in there with illegitimate children, have you thought of that matter at all?—No, sir; that matter was not considered; I have not taken that into consideration.

9787. In question No. 7 you are asked how far a system of payments might be adopted. In some instances, for instance in Fermanagh, a considerable revenue has recently been raised by accepting payments of very small sums weekly, as low as 1s and upwards?

9788. In the County Antrim Infirmary a similar provision has been established, and when a governor issues an admission order or a line to the medical superintendent, there is on the bottom of the line whether the patient can pay, and, if so, how much, and he is supposed to put upon it from 1s. to 10s., according as he thinks the patient can pay; we are getting a certain amount of revenue, but I cannot tell you how much; the doctor will be able to tell you to-morrow, but the system has been adopted, and I think will work.

9789. And you would be in favour of giving Boards of Guardians the same power to charge people for their infirmities—discretionary powers?—I would; because I think a great number of the patients would prefer to pay a trifle.

9790. It would be better for them?—Yes; I believe a great number of the independent Irishmen prefer not to receive alms if they can help it.

9791. They would feel more independent paying even a little?—Yes; they would feel they had some right.

9792. Now, as regards tramps, what do you wish to say on that subject?—Well, sir, the County Council think a change is greatly needed, but we are not in a position to say what; that is the furthest they are prepared to go.

9793. There would be a good deal of pro and con in it?—Yes; but, of course, it is particularly bad in districts near large towns, such as Belfast, where they start out on their regular round on Monday.

9794. A weekly circuit is it?—Yes, I think so; and they have very good accommodation, as they go. Personally, I would be greatly in favour of some power to compel them to do some work.

9795. There is that power?—Yes, in England.

9796. There is that power here?—Not nearly to the same extent as in England.

Jan. 16, 1903

Mr. J. H.
F. McCance.

Dec. 16, 1905.

Mr. J. E.
F. McGeen.

9977. They can detain them longer in England!—They can detain them for thirty-six hours.

9978. Would you wish to see the law extended in that respect?—Personally, I would.

9979. And you think that would be enough to begin with at all events?—It would be a start to deter them; I think also that there should be some method of reporting from the different unions that such a man was there and had travelled on.

9980. They change their names, and do things of that sort?—Of course they do; but they get to be known pretty well.

9981. Mr. MURKIN.—Would you not extend the thing a little further, and with these people who make a profession of going around the country seeking the accommodation of the workhouse, after the second or third visit, hand them over to the police and have them dealt with by the authorities there; would you go that far?—I would give the Guardians the power on the constant return of the same man to the same workhouse to deal with and keep him for a longer period than thirty-six hours; if he returned again I would give them power to deal with him for a week, but I don't know that in the meantime I would be prepared to recommend handing any of them over to the police. I think you can get sufficient power without that by giving the Guardians additional powers on the continued return of the same man without any cause.

9982. Do you think a visit to the police station would not have a deterrent effect on these gentlemen?—I dunno some of them had been there before, but the ones that had not been there before I would not like to send them there for detention alone.

9983. This would be in the case of habitual tramps and strollers?—In nine cases out of ten the habitual tramp and stroller is liable to the police for other reasons, and if the police were carrying out their duties they could get him for something else.

9984. Considering that the police do not seem to be paying any attention to these gentlemen now?—I think it would be well to get the police to do their duty and look after the gentlemen. The real objection to make it an offence to apply to the workhouse to get in that way is the fact that you may shut out one deserving case, thereby causing injury to his life or health. I think the proper course is to take the man in in the meantime, but if he is discovered to be able to do his work and to be imposing on you for the purpose of simply getting a night's lodging, to make it so uncomfortable for him that he won't try it again.

9985. There is also the danger that if you shut him out of the house he may go to a farmyard and do further mischief?—Therefore I would take them in, but make it so unpleasant for them that they won't come unless they need to come.

9986. Have you ever considered the question of boarding out workhouse inmates?—No; my Council did not consider that at all.

9987. Or harmless lunatics; sending them into the country instead of housing them in an institution?—No.

9988. You say outdoor relief is very little given in Belfast Union?—In Belfast Union; but in the County Antrim there is a good deal of it.

9989. But in Belfast Union?—I don't think there is much given.

9990. Have you any idea of how much?—I could not give you the figures.

9991. I believe the sum is infinitesimal; would that have anything to do with the number of inmates in the houses at present?—You would get that better from some of the Belfast witnesses.

9992. Dr. BROWN.—You mentioned that the County Council are in favour of separating the outside districts from the Belfast Union?—Yes.

9993. Did they consider that question?—They did; their reason for it is that they are separated from Belfast for all other purposes—for all other taxation now—and why should they be left for that purpose where it means an additional grievance to them of rates.

9994. Did that meet with the approval of the County Council for the division or the representative from the District Council?—I believe it meets with the approval of the Rural District Council; the reply we got from the Rural District Council was in favour of it.

9995. You also mentioned that the Ballymena Guardians make money out of the boarding out of the inmates from the County Antrim?—Yes.

9996. Have you any idea of how much they make?—I could not tell you, but they cover all expenses, and are quite willing to take more at the same price.

9997. Therefore you infer from that that they make a profit out of it, but you have not any figures to put you?—I could not tell you the actual cost.

9998. Supposing they make a profit, do you think it a fair and reasonable thing that one Board of Guardians should make a profit out of the inmates from the county generally?—I don't object to one Board of Guardians making a profit out of the inmates provided the county thereby is a saver as well.

9999. How does the county save. They get the capitulation grant and board these inmates out at 7s. 6d.; they would have to pay out a considerable further sum on buildings which they avoid; they have had out very well already—about £120,000 in the last four years—and to house the additional fifty at Ballymena would require further building accommodation at Antrim.

10000. The County Council pay 7s. a week for a lunatic; the inmates in the asylum cost about £31 a year?

—£32, I think, is the figure; that includes the Ballymena patients.

10001. But they go to reduce that cost; they only cost you 7s. 6d.—Yes.

10002. Therefore the County Council are making money out of the Ballymena patients as well as the Ballymena Guardians by getting the capitulation grant of 4s. for these inmates?—They are. Mr. McGeen was appointed by the County Council with me.

Mr. Campbell.—I appear on behalf of the Ballymena Board of Guardians, instructed by Messrs. P. & J. Boyle; I am not quite familiar with the course of the proceedings, but certain evidence has been given by Mr. McGeen affecting our district, and I would like to question him on one or two points.

CHAIRMAN.—Certainly.

10003. Mr. Campbell.—You reside at the very lowest end of the county?—Yes; between Belfast and Lismore.

10004. And Ballymena is at the very head of the county?—It is.

10005. Have you any experience of the locality at all?—Yes; I know the district very well indeed.

10006. Do you mean by visiting it?—Yes.

10007. Is it not a fact that that district is about as mountainous a district as you find in any part of Ulster?—There are some very fair hills in it.

10008. What would your definition of a very fair hill be?—I think Knockadea is a very fair hill.

10009. In any case you will agree it is a mountainous district?—I would; it includes parts of the Glens of Antrim.

10010. You would go as far as to say it is one of the most mountainous districts in the entire county?—Yes.

10011. Do you know anything about the roads in the district?—I do.

10012. Does the main road of the district run between Ballycastle and Cushendall?—It depends on what you call the main road. The main roads run towards Bushmills and Ballymena.

10013. You propose to amalgamate Ballymena with some other union?—Yes; that is the proposal of the County Council.

10014. What unions do you suggest?—Ballymena and Ballymena.

10015. What is the main ground on which the County Council make that recommendation?—On the ground that the Ballymena Workhouse is not nearly used to the capacity that we think it can be economically worked for, and that the train facilities from Ballymena to Ballymena are such that nobody would be injuriously affected by the change.

10016. The two points then are that Ballymena is not used to the extent you would like to see it used?—No, I did not say that; not to the extent I would like to see it used; I would not like to see it used at all; I said to the extent of its capacity for usefulness.

10017. In what direction?—Ballymena to Cushendall to accommodate 650 persons, and the present number is about sixty, and the staff would look after at least 320; therefore, in my opinion, it is not doing work for the expense it is incurring.

10018. There is a decrease, I take it, in the number of cases in every workhouse in the county?—There it.

10019. You speak of the railway facilities between Ballymena and Ballymena; do you know anything about the railway facilities in other parts of the district?—There is from Parkmore to Ballymena.

10020. What are the railway facilities between Cushendall and Ballymena?—Might I answer that question by asking you what are the railway facilities between Cushendall and Ballymena?

10021. What are they?—Equally good as between Cushendall and Ballymena.

9323. Take Ballymoney for instance?—We don't propose for a moment that the Cushendall people are to go to Ballymoney; they are to go to Ballycastle, but if they go to Ballymoney they have to go to Ballycastle in any case.

9324. Your evidence is that in respect of railway facilities the change you recommend makes no difference?—Remember we recommend that hospital accommodation should be left in Ballycastle as well—the person to be taken to the workhouse; the existing class of workhouse patients is not inconvenienced when they get to Ballycastle by having to put their feet in the train and be taken up to Ballymoney.

9325. Another ground is the seaboard position of Ballycastle; would not that also apply to Larne?—It would equally, except that the union does not lie in the position of Larne.

9326. Is not Larne, as regards the seaboard, in the same fix as Ballycastle?—Certainly, but not as regards other matters.

9327. And Larne is much nearer to other unions than is Ballycastle?—Certainly, but not as regards other matters.

9328. Have you any idea of the relative distances between Larne and Ballymoney, and Ballycastle and Ballymoney?—Yes; Larne is twenty-three miles from Ballymoney, and Ballycastle is about twenty-six, but we don't for a moment propose that Ballycastle and Ballymoney are to have any connection whatever.

9329. What would you propose to do with the inmates?—They are to go to Ballymoney.

9330. The other parts of the union should go to Ballymoney?—Yes.

9331. Was there a resolution passed on this subject by the County Council before this Commission was moved at all?—So I stated this morning.

9332. And did that recommend the abolition of Ballycastle as a separate district?—Yes.

9333. That was without any inquiry at all?—No; that was after a committee had sat and held a great deal of inquiry.

9334. Did you figure out in any way the distance between the nearest point of Ballycastle Union to Ballymoney?—No; I could not tell you that from memory; I did know it at one time.

9335. Would you be surprised to learn that the average distance is twenty-one and a half miles?—How could the nearest point have an average distance.

9336. Would you be surprised to hear the average distance is twenty-one and a half miles?—It may, but I don't think it would be, from my recollection. The average distance of—

9337. Of the districts of Ballycastle?—Of the districts of Ballycastle that we would propose to put into Ballymoney Union; I would be greatly surprised.

9338. Would you be surprised to learn that the average distance is about twenty-one miles?—I would be greatly surprised to know that the average distance of the districts we propose to put into Ballymoney is twenty-one miles.

9339. That is not exactly what I ask you?—You are asking me a question that I cannot answer in fairness.

9340. You cannot say yes or no to it? I say you are asking two questions at once that I cannot answer with yes or no.

CHAIRMAN.—Mr. McOrne proposes that the union should be divided into two; therefore he could not answer the question.

9341. Mr. Campbell.—Would you be surprised to learn that the average distance of the districts now included in Ballycastle from Ballymoney is about twenty-one miles?—It does not affect my position at all.

CHAIRMAN.—It really has no reference to the case. Mr. Campbell.—We say it has, and is a very important matter.

CHAIRMAN.—If you take it up separately and ask him how he proposes to divide the union, and then take the distances of one part from Ballymoney and another part from Ballymoney it would be relevant.

9342. Mr. Campbell.—Will you tell us how exactly you do propose to divide the union?—We propose to divide it down at the Cushendall end; all the Larne and Glenora and that district to go to Ballymoney, and the other portion to go to Ballycastle, which, naturally, lies into it.

9343. Have you any idea how that would increase the distance, having regard to the present distances people have to travel to get to Ballycastle?—It entirely depends on the person you take; if you take a man in Cushendall it will not increase his distance materially.

9344. To get to Ballymoney?—No.

9345. Do you think he would have the same facilities

to get to Ballymoney as to Ballycastle?—I think he would have more; he is within five and a half miles of Parkmore station in one district, and in the other case he has sixteen and a half miles to drive.

9346. CHAIRMAN.—Does not the railway go beyond Parkmore?—No; it is within seven miles of Cushendall village.

9347. Mr. Campbell.—Ballylin is included in Ballycastle; do you propose to take the people from there to Ballymoney?

CHAIRMAN.—I think we may leave them out; they won't embarrass the arrangement.

9348.—When they are landed in Ballycastle, Mr. Boyle will admit the railway station will then be at their service to take them to Ballymoney, and the hospital for the sick will be at Ballycastle.

9349. Mr. Campbell.—You propose to leave the hospital in Ballycastle?—We propose to leave a hospital.

9350. Is the hospital accommodation sufficient for the district?—I could not tell you.

9351. Do you know that recently a hospital was erected privately at Cushendall?—Perfectly aware of that, and a very nice little hospital it is.

9352. Mr. MINNAMARAN.—Have you considered the question of what you would do in the case of these two dissolved unions, what representation they would have; how would their affairs be looked after?—We don't recommend, of course, that it should be in any way altered for rural district purposes.

9353. But for Poor Law purposes what representation would you give them?—I would give them the same number of representatives on the other two boards that they have at present.

9354. And do you think the representatives would come all the way from Ballycastle to attend meetings of the Board in Ballymoney and Ballymena?—The view is, as far as we can ascertain, that they would, a great many of them, get to Ballymoney quite as easily as to Ballycastle; it is a driving district entirely from the outlying districts on both sides of the railway line, and once they get to the railway line they are within, comparatively, an easy distance of Ballymoney or Ballycastle; I don't think it would affect the position except perhaps with regard to the two representatives of Rathlin; they are at the extreme end of the triber; the bulk of them would not be affected very materially.

9355. You would consider the present representation should be continued?—I would; the County Council passed a resolution to the effect that they would like to see the work of the Guardians as much decentralised as possible—done by committees; that is more of the old dispensary committee work done by committees than there is at present done; that would necessitate less frequent attendances of large boards, which are always untidy.

9356. Have you ever considered the question of dispensary management as against the question of union management?—Do you mean the entire management of all the dispensary affairs?

9357. The Poor Law system over the entire union, instead of having it a union administration have it a dispensary administration?—It would lead to great complications, except in the shape of committees that would report to their boards at intervals and have their acts sanctioned by their boards; it would greatly increase the cost of working such small areas with officials.

9358. It would not necessarily mean officials; it would mean committees to look after dispensary areas?—I think the County Council would be in favour of that, of delegating large portions of the powers that at present exist in the Guardians to dispensary area committees.

9359. Would it not mean closer supervision?—Yes; the resolution of the Council to that effect is before you.

9360. You still think there would be four unions needed for the County Antrim?—Personally, I think one would be quite sufficient almost.

9361. If you take out the sick in the County Antrim, they number about 2,000, according to the latest report we have before us, you have about 600 children in the workhouse and 800 boarded out; then, if you take the lunatics and mothers of children, you bring down the number to about 2,000 in the county?—Are you including in that Belfast Workhouse?

9362. Belfast Workhouse?—If you have out Belfast Workhouse you will have the number reduced to about twenty-five, or somewhere down about that. If you have out Belfast Workhouse and take out those classes, except the tramps who are in for the night, it will be very much reduced.

Dec. 16, 1902.

Mr J. B. P.
22 Cases.

9831. CHAIRMAN.—The sick and aged and infirm are very large classes—I thought you were mistaking the aged and infirm in that class.

9832. Mr. MURPHY.—No; I am only taking out the sick and the children—I suppose there would be left under those headings in Antrim not more than 500 or 600, if you took out the acute sick and left in the aged and infirm.

9833. Do you think they would require four workhouses for those 500 or 600; I think the number is a great deal larger—You are including Belfast. I personally think a less number would do. I am personally in favour of a reduction of the number, but the County Council's recommendation is what I tell you, in favour of the abolition of only two; of course, Lisburn takes in a large area of the County Down as well as the County Antrim. Lisburn is not a purely County Antrim Workhouse; its area in Down is larger than in Antrim.

9834. Have you any view as regards county boundaries; would you like to see every county self-contained, an administrative unit; did you consider that question?—No.

9835. You are interlocked pretty largely with other counties?—Only County Down and the city of Belfast.

9836. County Antrim?—We have a trifle of it in Lurgan Union.

9837. You did not consider that question?—At one time Antrim was in favour of being amalgamated with Lisburn, but I think they have dropped that question.

9838. Mr. Campbell.—Before you go I would like you to answer this. The case that the Ballycastle Board of Guardians intend to make is this, that the Antrim County Council, in suggesting the abolition of the Ballycastle Union, are not actuated by any desire for economy or the good of the poor, but solely through political motives; what is your opinion with regard to that?—I have been a member of the County Council of Antrim since its inception, and I never heard the word politics mentioned at it, good, bad, or indifferent. We recommend the abolition of Antrim, and the politics of Antrim are very considerably different from the politics of Ballycastle, as far as I know them; therefore, the same actions that would animate us in abolishing Ballycastle could not be a political feeling to make us abolish Antrim.

9839. You will admit that Antrim stands in a very different position from Ballycastle; is it not surrounded on all sides by other unions?—Yes; so is Ballycastle.

9840. At a nearer distance than the unions are to Ballycastle?—I don't think Larne is much nearer to Antrim.

Mr. ALEXANDER MURPHY'S CONTINUATION.

Mr. Alexander
Murphy.

9841. CHAIRMAN.—You are the other member of the County Council who was delegated to give evidence?—I

9842. Well, we have had the evidence at considerable length of Mr. McCune, and I don't suppose it will be necessary to take you verbatim through it in the same way—I don't see any advantage in it at all.

9843. If there were any matters in which you dissent from Mr. McCune or your wish to express your own view so we will take it in that way from you?—Really, I have very little to say in addition to what Mr. McCune has put before you. The Council were actuated in this matter largely by a desire to save the ratepayers; as business men we considered that small unions with expensive establishment charges are not conducive to economy. We had before us Ballycastle Union with only twenty-six ordinary inmates, and we had Antrim Union with only seventy-four ordinary inmates; they were the two unions with the smallest number of inmates in the County Antrim, and we considered the advisability of the abolition of those two unions and their amalgamation with the adjoining unions. We were of opinion from the facts before us that the establishment charges in small unions are necessarily bound to be out of proportion to the establishment charges in the larger unions. Now, sir, that is borne out by the facts. If you take the Ballymena Union, with 126 inmates, we find there that the total cost for all purposes, including establishment charges, is £5. 4d. each inmate. Ballycastle Union I am sorry I cannot give you, for the simple reason that although we have applied from the County offices here we have been unable to get the establishment charges

9844. Do you know whether or not it is a fact that in Ballycastle a party have a majority there who have not a majority in any other part of the county?—I know nothing personally about parties, and take no interest in parties.

9845. Do you know whether that is so or not?—I know the County Council of Antrim had no political animus in this matter.

9846. They are a very innocent body; but do you know that a party have a majority in Ballycastle who have not a majority in any other union of the county?—I know nothing about the majority in Ballycastle.

9847. Did you ever hear of such a thing?—I have heard of contested elections in Ballycastle, where the party that you are representing have been defeated, so I don't know that they have a majority. Mr. Woodside, who represents that district, does not represent the party I take it you represent.

9848. You are speaking of the County Council's representation, I am speaking of the composition of the Board of Guardians of Ballycastle?—I cannot tell you about the composition.

9849. As a matter of fact did you vote against any commission of inquiry?—I did not.

9850. When the question was before the County Council?—No, I never did.

9851. On the resolution of Mr. O'Connell?—Never did. I would like to see it produced if I did, I would like you to produce any amendment I voted against.

9852. The resolution, I am told, is as follows:—29th of October, 1902, moved by Mr. O'Connell, Chairman of the Ballycastle Board of Guardians, at a meeting of the Antrim County Council: "That in the opinion of this Council the time has now come when the Government should appoint a Commission to inquire into the working of the Poor Law system in Ireland with a view to introduce some other method of dealing with our poor, or to make such changes in the present system as will lessen the heavy expenditure imposed on the ratepayers, and be more in accordance with the wishes of the people and the requirements of the poor." Did you vote against that?—That was an amendment proposed to the report of the committee which I had signed. Of course, I supported the report of the committee, which I had previously submitted, and, consequently, voted against that amendment.

9853. Whether it was an amendment to the report or what it was did you vote against it?—I voted in favour of the report I put before the Council.

9854. And against this resolution of Mr. O'Connell?—Certainly I did, and would again in the same position.

from the Ballycastle Union. But take Antrim Union. The total cost there is 7s. 1½d. per inmate, including establishment charges, as against 5s. 4d. for Ballymena, and 6s. 9½d. in Larne; so that it is quite clear that if the inmates of Antrim were distributed over Ballymena and Larne that the cost of these inmates would be less per head than at present. That is, broadly, the fact that influenced us in the course that was come to by the Council.

9855. Subject, of course, to any considerable expenses that might be incurred?—You mean, perhaps, for the transfer of the inmates.

9856. Yes?—That, sir, we thought would be much more than compensated for by the fact—

9857. And possibly other expenses, salaries?—Yes; but, broadly, we considered that if you increase the number of inmates, say in Larne Union, that you save establishment charges in Larne Union. That is borne out in Ballymena, where the number of inmates is larger—the rate per head for establishment charges is reduced in proportion to the number of inmates. The total number of ordinary inmates for the whole of the unions, as far as I know, would be about 600, omitting Belfast.

9858. In ordinary inmates do you include aged and infirm?—Yes; but not including the infirm.

9859. Not including the sick?—Not those in the infirmary and hospital. The total number in the various workhouses is 780, but from that I deduct half of Lisburn, because there is half in the County Down; and I deduct 150 out of 171 in Lurgan, because there is a very small portion of Lurgan in the County

Antrim; so, really, there are only about 500 ordinary inmates to be accommodated in the whole of the unions, at the outside.

9010. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Do you not think that it would be a waste of money to keep four institutions for these 600?—As a business man, I certainly say it would be. I would be in favour of reducing the number still further, but I am here speaking only in the first instance for the Council.

CHAIRMAN.—Now coming to it from your own point of view.

9011. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—What would you, as a business man—a man who would wish to manage the thing to the best advantage—what would you suggest would be sufficient accommodation for the class known as the infirm and destitute, and all who could travel by rail?—Looking at the figures before me, when I find that we have in Ballymena—where we have a large number of inmates—we have the cost down to 5s. 4d. per head, including all establishment charges; and that I compare that with, say, Antrim, with only half the number of inmates, and the cost 7s. 1½d., then I say our ideal would be to go towards the number at Ballymena, and have such a number of union workhouses as would accommodate the people in such numbers as at Ballymena.

9012. The average number in Ballymena is about 350, including inmates and all?—It is rather more than that. We have 326 ordinary, and in the infirmary and hospital 112, and there are, in addition, 112 inmates; about 360. You are quite right. That would be my idea of what we should come to.

9013. Do you not consider that for the 500 or 600 inmates that two workhouses would meet all the requirements of those able to travel—the destitute and infirm of Antrim—outside Belfast?—Not speaking for the moment as a representative of the County Council, but speaking for myself, I would not be in favour of more than two or three unions. But, personally, I would be in favour of adopting the system of cottage schemes for scattered couples throughout the county. We have some little experience of that at Carrickfergus, where the inmates get about £14 a year. I do think they serve a very useful purpose.

9014. Do you think that could be done with a strict regard to economy?—I think so.

9015. CHAIRMAN.—It would not be an indictment to people to look forward to the rates for support in their old age—I must admit I have heard that argument put forward. I don't think that parsimony, however, is the result of deliberate calculation, and I hardly think it is as appreciable an argument, although I must admit I have heard it put forward in Carrickfergus.

9016. If people have a nice little detached cottage and garden, and know they will get that as soon as they are rather feeble for work, would you not rely on the whole population looking for it?—I have heard the argument put forward, but it has not weight with me. I would not make such provision that they would be there for all applicants, but I would rather reserve them for destitute married couples—that would be my personal view.

9017. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—But still the country has to look after those that cannot look after themselves, and on general grounds do you not think it would be a danger to offer to people when they get into that condition of life that they are no longer able to work—to offer them a better condition of life than they had when they were well and thrifty?—But such a provision as I would propose, of not more than 6s. a week with a free house, would not be something to look forward to—it would be a something to prevent them going into the workhouse. That is my view.

9018. That is a pretty large extension of the outdoor relief system?—Not quite that. I would be in favour of the provision of suitable cottages, not necessarily detached cottages, but in rows, that they could be put up more cheaply, and grant, then, outdoor relief to old married couples.

9019. CHAIRMAN.—Would you be in favour of giving labourers' cottages to actual labourers?—That is a subject in which I am not prepared to speak with authority.

9020. The only thing is giving a cottage to a man as soon as he ceases to be able to labour?—What interested me is that it appears to me they could be maintained as cheaply as in the house, looking at the cost here, and that it would be far more acceptable to respectable poor people. We have a feeling that there are many respectable poor pairs who have to go to the

workhouse greatly against their own wish. I have in my mind many at present that would feel it a great hardship and disgrace, although I know they are living in great poverty.

9021. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—But would not the establishment of such a system as that have rather an irritating effect upon the labouring classes of the community, who, while giving their whole time to industry, would not be as well off as those who are idle?—I cannot see that—that if you give 6s. a week, which is 3s. for each person—you will be making them as well off as those who were working; and it should be a condition precedent that the parties are not able to work.

9022. CHAIRMAN.—I don't know whether you are aware that the agricultural labourers in some parts of Ireland only get 4s. a week for himself and his family, not including a free house?—I was not aware of that, but am I aware how they live on it?

9023. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—I know that the agricultural labourer does not get more than 9s. on an average the year round; and if you establish houses of this kind it certainly would be a source of irritation to a labourer to know that he had to work hard and not live as well as a neighbour who was doing nothing—just so.

9024. So you think two workhouses or so under the conditions you have outlined would accommodate all the classes known as destitute and infirm of Antrim, outside Belfast?—That would be my view, but it is not the view of the Council.

9025. CHAIRMAN.—You might push it further—would not one do? Take Ballymena a centre for Ballymena, Bellinacorney, Larnah, and Antrim—these are all the unions, except Belfast or Larnah; or even leaving Larnah in, and putting out Belfast, if you were satisfied that these poor people when once they become chronic inmates of workhouses received no virtue, would you see more hardship in sending them to one central institution than there is now in sending the means, many of whom are only temporarily infirm, and receive visits, would you see more hardship in sending them to one institution?—I would not.

CHAIRMAN.—There might be an objection in the case of people who would have to go to hospital, but they would have cottage hospitals.

9026. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Did the Council consider the question of a sanatorium for consumptives?—They did not.

9027. The Council would be in favour of an auxiliary asylum if it could be worked with economy?—You are putting the keynote—the question of economy. I must say the Council are very much afraid that if they have to undertake the remodelling of Antrim Workhouse they would be in for enormous expense. We have great dread of the expense in connection with lunatic asylums, or auxiliary asylums. We think they are not at all on a commercial basis. The dread is that the remodelling of Antrim Workhouse might be such an exposure rather it would not be advisable to undertake it.

9028. But, still, if the thing could be done without any additional cost, and to give better treatment to those afflicted people, you would be in favour of the change?—Certainly.

9029. Of course, this thing will have to be gone into closely and the matter considered in regard to expense and everything else?—Yes; the two points that interested us were the question of the expense and the question of the economical working after it was altered.

9030. Is not the Ballymena plan at present working fairly well?—So far as I know, it is.

9031. We went through the house yesterday and the inmates seemed to be well looked after?—As a County Councillor I don't profess to be familiar with the Poor Law system.

9032. But from the point of view of an administrator of the county, and that it brings a saving to the rates, you would be in favour of it?—We are entirely in favour of it. Mr. McCune suggests to me that Belfast is now a separate entity for all purposes.

9033. CHAIRMAN.—If they got rid of the little bit of the union outside they would have a union of their own?—Yes.

9034. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—And they would have no objection to shed that part?—I don't know.

Mr. McCune.—I don't think they would. It would not affect them in the very least.

Dec. 16, 1903.

Mr. Alexander
Macanpfeill.

Witness.—Not having any official knowledge on the matter, I don't wish to say anything.

9955. Dr. BACON.—You speak of cottage homes—what are the conditions for admission to those homes?—In Carrickfergus the conditions are, they must be natives of the town, be destitute, and be over sixty-five years of age, and unable to work.

9956. Have they any means of their own?—It is not a necessary condition.

9957. With regard to the Antrim Workhouse, did the County Council come to any decision what use it should be put to?—The opinion was very strongly in favour of using it as a branch asylum in connection with the one at present at Antrim.

9958. Are they agreed about that—is that part of their resolution?—It is not part of the resolution, but they were practically agreed on it. Mr. McCance reminds me it is part of the resolution. They were practically agreed on it, but they wished to fully consider it in view of what might be the expenditure to fit it for the purpose.

Mr. McCance.—It is referred to, sir, in the resolution which is submitted.

CHAIRMAN.—I have it, thanks.

Witness.—"It might form a very suitable auxiliary to that institution." They did not decide that it was to be so used, but they were of opinion that it might. The question of the cost of altering was considered.

9959. CHAIRMAN.—That is what frightened you?—Yes.

9960. Mr. Campbell.—Though you propose to abolish Ballycastle you don't propose to interfere in any way with Larne?—No.

9961. Does not every reason you give for abolishing Ballycastle apply with equal force to Larne?—I don't think so.

9962. Take them one by one—is Larne not a seaport the same as Ballycastle?—I did not give that as my reason.

9963. I am taking the reasons given by the County Council. Is Larne not a seaport?—It is.

9964. Is there not a small claim at present on its resources?—There are 124 in it, as against twenty-six in Ballycastle.

9965. Are you taking 126 as the average number?—I am taking the return we have from Ballycastle Union—I don't know whether it is correct or not—26 ordinary inmates.

9966. Have you any idea of the proportion of valuation between the two unions?—Oh, yes. £45,500 is Ballycastle, as against £150,000 of Larne.

9967. So that the proportion is about two to five?—Yes; but that does not at all affect the question.

9968. Are not all the districts of Larne in close touch with the surrounding unions?—Larne, of course, as you know, goes quite close to Cushendall. I heard you raising the question that Cushendall would be unduly distant from Ballymena or Ballymoney, and Larne is just in the same position as that point, but it is still further from Larne than any of those places are from either Ballymena or Ballymoney. Between Larne and Ballymena the distance is not great—you must not take Larne town, but take the Larne Poor Law district. The people have to come from quite close to Cushendall to Larne. They have to come a further distance to Larne at present than under the amended arrangement they would have to go to Ballymoney or Ballymena. The distances would not be so bad for the poor of Ballycastle Union as they are today for the poor of Larne Union.

9969. Antrim district comes very near the Larne Union district?—It comes to within about eight miles of Larne, and we are proposing to join part of Antrim Union on to Larne.

9970. Take the Ballymena district—how near does it come to Larne?—I don't know the boundary.

9971. How near does Belfast district come to Larne?—I suppose fifteen or sixteen miles at the nearest point; but don't take me as giving actual figures.

9972. Pass away from Larne altogether, and take the case of Ballymoney. What considerations weighed with the County Council to destroy Ballycastle rather than Ballymoney?—The whole force of the County Council's position is this—that a small union must of necessity cost more for establishment charges per inmate than a larger one, supposing the administration is equally satisfactory in both, and we look to the Local Government Board to see to that point.

9973. So that the main element was the question of cost?—Yes; economy to the county.

9974. Did you take into account to the same extent the condition to which the sick and destitute poor of the district would be reduced?—We don't see that there would be any hardship to them at all.

9975. Did you consider the question?—Oh, certainly. No intelligent man would give a vote without considering it.

9976. Did you make any inquiries in the district yourself?—Yes; we certainly had the most able representatives from the district.

9977. Who was last?—Your neighbor here, Mr. O'Kane, who made a most eloquent speech at the County Council, and enlarged on the whole case—it was put as well as it was possible to put it.

9978. You don't suggest that you have given effect to his recommendations?—We gave full weight to the case he made, but we did not agree with him. We did not think his views sound. If we had, we would have voted contrary to what we did.

9979. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—What do you think of an arrangement that would enable one union to be based on the infirm and destitute in a neighbouring union, pretty much on the plan that you do with regard to Ballymena here and the asylum without the discharging at all of the union?—I would rather not express an opinion. I have not given that matter thought.

9980. I notice the number of inmates in Ballycastle is not large, but even small as they are, they are nearly all in the infirmary. Of course, there will have to be a hospital kept there for the sick in any case. I don't necessarily say, of course, because it is quite possible the greater number of those may just as conveniently be removed to Ballymena, as they have to be removed from quite adjoining it at Cushendall to Larne. I would be disposed to take it that a great many in the infirmary could, without injury to their health, be removed by rail to Ballymena or Ballymoney.

9981. CHAIRMAN.—Do you mean leave no hospital whatever?—No, I did not quite say that; but these might be temporary cases. A hospital might be for acute cases, and these might be temporary cases in the infirmary that could be removed without injury to themselves.

9982. Then, that would be merely with regard to the size of the hospital?—Yes.

9983. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—In that case you know that these inmates could be boarded out in the neighbouring unions then the expensive staff that at present is required would not have to be maintained, but only the nursing staff and medical aid, and in that case you would effect economy without interfering with the local management?—I would have no objection at all provided the establishment charges can be kept down. One of the things that we have to pay for without the poor being specially benefited by is the establishment charge.

9984. A great economy in any change of the system will be secured by a reduction in the number of the staff?—That is the point thus influenced the Council.

9985. If we could get rid of a number of the expensive staff and still keep up the local infirmaries at a moderate cost we would arrive at economy without hindering efficiency, and carry out all the ideas we have been concerned for?—That is the ideal we are aiming at.

9986. What would you think of a system like that that would enable Boards of Guardians to be based on in neighbouring unions their infirm and destitute?—I don't see any objection to it. If a plan can be devised that will work economically I don't see any objection to it.

9987. There is a general impression wherever we have gone that the children should, if possible, be boarded out, and if the children were taken away and the mothers of the children sent to some reformatory institution the number would be very largely reduced?—We think it a very desirable suggestion. I am not an expert in union management, but from all I know, I think you are touching a very sore point in the management, but one that it is very desirable should be remedied.

9988. That is, the reduction of the cost of the staff?—Quite so. I wish to say in reference to the inquiry by the gentleman here to Mr. McCance about the political animus, I have been a member of the County Council, and I know that he is not speaking with the

authority of Mr. O'Kane, the County Councillor, when he suggests such a thing.

Mr. Campbell.—That is a thing this gentleman should not say. I am speaking with the full authority of Mr. O'Kane—that shows the nature of the County Council.

Mr. JOSEPH P. O'KANE examined.

9960. Mr. Campbell.—You have been appointed by the unanimous vote of the Ballycastle Board of Guardians to represent their views here?—I have.

9970. And I also understand that coming here to-day you represent the views of the Most Rev. Dr. Henry, who is the Roman Catholic Bishop of Down and Connor?—I do.

9971. The diocese of Down and Connor includes the County Antrim?—Yes.

9972. So you are not only speaking for the Ballycastle Guardians, but for the head of the Catholic community in this county?—Quite so.

9973. You yourself are a member of the County Antrim Council?—I have been for three years—the first term.

9974. While you were a member of the County Council did you propose the resolution I read to-day in favour of the Commission?—I did; on the 29th of October, 1901.

9975. And you were actually voted down on that resolution?—I was voted against, but amongst those who supported it was the Chairman, Sir Francis M'Laughlin, and Mr. McCance, to my own knowledge, voted against it.

Mr. McCance—I stated I voted against it.

9976. Mr. Campbell.—I object to any interference on the part of Mr. McCance. In any case your resolution has fruit later on?—Yes.

9977. You are thoroughly familiar with all the circumstances and requirements of the Ballycastle district?—I am.

9978. And, unlike the two gentlemen who gave evidence to-day, you have lived there all your life?—I have lived there for upwards of twenty years.

9979. Do you believe is there any reason for recommending the dissolution of this union on the ground of economy?—I cannot see it at all.

9980. Or in the interests of the sick and destitute poor?—Decidedly not.

9981. Is there any reason whatever except, in your judgment, a political motive at the back of it?—I cannot fathom any other.

9982. Is it a fact that Ballycastle is the only union in the County Antrim in which the Nationalist party have a majority?—Yes, that is admitted; it is undeniable.

9983. On this very question, with regard to what should be done with the union itself, was there a vote taken recently at your board?—There was.

9984. Was that vote strictly on party lines?—It was. Well, two gentlemen, liberally minded, refused to vote, but it was strictly on party lines.

9985. That is to say, the Nationalists wanted to preserve their integrity so and the Unionists wanted to destroy it?—Quite so. I should explain, I proposed at the board that there should be a Commission of Inquiry. I followed the example of the County Armagh, and I proposed a Commission of Inquiry. I am quite sure we are all delighted to see you present here at this Inquiry, for they would have had no Inquiry—they would have simply rubbed out Ballycastle without any inquiry and would have inquired afterwards.

9986. You have prepared replies to the various queries submitted by the Commissioners?—I have. On account of being, as it were, on the defensive, if we are going to be wiped out I took the precaution of entering a plea why sentence should not be passed upon us by Mr. M'Campbell and Mr. McCance. I have taken the queries, and I have answered them to the best of my ability. But, as regards the auxiliary system, I would like to bring to your notice the new departure suggested by the Belfast District Council, not in the way of auxiliaries at all, but as homes, and also as regards the outdoor relief question, where we have recommended a reversion to the old electoral division rating. I don't know that Mr. McCance or Mr. M'Campbell have ever had the happiness of being Poor Law Guardians. I have, for ten years, and I would suggest a grant in aid, that is, if we do

CHAIRMAN.—We may leave it so.

Mr. M'KINAGHAN.—We really don't want to touch on that question.

WITNESS.—But I must make the statement. I know Mr. O'Kane has said over and over again that there is not such a body in the world.

Dec. 16, 1903.

Mr. Alexander M'Campbell.

revert to electoral rating for the relief of the poor, the old system should be had regard to, that is, where it is over 50 per cent., it should be an entire union rating. With that safeguard I would wish to advocate a return to electoral rating.

9987. In regard to the Ballycastle Union district itself, is it a mountainous and almost inaccessible district in many parts?—I am an auctioneer, and I have gone over every inch of the ground, and the only way I could describe the road from Ballycastle to Torr, and on round to Cushendun, that is the coast road, there are two roads—the coast road and the main road—is to say it is a switchback.

9988. CHAIRMAN.—We are going to visit Ballycastle?—The only way I can describe it is that it is a switchback railway.

9989. Mr. Campbell.—Taking the district generally, does it consist of a series of switchback roads?—The greater portion of it. From Ballycastle to Ballymoney the roads are very good, but if you go by Arney to Cushendun, Torr and Fairhead, it is all undulations. To give you an example—if you are going from Coleraine Chapel to Ballycastle, Ballycastle is fifty feet above the level of the sea, Coleraine is 350 feet; you have to ascend 800 feet and descend 1,100 feet, that gives you an idea of the road.

9990. In any case, you agree with this—that there is not a more mountainous district in the northern part of Ulster?—Quite so; with the exception of Donegal, there is no district like it.

9991. And starting from the Giant's Causeway, going as the crow flies, to Cushendun, what is the mileage?—Twenty-one.

9992. Does the union also include Rathlin Island?—It does.

9993. And do some of the patients come from Rathlin Island?—They do.

9994. CHAIRMAN.—Do many come?—There used to be more come until outdoor relief came in.

9995. Do the sick come—a good many of the sick. I would say once in the two months, or once in the three months, since outdoor relief came in, before that, about nine or ten years ago, there was no such thing as outdoor relief; now there are 460 mouths being fed at a cost of £250 annually.

9996. How many get outdoor relief in Rathlin?—About forty-eight, I suppose.

9997. In Rathlin?—I don't know the exact number, but about 40.

9998. But it is given on the island?—It is given.

9999. And by whom—the Bellingham Officer?—I cannot say exactly.

10000. How far out does Rathlin Island lie?—I think eight miles.

10001. Speaking of the railway accommodation of the district, what do you say?—Of all the unions in the county it is the most inconveniently situated. It is an old saying that the railway was intended to be to Ballymena, but the railway is only from Ballycastle to Ballymoney, and that is the only line of railway, except you go from Cushendun to a place called the Battery, where there is a railway to Ballymena, but in the whole district round from the Causeway to Ballymoney, and round by Torr and Cushendun, there is not a single railway.

10002. Mr. Campbell.—Would it not add enormously to the inconvenience of the public men and representatives to have to go to Ballymena and Ballymoney?—There is a representative here who had to get up at a quarter to four this morning, and who will be back to-night at ten o'clock if he catches the 3.30, and that is what he would have to do if he had to go to Ballymoney.

10003. He does not support the scheme of the County Council?—He does not.

10004. Your general evidence is that Ballycastle is more poorly supplied with railways than any other union in Antrim?—Yes.

10005. Have you formed any calculation as regards the distances?—I have.

Mr. Joseph P. O'Kane.

Dec. 16, 1909.
Mr. Joseph P.
O'Kane.

10006. What is the average distance from Ballymoney to Ballymena?—Twenty-one and a half miles from Ballymena and nineteen three-quarters from Ballymoney.

10007. That is not speaking of Rathlin Island at all?—Oh, no.

10008. Take the case of Ballymoney itself, in regard to which the County Council make no recommendation, you know that Ballymoney is only seven miles from Coleraine?—That is all.

10009. Coleraine has a workhouse?—It has.

10010. And Ballymoney is eighteen miles from Ballymena, which has a workhouse?—Yes.

10011. And it is fifteen and a half miles from Ballycastle, and Ballycastle has a workhouse?—Yes.

10012. And the average from those three places is?—About eleven miles.

10013. And the average in the other case from the nearest union is about twenty miles?—Yes.

10014. Is Ballymoney more centrally situated than Ballycastle?—Oh, certainly—the map shows it.

10015. In fact, Ballycastle is out of the way altogether?—Oh, but it has a seaward position, which seems to be a cogent argument to the County Council.

10016. Is it colored green on the map?—I should say, sir, that the County Council at the time they recommended the abolition of Ballycastle and Antrim, went upon the ground that Ballycastle has a seaward position, and they were following out the terms of sec. 76 of the Act of 1863, which, as you know, in terms declares that the providing of an auxiliary to an asylum shall be reason for amalgamation; but the County Council did not want any reason, they gave that reason for Antrim, but for Ballycastle they gave the seaward position.

10017. Is Ballycastle at all centrally situated?—I refer to the map.

10018. It is not surrounded by any other workhouses which are very near at hand in any aspect?—No.

10019. And it has no good roads and no railway?—It has the Ballymoney railway only, although it is called the Ballycastle railway.

10020. With regard to the present buildings, have the County Council ever suggested any way in which those buildings could be utilized?—Oh, no.

10021. Have you made a calculation now yourself, supposing this transfer did take place, how it would work out in establishment charges?—With a great deal of diffidence I submit it to the chairman; he will know whether it is correct or not; I hand it in; and the gain on Mr. McCree's or Mr. Macanephell's system scheme would be about £17 on the most favorable consideration.

10022. And against that you must set off the enormous insurance to the representatives there and the enormous probable suffering of the poor?—Quite so. I admit workhouses were in the past houses for the sick-bodied, but I say now they have become infirmaries, and I would go so far as to say that, following the statement of Dr. Joseph Smyth, out of 100 inmates of an infirmary there would not be more than twenty that would be really hospital cases, and of those twenty probably five or six merely bed-ridden cases; I would make the infirmary a real infirmary; I would classify the pure from the impure, and the ones who had come to poverty from their own fault should be separated from those who had come to it from misfortune. I would have a real hospital, and place it on the same basis as in New Zealand or Australia, where a patient is either a paying patient or not, according as the committee of management afterwards decided, and I would make it a source of revenue. And, briefly, I would see that the houses that used to be workhouses now become infirmaries plus district hospitals, whereas what we have to do is to provide for the sick poor when formerly we had to provide for the poverty-stricken poor simply. The areas are large enough; I would keep these areas; but I would no longer have them workhouses, but district hospitals and infirmaries; with all this idea of amalgamation there is only one way of making a saving if it could be carried out, that is if you had a central home in Ballymena for the paupers, and then comes the argument that if you had it what about the old and infirm and those incapable of long journeys; one of the members of the Commission raised a pertinent remark that after some time they will become old and infirm. I would have a central home—a hospital and infirmary. Where workhouses now are keep the buildings and give us what medical science says we require. Many a poor man if he takes sick tomorrow his independence will not let him go into the workhouse if he

could go into a hospital in his own village or town where he could pay a small sum and preserve his independence. It does not matter if a pauper is weak him, he can get medical attendance and trained nursing, and that is the trend of events now, and not the scheme of amalgamation which, with all respect, I say is supported by people who have never studied the question and whose experience of workhouses begins and ends outside of one.

10023. CHAIRMAN.—How would you apply this plan to Ballycastle; what would be the change that would take place at Ballycastle?—I would say, first of all I would band out the children; I would like the infirmary classified.

10024. You would first put an end to the workhouse as a workhouse?—I would.

10025. You would use the same buildings, and they would be merely for the reception of the sick and infirm?—Yes; but, of course, I would have a hospital attached to it.

10026. A fever hospital you mean, for the medical and surgical sick and the infirm, and you would have no other class whatever there?—Of course accidents would be in the hospital, and then comes the question of the tramps; I think you should have a casual ward for them. You cannot differentiate between as honest men tramping for work and a man tramping to avoid work.

10027. You have very few tramps at Ballycastle?—Sometimes the winds attract them in summer.

10028. Mr. Campbell.—They don't get so far as Rathlin?—They do not.

10029. CHAIRMAN.—You would have the same board of management—the Board of Guardians and the District Council—and the people who are now members of the Rural District Council would manage the district hospital?—Yes; I would have the hospital the infirmary, practically, and I would band out the children.

10030. You would not save your way to use that place for anything but the sick and infirm, closing it as regards tramps and closing it as regards women coming in with illegitimate children?—That is a case sometimes that is very heart-rending; I would pause before I would go the length of that, because with some it is undoubtedly their fault, but for others your sympathy would be aroused.

10031. I am looking at it from the most sympathetic point of view possible, if these girls on the corner of their first lapse were sent to a religious penitentiary where they could remain?—I could not argue against that; I would say it would be a very good idea.

10032. Where they could remain for a few months and go to the lying-in hospital and then back to the penitentiary; as an old Guardian and Chairman of your board, do you think the people would have any objection to pay perhaps a little more than the average cost of maintenance; these women have always cost a good deal of money to the rates; do you think they would object to pay the cost of maintenance to the institution?—I don't believe they would object.

10033. That might have the effect of forwarding the career of that girl as a mother of illegitimate children, and in that way, taking the lowest point of view, it might be an economy?—Quite so.

10034. You would let the lunatics go?—We are all sane at Ballycastle; we have no lunatics in the workhouse; we have obeyed the Local Government Board orders and sent the lunatics over to Antrim.

10035. Now I think I understand thoroughly what you suggest?—It is gone thoroughly into my mind; I would be very glad to let you experience the mode of Ballycastle when you go down.

10036. Mr. Campbell.—The number of people in the workhouse is small; they are nearly all in the infirmary?—They are all patients; of course there are some aged and infirm.

10037. With regard to the hospital accommodation in Ballycastle, have you recently erected there by private subscription a hospital at Oushanahill?—No; it is by private philanthropy; a Miss McDonnell erected the hospital.

10038. That is used at the present time by the people of the district?—It is.

10039. CHAIRMAN.—That was never taken over as a district hospital?—It never was; I did my best to get it taken over, but I was defeated by a small majority; Miss McDonnell was going to endow it with £200 a year.

10040. Would Miss McDonnell be willing to give it absolutely; turn it over as a district hospital?—She would, and endow it with about £200 per annum.

10041. Would she still?—Unfortunately, I think I

am justified in saying that Miss Barbara McDonnell, her sister, said she did not think she would; she felt gratified at her generosity being refused; I cannot say for certain.

10042. Mr. Campbell.—I understand the Guardians would have taken the hospital over but for certain conditions which she would not waive?—Conditions which she majesty would not accept.

10043. CHAIRMAN.—Some of them would be hardly legal?—I think if you called upon her, with the other two gentlemen, you would succeed.

10044. Mr. Campbell.—If this amalgamation scheme is carried out the people that will be most injuriously affected are the sick and destitute poor?—Quite so.

10045. You have made a calculation with regard to the probable gain and loss on amalgamation?—I have.

10046. And is the net result of your calculation that the gain would be £17?—Quite so, and that only possible.

10047. You still retain your dispensary and fever hospital?—Yes.

10048. And your doctors and relieving officers and your infirmary ward?—Yes; well, second wards; that is assuming amalgamation not on the lines I have suggested; and all the officials—the chaplain, dispensary doctors, medical officers to the fever hospital, the porter, we might do without the master of matron, not both, and the relieving officers.

10049. CHAIRMAN.—Why could you not do without the master and matron?—We would require somebody in charge.

10050. The matron, I suppose, is unmarried; she is not a nurse?—No, she is not.

10051. Would it not be better to make one of the nurses a matron?—She might; but you would hardly ask a nurse to have charge of the whole building.

10052. There would be no difficulty?—Well, it is a matter of detail.

10053. Mr. Campbell.—You think the net result of the County Council scheme would be to abolish one post and create two new ones in its place?—It would.

10054. Spending of accidents, have you repairs and repairs in that district in actual working?—We have three.

10055. And accidents do, of course, occur to the workmen there?—One occurred—a fatal one—last week.

CHAIRMAN.—The hospital will remain, of course.

10056. Mr. Campbell.—From your experience as a County Councillor and also as Chairman of your board, is there any reason you can conceive why Ballycastle should be abolished and such unions as Ballymoney and Larne should be allowed to exist?—I don't see it at all.

10057. Would there be any advantage in the way of economy?—I cannot see it.

10058. Would there be any advantage to the sick and destitute poor?—Decidedly not.

10059. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—You take a great interest in this question of Poor Law reform?—I do.

10060. You say you are in favour of boarding out children and you say you are in favour of sending out inmates into other institutions for better care?—I am.

10061. You say you are in favour of sending mothers to some reformatory institution in the hope that they will be reclaimed; now, when you take out those three classes you don't have many left?—No.

10062. Would it not be a good thing for Ballycastle simply to have an infirmary there under the same management and control as at present?—Must decidedly, and that is what I have suggested, because there is no longer the able-bodied; it is the sick poor in the infirmary and the hospital only is required for the same administrative area.

10063. You did not wait until I had finished; we have got rid of three classes—the children, the inmates, and the mothers—then we have nothing left except the sick, the infirm, and the occasional tramp?—Quite so.

10064. Now, as regards the tramp, when he is not a frequent visitor, would it not be a good arrangement if the Guardians could give that man a lodging for the night in some house in the town?—That would be a very good idea.

10065. Suppose the Guardians had the power to pay for a man's night's lodging and breakfast, that would be a small sum of money?—Yes; but with the buildings you have if you have the space there and require a porter as well for your hospital and infirmary, you have a casual ward there, there is no necessity to pay anything extra; give them a bit of bread and a drink at night, and the same in the morning, keep

them there for three hours, and extend the terms of the Vagrancy Act.

10066. CHAIRMAN.—You have practically no tramps in Ballycastle?—No; except in the summer time; but I am speaking of the question generally.

10067. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Do you not think it would be a wise thing for the Guardians to have power if they wished to use it?—I do.

10068. Then having got rid of these four different classes, you have nothing left but the sick and the infirm and the destitute, and what objection is there to give the Guardians power to make an arrangement with some neighbouring central union, supposing there were two in Antrim, to board out that class, pay for their upkeep, and see that they are well taken care of?—If you got the Guardians of a neighbouring union to board them out, and not for us to be responsible for the increased duties attaching to the officials that will be there, and the upkeep of the institutions to which they have gone, there are no Boards of Guardians in Ireland but would jump at the offer, and I promise my board will do the same.

10069. Ballymoney is not far from you, and suppose you could enter into an arrangement with the Ballymoney Board of Guardians to keep your infirm and destitute for, say £s. a week, you would require no expensive staff in Ballymoney, you would still be masters of your own household as regards the management, what objection would there be to a course like that?—I place it on record that on the terms you have suggested no Guardians but would jump at the offer. But you will have to pay for the increased duties, the wear and tear and the upkeep as well; I maintain it would be as dear as in the other case.

10070. But suppose after investigation it was found to be thoroughly workable and safe, would you see any objection to it?—I would not; I would be delighted at it.

10071. You have taken a very great interest in this work and speak sympathetically; all we want is to get at the true facts of the case and arrive at the best result possible?—Yes.

10072. CHAIRMAN.—You think the Ballymoney people might not see it in the same way?—Mr. Murtaghan's idea would be a splendid one, but I would go further; I would say what would be beneficial and economical for a seaboard union would be the same for an inland union—Ballymoney. A workhouse was to accommodate 700 or 800, but amongst all the Antrim workhouses there are not more than seven or eight hundred inmates. Why not utilize the workhouses to the utmost capacity, and don't stop at Antrim or Ballycastle, but go round the others; Ballymoney is central.

10073. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Suppose we apply the same principle to Larne where we got there?—I say that is the only principle on which you will do it.

10074. Mr. Greer.—Am I to take it as the effect of your last answer that you have no objection that your workhouses should be abolished if all the others, with the exception of Ballymoney, were abolished?—On the terms I have indicated. I am not going to give you a general answer to a general question.

10075. What do you mean by that?—On the terms Mr. Murtaghan has suggested.

10076. Do you understand by those terms that there would be any difference in the constitution of the union?—I cannot say what is in the mind of the Commission.

10077. Then you have given an answer without quite grasping the point of the question?—I never do that. Who do you appear for; is it Ballymoney?

Mr. Campbell.—Mr. Greer is the solicitor for the County Council.

Witness.—He might have the courtesy to answer.

Mr. Greer.—I am here to ask questions.

Mr. Campbell.—Mr. Greer is the County Council solicitor, and Mr. O'Kane does not know in what capacity he appears.

10078. Mr. Greer.—As I do happen to be the County Council solicitor, perhaps you will allow me to refer to the answer that you gave; you said that you proposed a resolution on the 26th of October, 1901.

Mr. Campbell.—I object to this; he is not appearing for the County Council.

CHAIRMAN.—This dignity does not go—

Mr. Campbell.—It is an extraordinary business that the solicitor for the County Council should appear for the Ballymoney Board of Guardians.

CHAIRMAN.—We give the fullest latitude to everybody here.

10079. Mr. Greer.—As a matter of fact, was not what

Dec 16, 1903.

Mr. Joseph P. O'Kane.

Dec. 14, 1903.
—
Mr. Joseph P.
O'Kane.

occurred this—Did not Mr. James Caruth propose and Colonel McNell second: "That the report of the workhouse committee now read be adopted and referred back to the committee to take the necessary steps to have their recommendations carried out." And did you not move, as an amendment, seconded by Mr. McSparran, that you have already read out, and was not that amendment lost by fourteen to five; is not that right?—So far as I remember.

10083. So that if Mr. McCann had voted for your amendment he would be voting against the recommendation of his own committee—I make you a present of the difference.

10084. Perhaps you will make me a present of this also; was there one word said, except perhaps by yourself, with reference to politics in the discussion—good, bad, or indifferent—by any member of the Council before the voting occurred, and, if so, by whom, for I was present at the time?

Mr. Campbell.—I don't know in what capacity Mr. Greer is speaking.

10085. Mr. Greer.—It is in reply to my friend, who said it was decided on political grounds.

Witness.—It is not necessary for Mr. Greer to tell me that he was present for me to tell you what happened; I generally speak as truthfully as any other man; you don't require to hold out that throat to me that you were present. "I was present," he says, as much as to say, "Don't quarrel with me."

10086. CHAIRMAN.—I would not take that inference from it—I don't like that last string, "I was present," as much as to say it required his presence to keep me to the facts. There was no word of politics whatever, and in the Antism Union Council, so far as I was concerned personally, I never had anything but the greatest courtesy from any individual member; we might differ very acutely, and very keenly, on several occasions, but after that was over our differences ceased, and I never had anything at all but the feelings of friendship for everyone; there was no politics whatever mentioned in the wide world afterwards.

CHAIRMAN.—I think we might remember that we are in the Council chamber here, and in the same atmosphere.

Witness.—What I wish to say is that the only time politics were mentioned by me was when I asked for a reason why Ballycastle should be wiped out; they were following the action in the Act of Parliament in Antism; they would not follow it in Ballycastle; and I said in the public press, not behind backs, that unless they could give some more tangible reason than merely a selfish position that I would come to the conclusion that politics was the main spring, and not otherwise, and I now say it.

10084. Mr. Greer.—I notice your Council has several times referred to this amalgamation scheme of the County Council as if the County Council brought forward any amalgamation scheme?—My District Council never referred to this amalgamation scheme until the report was sent down to them by the County Council recommending the abolition of Ballycastle and Antism, and then a violent party vote was taken whether Ballycastle should be rubbed out or remain; the minority at the District Council would have no inquiry, but would rub us out.

10085. But this Inquiry is not being held in pursuance of any scheme the County Council brought forward?—No; because the County Council wanted no inquiry whatever; they were against this Commission being appointed.

Mr. Campbell.—Perhaps the minutes will show the last vote that was given—

Mr. McCann.—Perhaps I might be allowed to say—

CHAIRMAN.—No, no; really!

10086. Mr. Greer.—I have not had time to read this; you are giving it in as evidence now; but I want to know from you whether I may take it that it does not affect the question of the amalgamation of Ballymoney Union; does it only deal with the question of the Ballycastle Union?—It deals generally with Ballycastle.

10087. You don't intend it to affect Ballymoney?—I really don't think it touches any union but Ballycastle; I am nearly certain of that.

10088. Because I have not had time to read it to ask you any questions. In reference to the roads, you say there are very bad roads in Ballycastle Union?—Yes; and you live at the top of a very bad one yourself.

10089. Well, I hope I won't have occasion to go to the union. Is it not principally from Ballycastle towards Cushendall that the roads are bad?—I would say principally.

10090. Of course Knocknagney is in the other direction?—It is principally in the direction where there is no railway.

10091. Is not the idea of the County Council that the majority of the people who would come to Ballymoney would come through Ballycastle and come by train?—Without meaning any disrespect to the County Council, they did not know what way the people would come.

10092. That being so, would not the roads they would have to come over be the very same roads that would bring them to the Ballymoney station and would bring them to the Ballycastle Union?—Yes.

10093. So that as far as the road is concerned the inconvenience would be the same, but you would add the difference of the railway journey?—It would be the same, but when they come to Ballycastle they would say "Thanks be to goodness, my journey is over," but in the other case they would say "Money be to God, here is an hour's railway journey before me."

10094. Could you tell what the average in the house has been for the last three years?—It has gone from sixty-eight to seventy-five and up to eighty.

10095. Could you not give the average?—Sixty-eight.

10096. Can you not supply the figures to us that we were not able to get before—that is to say the cost per head per minute?—Well, I think the cost per head is 3s. 6d. to 3s. 8d.

10097. Does it include establishment charges?—It does; I will get it for you.

10098. Does it include more than the mere upkeep?—I cannot tell you; if you want to contract Ballymoney with Ballycastle it is no harm to tell you we are cheaper in the year rate.

10099. I would like to get the information; we have got it in every other instance but Ballycastle?—I promise to get you the return, but we are cheaper; we keep our poor cheaper and so comfortable.

10100. Mr. Campbell.—Mr. Greer is appearing for the Ballymoney Board of Guardians; do you know that the Portrush Guardians go to Ballymoney?—They do.

10101. And do they actually pass Coleraine on their way, and Coleraine has a workhouse?—Yes; they pass from Portrush, through Coleraine, into Ballymoney.

10102. Where do the Portlough Guardians go?—To Coleraine.

10103. Mr. Greer.—How far is Portlough from Ballymoney?—I could not honestly say; it is six or seven miles to Coleraine and about eleven or twelve miles altogether.

10104. Is there not a tramway from Portlough to Bushmills?—There is.

10105. So that the Bushmills people can come by train and railway to Ballymoney?—Yes.

10106. Does not the end of your district just come to Bushmills?—Yes.

10107. If you could put yourself in the position of a destitute infirm person would you not rather come by train and trade to Ballymoney than by a car to Ballycastle by Bushmills on a cold winter day?—I would; and I am very much obliged to you, for you have proved my case—the facilities in the one case and the want of facilities in the other.

10108. Mr. Campbell.—Is there a feeling in the district that the people should not be taken out of Ballycastle district to an outside district?—A very great feeling.

10109. Why does that feeling exist?—They don't care to go to Ballymoney.

Mr. Campbell.—For reasons you don't care to go into.

Mr. ALEXANDER BLACK examined.

10110. Mr. Campbell.—Are you a member of the Ballycastle Board of Guardians?—Yes.

10111. Is the board divided into two sections?—It is.

10112. Do the Nationalists number twenty-one and the Unionists twelve?—Exactly.

10113. Was there a vote taken recently on this very question with regard to the abolition of unions?—Not recently; some time ago there was.

10114. And did that vote take strictly party lines?—I believe so.

10115. The Nationalists were in favour of keeping the union and the Unionists for abolishing it?—Yes.

10116. I believe you manage matters so admirably in Ballycastle that you actually have a Unionist chairman?—Yes.

10117. And in electing a Unionist chairman you intend to set a good example to the Antrim County Council and other backward bodies about Belfast?—We do.

10118. You know what the feeling of the district is with regard to the proposals of the County Council?—I do.

10119. Is the feeling among your people unanimously against this idea of the County Council?—It is. I may say we feel that owing to the chairman of the Board of Guardians not being a member of the County Council it looks like a scheme being put forward to which we have no voice. Our chairman is not a member of the County Council, and, consequently, we have no voice.

10120. CHAIRMAN.—The Chairman of the District Council is?—Yes; but this being a Poor Law Reform Commission we look on it that we have no representation on the County Council.

10121. No Chairman of a Board of Guardians is a member of the County Council; that applies all over Ireland?—Yes, unless he is Chairman of the District Council.

10122. Mr. Campbell.—What you mean to convey is, that in the idea they put forward here to-day they have no representative weight from the people of this district?—Yes.

10123. How would it affect you yourself if the union were shifted to Ballymena or Ballymoney?—I would not attend; I could not possibly attend; I consider it disfranchising it.

10124. Does that not only apply to yourself but to a number of members of the board?—Yes, worse than to me.

10125. Would it apply to the majority of the board?—It would.

10126. Would those be members of the present majority of the board?—They would.

10127. So, in the net effect of your evidence, that if this scheme is adopted by the Commission it would mean practically the disfranchisement of the Nationalists of Ballycastle?—It would.

10128. And have you any idea that the real reason behind this scheme of the County Council is such an idea as that?—I could hardly say that.

10129. Do you believe it is done in the interests of economy?—I cannot say that it is done in the interests of economy.

10130. Do you believe it is done in the interests of the sick and destitute poor?—I do not.

10131. And you cannot see any ostensible reason for it?—I cannot.

10132. Explain how you think it would affect the destitute sick in case this scheme was carried out?—I would think that it would be a great inconvenience to be shifting them over roads so far—they would have such long journeys, such difficult roads to get over. I claim it is disfranchising members, because I am about as well situated as any other member in this district, and I could not possibly attend. I can see you my reasons, and I think you will agree that it would be quite impossible for me to attend. I come to attend here; I got up at a quarter to four this morning; I live four and a half miles out of Ballycastle; I got breakfast, and was ready to leave at five o'clock, and walked into Ballycastle, and got a train there at a quarter past seven to come to Ballymoney and come here. If I had to attend in Ballymoney I would have to do the same thing, because I see that the meetings would be held at eleven o'clock.

10133. Dr. BROOKS.—If the meeting was at twelve

o'clock could you not get home about three o'clock?—My twelve o'clock; there is no train back then until half-past five; I should not arrive at Ballycastle until twenty past six; I should then have to take this road journey again. I assure you I would not do it, and there could not be a member of the division got to do it.

10134. How many miles is it to Ballymoney from your house by road?—It is four and a half miles to the train, and then sixteen miles by train.

10135. By road?—It is twenty miles.

10136. Mr. Campbell.—As regards you and the members of your division, it would be just as good an idea to change the union to Belfast as to Ballymoney or Ballymena?—Quite the same, as far as time is concerned.

10137. You would have no representation, and you would have larger rates?—Yes; the members of the board are all men who follow their own plough, and they could not afford the time to go to Ballymoney or Ballymena, because Ballycastle, being the market town for them, and the board meeting on market day, they can do their own business and attend the board. They are not in a position to spend money, and although it is only an hour's journey by train, it means money.

10138. You heard the evidence of Mr. O'Kane with regard to the peculiar nature of the district—do you agree with that?—I do.

10139. Do you agree that there is no advantage whatever in this change in the interests of the sick and destitute poor or the ratepayers themselves?—I cannot see any benefit.

10140. Mr. GEAR.—I want to ask you a question or two and it is in no hostile spirit. We all understand that there are some changes in the air, and I understand we are met here to discuss what they ought to be with advantage. We have heard that in no case would the infirmary be taken away from any place where there was a workhouse, and there have been suggestions made that the children and women of a certain class should be dealt with specially—that leaves the tramps and the able-bodied poor to be dealt with. Do you not think that they might be housed in some more central workhouse in the county?—I have never given the question any consideration, because, owing to the fact that when I become a Guardian, the County Council had made this attack on Ballycastle, and had come to the conclusion of abolishing Ballycastle, it then became a question of life or death with us; we felt that we were getting disfranchised, and could not look after the interests of the place, and, consequently, it became a question of trying to prevent amalgamation; and, as far as I was concerned with regard to the reform of the place, I have given it no study.

10141. Has not this amalgamation question been gone into in every county in Ireland where the Commission has already sat?—Yes.

10142. And have there not been witnesses after witnesses examined?—I don't really know; I have not followed the question up, really.

10143. If it happened to be a fact that in every other county witness after witness has been examined in favour of amalgamating unions would you come to the conclusion that the County Council of Antrim was making a special attack on the Ballycastle Guardians?—I look on it this way—that the County Council should have endeavoured to get local opinion, and taken that into consideration; either that, or let it come out after the inquiry. I don't think the County Council have any animus, but I think it has proceeded without any representation from the local body.

10144. Supposing there was a change made, and the poor and the class I have mentioned—that is, the able-bodied poor—were sent out of the Ballycastle union to some other union, could the rest of the work not be carried on by a committee at Ballycastle? You know the sections of the Local Government Act giving the Board of Guardians power to entrust certain work to committees—don't you think that could be worked effectively?—I really would not like to express an opinion.

10145. Would not that prevent you, and people like you, from having to come up to Ballymoney for

Dec. 16, 1903.

Mr. Alexander Black.

Dec. 16, 1893. **EXAMPLE**, except on important occasions—would you not be carrying out all the actual work, the administrative work?—Quite so.

10145. And then you would have quarterly meetings that you could attend either in Ballymoney or Ballymena or elsewhere?—I could not give an opinion; I have never considered the thing, and don't know how it would result. I am against expense as much as anyone.

10147. Can you tell me what your poor rate is in Ballycastle?—I could not tell you.

CHAIRMAN.—It is 9½.

MR. THOMAS McILROY examined.

MR. THOMAS McILROY.

10151. Mr. **Greer.**—I believe you have been a member of the Board of Guardians of Ballymoney for a number of years?—I think over thirty years.

10152. And how long have you been chairman of the board?—Twenty-one, I think.

10153. And you have taken an active interest all that time in the administration of the Poor Law Act?—Yes.

10154. You have had this list of queries that were submitted to the board before you?—Yes.

Mr. **Greer.**—I think the reply of the board has already been sent forward, so that we need not refer to that.

CHAIRMAN.—More his own personal views, I think.

10156. Mr. **Greer.**—Take the first question—“Whether, having regard to the extent, population, necessities of the sick and destitute poor and economic condition of the County Antrim, and the facilities of locomotion and proper administration of the Poor Law therein, it would be expedient to dissolve any of the unions wholly or partly contained in the county, and, if so, what arrangements, whether by amalgamation or otherwise, should be substituted therefor.” I think the board has already sent forward a reply that it does not wish to deal with the question of amalgamating any union?—No, they did not want to go into that question.

10155. Have you anything to say as an individual on that subject?—At one time there was an agitation on the subject of amalgamation, and Mr. **Bears** at that time was chairman of our board, and he and I went to Coleraine, and we had a meeting there, and went into a great many figures, and came away with the conclusion that it would not produce much economy.

10157. In any amalgamation scheme I presume the sick people would have to be dealt with locally?—I would think so.

10158. And other persons as well—imbeciles and, perhaps, children—and then taking the reason, it would not make much difference to them if they were cared for in one or two establishments?—We thought so; but, of course, circumstances are somewhat changed since that.

10159. That is all you want to say about the first question. The second is—“Whether, in the event of any union or unions being dissolved and of the workhouse or workhouses thereof being no longer required in Poor Law purposes, such workhouse or workhouses could, with advantage, be taken over by the County Council for an auxiliary lunatic asylum under sec. 76 of the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1893, or could be otherwise utilized for any other, and, if so, what public purposes?” Assuming that two or three workhouses were left vacant?—I think it would be very important to have suitable accommodation for people who are imbeciles and lunatics and not have any of them in the workhouses at all.

10160. Harmless lunatics?—Well, there is a class of lunatics that would be better away in another place and get better treatment.

10161. Do you think it is a suitable thing that lunatics of that kind should be kept in a workhouse?—I think it is not. We have one case at present in Ballymoney Workhouse, a woman, and she was sent to the asylum at Antrim and returned, and she is in the infirmary at the present time. It does not suit her at all, and it just suits as ill the patients who are lying beside her.

10162. She is a nuisance to them, I suppose?—Yes; she is incapable of going about.

10163. And the treatment you can give her in Bally-

10148. Mr. **Greer.**—And you don't know how much it is in Ballymoney?

CHAIRMAN.—Oh.

10149. Mr. **Compell.**—You heard Mr. **Greer** say that the Ballymoney Guardians are not actuated by any spirit of hostility to Ballycastle?—Yes.

10150. And you have heard his question. Do you know whether he is acting for the County Council or the Ballymoney people?—I don't know.

Mr. **Compell.**—That is the case as regards Ballycastle.

money Workhouse is not satisfactory?—It is not what we would like to give her.

10154. Are you in a position to judge whether it would be a wise thing to take one of those workhouses—for instance, Antrim—and convert it into an auxiliary asylum in connection with the Antrim Asylum?—I think it would be a very sensible thing to turn it to if the question of amalgamation was decided on.

10155. And, of course, there would be the further question whether the cost of the alterations that would have to be made in the workhouse to make it suitable for the imbeciles could not be better expended in building a new wing to the present asylum?—That is a question I did not get into.

10156. Are there any other purposes to which you think these workhouses might be applied—for instance, as a sanatorium?—I think that some of them might be turned to a sanatorium, or some might be devoted to the education of children.

10157. Do you mean bringing children from other unions?—I would think so. The reason why I say that is, take Ballymoney Union, which is an average union, we have not enough children there to keep ten teachers going, and they get no training in the way of technical instruction, or anything that will fit them for future life; and I see when they are out they have not the spirit that other children have, and I think it is from want of proper training, and we have not enough of them in the house to give them proper training.

10158. Do you think it would be a better thing to collect children from a larger area into one place and have a better class of teacher?—I think it would; and teach them some industries to fit them for whatever position in life they go to.

10159. Have you considered the question of a sanatorium?—Well, no, I have not.

10170. Then, the third question is—“Whether with or without a dissolution of any union, it would be possible: (a) by an arrangement for the maintenance of any class or classes of paupers in the workhouse of another union; or (b) by combining a number of unions for the purpose of Poor Law relief; or (c) by boarding out workhouse inmates, to make better provision for the classification and treatment of the inmates chargeable to the said unions?” Would you be disposed to send any of the destitute poor, the people who come to the workhouse, to any other union at so much per head?—I don't think there would be much good from my standpoint in it. I think I would as soon retain them in Ballymoney, where they are; there are sometimes some of them have to go out and so; if you send them away it would be difficult.

10171. Supposing they were not infirm, but just destitute persons, in fairly good health, do you think it would be a bad thing to send them away, say, to Ballymena, or still further, from their friends?—There are some of them we would let go very cheap.

10172. Tramps?—Well, no; a class of people who come in through drunkenness and one thing or another, who would be just as well away from home.

10173. Is there another class of well-conducted poor people that you would not like to send?—I would not like to send them away.

10174. Why?—Their friends come very often to see them, and I think it would indicate a hardship on them and their friends both if they were sent away to another district.

10175. Do you know of your own knowledge that in the Ballymoney Union a number of these inmates are visited by their friends?—Yes, I have seen them frequently coming in.

10176. **CHAIRMAN.**—To what part of the workhouse?

—Well, it is principally to the infirmary, but they come to see them in the body of the house as well, but none to the infirmary.

10177. Have you often seen them coming to the body of the house?—Oh, yes.

10178. To visit friends?—There are some decent old people who are in there whose friends are living in the district and who like to see them.

10179. Mr. Greer.—Then the second class of the question as to combining a number of inmates?—Well, I was not thinking about combining, but I think there should be a better classification of persons in the house, because I was through the old men's ward the other day, and there are some very decent old men there, who have lived a decent life all the time, and there are also some of the greatest scamps in the union there, all kept in the one common ward, and it is not a good thing, and I think the same applies to the female side of the house as well.

10180. CHAIRMAN.—Would you find any difficulty in dividing the two classes, if you had to do so, into the dress and the scamp?—There are plenty of them even in there with their characters made.

10181. There would be no difficulty in dividing them?—There would be no difficulty in dividing them, and there could be made for good conduct and good habits a sort of promotion.

10182. Mr. Greer.—I take it you would have no objection to hand on the scamps to some other union?—Not a bit.

10183. The next section of the question is the boarding out of workhouse inmates—have you anything to say on the subject of boarding out?—I don't see that there would be any good in boarding out the inmates we have; we give a good deal of outdoor relief.

10184. Are you dealing with the old people now?—Yes, old people; but children, of course.

10185. First let us deal with the old people—you don't believe in boarding out old people?—Not the class that come to the workhouse.

10186. Mr. Milnespall, one of the previous witnesses, said something about having houses in which old married people might be boarded out, what is your experience?—We have none of that class, because decent old couples, on the recommendation of the local Guardians and the Relieving Officer, get outdoor relief. I remember a year ago we agreed to provide some rooms for the accommodation of old couples, and that was let be known, but it never was once asked for.

10187. Now take up the question of boarding out children, do you agree with that?—I do.

10188. Have you done it already?—We have a number boarded out, but there is great difficulty in providing suitable boarding houses for them. The people that we would be willing to let them go to, a great many of them would not take them, and a great many of them who would take them we would not let them go to, so that there is a difficulty in getting as many boarded out as we would like.

10189. CHAIRMAN.—Have you any in the house for want of finding out anybody to board them out with?—We could have sent more out if we had suitable places for them.

10190. Then you have some in the house still who are eligible for boarding out?—There are some in the house, we would send out if we had boarding out houses; but the members of the ladies' committee can shew that better than I can; they have gone more into the question.

10191. Mr. Greer.—The next question is—"Whether, in the event of an amalgamation or combination of unions being carried out, or any other arrangement being made for the relief of the destitute poor, any changes in the law and procedure as to administration and in the chargeability of relief would be desirable?"—That is a thing I did not consider.

10192. I presume that means whether it should be a county-at-large charge?—I did not think over that.

10193. The next is—"Whether, having regard to the number, capacity, and situation of the workhouse hospitals, county infirmaries, county fever hospitals, and other hospitals existing in the county, additional accommodation is required for the proper treatment of the sick poor in any union, district, or locality in the county; and, if other accommodation seems desirable, how it may best be provided without entailing undue hardship upon the destitute or on the sick poor of the union?"—Within the last dozen or years or so the number of sick coming to the house very largely

increased, and as the numbers have increased we have given larger and better accommodation for them, so that in Ballyvaughan we are in a very good position, so far as infirmary and hospital are concerned.

10194. I believe you have had to expend £1,200 within the last few years?—Yes, but Mr. Hamilton can give you the figures.

10195. It was at the instance of the Local Government Board you had to make this expenditure?—It was absolutely at their suggestion.

10196. The next is—"Whether any administrative and financial changes are desirable in order to secure a more economical system for the relief generally of (a) the sick, (b) the insane, and (c) all other classes of the poor or destitute, without impairing efficiency of administration?" Can you point to anything where economy might be effected?—No, I could not.

10197. Then there is the question—"How far in the case of persons who are not destitute it would be desirable to introduce a system of payments, or contributions, in aid of the cost of treatment of the sick and insane in hospitals or other such institutions?"—We receive now and again patients who generally pay something in proportion to their means, but I find that a good many people are not willing to take advantage of that, because they are put into the infirmary along with paupers, and I think if there was a separate ward and suitable charges made there, and proper attendance given that it would be a great advantage, and a good many people would avail of it.

10198. Do you mean that patients who would come in would not be placed alongside pauper patients?—No.

10199. And you think that would be an advantage?—I think it would be an advantage.

10200. Would it be an advantage in taking people, for example, who were suffering from infectious diseases from their homes and putting them into—

CHAIRMAN.—The powers, I think, are sufficient for that.

10201. Mr. Greer.—What I want to bring out is, is there a stigma of present attaching to persons being taken away to the workhouse?—There is always that.

10202. Have you known of cases where the fact of an infectious disease existing was concealed?—I have known of a good many cases where they were very unwilling to be sent; but in cases of infectious diseases, fever, there is generally no difficulty at all.

10203. Of course, you have power to take them, but there is an unwillingness on the part of the people to go?—Yes, to be put into an infirmary—there is the stigma of the workhouse about it.

10204. The last question is—"What change, if any, seems to be possible and desirable as regards the treatment of the vagrant poor, generally known as tramps or casuals?"—Well, I don't know; I think our union has about as many of them as any other union, and they have always been a great difficulty with us.

10205. Have you tried any means of stopping the nuisance?—We recently put on a labour test, but the officers had quite enough to do, and it was very difficult to carry it out, and it really has done no good.

10206. Would you approve of what Mr. McCune suggested, having a power to detain them?—I think we have some powers already, but we are generally glad to get rid of them as soon as possible.

10207. Can you suggest any improvement in the law in respect to them?—We discussed that matter at our board, and the general opinion seemed to be that it would be better to have a separate place for tramps, where they would be more directly under the superintendence of the police than they are with us, because the workhouse officers cannot find out the case of these tramps at all, and so far as I can see, I would think at least three-fourths of them belong to the criminal classes.

10208. Would you like to have any system of identifying them?—Yes.

10209. And you think it would be desirable if you found they were coming back three or four times that the police should have power to deal with them?—If they come back within a certain time they are refused admittance at present; and they know that very well, and don't come; but, on the other hand, there is a difficulty if you don't provide accommodation for these people they get accommodation for themselves, and they are sometimes rather more dangerous outside the house than in it.

10210. Then is there a suggestion you would like to

Dec. 14, 1905.

Mr. Thomas McElbery.

Dec. 16, 1903.
Mr. Thomas
McElroy.

make on that subject to the Commission?—In discussing the matter we considered the different systems in England and Scotland, and we came to the conclusion that to adopt the English line would be about the best.

10211. You have got some statistics prepared by the clerk, I believe?—Mr. Hamilton prepared statistics.

10212. Mr. McELROY.—When you went into the question of amalgamation and the cost of it, did you go closely into the figures?—We did at that time. I did not go into it at that time but I did before.

10213. To any considerable extent?—Yes; I went into it to a very considerable extent, and we came to the conclusion that the saving would be very small. The houses are there, and at first sight I thought there would be a great reduction in the number of officials, but I came to the conclusion it would not be such a large reduction at all.

10214. Why not?—Because we must keep up infirmaries and fever hospitals, and when we keep these up, the number of officials and the amount of salaries would be very small that would be reduced.

10215. You would not want an expensive staff for a small hospital?—We have not a very expensive staff as it is.

10216. You have a very elaborate staff for workhouse purposes?—The principal expense in connection with our workhouse is in the infirmary.

10217. Still you have to keep up a large staff that is not necessary for infirmary purposes, and if you get rid of that staff and get rid of the upkeep of the building, you must remember that these houses cost about £200 a year to heat—these large barracks of workhouses—there is an expenditure on fire necessary; the number of the poor in the county is not so large that one or two houses could not accommodate them. I am afraid you have not gone very closely into the figures?—I did; at that time I went very closely. The master and matron and porter would be done away with. Their salaries come to about £80 a year, and then, of course, their dietary.

10218. That is a considerable sum; and then the question of fuel is no small item, and the upkeep and repair?—The fuel in Ballymoney comes to about £200 a year.

10219. At least that, I know in a neighbouring union, not much larger, it costs £400?—There are 280 tons of coal contracted for each year.

10220. Anyhow, if you did see that there was economy, and a considerable economy and improvement, too, in the condition of things, would you change your view in regard to the question of amalgamation?—Oh, yes; if all that could be proved I would certainly change my mind.

10221. You have a large number of children in your house?—We have at present, I think, nearly one-third of the whole house; but from whatever cause I don't know, within the last month about a dozen more children have come in.

10222. If those children were taken away—as you advocate the taking away of them—it would lessen the number very considerably in your house?—It would. I got from friends some time ago a number of letters about the boarding out in England, and I was very much struck with the manner in which it is done there. There are cottages and houses erected there, and so many children are put under a foster mother, or matron, and the children are brought up there more with a home life than they can be in the workhouse, and I would like something of that kind very much. The great fault with the education of the children in the workhouse at present is, they come out almost fit for nothing. You cannot send them to service or put them to a trade, because they have not the spirit that children reared in a home life have.

10223. You would prefer the boarding out of the children amongst the ordinary population to sending them to an institution?—I would, if in the ordinary population we could get a sufficient number of homes to take them in. Of course, there is the religious question comes in and the suitability of homes; there are plenty of people that apply for children, and on no account would I let a child go to them, and the people to whom we would like to give them won't take them. I would like to see every child in the Ballymoney Workhouse in some sort of an institution where they would be sent to school, attend their own place of worship and Sunday schools, and be under the charge of a matron or foster mother.

10224. Have you made any effort to get foster

parents for those children in your district?—Oh, yes; that is a matter that Miss Hamilton can tell you about.

10225. I was greatly struck with the large number of children in your union and the neighbouring union. We have found nearly four times as many in these institutions as in any similar institution we have come to yet?—I must say that the children in Ballymoney have been very well done for, and have turned out, as a whole, very well. I know people brought up in the workhouse who are now filling respectable positions, at the same time they were handicapped in the start in life.

10226. Were these children boarded out?—No; it was before the boarding out system.

10227. You have not considered the question of boarding out the aged and the insane; that would get rid of the difficulty of taking away the poor from their own locality if suitable arrangements were made for the boarding out of them in the locality?—I don't think that would be much use to us, for we have very few we would send out. We give outdoor relief, and where a respectable old couple are living together a little given at home is better to them.

10228. You approve of the outdoor relief system?—I do; but, of course, they are constantly under the superintendence of the relieving Officer and the local Guardians, and we make it a point that if they are old and infirm we will not give them outdoor relief unless some neighbour or relative undertakes to keep an eye on them.

10229. CHAIRMAN.—Have you had much increase in the outdoor relief?—Not for a number of years. There is only one point I would like to say—I think in the appointment of officers there should be some regulation that the Local Government Board would give a proper examination, and let the officers be suitable for the appointments, such as for master and matron. It requires a person of intelligence, and acquainted with figures; and very often very decent people come and apply for the situation, and get it, who have no qualification for that sort of thing.

10230. Mr. McELROY.—Does not that rest with the Guardians?—The Guardians go more generally as the question of low salary than efficiency of the office.

10231. They have to pay the money—why would they not? Is it any wonder that they are more careful as to salary than a board who has to pay nothing?—I would rather pay an officer £80 a year who was qualified for his duty than £20 to one who was not.

10232. Do you find the present day Guardians any worse than their predecessors in that regard?—No, I have found it the same all along.

10233. Do you think there should be some standard of fitness marked out for these officials?—I do think it. A master has important duties to perform and a number of difficult calculations to make. A man would not be admitted into any other Government office without some examination to see whether he is qualified to discharge his duties or not.

10234. The master now has to go through an examination, and actually an Inspector of the Local Government Board of his fitness before he would be approved of?—I am aware of that; but I believe there should be some sort of examination, similar to the Civil Service examination, where they would be properly tested.

10235. Do you not think you would be asking the ratepayers to contribute a sum of money unnecessarily?—If you make the standard too high, but if you make it a standard suitable for a man to perform the work, I think a person appointed as master or matron requires to know some of the rules of arithmetic anyway.

10236. Don't they require that at present as to workhouse?—Well, we have a master at present who is doing his work very well, but he had a good deal to learn after he came in; he is a very good master, and does his work very well.

10237. Is he a recent appointment?—He was appointed four or five years ago.

10238. What better test would you want than a test of ordinary education, well qualified to read and write—an intelligent man for such a position as that—you don't want a Bachelor's degree for a position such as master of a workhouse?—The salary would not afford it.

10239. Do you want a change so that it should be such a person?—No; but a master has a good many calculations to make in connection with the dietary and all that sort of thing; and I would like to

examination to show the man was familiar with the figure he is called upon to work with.

10290. That is so at present, as far as I know?—It is done, but I think it is done in rather a haphazard sort of way.

10291. You think the Inspectors of the Local Government Board are not mistaking individuals?

10292a. CHAIRMAN:—Have you ever seen the papers?—I have never seen the papers.

CHAIRMAN:—I have seen a great many of them, and I cannot agree with your judgment on them.

10292. Mr. Green:—Do you think there should be some system of advancement?—I think it would be a good thing if there was, and that a man should advance in the service.

10293. That a schoolmaster might be advanced up to a higher position on passing an examination?—You; and we had a master for a considerable time who was a schoolmaster—in fact, two masters who had been schoolmasters, and they were both excellent masters.

10294. Do you think the appointments should be taken out of the hands of the Boards of Guardians and put into the hands of the Local Government Board?—I don't think that. All I would want would be that there should be some guarantee that a suitable candidate should be appointed, and not whoever offered at the lowest salary.

10295. You think the present system has not been altogether satisfactory?—Some Guardians are inclined to advertise for officers, and what salary they will take, and that brings in a class of candidates who are not fit for the appointment at all.

10296. CHAIRMAN:—Were any of your officers appointed on that tender system?—I think it was once done.

10297. It is no longer an evil with you?—No.

10298. Mr. Campbell:—You know the Antrim County Council wish to add on to the Ballymoney Union some of the districts in Ballycastle?—I heard that.

10299. Is the feeling of your board that that change is desirable?—Our board never discussed that question.

10300. Did you ever consider it in any form?—We never discussed it.

10301. As to how it would work out in the way of economy or otherwise?—We never did.

10302. And, as far as you know, is there any desire at all amongst the Ballymoney Guardians to have this transfer?—We would be delighted to see the Ballymoney Guardians coming to us; we never took any steps to bring them, and have expressed no opinion on it.

10303. Would you be equally delighted on your side to go to Ballycastle?—We would be going out of the world to go to Ballycastle.

Mr. JOHN BORN examined.

10307. CHAIRMAN:—Are you one of the Guardians of the Union?—Yes; I am a Guardian.

10308. You have heard the evidence that the chairman of the Guardians has just given?—Yes; and I am quite in accord with the greater portion of it. I suppose you have got already information from the Guardians themselves.

10309. Mr. Green:—Is there anything special you want to refer to?—Beyond the fact that I think he might have amplified some of the objections. I think there are more objections than he mentioned, and more disadvantages, and I think the balance altogether is in favor of amalgamation, especially in regard to classification, which is impossible with the present unions and the management of them. The feeling generally in this amalgamation would tend to lessen expense, but it would depend very much on the arrangements. It would be exceedingly difficult to convince me that arrangements could be made for utilizing old houses that would be empty with very much saving, for the cost of making alterations in them when we are making changes to suit the new requirements of public feeling in regard to lodging after the poor would be very large. There was £1,200 spent in Ballymoney alone in making improvements within the last twelve months, and it is not enough, because it only applies to the improvements in the infirmary; possibly the sewerage would have a good deal to do with it. I think that the principal objection I would have to

10304. You would be perfectly willing that Ballycastle should come to you, but you would not go to Ballycastle?—We never took any steps to bring it about.

10305. In Ballycastle there is an infirmary that accommodates forty patients—do you think it would be a good thing to have that continued there under local management?—I think it would be better under local management.

10306. Thus under Ballymoney management?—I don't know. Our patients are about the best treated we know.

10307. You think it would be as well to have well alone?—We are not asking for them.

10308. You say in Ballymoney there is a feeling among the friends of the poor that they should not be sent out of the locality to another district?—Yes.

10309. I suppose you can understand the same feeling existing in Ballycastle?—I am sure it does.

10310. You said with regard to the bounding out of children that a religious question would come in there?—That always crops up, because we have to look for homes that suit the dispositions of the children.

10311. And you, from your knowledge of Ballycastle, would know that a religious question would crop up there also?—The religious question never has cropped up with us unless when looking for a suitable home. We are always very careful to send children to a home that would be approved of by their own religion.

10312. You don't take seriously the suggestion to send the scamps up to Ballycastle?—A gentleman gave evidence about coming to Ballymoney that he would have to leave home at seven o'clock in the morning; you could have Ballycastle at eleven o'clock, and the Ballymoney Board meets at one o'clock, and he would get home at a quarter past three. I am not saying a word either for or against it, but I want to show that the accommodation for coming to Ballymoney is not as bad as he pointed out to me.

10313. CHAIRMAN:—They would not have much time for a bit of dinner?—They could get home by half-past five.

10314. Mr. Campbell:—How would that man get his dinner—the man you speak of now that would get away so soon?—We don't have luncheon in our place, but he would have half an hour between the time he came in and the meeting of the board, and he would generally have an hour after that before going to the train.

10315. Mr. Green:—Your union and the Ballycastle Union are neighbours?—Yes.

10316. And you did not want to come to any collision over this question because you are on good terms with them?—We never debated it at all.

Mr. Campbell:—They are very good neighbours.

amalgamation would be with regard to the fitness of the place for the things suggested, but if that would be overcome I think there are other things which some of the witnesses have mentioned that it would be quite possible and exceedingly useful and very desirable to use these workhouses for. I think the locality would have a great deal to do with their selection—a sanatorium for consumptives I think is a most admirable suggestion, and some of the workhouses, owing to their situation, would be much more suitable than others, and if the feeling in connection with the medical treatment of both well-to-do and poor goes on as at present I think it would be an admirable thing to have at least one sanatorium for consumptives in the County Antrim. Another thing would be that boys and girls if necessary, if there was accommodation, over a certain age, that is when they would pass the standard which would allow them to be exempt from compulsory attendance at school, should be sent to a central school, and I would have none of the children in the workhouse at all; I would have them all boarded out. Of course I need not tell you we have not the power to board all classes out. There is still a fringe of children in a house like ours that would not be eligible for boarding out even if we got the authority to do it; that is they are sent there for short terms—a month or three months; but they don't come under the control of the Guardians and are only waiting passively until their parents come out

Dec. 14, 1908.

Mr. Thomas
Military.

Mr. John
Born.

Dec. 16, 1892.

Mr. John
Eggs.

of jail that they may be removed. But still, in the administration there is very great difficulty in arranging any plan which would include the whole of them, but all children capable of being boarded out should be boarded out of the house. There are, in our locality, a number of farm-houses better than the ordinary labourers' cottages. The law in connection with letting these is pretty strict, but, I think, on looking to what the prospects of the next few years are, I think there are a number of these houses from which that disbarment will be removed and those better-class houses will be utilised on the principle of sending the children to them under a caretaker, or the occupiers of these dwellings could take some of them off our hands.

10270. You were going on to tell when the children passed a certain standard?—I say when they pass a certain standard I would send them to one training school or technical school—of course without the talent of detaining orders—something like we have at Hampton House here in the neighbourhood of Belfast.

10271. How long would you have them kept there?—I find on a memorandum here that the committee in charge of that school would have them there as detained or trained until such time as they could apprentice them or send them out, but always with a provision that would take them out of local influence. Local influence, sometimes, is a great advantage, but when it comes to a certain time it would be better that they should be put where they would not be either praised or blamed. I believe the union in Ireland, in all cases, should be retained. We have had a considerable number of respectable people using the hospital with us, and it has been a boon to several people—sometimes people who were in situations not living with their families—and the feeling was that it was a boon to the house that they were removed from and there was a very much better chance of their recovery. I remember a good many years ago thirty patients being ill with fever, and the attendance and attention they got in the fever hospital now gives them ten chances of recovery as compared with the old time. Having regard to the great improvement of infirmaries and hospitals and dispensaries, with the judicious outdoor relief that is given in nearly all the unions in the County Antrim, I think the wants of the sick poor are very liberally met; those who are as old as myself find there is a great improvement, and the people get a great amount of attention and sympathetic and careful administration, and there is very little want for anything connected with the sick poor at all. There is another class which comes in afterwards which is a problem that this generation or the next won't solve. I think that the classification of the inmates of the workhouses is very desirable. It may be more or less difficult, but I am quite sure the majority of the Guardians would do it if this Commission could recommend anything in the nature of a division of the cost, because to make the present workhouses suitable for a classification without a complete change would be very difficult.

10272. CHAIRMAN.—What do you mean by a division of the cost?—I mean to say whether they would not be capable of being removed to a central workhouse made for that purpose. If you send them all to one house, if the cost would be less than the ordinary, the union would prefer to pay it; if it would be greater they would prefer leaving things as they are.

10273. Mr. Greer.—Do you mean that if you have an alteration of an establishment to serve the entire county the cost of the alteration should be borne by the entire county?—I do; if they cannot get rid of the cost of altering themselves they ought to alter and classify at home. I have gone into the question of boarding out, and in Ballymoney we have met the matter very squarely. I find there are only a very small number in the house who could be boarded out. If I had the opportunity of boarding out all the numbers that have ever been in Ballymoney Workhouse in my time of the respectable class I could get them nicely boarded out for about 4s. a head, and therefore I would not say that there would be any difficulty in making provision for them.

10274. CHAIRMAN.—Do you mean the adults?—I do; there are eight children under two years, forty-two between two and fifteen. I would say that there would not be more than one-third of those that would come under the age to send to the school.

10275. Are you speaking altogether about children or old people?—I am speaking first about children. I

would class the deserving poor as forty-nine, but I could not put that forty-nine in the sense of deserving, for the majority have brought themselves to the workhouse from the neglect of common precautions, which the next generation will hardly fall into—I mean, in the matter of saving and the necessity for going into the workhouse at all—partly from dissipation or the early marriages of their children or emigration; there are in the workhouse at present fourteen of these. The whole of the workhouse is 115, and in addition to that there would be about fifty-seven in the infirmary. I would not have any objection to sending the majority of the forty-nine to another workhouse, but if we are to be retained we may as well retain them. We have no married couples in the house at all. There are two men in the body of the house whose wives are in the infirmary. As far as adults and unchildren, we have two in the entire house, and while I am quite correct in the matter of my opinion about Ballymoney it is only for the one house I am speaking about. I know there is a delusion in lumping up another matter connected with it, that you have all been asking about, and that is with regard to the class of women that are in it. At first I had an idea that it would be wise to make one workhouse into a Magdalen Asylum. My experience of the houses of the kind, however, is most unfavourable, and I have other reasons. I find that in the year 1880, 1882, and 1883 the number of births in the maternity ward was eighteen, and the mothers of those had already children; some of them had as many as six; there were three had one, four had two, four had three, one had four, four had five, and one had six, and one I could not tell how many; a man might have many or might have few. The position that I take up is this—I could not tell you how long I have been in the habit of going to the workhouse—twenty or thirty years, possibly more. Recently there has been been a week I am not in it, and I know that that sort of the kind of subjects that nobody likes to tackle, and one of the kind of duties that nobody likes to take on, but I am quite sure with intelligent and Christian sympathy and attention a vast amount of good can be done by trying to ameliorate or, at least, get somebody to make provision for the infirm class. People interested in matters of this kind have enabled some of the Guardians that I know very well to take up the cause, and in three cases they have been enabled to recover very considerable sums of money—as much as £200—and in one or two cases as much as £25, and these people are removed, and by the help of the money they get they have been removed out of the locality, and not only prevented coming on the rates but living an moral life to support themselves. I find what is probably worth being noticed as a matter of statistics is that these are nearly all servants.

10276. House servants or farm servants?—I refer to domestic servants. There are five farm servants, and there are two mill workers, and there is one labourer—the girl and her people were labourers—and one soldier's wife, and one married tramp, and the rest were servants in term. I need not say that this does not possibly—what I am talking about now does not come within the arrangement, but what I am going to say now I think does. That is, I would not send these people to the Magdalen or any other place like it. I would rather keep them and look after them. I am quite sure the feeling could be cultivated with first offenders that would not make it a disgraceful thing to help them. And with regard to the others, if we send them out we have the problem of their children—a very large and difficult question, unless we have a deterring law, and I don't think any Parliament would pass a law for separating these children from their parents.

10277. If the House of Commons could be beguiled into passing such a law, what would you think about it?—I would say you would only get a greater temptation in the way of those who have not come through the same position; you might lessen it in one way and increase it in a far worse way. We have not a single person in the house that we could depend on for washing or scrubbing and doing work of the kind, and it would cost at least six or seven attendants to do the necessary work of the house.

10278. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—That is not the point; our intention is not to send these poor unhappy people to any place where they would be punished; it is for reformatory purposes; to take them away from the surroundings where they fell and put them into a place where they would be informed and changed by sympathetic attention and kindly advice; it is not

sending them to jail or a place of imprisonment at all; it is in the very opposite direction?—I am quite under-stand your feeling. I am speaking now of what I have personally experienced, and that is in spite of the feeling that there are lost and helpless. There is a considerable amount of affection for their children in the class I refer to, outside the tramp class, and sometimes in these too.

10270. CHAIRMAN.—You say you have an unfavourable impression in your mind about some of these institutions, is that from close knowledge or inquiry?—No; it is from people who were inmates, and came out when I was trying to get them to return. I would not like to say it; it is plain language—they preferred to go to that awful place.

10271. The workhouse?—No; hell! It is worse than the workhouse, as far as I know. Have I said enough, or may be too much, about this particular subject?

10272. Mr. Green.—What do you say about the tramps?—The tramps are a continually marching army, who go in a circle and come back again; it was 3,800 the year before last and 1,900 this year, and the actual deduction from that would be very nearly one-third, and this one-third would be people belonging to the neighbourhood who make a habit of going in and out, and are counted as tramps, although they don't belong to the army.

10273. What would you prefer to do for the tramp classes?—The proposal I would make would be to make sure that the people who are accused of being tramps are tramps. A week or two before the militia training there would be fifty people, at least, in the workhouse in addition to the ordinary men.

10274. Assuming there is any number you like, what would you propose to do with them?—I want the Chairman of the Commission to understand that there is a very large number of the militia who use this place as tramps.

10275. CHAIRMAN.—We have not held a single inquiry yet that we have not heard that?—We have at the present time a police inspection. And from the most minute inquiry I find that a large number of these people have some trade, such as iron-workers or wire-workers, and they come round regularly. I heard a question asked with regard to identification—how to do it. I don't know how you see to do it.

10276. Mr. MURKIN.—Then there are not regular visitors?—They are not regular visitors in that sense.

10277. You dropped an remark in regard to these unhappy women if they were sent to a penitentiary that it would take them away from working in the institutions; do you think it fair to utilise the misfortune of these people for the benefit of any category?—I do not, but if they were sent away for any purpose I say there

should be a provision not to separate them from their children.

10278. That might be done under a new system, and I am sure such a kind-hearted gentleman as you would not want to keep these unhappy people as drudges and slaves for the benefit of the ratepayers?—I certainly would not. I made inquiry, and I found the feeling is that in summer the tramps would not care to stay three or four days, but in winter they are glad to do it. We have some of them in the house now. In summer, when their feet get broken up, the doctor sometimes allows them to stay one or two nights, and I don't think three days' detention would meet the case at all. I would like to have a classification made even of tramps. Decent people I would treat decently, and the man who would not work I would make him suffer. There is a very considerable cost about washing the bed-clothes for them.

10279. CHAIRMAN.—Fresh linen every night on their beds?—Every article on their beds washed every night with it. I would have an ordinary shelter, the same as they have in England, a plank bed, or a broad bench around the walls; I would give them bread and water and a good fire, and, if you choose, rugs, but I would see that no person lost their lives or was unnecessarily punished for want of a shelter, such as humanity would give a bad character, and I would give them no more. I am very sorry if in the excitement of wanting to tell you all I could I have kept you longer than I should.

10280. Mr. Campbell.—Did I understand you to say that in any scheme of amalgamation the fitness of the place should be considered?—Yes.

10281. What you mean, I take it, is that the geographical position of any special locality affected should be taken into account?—In the event of amalgamation an unused house should be selected for the object it could best be turned into.

10282. Would you go this length and say that the geographical position of any district in the county should be considered in the event of any amalgamation being decided on?—No; I would say that having first decided on amalgamation, the one to which you would put any particular workhouse would depend very largely on its locality.

10283. Would you not think it fair to take into account the geographical difficulties of any particular district?—Oh, yes.

10284. In the interests of the sick and destitute poor. I think Mr. McIlhenny said you and Ballycastle had been very good neighbours?—Undoubtedly.

10285. And your desire is that you should continue so?—Undoubtedly. I have no objection to Ballycastle remaining if it is considered it is doing its duty properly, and I don't think there is any one in Ballymoney that does not think the same.

Miss HAMMOND examined.

10286. Mr. Green.—You are a Guardian?—Yes.

10287. Have taken a very deep interest in workhouse affairs since you joined the Board of Guardians?—Very much so.

10288. You represent Portrush?—Yes.

10289. Have you anything to say with reference to the boarding out of children?—We think we would like increased powers to board out more children than we are able to do now. There are three sets of children we cannot board out at present, and we would like powers to board them out. Adopted children—adopted from either vicious parents or parents who have treated them cruelly, or under the Industrial Act—and we at present have not the power to board them out. We think it would be well if we had power occasionally to transfer a child from one union to another. I mean to make it over entirely to the care of another union that our relieving officer would not be called upon to visit it.

10290. That is to say you would not object to have the power to board out your children with another union?—We would like to make the care of that child over to that other union. If we wanted to board out a child in the County Clerk we could make it over; there are certain circumstances in which it might be desirable to do that, but we have not the power.

10291. You say something here about scattered homes?—These have been already referred to. We think the plan of scattered homes would be very good indeed.

10292. CHAIRMAN.—Would you be in favour of having powers to board out all children who come into the workhouse except legitimate children?—Oh, no; there are some mothers we could not take them from.

10293. Would you be in favour of giving the Guardians discretionary powers to do so?—I think that might be a very good plan, but it is the adoption of the children we want power for; there are other children, and it seems unreasonable we should not have power to board them out.

10294. Mr. Green.—You think their interests would be better looked after if they were boarded out?—It would be greatly to their interest.

10295. CHAIRMAN.—Would you be glad to see no children left in the workhouse?—Yes, if that were possible.

10296. Therefore would you agree to have the boarding-out powers of the Guardians increased as much as possible?—Yes.

10297. Mr. Green.—Would you board them out with people that you would think suitable to take them or would you have special homes built for the purpose?—No; in some unions in England they do build scattered homes, but if we could get any suitable houses and took them and put in foster parents—a master and mistress—and put a dozen children under their care, and let them lead the sort of life workhouse children would lead in the country; when people have only two or three the amount of money they get is not enough to enable them to live comfortably.

10298. How would you deal with the religious aspect?—Certainly keep each child under its own religion. Supposing the Local Government Board did think of giving us three scattered homes, with a master and

workhouse except legitimate children?—Oh, no; there are some mothers we could not take them from.

10299. Would you be in favour of giving the Guardians discretionary powers to do so?—I think that might be a very good plan, but it is the adoption of the children we want power for; there are other children, and it seems unreasonable we should not have power to board them out.

10300. Mr. Green.—You think their interests would be better looked after if they were boarded out?—It would be greatly to their interest.

10301. CHAIRMAN.—Would you be glad to see no children left in the workhouse?—Yes, if that were possible.

10302. Therefore would you agree to have the boarding-out powers of the Guardians increased as much as possible?—Yes.

10303. Mr. Green.—Would you board them out with people that you would think suitable to take them or would you have special homes built for the purpose?—No; in some unions in England they do build scattered homes, but if we could get any suitable houses and took them and put in foster parents—a master and mistress—and put a dozen children under their care, and let them lead the sort of life workhouse children would lead in the country; when people have only two or three the amount of money they get is not enough to enable them to live comfortably.

10304. How would you deal with the religious aspect?—Certainly keep each child under its own religion. Supposing the Local Government Board did think of giving us three scattered homes, with a master and

Dec 16, 1903

Mr. John Boyd.

Miss Hammon.

Dec. 14, 1903.

Miss
Hamilton.

women, would they pay portion of the salary, as they do with the schoolmaster and schoolmistress?
10306. You think they should?—We think it would be worth while their considering. We would keep each demonstration to itself, even as far as possible, and I don't think any foster parents to be employed should be of an ecclesiastical nature, either dissonance of the Anglican Church or such.

10308. Is there a ladies' committee in Ballymoney?—There is. We think that where there are ladies' committees working the relieving officer should not be required by law to visit more than once a quarter; it seems a great waste of time and power.

10310. CHAIRMAN.—You think, perhaps, a good arrangement would be where there is an active committee that that committee should be authorized to suspend the relieving officer's visits to some such limit?—Yes; as it is, he is bound to visit once a month; that makes our visits almost unnecessary.

10311. Mr. Grev.—Have you anything to say about the feeble-minded inmates?—Yes; that is a subject I think a great deal about. We need more powers of taking care of the feeble-minded. I believe the word "feeble-minded" is not included in the Local Government Board classification, and it really is a very large class in our workhouses—people that have a want; they are not imbecile and they are not insane.

10312. CHAIRMAN.—There are a large class everywhere?—Yes; and they are an ever-increasing class.

10313. Mr. Grev.—Can you subdivide them?—Yes; some have a mental want and some a moral want; they are not able to take care of themselves; and I think we need powers to take care of them.

10314. CHAIRMAN.—What power would you want?—Power to keep them in. I would like houses for them.

10315. How would you proceed to exercise those powers if you had them?—I don't know that I thought about that so much. I suppose the Board of Guardians would have something to say to it.

10316. How would you go about it if you thought some young woman had a mental or moral want; how would you propose to keep her straight?—The medical officer would be present to consult.

10317. You would have to get a certificate that she was not right in her head?—No; that goes further than I mean.

10318. I am afraid if you wanted to lock up everybody who had a slate off it would be a big contract?—There are girls that are feeble-minded, and at fifteen or sixteen they have power to go out and live themselves, and I have seen time after time when them come back the worst had happened. I could give a great many instances.

10319. If you give a typical case without mentioning names the amount of defect you mean?—Simple-minded.

10320. Have you any case in your mind?—Half a dozen.

10321. If you give me one; what is the particular defect?—That they believe everything that is said to them, and that they will do everything that is told them—good or bad. They don't understand the difference between good and evil. There is one girl I know; she is not in our union here; her first baby was born before the war sixteen; she is now twenty-two, and has four or five babies; one baby died; she went in and out just as she liked; the children were constantly ill and ill-treated, and one died.

10322. What symptoms had she of any mental infirmity?—Her language and her conduct, and she was not married, and her mother was not married, and her grandmother was not married.

10323. Mr. Grev.—Did she go out to service?—I don't know; but another case of a feeble-minded girl I know; she was just silly; she did just exactly what you told her; if you told her to do a wrong thing she would do it just as easily as a right thing.

10324. CHAIRMAN.—The doctor would not certify her?—No.

10325. Mr. Grev.—How do you propose to deal with her when she comes to the workhouse a second time?—After they become a danger and an expense to the country we ought to have power to lock them up and be kind to them. In Massachusetts they have such homes that they call custodial homes, where, if there is reason to think that anyone is becoming a danger to the State, they go before a judge, and two or three other authorities are brought in, and if it is found on examination that it would be well for everybody that such a person should be put under restraint they put them into a home—one side is the custodial home and the other is the training home for girls. I don't think

there is such a class recognised as feeble-minded under the Local Government Board.

10326. Have you anything to say about training masters and mistresses?—Mr. McEllery, I think, referred to it. It occurred to me that the Local Government Board might plan some system of promotion when they see from their inspectors how people manage their various unions, and recommended them for promotion, and I think there is more than the power of keeping accounts required; there is something in discipline; there are ex-politicians who understand discipline.

10327. Mr. McEllery.—Where could you promote a clerk?—There are a great many small unions.

10328. Send him to Belfast, if they want a clerk from Ballymoney?—Exactly. Mr. Boyd referred to a certain class of women, and sending them to penitentiaries. I think if we had a little more power of keeping them in the workhouse it would set very well.

10329. CHAIRMAN.—Have you ever thought that keeping them in the workhouse contributes more than anything else to the objectionable idea that people have of workhouses at present?—Yes; but perhaps there would come some change in the arrangements—some new classification.

10330. Workhouses becoming so much as they are now—hospitals—how would you propose to get rid of that class of persons?—I don't know that I would exactly propose to get rid of them.

10331. Don't you think it would be a great mistake to keep them there?—I would not keep them there always.

10332. You would always have some of that class?—Yes.

10333. Don't you think that would be a great mistake to have the workhouse for such people?—I suppose, no matter where they are, we would have to pay.

10334. Do you not think it is a great mistake to have the ordinary country hospital tainted as it is by such persons?—It is more than a country hospital now.

10335. A union hospital; but one of our hopes is this matter is to reduce it very much to the condition of a district hospital, getting the children out and getting the mothers of illegitimate children out?—If we could have a home for them; it would be so much better to make one of the workhouses into a place for them.

10336. I don't say that these poor women are in themselves so objectionable, but they create the idea, and people do object to send their relatives into a place where they will be perhaps in direct contact with these women?—Yes; but then you know they would not come near them.

10337. They would be scrubbing up their wards for one thing?—There is always a lot of laundry work to be done by them; the women I am speaking of are the hardiest offenders.

10338. Well, all the more objectionable?—I would not like to have them wandering round the country.

10339. Suppose they go into a penitentiary?—I don't like the idea of penitentiaries.

10340. Well, call them anything you like. What was that Massachusetts word that fascinated you?—Custodial homes; that is for the feeble-minded only; not for this class.

10341. Mr. McEllery.—They have places of the kind in certain parts of the States for these poor people. Some are known as Houses of the Good Shepherd, under the care of religious communities; they are detained there for six months or a year in the hope of reformation. Would something of that kind in Ireland not be an advantage?—It might; but I am not fond of religious institutions.

10342. Still, after all, we must remember they would have a better opportunity of reformation than they possibly could have in the body of the workhouse, where there was nothing to elevate them or give them hope. The idea is that these unfortunate people will cease their kind of life and reform, and that after a time we will get rid of this class altogether?—I only speak of things as they are; they can run as and as they always come back with an ever-increasing number of children, which decent working people have to support, which is not right.

10343. You would stop it by sending them to penitentiaries?—I would stop it by keeping them in the workhouses and making them work.

10344. CHAIRMAN.—That would be impracticable for life?—No; I would give them one year to begin with, and if they offended again I would give them two at three, or up to five years.

10345. The penitentiaries we had in view were penitentiaries managed by religious people of diverse communities?—I don't know really very much about them.

Mr. CAMPBELL W. TWEED examined.

Dec. 16, 1903.

Mr. Campbell
W. Tweed.

10345. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the Lurgan Board of Guardians?—Yes; I am a member of the Lurgan Board of Guardians; I have been a member for thirty-eight years.

10347. Now, there is no proposal of the County Council to break up your union?—Not at present.

10348. Did the Board of Guardians pass any resolution on the subject of amalgamation?—No, sir, they did not.

10349. What are your own views on the subject?—I think, sir, we have too many unions in the county.

10350. Putting Belfast out of the question you have six?—Yes.

10351. How many do you think you could manage with?—I think one would do the whole county.

10352. One at Ballymena?—Ballymena would be a central place.

10353. Is that would you put the infirm sick that could be removed by railway?—Yes.

10354. Would you approve of sending lunatics elsewhere?—I would put lunatics in some one place by themselves.

10355. Either in an auxiliary lunatic asylum or a lunatic asylum?—An auxiliary, I think, would be a proper place for them.

10356. Then as regards the children, do you approve of the boarding-out system?—Oh, yes, by all means.

10357. Would you approve of enlarging the powers of the Guardians so as to enable them to board out all the children?—All children, because we find that when children are boarded out from the workhouse they are not likely to come back on us again, and if they are kept in the house they generally come back; they think it is their home.

10358. You heard a conversation we had just now with Miss Hamilton about the penitentiaries; are you inclined to think it might be a useful thing to send these poor women to a place where they would be dealt with by religious influences according to their religious faith?—Not a doubt.

10359. You would be in favour of that?—I would, because this class of women comes in to have a baby and they go out again; the whole thing goes over again; I would be inclined to have them sent to some penitentiary.

10360. From your knowledge of the workhouse do you think a workhouse is the place where any kindly and Christian influence can be brought to bear on a poor woman of that kind to keep her straight?—I don't think so.

10361. Therefore you think that really any hope would be in another direction?—I think so; I think the atmosphere of the workhouse is not the proper place in which to make any reformation.

10362. Then it would come really that the only people you would have left in the workhouse would be the sick and aged and infirm. The sick you would deal with in a local hospital, and the aged and infirm you would send to one building for the county?—Yes, and all children boarded out in proper country houses.

10363. Have you found trouble much of a trouble in your union?—In the summer season they tramp round the coast; I really don't know what you could do with them; it is a very hard question to do anything with them at all; we tried to get work out of them in our

house; of course they broke all the utensils and harness, and we had to get iron harness for them; so I don't know what you would do with them at all, unless we had some ticket from the union they were in the night before to carry to the next union again, so that we would know if they came back to us.

10364. You would telegraph on?—Yes; a very useful thing.

10365. Mr. MURKIN.—How would it do to make it necessary for them to get a ticket of admittance from the police officer of the town?—I think it would do very well; that is the proper place for them to get the ticket, because the master of a workhouse is not the proper man to work with them at all.

10366. Then the question of distances; if you had only one workhouse in the county they would have a long trip?—They would; they should apply to the relieving officer for a night's lodging, breakfast, and supper.

10367. CHAIRMAN.—Do any people pay for their keep in your workhouse?—They do; it is according to their means we charge.

10368. Do they ever dispute that with you?—No; they never do.

10369. You would be in favour of the Board of Guardians being empowered to recover that legally?—I would; anyone that is able to pay.

10370. At their discretion?—Yes.

10371. Mr. MURKIN.—You would be in favour of continuing the present system of representation and making no change?—Certainly.

10372. Let the Guardians manage the district hospital and let them pay for the expense of their destitute and infirm in the central union?—It has been very well done so in Larne.

10373. You would rather have that system than something like dispensary committees to manage the Poor Law affairs of the union that is dissolved?—I would say it would be better because it would be more representative for one thing.

10374. And, of course, the Guardians being the district councillors there would be no inconvenience in the matter; no additional labour?—Not at all; no additional labour.

10375. Have you any views as regards the question of the area of rating; do you prefer the union to the electoral division?—We count the electoral division the proper rating, because I think the Guardians take more interest in it.

10376. CHAIRMAN.—For what purposes; what expenses would you charge in the electoral division?—The former charges; the doctor's charges and the paupers that were in the house.

10377. Go back to the old system?—Go back to the old system.

10378. Mr. MURKIN.—Make each division responsible for its own poor?—Yes.

10379. You think it was more carefully looked after in those days?—A great deal.

10380. Mr. BROWN.—You have a cottage hospital in Larne?—We have.

10381. Have you found that that reduces the number of admissions to the workhouse hospital?—It is only opened; we can say very little about it yet; it is only just about a month opened.

Mr. ROBERT ALLEN examined.

10382. CHAIRMAN.—You are also a member of the Larne Board of Guardians?—Yes, sir.

10383. You have heard the evidence of your Chairman?—Yes.

10384. Are there any matters in which you differ from him or anything you would like to add to what he has said?—No; so far as I have heard, I don't know whether you have the answers to the queries sent him as or not.

10385. Yes?—They were practically my drawing up; I am in favour of the amalgamation.

10386. How many workhouses would you have in the county?—I am sure four would be plenty.

10387. Mr. MURKIN.—Your chairman said one? Under certain circumstances. Suppose the hospitals are retained and the children boarded out; I think Ballymena could accommodate all the rest.

10388. Take the harmless lunatics out of Ballymena and put them in an auxiliary asylum?—Yes; I think Ballymena could accommodate all the rest.

10389. Larne would not have any objection to that?—I don't know; personally, I would have no objection at all.

10390. Was the matter discussed by your body?—Not very much; a copy of these queries was sent out to every Guardian and they were asked to make suggestions, but very few did it.

10391. Then you had no public discussion or notice?—No; there was not.

10392. We find there is an unwillingness on the part of each locality to sacrifice itself, but, theoretically, there is a great feeling in favour of amalgamation?—The Guardians did not seem to take very much interest in it as a rule.

Mr. Robert
Allen.

Dec. 16, 1903.
Mr. Robert
Allen.

10393. But you think, on broad principles, it would be better to change the system?—Yes; it seems to me, from reading over the annual reports of the Local Government Board, that the smaller the union the greater is the cost, so then I reasoned that if there were fewer workhouses they would cost less; there would be economy.

10394. And better management perhaps?—There would be better classification; a want of proper classification in our union is one of the worst things I see; decent people being left with a lot of blackguards.

10395. Have you many in your house?—205.

10396. Many of that number children?—No, very few; about fourteen or fifteen; we board out all the orphans and deserted children.

10397. You find that a satisfactory method?—I am greatly in favour of that.

10398. Have you homeless inmates in the house?—No, we sent away the greater part of them to the asylum within the last few years.

10399. You had no trouble in getting the asylum authorities to take them?—No; only they said there was not room, and we had to wait, and there are some still that they say there is not room for.

10400. Have you anything to say about the tramps?—The tramps are a very hard question; I think the relieving officer or master of the workhouse should have power to admit them if they are very old; if they are young people, and not likely to suffer, I think they should not be admitted at all; I don't know whether there is power to keep them out or not.

10401. You would hardly want a person to be out

at night if there was no shelter?—In summer it would not be much harm.

10402. He might go into your barn or house?—I think I would be prepared to take the chance; we are not exactly at the mercy of the tramps.

10403. Do you not think that if they had to go to the police station to get an order for assistance it would be better?—There is not a question, and if there were fewer workhouses there would be less tramps.

10404. You heard the questions put by the Charities in regard to the mothers of children in the houses?—I don't know anything at all about that; I don't care to express an opinion; there are a class in our workhouse that I don't care to go among at all; I don't see what we could do with them.

10405. CHAIRMAN.—You would rather have them away if you could?—I don't know whether they would be better outside than in.

10406. They are a class you feel rather hopeless about?—Yes; it has always been, and I think it always will be; there are some things that the Local Government Board should give us a little more liberty about. There is one question that Dr. Higgs is acquainted with—the question of paid wardens. It seems to me a great nuisance; the class we get as a rule are no better than the paupers in the workhouse; and they don't do the work well, at least according to the nurses and the doctor.

10407. Dr. HIGGINS.—My experience is that they do it much better?—We have a third pair since you were there.

10408. I would not compare your workhouse with Ballymena, where they have no paid wardens?—I think we should all be treated uniformly.

MR. PATRICK HAMILLE examined.

Mr. Patrick
Hamille.

10409. CHAIRMAN.—You are also a member of the Larne Board of Guardians?—Yes.

10410. Have you any idea of how many workhouses would be enough for the County Antrim, putting Belfast out of the question?—I don't think any at all are required.

10411. How would you administer the Poor Law?—I would first and foremost make a selection in any of the unions, take the able-bodied, the children, and the inmates, and then set the destitute on one side, and how few you would have you would be surprised.

10412. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—What would you do with them?—I would then send them out; outside the house entirely; board them out, and dispose of these standing memorials disgraceful to Irishmen to look at them; dispose of them, or else send them.

10413. CHAIRMAN.—They would make quarries as long as they would last?—They would.

10414. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Do you not think the destitute class might grow when you boarded them out?—I do not.

10415. Not afraid it would spread?—I don't think so.

10416. CHAIRMAN.—Would you keep any place for the sick?—Oh, yes, a hospital, and for the aged and infirm cases, I would go in for having treatment for them; boarding them out.

MR. ALEXANDER MILLER examined.

Mr. Alexander
Miller.

10420. CHAIRMAN.—The opinion of the Ballymena Board of Guardians is that amalgamation with adjoining unions is desirable and could be effected with very little, if any, disadvantage to the sick and poor; how many unions, do you think, might be retained in the County Antrim, provided that a hospital is kept up?—The Board did not express an opinion with regard to the numbers, nor even the particular ones, that should be amalgamated; we kept ourselves free in that matter.

10421. You have heard a great deal to-day on that subject, and no one wanted to knock down Ballymena?—No; I must say we are in a favoured position.

Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Thanks to its situation.

10422. CHAIRMAN.—And the railways; do you think Ballymena ought to get?—No; certainly.

10423. Do you think it would be able to receive all the rest?—Aged and infirm in all the others. I am not exactly sure with regard to the capacity; I have

not made out the figures, but the workhouse was supposed to be able to accommodate 1,300 individuals, and I don't suppose there is that many in the whole of them.

10424. You think the number of workhouses might be reduced very much, but you don't go so far as to say that Ballymena should act as the only union?—No; I would not particularise; my Board has not, and therefore I would not.

10425. Your Board thinks that an arrangement could be come to whereby some class of paupers could be maintained in the workhouse of another union; that would be the very arrangement we have just been speaking of?—But I think their idea is ridiculous; that matter was that in case any of the workhouse were done away with, emptied of their present patients, these establishments should be made a training school for destitute children.

10430. That does not come under the heading of No. 5; they state there that the inmates of workhouses that were closed could be sent to another and maintained in that?—Perhaps we did not understand exactly the import of the query. Our idea in answering it was sending all the children to one place and having them taught primary education, and then, perhaps, trades.

10431. Your union wishes to go back to the old chargeability of electoral charges?—Yes; such was their decision, not altogether unanimous but almost.

10432. For all Poor Law expenditure?—Well, yes.

10433. Even for the maintenance of the sick?—I don't know exactly about the sick; it is principally in connection with outdoor relief.

10434. That is what I thought; it is merely as regards outdoor relief you want to go back to electoral division chargeability?—I think that is the principal thing; I think it is principally for the purpose of outdoor relief; we find the Guardians in a certain division do not care how many they put on outdoor relief in that division as long as it is a union-at-large charge, but we are of opinion that if it was a divisional charge they would be more cautious and careful.

10435. Has outdoor relief increased much in your union?—Not latterly; I think it has been decreasing less or more.

10436. Do you know how much a year it is now?—I think it is close on £2,300 or £2,400.

10437. How much is Belfast?—I could not say that.

CHAIRMAN.—You are about £2,000 over them.

10438. Mr. MURKHAUGH.—You are a kindly people in Ballymena?—Yes.

10439. CHAIRMAN.—On what basis do you give outdoor relief?—Some are entirely destitute; and others have a little to support them, but not sufficient to keep them out of the workhouse.

10440. Some are destitute and some are not destitute?—Not altogether destitute; they have a little to support them, but not sufficient to keep them out of the workhouse, therefore we give them a little relief because they have a great aversion to come into the workhouse. Better to give them £2. 6d. as outdoor relief than maintain them in the house at £3. 8d. per week.

10441. You said just now there was a considerable competition amongst the Guardians to give outdoor relief because it is a union charge; would you distribute some of the outdoor relief given to the fact that it is a union charge and comes light on the whole union?—Some of the divisions would feel it very heavy if it was a divisional charge because some of the divisions are very poor and require relief and the charge would be heavy on them.

10442. Do you find that the numbers in the house have gone down since you took to this outdoor relief as a large scale?—No, I think the numbers in the house have not gone down as far as I am aware; the Clerk is present and can go better into the figures than I can. But the outdoor relief acts as a preventative to them coming into the house.

10443. As regards the lunatics, supposing your workhouse were used for a central workhouse for the aged and infirm of the County Antrim, than what do you think might be done with the lunatics you have there?—We did not calculate in considering the queries to do away with the lunatics; we wrote the Local Government Board some time ago and they advised us to lay the whole matter before you as a Commission. The statement I would make would be on the lines of the letter I wrote laying the matter before the Local Government Board. I will read you the letter and reply:—

"Queen-street,

"Ballymena, 26th August, 1903.

"Gentlemen,

"In reply to the enquiry of the Ballymena Board of Guardians of the 20th June, 1903, you refer them to your circular of July, 1902, which states that Boards of Guardians should take steps to have all inmates in workhouses transferred to the county asylum. I have been directed by them to inform your Board that the Ballymena Board of Guardians appointed a committee twelve months ago to have four recommendations carried out, and at an interview with the asylum committee we were informed that the asylum was already congested, having seventy more patients in it than the space was supposed to accommodate. We then proposed that, since they could not take them from us, that they should

transfer them into their books and board them out to us on the same terms and at the same rate paid us for the fifty boarded out to us by them under the Act of 1875; this, we considered, would only be fair and just. We have had several interviews with them on the matter, but up to the present the only information we have from them is, that "the subject is still under consideration." Had we obtained the consent of the asylum committee to an extension of the existing scheme of course it would have been submitted to your Board for approval. Now, gentlemen, they pay us 7s. per week per board, for the patients we have from them under the Act of 1875, and that amount per board for the fifty we wanted to transfer to them amounts to £17 10s. per week, or £10 per annum. This is not only a local charge on the ratepayers of the Ballymena Union, but we are obliged to contribute our quota as a county charge for the upkeep of the asylum at Antrim, filled by the inmates from Larne, Ballycastle, Ballymoney, and the other unions in the county. I ask you is that fair or just to the ratepayers of the Ballymena Union, and I would further ask you to consider us how we are to obtain relief and redress. Have we not a grievance? Have we not reason to complain? We informed the asylum committee at the same time that we could take more than 300 additional of the harmless lunatics if they wished to avail themselves of the accommodation in the Ballymena Workhouse, and that would relieve the congestion at the asylum, and might possibly obviolate the necessity of additional expense by adding to their present building, or of converting any of the workhouses into an auxiliary asylum at a cost of several thousand pounds. Could they not be cared for and maintained as well in Ballymena as in Antrim, and at a much cheaper rate? But gentlemen, should the asylum committee decide to build an auxiliary asylum out of some one of the workhouses, when we would be relieved of the unjust burden of maintaining the fifty they refuse to take off our hands? That should have been a county instead of a local charge, to the disadvantage of the ratepayers of the Ballymena Union for the last few years. I venture to say that either of these schemes, if adopted by the asylum committee, would not be ready for the reception of patients for the next two or three years. Are we to suffer to the extent of £10 a year for the next few years as we have done in the past? We hope your Board will be as good as to devise some means whereby we will be recompensed for the past injustice and relieved at once of this unfair state of matters.

"An early reply will oblige.

"Yours most respectfully,

"ALEXANDER MILLER (Chairman).

"Messrs.

"The Local Government Board, Dublin."

"No. 52,575/1903.

"Ballymena Union.

"Local Government Board, Dublin,

26th September, 1903.

"Sir,

"The Local Government Board for Ireland have had before them your letter of the 26th ultimo, relative to the chargeability of the cost of maintenance of certain harmless lunatics, numbering about fifty, who are at present ordinary pauper inmates of the workhouse of Ballymena Union, and whose chargeability is different from that of the inmates boarded out in the workhouse by the authorities of the County Antrim Lunatic Asylum. In reply the Board desire to point out that the patients in the County Lunatic Asylum are admitted from the various localities in the several unions of the county, and the cost of maintenance is therefore borne by the county at large.

"The Board are informed that harmless lunatics are maintained in the other workhouses in the County Antrim, the cost of maintenance in their case, as well as in Ballymena, being a local charge, and that the ratepayers of the Ballymena Union are

Dec. 26, 1903.
Mr. Alexander
Milkhen.

not placed in a different position from those of the other unions in the county in regard to this matter.

* With respect to the suggestion that the asylum authorities might send further patients to the Ballymena Workhouse, the Board have to state that before steps could be taken with that object, it would be necessary to carry out extensive structural alterations in the workhouse buildings, involving a large outlay.

* Under the circumstances, and having regard to the fact that the question of asylum accommodation is included in the terms of reference of the Poor Law Reform Commission, the Local Government Board consider that the Guardians would do well to place all the particulars of their case before the Commission, and to await the result of its deliberations before incurring heavy expenditure on workhouse alterations of this nature.

"I am, Sir,

"Your obedient Servant

"A. R. BARRER,

"Assistant Secretary.

"Alexander Milkhen, Esq.,

"Chairman of the Board of Guardians

"of Ballymena Union, Queen-street,

"Ballymena."

10444. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—In regard to outdoor relief, do many of the recipients come from the town of Ballymena itself?—Yes; there is a considerable number.

10445. Have you many towns in your union?—Yes; we have four or five considerable towns.

10446. Have you any idea as to the numbers from those towns that are on the outdoor relief list?—Yes; I have not specified particularly to what divisions they belong.

10447. Our experience, so far, is that the outdoor relief has grown principally because of the number that are relieved in the towns?—Yes.

10448. You are not aware whether there are many in receipt of outdoor relief in the country parishes or not?—We have three relieving officers, and I believe I would be correct in saying that in one of the districts they have far more on outdoor relief than even we have in the urban district of Ballymena.

10449. So then it does not altogether apply in your case?—It does not.

10450. You have a large number of children in your house?—We have; I think we have only some twenty-five or twenty-eight that are attending school; we have a schoolmistress, but there are some younger children than those attending school.

10451. I think there were forty or forty-five in the house yesterday?—I daresay.

10452. Have you tried to get houses for these children?—Yes; where we can get suitable houses we do, but out, and as far as I am personally concerned I certainly would advocate the boarding out of children, all that could possibly be got, but the difficulty is getting suitable houses for these children.

10453. Do you make any effort to get these houses; do you let the people know in the country?—The people generally know that we are prepared to board them, but provided suitable houses can be found for them, and I think it is the right thing, as far as I am personally concerned, because they grow up with other surroundings and out of the atmosphere of the workhouse entirely. I saw some time ago where one gentleman gave evidence that he found in some of those cases that they were made to herd the farms. I believe a farmer's son would have to do that himself, and I don't think we need export boarded-out children from workhouses to be better viewed than a farmer would treat his own children.

10454. CHAIRMAN.—You are quite right!—Of course the ones that we would give them to don't want them, for it is not generally well-to-do persons that are prepared to take them, and ones that would want them we refuse to give them unless where they are proper persons to bring up children. I know some of them that are boarded out. I have visited them myself, and you could not tell when they go to school that they came out of a workhouse at all, nor is it recognised in the community that they are, and I only wish we had more of such homes.

10455. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Have you many tramps in

Ballymena?—We had, but they have been considerably reduced lately.

10456. Would you be in favour of giving the Guardians any more power?—I certainly would. I am largely in favour of the answer that has been based on, and that is that the word "vagrant" in the Act should include any person frequenting a workhouse more than twice a month, and who, in the opinion of the Guardians, is able to work, and unless there was some reasonable cause they should be liable to be prosecuted before a Justice of the Peace, even though that person belonged to the union in which the workhouse is situated. We find that sometimes in our own area a person will come in postage two or three times in the week and go out the next day. The word "vagrant" in the Act does not contemplate that person as a vagrant at all, and therefore we have inserted this that a person who comes in perhaps two or three times in the month should be treated as a vagrant, and in the opinion of the Ballymena Board of Guardians there should be accommodation provided at the various police barracks for persons of this class. If there was accommodation provided at the police barracks I believe some of these persons would be likely to try to improve on the rates. That is our opinion. I think they are a very great imposition, and there is too much encouragement given to them.

10457. Your rates are much higher than in any of the other unions in the county; how is that?—I don't know.

Mr. MURKAGHAN.—They are 1s. 6d. in the £, whereas in the other unions they are 8d. and 9d.

CHAIRMAN.—£2,400 on outdoor relief more than accounts for it.

10458. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Do you find these lunatics which you have got from the asylum a source of income to you?—They are very little of an income where you have 1s. per head per week beyond the cost of maintenance; a worker in a mill would pay 1s. a week, or more, for his lodgings, so that we are not overpaid. A very important percentage—I must say I am thankful to him—informed the Commission and the public to-day that he was very well satisfied with the treatment that he himself had seen that these lunatics got in the Ballymena Workhouse. I refer to yourself, and I accept it as a compliment.

10459. We found the place very well kept and the people apparently very comfortable.—I suppose we found also that we have accommodation for a considerable number more of the same class, if they do not decide to build an addition to the asylum?

10460. We want to give you another class, and take these away from you?—We might not be anything the worse in the long run as a union.

10461. Dr. BURGESS.—You mentioned you made in a week out of the lunatics that are there; you have 11s. that is 25 lbs. a week, and you think they are very well treated there; do you not think it would be desirable for the Guardians to treat their own lunatics just as well?—We were waiting for a decision in reference to this matter that I have brought before you. If the Asylum Asylum Committee had taken our lunatics on their books and boarded them out with us on the same terms we certainly would have made arrangements in the same way for the ones we have ourselves, but after all I think they get almost the same care and treatment.

10462. There are about eight sleeping with 250 cubic feet each?—Yes; but you must admit there has been a considerable improvement since the last time you were there.

10463. There is still room for more?—And always will be, no matter how much we do.

10464. Do you think the lunatics are the proper class to do the attendance in the infirmary?—There are some of them quite capable, very little being wrong with them.

10465. You would have to pay attendants if you got rid of your lunatics?—They are very useful in many ways; we have a twenty-acre farm, and they do the labouring work.

10466. I refer to the four or five lunatics that are employed in the ward, and the nurses seem to think that their time is largely taken up looking after the lunatics?—They have to spend two or three hours in the morning cleaning, and then return to the body of the house.

10467. Have you been through the house early in the morning, at half-past ten or about 11?—Yes; I visit sometimes twice and sometimes three times a week.

10468. If the accommodation for the healthy should be increased in Ballymena do you think you would

have room for an increase from other unions and at the same time hold the lunatics you have—I think we have, if you take away the children; look at the large rooms we would have that are now used as schoolrooms for twenty-three children.

10494. It would not accommodate many healthy people; is that the only empty place?—We have other places besides that; we have vacant wards.

10495. How many persons from other unions do you think you could accommodate?—I have told you already the number that the house was supposed to accommodate when it was built, and I think we have altogether about 360 in it, including lunatics from Asylum and Belfast.

10496. CHAIRMAN.—How many of these are lunatics?—112, besides our own fifty.

10497. It is a very odd thing that made it necessary to have them kept there so long?—We tried the Asylum authorities to take them from us and they were not able to do it; they told us that there were seventy more patients in the asylum than the place was built

to accommodate. We took steps to carry out the directions of the Local Government Board, and they could not receive them; therefore we have been maintaining them ever since as a local charge, when they should be a county charge.

10498. Making it a week on it?—Oh, no; there are fifty of our own for whom we receive no payment.

10499. Dr. BROWN.—You mention in your letter that the other unions have them on the county; that is quite correct?—There are not fifty in all the other unions combined.

10500. CHAIRMAN.—How do you happen to have so many?—There never was any of them taken to the asylum from us; in Ballycastle they have only two.

10501. Mr. MURPHY.—There are only about fifteen outside Belfast and your own place?—Oh, I think there are eighteen in Asylum. At any rate we have more than all the other unions combined.

10502. The railway facilities are good at Ballymena?—Yes; in all directions—Larne, Belfast, Derry, and Farnham in the direction of Oshenduff.

Mr. JOHN CLARKE examined.

10503. CHAIRMAN.—You represent the Board of Guardians of ASYLUM?—I am the Clerk.

10504. Have you any of the Guardians here?—Two Guardians.

10505. You have not come to express any opinion yourself?—Yes; that is what I have come for.

10506. To tell the opinion of the Board of Guardians?—No; it is a personal matter altogether. The opinion of the Board of Guardians is embodied in the replies to the queries.

10507. What did you want to mention?—It is my own personal opinion entirely. That is that there should be one county workhouse.

10508. Where would you put it?—I leave that to the Commission to decide.

10509. What class of inmates do you think ought to be in that workhouse?—What I would call the middle or inferior characters I would send to that. I would board out all decent aged people over sixty years of age; I would board out all orphan children; I would advocate that the Guardians pay a little more to adopt decent people to take these children. At the present time I find that the difficulty we have to contend with is to get a decent home for these children. In Asylum we pay £60 a month, which I think is quite little to induce people of the standing that children should be boarded out with, and I would advocate that the Guardians would pay a little more in order to get suitable homes for these children. I think that the children are the most important item in the whole programme—the young.

10510. So as to take them off the list of the paupers eventually?—Yes.

10511. The sick you would keep in the local hospitals?—Well, my idea with regard to the sick is that the sick would go to the infirmary in connection with the workhouse, and I would provide a couple of wards in connection with each dispensary. Of course this is my own idea—I am not giving it as the Guardians—under the superintendence of the dispensary medical officer. The Local Government Board at present are insisting on a trained nurse being appointed for each dispensary district.

10512. Midwife you mean; she is not a trained nurse?—They are insisting on a nurse being appointed as midwife; my idea is, of course, that this midwife or nurse would be available to treat any accident.

10513. She would know no more about it than one of the charwomen you would meet outside, say, knows about surgical or medical nursing?—Then my theory bills to the ground.

10514. It does unless she happens to be a medical and surgical nurse as well?—At any rate my idea is that in connection with these two wards they should be available for paying patients in the district; you could arrange a scale of fees.

10515. You would propose that there should be in each dispensary district, besides the doctor, a trained nurse, who should also be a midwife, such appointments to be made gradually, and that there should be a small hospital in connection with each dispensary district?—Yes; and available for any paying patients.

10516. But primarily for the poor?—Yes; it would only be for cases of accident and sudden diseases that could not be removed to the county infirmary; the

county workhouse you might call it, or county infirmary in connection with the workhouse.

10517. Would you propose that all the sick except the very acutely sick should be dealt with in one building for the whole county?—Yes.

10518. If a person got ill at Ballycastle or Asylum would they have to go to the central institution to be cured?—Yes; that is the idea I have, except in cases of acute or sudden sickness.

10519. Mr. MURPHY.—Do you see any danger in that?—Not if they are fit for removal; my experience is that the great majority of infirmary patients could go to any place at all.

10520. CHAIRMAN.—Don't you think it would be greedy to remove the sick from their own friends?—Yes; but my idea would be to board out all those people.

10521. I am talking of the people who are really sick; supposing a man is not acutely sick, but yet would require three weeks or a month hospital treatment before he could be put right—an attack of acute rheumatism—you would send him from Ballycastle to Ballymena?—No; but to wards in connection with the dispensary; in Asylum there are six dispensaries.

10522. That can could bear removal. I am afraid you are going a little ahead as soon as you get into the medical aspect of the case?—Then I will drop that. My idea with regard to the management of the county workhouse is that it should be placed under a committee of the County Council, and the District Councils in proportion to valuation should send two or three representatives, and in that way I think they would minimise what is complained of—the outdoor relief. There would not be so many people to approach—that is their neighbours would not be disturbing them or pressuring them to have outdoor relief in all cases given. Outdoor relief, to my mind, is at present shared. There is too much favoritism; it is not given on the merits. If the management of the county workhouse were in the hands of a committee from the County Council and a small committee from each of the District Councils I think it would reduce that considerably.

10523. Could the outdoor relief be administered by a central committee?—Yes. The expediency in the first instance, the upkeep of the establishment, and all the efforts at present would be a county charge, each union paying for the support of its own paupers that would be sent to the county infirmary or county workhouse.

10524. Take an application for outdoor relief from Glenamara, how would that be dealt with by a central body meeting in Ballymena?—It would be dealt with just in the same way as at present.

10525. Mr. MURPHY.—How would they get local knowledge as to the necessities of the case?—From the relieving officer.

10526. Could he be present?—He must be present at each meeting of the board.

10527. If it is delegated to the County Council could you bring all the relieving officers of the county to meet the County Council?—It is not delegated to the County Council but to a committee of the County Council, and that might be a local committee appointed from or by the County Council, and the District Council I would have it in the same way; the committee

Dec. 14, 1903.
Mr. Alexander
Milliken.

Mr. John
Clarke.

Dec. 16, 1904.

Mr. John
Giffin.

they should appoint should be either chosen from or by them to attend at the workhouse, as the Board of Guardians do at present.

10503. That would do away with supervision—the most important part of administration?—The boarding out can be principally under the charge of the District Council or dispensary committee. I would appoint a committee in each dispensary area to manage the wards; revert to the old principle of dispensary committees.

10504. At the present time the asylum committees frequently have before them considerations as to the ability of persons in the institution to pay, and they have to apply to outsiders for information; the same thing would likely occur if you adopt that system of committees?—The difference between the asylum committee and the committee I propose is this—the committee chosen by the District Council would have all the information that the District Council could give in connection with any pauper that was seeking admission or getting outdoor relief.

10505. What advantage would there be in taking from the Guardians the administration of this important matter and referring it to a committee; why not leave it with the body still?—If you had one county workhouse you could not have the whole of the members of the District Council attending that county workhouse.

Mr. THOMAS FERGUSON examined.

Mr. Thomas
Ferguson.

10510. CHAIRMAN.—You are one of the Guardians of the Antrim Union?—Yes.

10511. What are your views about the amalgamation of unions?—I suppose you have the answers to the queries from Antrim.

10512. We have; you believe that a scheme is desirable?—I do not; I don't believe in amalgamation, although I am here.

10513. You are here to express your dissent from that?—Yes; and, of course, I was selected to come and give my views.

10514. As one of the minority?—Yes; as one of the minority.

10515. Would you make any change in the administration of the present system?—Of course I believe a great many changes would be desirable, but I don't see that amalgamation would effect an improvement; economy is one of the objects, I think, that we aim at.

10516. It is almost a necessary condition?—Yes, economy and efficiency.

10517. Economy with efficiency?—Then I hold that if we want to accommodate and relieve the poor we cannot disturb the present workhouses and effect that purpose, and in the next place I believe that instead of amalgamating the present institutions the idea is to create another, or two, because it has never been proposed to do away with the present hospitals or infirmaries, and I can say for Antrim that if you have a central institution I don't believe you have a dozen people you could send away from the neighbourhood to that central place, and, even supposing you had a dozen, by still maintaining the present establishment you would have to employ and pay for the labour that what are called able-bodied paupers do at present, and that is even good for them to be employed at—to work about the gardens and about the place. Then with regard to the auxiliary asylum—

10518. That is a question that touches you closely at Antrim?—It does. A great many of us believe that instead of the being an economical idea to turn the Antrim Workhouse into an auxiliary asylum it would be far more profitable to extend the present asylum buildings; it has been estimated it would cost about £20,000 to convert the Antrim Workhouse into a fit place for an auxiliary asylum; it has also been estimated, in fact it is quite settled, that £15,000 would provide the needed accommodation at Halwell—the present asylum—and you would not have then to employ a new staff; the only difference in the outlay between the larger establishment and the present would be the addition of some attendants or keepers.

10519. So you would be against the auxiliary asylum?—Yes.

10520. You would not break up any of the workhouses in the county?—I believe in the boarding out of the children and all that sort of thing, but even after you had all these changes made you would still require the

10506. Then you would propose to do away with the present system altogether?—Yes.

10507. And follow pretty much the lines of the County Council as at present, giving only to the dispensaries a certain representation on the committee; is that the view you take up?—No; I don't exactly follow you. The point I take up is that the upkeep of the workhouse would be a county charge; consequently, a committee of the County Council would be appointed to look after the interests of the county charge; the paupers in that workhouse would be a district charge, or a union charge, and, consequently, the District Council would appoint committees to look after their paupers.

10508. The paupers from their own unions?—Yes; it would not revert back to the old principle of union charges and divisional charges; but instead of that it would be county charges and union charges.

10509. We have been told here to-day that the wide area, except extravagance?—Well, with regard to the divisional charges, I think it is a hardship on a poor district to have to pay for the poor of that district; they have all their rates to pay; in a poor district I feel from my experience that there will be less money expended on roads and other matters than in a more populous and thriving district; consequently, I think it would be a hardship on the poor district to have to support their own poor.

present places. The Antrim Workhouse was built to accommodate 600 or 700 paupers or inmates, and it appears that now when every inmate would be allowed the space that is required, according to the newer regulations, it would be fit to accommodate about 300 only, so that there is not so great a saving building as might appear at first sight.

10521. Mr. MURPHY.—You have a large number of children in your house?—We have.

10522. Have you ever tried to get them boarded out?—No; we send a few very young children out to some, but we have not tried to get the young people boarded out.

10523. Did it ever occur to you that it would be a good thing to get those children out of the house?—We never considered that very seriously, but I believe it is a very good idea.

10524. If you get the children away and get the harmless lunatics out of the house you would not have much use for the institutions?—They would not be so very well equipped. But when should we do away with? If you would keep the hospital there and the infirmary you would not send the old infirm people out of their own district.

10525. You have a number of people there that would be very well able to go on a train to Ballinacree, for instance?—They could, of course; but would you save by doing that if you don't improve their condition or position.

10526. It would not take as much to keep up the fever hospital as the whole house?—No.

10527. The fever hospital would very nearly accommodate the sick of Antrim?—It might.

10528. The upkeep of that institution must be considerable, and the expenses of the fuel and a large staff, and all those things, might be reduced?—Yes.

10529. And the people that you would send away to a neighbouring town perhaps could get better treatment without any additional cost?—They might, of course, but I think they would regard it as a great hardship to be sent out of their district. I know there is a feeling among the poor that if Antrim were done away with it would be a great calamity.

10530. We have made inquiries in our visitations and have found out that the people who have been a long time in the body of the house really receive visitors?—Yes; but when they have been there for a long time they begin to regard it as their home, and don't feel the need of outside visitors. I know some old people in Antrim who have been fretting over the thought of leaving it.

10531. But when they had been in the new institution for some time would they not regard that as their home?—But they would be away from the district in which they were brought up.

10532. When you go home I hope you will think over the question of boarding out children?—Yes; I think there is something good about that.

Mr. THOMAS BRYSON examined.

Dec 16, 1905

Mr. Thomas Bryson.

10533. CHAIRMAN.—You are also a member of the Board of Guardians of Antrim?—Yes.

10534. Were you one of the majority or one of the minority? did you support the proposal for amalgamation or vote against it?—I am not clear; I think I voted for amalgamation.

10535. Which would you vote for now if you had to do it again?—I would vote for amalgamation.

10536. What are your reasons for going in favour of amalgamation?—I believe it would tend to economy in the first place; it would do away with a great many of the officials, and I would like to see the Antrim Workhouse utilized for something more useful.

10537. What do you think might be done with it?—I don't know whether I should give a personal opinion.

10538. Certainly?—I think a sanatorium or a school for all the children in the county.

10539. All the workhouse children?—Yes.

10540. Would you prefer sending the workhouse children to a common school to boarding them out?—I think I would board them out.

10541. Therefore you would not make them into a school; you would prefer making it into a sanatorium for consumptives?—Yes. Part of it could be utilized, say, for the very sick—that is to say for anyone who had met with an accident—and I would recommend a place for paying patients—that is to say a person who was able to pay a little and had an adherence to going into a workhouse as a pauper.

10542. We have had cases of that kind come under our notice?—People who would like to pay 2s. or 4s. a week, but we have no place set apart for people of that class.

10543. What would they like—a room to themselves or to be in a pay ward with other paying patients?—A pay ward where there would be six or seven.

10544. It is merely the fact that the other people don't pay that they object to?—Yes; going in as pauper.

10545. But they are not in as persons in the infirmary; they are only in as poor people?—Well, they have that feeling that they are when they are not paying. What I mean to convey is in the case of a person who required proper medical attendance, and was able to pay 4s. or 5s. a ward might be set apart in the workhouse for those people.

10546. I was wondering what the necessity for a ward would be; people sometimes have the idea of getting into a ward by themselves, and after a bit they feel very lonely and are sorry they are there—I would not recommend a ward by themselves. I think the previous witness touched on divisional ratings.

10547. He did?—I don't agree with him; I prefer union rating.

Mr. JOHN McHARGUE examined.

10548. CHAIRMAN.—Did the Licham Board of Guardians consider this question?—They did.

10549. What was the resolution you passed on the subject; for or against amalgamation?—For.

10550. How many unions do you think might be broken up in the county?—If I were speaking for the Board of Guardians I would have to say two, but I think you might go further under certain stringent conditions.

10551. The Board of Guardians thought two; what is your own view of the matter?—I would be prepared to go the whole length, leaving one.

10552. That would be leaving some central one?—Quite so.

10553. Leaving accommodation for the sick backed at each place?—Yes; practically leaving the present poorhouses—that is the Licham, Larnoe, and the rest—as hospitals as far as possible, and do away with all else; you can centralise as far as possible.

10554. Then if before our report came out major ameliorations are improved to a considerable extent you might go further and shut up the hospitals in such places?—It might come to that in the year 2000.

10555. You heard the evidence that was given to-day about moving the aged and infirm from all over the county to one workhouse; do you see any objection to that yourself?—None whatever.

10556. As regards the various classes we would have to get out of the workhouse if that were carried out, the lunatic you would send to the Lunatic asylum or ordinary lunatic asylums?—Yes.

10557. Where do you send?—In the town of Antrim. There is one thing I would like to impress on the Commission, and that is with regard to tramps. I have had great experience for thirty years of tramps passing through Antrim. They go from Belfast to Antrim, and they solicit alms from there leave Belfast to Antrim.

10558. What road do they walk?—The county road—the straight road—and they then go and stay in the workhouse over night, and they leave and go on to Ballymena.

10559. Can they do that in one day's walk; how many miles?—Sixteen miles.

10560. That is a pretty good step for them?—They can do that, and then it is eleven miles from Antrim to Ballymena. I think that tramp question is very difficult to deal with.

10561. It is not a serious one as regards expense. I don't suppose it costs you £50 a year?—I think that police supervision would be a good thing; it would have a deterrent effect.

10562. If a workhouse was closed altogether tramps could not go to it?—If Antrim was closed they will have to tramp from Belfast to Ballymena; I believe that would have a deterrent as far as the tramps are concerned, but in some instances they are deserving people who are destitute, and, of course, they should have a place where they could get a night's lodging.

10563. Do you think it would be unfair to ask such people to get a ticket, say from a relieving officer if there was one in the town, and if not, from the sergeant of police, for a night's lodging if they were entitled as to their being decent people, at some lodging-house, the Guardians to pay?—Yes; I would consider that a good thing to adopt.

10564. It was suggested by some witnesses?—Of course I would strongly recommend the boarding out of children.

10565. How is it that nothing was done in that way at Antrim yet?—Well, we have some children.

10566. Mixed out, but not boarded out?—There are a few.

10567. How is it you did so little?—As to that I cannot say.

10568. You have not started boarding them out until recently?—No.

10569. But, as a Board of Guardians, do you approve of boarding out?—I do, for the reason—it takes them away from the taint of the workhouse.

10570. Mr. McHARGUE.—It gives them a knowledge of domestic life that they never can get in an institution?—Quite so. They get mixing more with the people.

10571. The children?—That is a difficult question. Theoretically, they should be boarded out, but my experience of it is that it is a patch-work system; it does not work; you cannot get people to take them.

10572. That is a very unusual piece of evidence?—It is the truth.

10573. There are some special circumstances in the Licham Union I expect that makes it difficult?—I don't think so.

10574. Small farmers won't take them?—No.

10575. Have you a ladies' committee there?—We had a lady that looked after them.

10576. No; a ladies' committee?—No; I don't think so.

10577. If you had a ladies' committee there is nobody who would make inquiries and get children boarded out more successfully?—I may say that I have had inquiries made of me by persons who wanted them, but they found difficulties in the way.

10578. What were the difficulties?—They think they would not be very useful to them, and they would be inspected very closely, and the cost of keeping them would exceed the profit; the gains would not be worth the candle.

10579. How much do you give in your union?—I cannot say exactly. I should say 2s. or 4s. a week, but I am only speaking from memory; I could not say exactly.

10580. About £5 a year would it be?—Possibly. I give you that under reserve.

10581. Mr. McHARGUE.—You have not tried the

Mr. John McHargue.

Dec. 10, 1901.

Mr. John
M'Hargre,

experiment much. I see you have only two boarded out!—We are willing to board out any we can, but people don't come forward.

10582. In other unions not far away there is competition for the children!—It may be the circumstances of the district; the districts differ very much.

10583. CHAIRMAN.—I think if you get a ladies' committee it will help you in the matter!—I think when all is said and done there will be a consensus that must be attended to—that won't be got on.

10584. If they never come as you cannot get them out. If you don't admit children to the workhouse of the future!—That is another aspect of the question.

10585. Dr. BOGGS.—How much do you give for keeping the boarded-out children; the two you have?—I said my impression is from 2s. to 4s.

10586. If you increased the amount would you not have plenty of applicants?—Ought here; I could not say; but even so, the question still remains, will they get properly trained and equipped for the struggle for existence afterwards; will they be trained to industrial habits; there is that question to be considered.

Dr. BOGGS.—The experience is that nearly every foster mother adopts the child when it becomes fitful; they nearly all do adopt them.

10587. CHAIRMAN.—They really fall into the home life!—I quite approve of it, but I see some difficulties. 10588. Don't you think the training of the home life is better than that of an institution?—It is, if it can be managed. I should be the last to throw difficulties in the way.

CHAIRMAN.—I think if you get a ladies' committee appointed you will be doing a good deal to remove difficulties out of the way.

10589. Mr. MURKIN.—You ought to try a ladies' committee and see if they cannot find suitable homes for some of your children; you have a number of mothering children in your house who are wasting their time!—How is that worked in other places?

CHAIRMAN.—Simply the Guardians name a committee; they need not be Guardians—retirees.

10590. Mr. MURKIN.—Select a committee of four or five ladies who have time at their disposal and are energetic and willing to undertake the work of looking after the children!—We had a lady Guardian who looked after them very closely; she was a committee in herself—Mrs. Keightley.

Mr. MURKIN.—You could hardly expect one lady to do all the work.

10591. CHAIRMAN.—You want ladies from different parts of the union to each look after one parish or district. Would you be in favour of sending women with illegitimate children to a penitentiary?—I have not considered that question. I suppose there should be something done in that line for these people.

10592. Mr. MURKIN.—You did not consider the question of union rating as against divisional rating or dispensary?—As far as my own position is concerned the electoral division rating would be the best arrangement. I live in about the centre of the district, but after all I don't think it is fair; I think the present system works pretty well; I know they are all fairly well satisfied—all the members of the board—and I don't believe that there is a single person getting outdoor relief that the board would like to cut off.

10593. Have you got many on the list?—We have; we have generally from 250 to 300.

10594. Getting on an average 2s. a week or 3s. 1s. From 1s. 6d. to 2s.; 2s. might be the average.

10595. You think there is no person in receipt that is not entitled to it?—I don't think there is. Two of the most economical members of the board were selected as a committee to go round Lismore, and the report of these members was that there was not a soul in Lismore they could strike off; we go over the list periodically.

10596. In the event of amalgamation how would you continue the management of the system; would you leave it as it is, in the hands of the Guardians, or would you alter it in any way to a county administration or dispensary?—To a certain extent I fancy you would need to alter it. Suppose, for instance, you make a big central institution to send the infirm to, I think a committee would be the best in that case.

10597. Ought not the Guardians, in their respective localities, look after the local hospital?—Quite so.

10598. And simply contract for the pay of the infirm that they boarded in the central union of the county?—They could; that would do.

10599. That would be a simple method, and would not arouse much opposition?—That would do very nicely.

10600. And it would not mean additional labour, for the body would meet as a District Council?—Yes. In the case of the Lismore Union there is a difficulty because they don't meet as a District Council and Board of Guardians; we have two District Councils amalgamated to form the Board of Guardians. They met separately as District Councils, and on different days, and combine together to form the Board of Guardians, so that difficulty arises there.

10601. But still you could get over it?—I point out to you that it would need to be looked into.

10602. Have you any view as regards the question of county boundaries—that is to leave every county as it is itself in the administration of its own affairs?—We have the administration except in the case of the Poor Law. I don't know whether it would work well then Lismore.

10603. Now, for instance, if the Guardians were empowered to board out at a neighbouring union would it not work out all right. If there was a workhouse convenient to another union outside that county they could bargain with that county for the upkeep of their destitute poor?—Yes; that would be advisable.

10604. Some witnesses we have heard seemed to think that the counties should be units in themselves for all administrative purposes; you did not think over the matter?—I did many a time, but I don't see just at the moment that it is advisable. Of course you understand the way we are at Lismore; half the union is in the County Down; at present the two counties contribute for the support of the place; if you divide them you cut them into small fragments, and the question arises whether that would be satisfactory or not; you need to have a pretty fair area of change to work one of those places.

10605. Of course it is a matter for close inquiry?—It is a matter that, in my opinion, would raise controversy to the whole spirit of your Commission. You are to effect amalgamation; this would be a scotching.

10606. No; it would be only marking out more clearly the lines of the different administrative entities; don't you think there is some little difficulty in having two counties interlocked in that way?—We have not found any as yet; there may be a difficulty in carrying out any scheme you would draw up for Parliament.

10607. You have no views to give on that particular point?—No; nothing definite. There is the question of canals; we are plagued with them to an extent that is unusual; we are a distributing centre for Astor, Lurgan, Banbridge, and Newry, from what the police tell me. Newry is the only place that sprouts in the North of Ireland; we have about 4,000 a year, eighty a week.

10608. CHAIRMAN.—What do you think about it?—If the scheme I have outlined is carried out it would solve the question automatically, but if not I think we should be provided with more powers in regard to these people.

10609. Would you be satisfied with the powers they have in England of detaining them?—That is what we proposed, and it was adopted by the board once or twice.

10610. Do you think that would be sufficient?—I don't think it would be sufficient, but it would tend towards it.

10611. If you could close your workhouse they have no place to go to!—I have already given you the power that it would tend to solve it.

10612. Mr. MURKIN.—Still there ought to be some provision for a person who was destitute and had no shelter?—Yes; and it would be a danger to the community if there were not.

10613. And also it would be very undesirable?—Yes.

10614. If some arrangement could be made that the Guardians would be empowered to furnish the rest of a bed and breakfast for a person of that kind would it not be a simple method?—It would; but it is not in the score of expense that we deal with this question; it is on moral and sentimental grounds; they give a great deal of trouble in the workhouse besides.

10615. Supposing the casual or tramp had to go to the police station and state his case to the sergeant, and the sergeant would have power to give him a ticket to some lodging-house where he would get his bed and breakfast, and the Guardians should pay for it!—That would be quite satisfactory.

10616. The sergeant would know him, and if he came often would begin to deal with him in another way?—Yes. We are in the vicinity of a big town, with hospitals; our poor sometimes have to go to Belfast.

10027. CHAIRMAN.—You have got two hospitals in your own town?—Yes; but in special circumstances they have to go to Belfast. Of course we have the power of sending them by admitting them into the workhouse first and then sending them, but there are cases arise, and there is one case occurs to me at the moment—that of a child suffering from intussusception—that child was taken away to the Children's Hospital, twelve miles off, in Belfast, and its life was saved, and the decision to send it there was arrived at in an hour. I think the Guardians should have the power to bear the cost of such a thing.

10028. You propose the Guardians should have the power to send any poor person?—Not to send, but to bear the cost after they are sent, when they have investigated the matter; it would have been too late in this case.

10029. Able to defray the cost of any poor persons being sent to hospital?—Yes; that you should relax the bonds of red tape.

10030. It is the bonds of red tape in the unions and hospitals. One person suggested what you suggest, but that it should be on the recommendation of one of the relieving officers?—Yes; or any medical officer at all.

10031. Dr. BROOKS.—I suppose you would say dispensary doctor?—I should like to relax this red tape business.

10032. You must draw the line somewhere; if a person is able to pay a private medical man why should he be paid for out of the rates afterwards; if it is a poor person then the Guardians might pay afterwards?—Well, that seems reasonable; subject, of course, to the approval of the Local Government Board.

10033. CHAIRMAN.—Their approval would not be necessary to that?—I should think it would be in this case; it might be abused. I should think there should be proper precautions taken.

10034. There is not much danger of its being abused; it does not give a person any pleasure to go to hospital?—In districts surrounding a big town where there are hospitals available they should be made available.

10035. Dr. BROOKS.—Would you like to give more liberty to Guardians or their medical officers to send cases to large city hospitals without going into the workhouse at all?—That is the gist of my evidence.

10036. At a fixed rate per day or week?—That would be too delicate a matter for me to go into.

Dec. 16, 1901.

Mr. John
McHarg.

The Sitting was adjourned.

Dec. 17, 1903.

TWENTIETH PUBLIC SITTING—THURSDAY, DECEMBER 17TH, 1903.

At the Courthouse, Belfast.

Present:— Mr. MICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. CORY BROOKS.

Dr. GEORGE ST. GEORGE examined.

Dr. George
St. George.

10627. CHAIRMAN.—You are the Medical Officer of the Lifford County Infirmary?—Yes, the County Antrim Infirmary.

10628. Would you just let the Commission know your views?—Of course I can say nothing on the amalgamation of unions; that point is beyond me; I think myself, of course, there are too many unions in Antrim, but to give any idea as to what unions should be broken up, or how it should be done, is beyond my ideas.

But from a medical point of view I think it would be wise if the hospitals at present attached to unions were disseminated from them so as to relieve them of the idea of pauperism, and made, if possible, district hospitals, or abolished, as might follow amalgamation. I think there is great necessity for some form of district hospital for infectious diseases, over and above the present fever hospitals to which respectable people might go on payment. As it stands at present a respectable person of the middle class has nowhere to go except to the union, and the consequences are they are nursed often in their own homes, with the result of spreading infection through the house and neighbourhood.

10629. Of course you know that the fever hospitals attached to the workhouses are largely availed of by respectable people?—Fairly.

10630. Much more so than the infirmaries?—I quite agree with you. I also think that there should be some attempt made to try and get patients to pay. In the infirmary, of which I am surgeon for the last three years, we have been trying to get patients to pay and we find it worked very successfully. The year before last we got £291 in small sums from paying patients, and last year, that is the year ended 30th November, 1903, the fees rose to £165.

10631. Was there any special reason for that increase?—Simply that we are working them more into the habit of giving. On the issue of admission the governor puts the rank in life of the patient; his means and whether it is the bread-winner or otherwise is coming in; puts on what he thinks right, and tells the patient or his friends that he thinks so and so should be done, and they pay that sum so much weekly, or else when they are leaving.

10632. There is no compulsion?—No compulsion whatever; they pay sums varying from 1s. 6d. to 10s.

10633. You have no power?—No power at all.

10634. Do you think there is any necessity for you to get the power?—At present it is working very well.

10635. You don't see any necessity for the power?—As far as my hospital is concerned it is working very well.

10636. Do you think the people are really giving as much as they can afford?—I do. Of course we have private wards as well, for which a patient pays a much larger sum for getting the use of that private ward, but that is not so much availed of as the general ward of the hospital. In reference to the amount of work done in the county infirmary last year, ending 30th of November, I treated 335 cases in the hospital, and those are from all parts of the county. Now at the present moment—today—I have patients in the hospital from Ballycastle, Ballymoney, two from Ballymena, two from Cullybackey, Bandalstown, Toome Bridge, Crumlin, Antrim, &c. Last month I discharged a patient from Portrush.

10637. Dr. BROOKS.—Is it anything like the same proportion as in the immediate district round Lifford?—Oh, no.

10638. They are exceptional cases?—They are; the same would apply no matter where the hospital was in Ireland; people think a great deal about sending patients away from their friends, and no matter where

a hospital is it will be availed of by the neighbourhood more than the more distant places. There is a very large extern, but that does not draw on the funds of the infirmary. I simply give advice free; the patients get the prescription, and must provide their own medicine outside; there are about 550 externs, but they have to provide their own medicine; they don't not the hospital anything at all except the paper the prescription is written on.

10639. Do you treat many extern patients for surgical diseases?—Very few, except exceptionally small fractures of the arm or collar bone, and small accidents.

10640. Do you think there are any changes desirable in connection with the county infirmary?—Nothing, except that I think it would be advisable if the Board of Guardians had power to send patients to me in difficult cases; the dispensary doctors do send them to me from a distance, but then a patient has to pay his own expenses coming, and I think it is cases where they are not able to pay their own expenses I don't see why the authorities should not pay them. Of course Lifford contributes very largely to the infirmary. Two years ago we had a large basins at Lifford, and raised £1,100, with which we put the whole infirmary into thorough repair; refitted everything; put in ventilating shafts into all the wards, and put up, as you saw yourselves, an operating theatre, and made it up-to-date. Then, again, at the Queen's Jubilee, 1887, the town bought, and presented the house next door, to make the nurses' home, the private ward, which is now attached and part of the building of the county infirmary, and in 1897 they presented us with an ambulance which cost £115.

10641. What does your annual subscription amount to?—I suppose it would be about £400 between collections and one thing and another; the milk subscribes, and the people about, and the churches in the town and neighbourhood.

10642. The County Council contribute?—£500 of my salary; that is £294, and out of that they receive £50 from the Corporation of Belfast, and £3 10s towards my salary.

10643. Do the Corporation of Belfast receive £294?—They do, and more.

10644. Do many patients go from Belfast to Ballymena; there are, at present, three patients from Belfast; we have between thirty and forty every year from Belfast.

10645. Is that from Donaghadee?—No; inside the boundary.

10646. Ballymore?—Perhaps so; some come from the other end of the town.

10647. CHAIRMAN.—Would those people who had family connections with Lifford?—Some, and perhaps it is agitated to say—have heard of me. I have a patient wanting to come in from Ballymena, and won't come until my arm is well. I have not been in Ballymena since I was at school there as a boy.

10648. Dr. BROOKS.—Are your funds ample?—This year we had a balance, for the first time, of £30 out and above our expenditure. Mrs. J. M. Becher presented £2,000 to the infirmary, to be (granted in condition of the infirmary remaining in Lifford) if it is removed from Lifford that is forfeited.

10649. Do you get many patients from the County Down?—Forty or fifty a year, and these patients must pay 10s. a week to come in; that is understood.

10650. You won't admit a person free from the County Down?—No.

10651. Would you suggest any changes in reference to that?—Yes; I went to the County Council of Down twice on a deputation; the first time they were rather

against us, but the last time they appeared inclined to meet us, partly when they saw the names and residence of the patients who came, and as by the Local Government Act it is perfectly competent for them to agree with the Antrim Council to arrange for these patients, the County Antrim Council, at the last meeting of the Board of Management, asked could we suggest what should be done. I suggested we should go in for a policy of reciprocity—the County Down Council should give 10s. a week for their patients and we should give 10s. a week for any Antrim ones who went into Down; but if a patient paid anything for his keep that was to be deducted from the 10s. charged to the County Down, and vice versa; it is only in preliminary negotiations at present.

10652. Do you think that would meet the case?—I think it would, because by the Act there would be a member of the County Down Council on the Board of Management of the County Antrim Infirmary, the same is at present with the Belfast Corporation—Dr. O'Donnell represents the Corporation of Belfast on the Infirmary Board.

10653. You have an ambulance in connection with your infirmary?—Yes, it was given to us.

10654. Have you any trouble in the working of it?—It is used fairly about the neighbourhood, but not at any distance, because we have to charge for the hiring of it—make the patient's friends pay. That, I think, could also be well managed if they allowed us a grant for the expense of hiring so as to allow the patients to be brought in free; it is a very fine ambulance, and I think it is a pity it is not more used.

10655. I don't think it is a general thing in connection with county infirmaries; you are rather exceptional?—Yes; we make the patients pay the hiring of it, but even that sometimes proves a poor people who have to be brought in.

10656. Should the County Council have power to defray all necessary expenses of the infirmary leaving the subscriptions for improvements and matters of that kind?—I think it would be better.

10657. You think it would really work better?—I do.

10658. You are in a wealthy district, and probably have a larger number of subscriptions than most county infirmaries in Ireland?—Perhaps so; Lisburn is a very large manufacturing centre, and the workers in the mills not only subscribe freely, but the owners of the mills do.

10659. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you think that would not have the effect of closing up private contributions?—I would think not, because the private contributor would be still a governor and have a right to recommend; he would get value for his money.

10660. Dr. BROWN.—It was mentioned about a patient from Lisburn Union having been sent to Belfast for an operation; could that case have been well enough treated at Lisburn?—Yes; I am connected by telephone with Belfast; I have a very large consulting staff; Professor Sinclair is the consulting surgeon; Dr. Caldwell of the Royal Infirmary, Dr. Cecil Shaw is the ophthalmic surgeon, and Dr. Campbell is the gynaecologist. Those are all honorary, but they are available at short intervals. I have a telephone that was put in by a private friend. A case of appendicitis was sent by a local medical man to the Royal Infirmary and Mr. Kirk, of the Royal Hospital, advised the Board of Management to send it back to me, so they thought it was crowded enough with their own cases. It was done so, and in the presence of those medical men I operated in the case of appendicitis. In that case of misapprehension the doctor thought it was better to send it to the Children's Hospital; I have a children's ward, especially reserved for children, and I am available at day and night; I have a telephone from the infirmary to my own bedroom; I have a large staff, and a trained matron, and a trained nurse.

10661. Do you train your own nurses?—Yes.

10662. You have no difficulty in getting probationers?—None at all; we won't let them have less than a three years' course. I lecture during the winter; give thirty-five lectures, and see that they are examined by independent men from Belfast; Mr. Kirk and Mr. Caldwell act as my examiners, and the certificate is granted with my approval; no nurse receives a certificate until she has completed three years' training in the wards and has passed an examination.

10663. CHAIRMAN.—How much has the present infirmary cost of recent years for structural changes?—We might say about £500 or £700 last year; the County Council have given us nothing towards im-

provements, and the house is indeed in bad repair.

10664. Is it an old town house?—It is an old house modified.

10665. It is not a property that the county would lose on if they were to sell, wishing to rebuild?—It would have to be pulled down; it is a good site; there is a good garden beside it.

10666. Would the house not sell?—I don't think so; it is built in a curious way, like an E with the middle part left out, and that would be very awkward; there have been so many changes made in it.

10667. At all events they would never dream of pulling it down before they sold it?—I think not.

10668. Mr. MURKIN.—At present it is not county property?—I think it has been decided that the infirmaries are not county property but the Board of Management property; I think it was decided in reference to Omagh.

10669. Dr. BROWN.—I understand the decision was the other way, that they are county property?—I am not sure. Of course it is a very old house, but we have improved it so much recently, except that it is a little overcrowded.

10670. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose you would be glad to see a good modern hospital erected?—I would.

10671. If such a modern hospital were erected do you think it would be necessary to keep open any other sick wards in the town of Lisburn?—Except for what you might call insanities, chronic infirmities, rheumatic cases, and bronchitis that would not be treated in a general hospital unless you added infirm wards to those, but as far as the sick and surgical cases I would say no.

10672. It would be unnecessary to have any other provision?—That is what I would think; my experience of the workhouse in Lisburn is that there are very few acute cases—I am excluding fever cases—there are very few acute cases in it, and I know for the last twenty years there has not been an operation performed in it of any consequence. In the County Antrim Infirmary, last year, I did eighty or ninety operations.

10673. You have a good exercise ground there?—Oh, yes, very good, half an acre of garden.

10674. For patients to exercise?—Yes; of course. I don't receive any consumptive cases; there is a great want of a sanatorium for the county into which phthisical cases can be sent; it is not good for the sufferers, and worse still for the other patients, to treat them in the general ward of a hospital, and if you crowd a number of phthisical cases in an ordinary ward I don't think it is good for the patients; some at home do make shelter, and open air treatment is greatly wanted for the North of Ireland on the lines of the Foster Green's Hospital in Belfast.

10675. Mr. MURKIN.—An attempt has been made, on a small scale, at Coolhill?—I did not know that, but I think it would be a very good plan.

10676. Dr. BROWN.—Do you know anything about the sanatorium treatment; have you any suggestion to make with regard to it?—Except what I have suggested, that the open air treatment of the cases would be desirable. I think that while lunatics should be sent to an asylum, imbeciles should be treated more on the style of trying to teach them something and elevating them something, on the style of the epileptic colonies in England. The treatment of the insane, of course, we need not go into at all; I have nothing to do with it.

10677. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you not think that it would be well to have a considerable quantity of land around one of these institutions—don't you think it would be advisable to have scope for the employment of those people who are able to do something?—You are speaking of unions?—

10678. Yes; don't you think it would be desirable to have land on which these people could be occupied in doing little things; it would shorten the day on there; benefit their health and they would rest better at night?—Perfectly; quite true; and I think too that it would also make them feel that they are helping to contribute to themselves; I think anything which makes persons feel that they are not paupers will elevate them more or less.

10679. The cases I refer to are the infirm and aged people; to have a place where those able to work could be occupied?—I agree with you; it would raise them above the idea of being perfectly destitute if they were doing something for themselves.

Dec. 17, 1905.
—
Dr. George
St. George.

Dec. 17, 1903.
 Dr. George
 St. George.

10580. Something of a home form on a large scale that would occupy these people when they are fit to do anything!—Yes, instead of, as at present, loafing around the yard.

10581. We find, as we go on our visitation, that they are cooped up in wards where they have no exercise and very little ventilation; it seems to me that in any

change that takes place some central place should be obtained where there would be a good deal of land about it that these people could be kept, with the weather was good, in doing little turns which, perhaps would lighten their hours!—I quite agree with you; it would make them sleep better, eat better, and live longer, and feel that they had some interest in life.

Dr. ELIZABETH BELL CONTINUED.

Dr. Elizabeth
 Bell.

10582. Dr. BROWN.—Would you just tell the members of the Commission your views?—Miss Blackburn, the matron of the Rescue Maternity Home, is here. We wish to bring under your notice the cases of unmarried mothers with their first children—first cases. We have here a record of the cases helped in our Rescue and Maternity Home, 28, Malena-place, Belfast, during the past three years—thirty-two cases in all. Mothers—married, 2; in service, 23; in workrooms, 3; fever nurses, 1; in own homes, 1; dead, 1; fallen again, 1; total, 32. Children—living, 27; dead, 5; total, 32. The last seven cases on the list were women we kept in the Home after, and sometimes before their confinement, and whom we assisted to find suitable foster-mothers for their children. We found these cases the most hopeful, and two years ago the Maternity Home was added to the rescue work to keep these girls out of the maternity ward of the workhouse from the inmates of which place the girl was likely to acquire a deeper knowledge of evil, and come out later beggars, helpless, and reckless, and without a friend to help her or her child. In our Maternity Home we take the women in care to three months before the birth and keep them three weeks to three months afterwards. The patients pay 5s. weekly, or some lady interested pays, or helps to pay, the amount. We make it a rule to write to the alleged father, and usually the paternity is not denied. In two cases help was given in a lump sum, and in two the mothers got married. The keep of a child in a good home costs, usually, about 5s. weekly; this means £15 a year; a sum the girl finds it impossible to pay without assistance out of her small wages. Of the thirty-two cases we have had twelve have been helped by Dr. Barnardo; at present he is helping ten cases with sums varying from 2s. 6d. to 3s. 6d. weekly. We help the mothers to get suitable employment and to find suitable foster-mothers for their children; we encourage them to visit at the Home frequently. When in the Home, as patients, we keep them as much apart as possible, as even some of these first cases are not suitable for treatment with others. We like to make the mother breastfeed her child, if only for a few weeks, so as to strengthen the natural bond between mother and child. We would like to extend this period, and at the same time train the mother, if untrained, to fit her for better paid domestic service. In the after care of each case we encourage them, as I said, to visit the Home, and here again we find it best not to let the girls meet. We see that they visit their children, and if the child is at nurse, out of Belfast, we advise the mother to ask for part of a day each month instead of the weekly night out. We would like to look after the girls on this weekly night out allowed in domestic service, and perhaps teach them to sew, make clothes for themselves and their children, or learn anything else that might help them in their positions in life.

10583. Is the period that you keep them after the birth of the child from three weeks to three months?—Some of the cases we would like to keep longer.

10584. Is the difficulty about funds your reason for not keeping them longer?—Yes; the girl has to pay, or some one interested in her. It is altogether a question of money; some we could not keep. Some girls are in good situations, and would not stay longer than three weeks, and they got back to their situations, and a good many mistresses take back the girl.

10585. Dr. BROWN.—And look after them?—Yes; they are very good to them now; they need not to take them back.

10586. CHATELAIN.—Have you had repetitions?—One out of these thirty-two, and that girl was in and out of a workhouse in her childhood, and came from Hampton House—one of the industrial homes.

10587. That was hardly a case for you to take at all?—She was a very nice girl; we hoped she would be all

right; she has a second baby now, born in the workhouse; it was another girl we blessed.

10588. Would it be at all attributable to the facility with which they can come and go to your Home and get rid of the child?—Oh, no; it was really this girl's companion was blamed for leading her wrong a second time, and she stopped coming to the Home.

10589. You did not take in any case a second time?—No, not this girl; she went to the workhouse. We have taken two second cases, but they were quite separate from the others, and counted as rescue cases; we got them out of the Magdalens.

10590. Are you short of funds?—No, sir.

10591. Miss Blackburn.—Funds are collected in the town.

10592. CHATELAIN.—Do you find that you can raise enough money for your ordinary working expenses?—We have done so; but it means a good deal of work for the ladies.

10593. You have trouble to collect it?—Yes.

Dr. Bell.—Dr. Barnardo helps the girls afterwards.

Miss Blackburn.—Some of these girls would not have been able to support their children.

10594. CHATELAIN.—Are you the medical attendant to the institution?—Yes.

10595. Do you happen to know whether your committee would be willing if the Board of Guardians or local authorities came to the decision to ask you whether you would be willing to accept first cases?—We refuse no first cases.

10596. And if necessary you would even accept second cases?—Yes; but we would not like them to mix with first cases.

10597. Of course not!—These would be treated as rescue cases.

10598. If the Boards of Guardians came to the conclusion that it would be wise to exclude all women under these circumstances from workhouses in future, would you be willing, as far as your institution permits, to accept all such cases?—Do you mean third and fourth cases?

10599. Every case in fact?—I could not answer.

10600. As far as first cases you certainly would?—Yes; we are just interested in first cases and considerably in rescue cases and young girls.

10601. The difficulty would be if the Guardians were not enabled to deal with the whole of that class there might be a difficulty in merely handling over some!—First cases are so much more hopeful.

10602. One would hope that one would see the lot of these chronic mothers of Magdalens children if such efforts were made to exclude them from smothering together without any classification!—Yes; even some of the second and even third cases are not so bad.

10603. I think you might talk it over with your committee!—I think so.

10604. Dr. BROWN.—Was it started altogether for first cases?—Yes; it was really started on account of these first cases; these seven cases we did not know what to do with them, and the maternity ward was opened not to let them go into the world.

10605. Mr. CHATELAIN.—How long has your institution been in operation?—Only two years for the maternity part, but before that we helped some of the girls, keeping them before and after.

10606. So you have not had any lengthened experience as to the value of the work you are doing; the fruits may be later on!—They may.

10607. Dr. BROWN.—Are the committee satisfied so far as they have gone?—Yes; and really the girls look well, and they are very grateful and thankful.

Mr. Oswald.—Some years ago a member of our Guardians moved, and I was a supporter, that the lady should be appointed a warder to our institution. At the end of a few weeks we found this lady was sending so many cases down to us that we had to withdraw her name as a warder, for one of the Guardians found that if these poor girls who went to this institution could not pay they brought them down to the gate and the master had to admit them.

10707. CHAIRMAN.—That is owing to want of funds, which naturally is to be expected. What we wanted to find out was would the Guardians be willing to supply funds if the machinery was well managed.

Mr. Oswald.—You will find we have plenty of machinery. Am. 17, 1902.

Miss Blackburn.—This House was in connection with the Midnight Mission; that was the foundation of it. Dr. Elizabeth Bell.

Dr. DAVID WHISON examined.

10708. Dr. BINGER.—You appear for the Belfast Rural District Council No. 1?—Yes.

10709. Would you just let us know what your views are?—In answer to the queries we received the Council are opposed to separation unless we are separated for all purposes, and to No. 2 question there was no reply.

10710. Are you opposed to the separation of the Belfast Rural District from the Belfast Union?—Yes.

10711. It was mentioned here yesterday that you were willing to be separated?—It was never put before the District Council.

10712. That was not the decision of the District Council?—It was not; the decision of the District Council was that they were opposed to be separated.

10713. CHAIRMAN.—Unanimously?—Yes, it was.

10714. Dr. BINGER.—You answer here *that the Council is opposed to the separation of the Belfast Union unless at the same time the Belfast Rural District as a county district is obliterated and divided between the surrounding districts?—Yes.

10715. CHAIRMAN.—You don't like too small an area of charge?—No, sir; we don't wish to be separated for Poor Law purposes.

10716. On account of the area of charge?—Yes.

10717. Mr. MURKIN.—You want to keep beside the back neighbour?—We want to be where it would be convenient for the poor.

10718. Dr. BINGER.—No. 31—All pauper children should be boarded out in unions to foster parents to nurse, and as far as possible boarded out to small farmers and brought up to a country life.

10719. You would rather have them brought up as farm labourers than mill-hands?—Certainly.

10720. Query No. 41—In unions like Belfast the law and procedure and the administration should be so altered that the children could be boarded out beyond the limit of the union.

10721. You could do that at present?—It is only in very few cases it has been done in my presence, and I have been a long time in the workhouse as a Guardian. Powers to adopt the children extended, and generally to enlarge the powers of Guardians as to the boarding out of children, also to send paupers back to their own districts who have not worked at least six months in the union.

10722. Would not that be very troublesome to work; would not the other districts require to have the same power of sending you cases in; would it not mean a good deal of inconvenience?—Of course we would be taking and giving; we would have to receive our own and give away the strangers.

10723. No. 51—We recommend a sanatorium for consumptives.

10724. Do you wish to enlarge upon that in any way?—No, sir.

10725. CHAIRMAN.—There is one for the city of Belfast—There is a Foster Green Hospital; not on the river.

10726. Is there one in contemplation?—Yes, there is.

10727. Dr. BINGER.—No. 61—No reply.

10728. No. 71—Sick, insane poor, not destitute, should pay part of the cost of treatment; the Guardians should have power to set apart a ward or wards and fix the scale of payment.

10729. Do you think that would be largely availed of?—I think it would.

10730. You have a number that pay for the cost of maintenance?—Yes.

10731. You would rather have that extended so as to make different scales of charges?—Certainly.

10732. Would you say what the scale might extend to—from the lowest to the highest?—We did not think of that.

10733. Anything about the lunatics?—No; we did not say anything about that.

10734. CHAIRMAN.—You have a large number in Belfast—between 130 and 150. Is there a desire on the part of the Guardians to get them out?—There is.

10735. Dr. BINGER.—Regarding tramps?—A labour or task should be imposed on all, with a power to detain them until completed.

10736. Habitual tramps?—They should be detained and prosecuted as vagrants.

10737. Do you wish to enlarge on that?—I do not.

10738. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you speak as a professional gentleman or a representative of the Guardians?—A representative of the District Council.

10739. CHAIRMAN.—You are Chairman of the District Council?—Yes.

10740. Mr. MURKIN.—When you say your body is opposed to separation I would like to know from you what you mean by that?—We don't wish to be separated and joined to Larne, Larne, or Antrim Unions.

10741. Do you not know that there is a waste of forces in having a larger number of institutions than is actually necessary?—Yes.

10742. And if some arrangement could be made, I suppose you have sufficient accommodation for the sick in the neighbourhood of Belfast?—We have.

10743. I suppose you are in favour of boarding out children?—Yes.

10744. I presume you are in favour of sending inmates to auxiliary asylums or somewhere where they could be better taken care of than at present?—Yes.

10745. I suppose you would have no objection to sending unmanageable patients to a place where there would be some hope of reformation?—I would not.

10746. When you take away these several classes you would have hardly anybody left but the infirm; do you think there would be any hardship in having an arrangement with a central union where the people would have sunshine and air, to send them there and board them, the Guardians having control of their own area as at present?—I don't think I would object to that.

10747. If that could be done on a better basis and without any additional money you would not disapprove of it?—I would not.

10748. You would not have any objection to removing from Belfast Workhouse to a central place where they could have better country life and some little expense the districts—those chronic cases not in need of medical aid?—No; I would not object to that.

10749. Would you approve of the Guardians getting extended powers in regard to tramps—power of turning them over to the police—or do you think something like the English system of detention would be sufficient?—I think the habitual tramps should be treated as vagrants, and turned over to the police.

10750. The suggestion was made during the course of our inquiry that it would be well to make these casuals go to the police station for shelter, empowering the Guardians to pay for a night's lodging and breakfast; do you think that would be an improvement?—It would be.

10751. CHAIRMAN.—This matter has not been considered by the Guardians, so that the opinion you have expressed is merely a personal opinion?—Yes.

10752. If you had some poor sick and infirm people, and they were taken to Larne or Larnoe or Newtownards, would it not be a very expensive thing for their friends to go occasionally and see them?—The distance being considerable, it would be expensive.

10753. Mr. MURKIN.—But the idea I put before you was to retain hospitals for the sick and only send the chronic cases to the central place?—I understood that.

10754. Where they would have exercise and fresher air, and, if possible, better treatment?—Yes.

Dr. O'CONNELL examined.

Dec. 27, 1902. I should like to give you my views in case you come to some conclusion in regard to amalgamation about the hospitals, as that is the point I am best acquainted with. I am senior surgeon of the Mater Hospital here, and I have taken a considerable interest in public health and have had opportunities of seeing the system of hospitals in various countries—quite recently in America. I have just returned from a couple of months' trip there. I consider that Belfast stands in a position by itself, in regard to the subject matter of your Commission, quite different from the country. As regards the country, my views briefly are that, owing to the great decrease in population and the fact that these workhouses were built for a very much larger number, that amalgamation of some sort should take place; where you have perhaps only fifty people where there was accommodation for 500, I think some arrangement should be made, especially as I think it is quite agreed now that the children should be taken from the surroundings, that it is not desirable to continue children among the people who form the population of a workhouse. Boarding them out is a very excellent system, and would cover a good many of them, but the remainder, I fancy, or a selected number, should be brought to some central place and taught some useful trade.

10704. CHAIRMAN.—If the law were enlarged sufficiently, would you see any objection to boarding out all?—If it could be done, especially in the country districts. Probably they would be better to be trained as labourers, of which there is a great scarcity, than as tradesmen, but if required a certain number of them might be attached to the industrial schools in various large centres, such as Dublin, Belfast, or Cork. The epileptics will also have to be, I fancy, farmed out in some way, so that that reduces the number that exists still further. Then I am sorry to say that my view is that the population of this country is still on the decline, and will continue, and although I take a great interest in this technical education I feel the first effect of it will be to give a further impetus to emigration; we will have a great number of highly trained young persons of both sexes, and I am afraid that for some years we will not have the means of employing them outside Belfast, especially when they will not go back to the country, and I fear the effect will be to still further increase emigration; we have not touched bottom yet.

10705. Going away with knowledge—I am glad to say that they are going with knowledge, and not as formerly—without knowledge—and then there is no intention of coming back to this country. I gathered that in America.

10706. Don't you think that some of them come back?—Very few. I regret that exceedingly; so on this ground I am in favour of amalgamation generally. Having said so, I now want to state my opinion that although you may abolish a certain number of the workhouses it will be absolutely necessary to continue some form of rural hospitals for certain cases. Now, if I had my own will, I would start a new hospital independent of the workhouse altogether.

10707. If you got all the other inmates out of it then you have nobody but the sick remaining?—If you did that, with a good many alterations, because some of the hospitals I have seen are not at all adapted to modern hospital requirements.

10708. Do you think it would be cheaper to build a small cottage hospital?—Decidedly; you could build a one-story building, with good air about, and space, and a fever hospital, which will always be an essential.

10709. Do you think the sale of the site might go a long way towards building?—Decidedly; if industry began to flourish I don't see why these fine buildings should not be utilised and sold for a good price. I suppose it is outside the scope of your Inquiry to allude to county infirmaries?

10710. No?—I consider county infirmaries are for the most part hardly the use they were intended for. First of all, county infirmaries, as far as they are supported by the county, don't do the work as a sort of high-class hospital for the county.

10711. In Ulster have you seen them lately? we have been just round there?—I am fairly acquainted with them. I am a member of the County Antrim Infirmary for some years, but I don't speak of it; it is very well conducted.

10712. We have found many of them quite modern?—Many important cases in the old days were sent to the

county infirmaries because transport to the large cities and surrounding hospitals was difficult; that has now gone away. In the county infirmaries you have very efficient men who are able to do a great many of the ordinary operations, and do them very well. The consequence is that I believe in a great many cases the county infirmaries simply serve as a hospital for a limited radius of fourteen or fifteen miles.

10713. Are you aware of many union hospitals outside of large places, like Belfast, where they have suitable rooms and conditions for operating?—They have not the modern conditions, but they are in a high position, and with cleanliness and everything else they seem to succeed very well.

10714. Would you like to operate yourself in a ward there?—No, certainly not; still in the country in a small union ward it would be quite possible to keep the place sanitary; there is no place so suitable as where every provision was made. In most of the towns where there is a county infirmary you have also a union hospital on a large scale. I certainly say the county infirmary should be quite sufficient for the limited population of the county towns of Ireland, and I see no necessity of carrying on two hospitals in a small town. So that the funds would be available for further extension of cottage or district hospitals. In regard to Belfast, it is a very large concern, and it requires a great deal of judgment in managing it.

10715. There are two main outside hospitals here?—Yes.

10716. Do they rely largely on voluntary contributions?—Altogether, or else on some small endowments.

10717. Is there a great difficulty to raise the necessary funds?—Great pressure always.

10718. A great many poor are treated in these hospitals?—Yes; but not the extreme poor, except they come in as accidents; they seem to differentiate to some degree.

10719. Has there ever been a question of getting public aid for these hospitals?—It is always a question existing here.

10720. I don't mean public charity?—It has been mooted in the City Corporation from time to time, but nothing has been done.

10721. The question has not been raised?—Not formally.

10722. What would be your view on that question?—There are two sides to it; you might dry up the source of benevolence if you had it altogether on the city or locally supported.

10723. Suppose you were to divide the expenditure into two classes, expenditure on what would be absolutely necessary and expenditure that would be desirable, although not absolutely necessary?—I would be inclined to take the absolutely necessary from local sources.

10724. And look to charity for the other?—Yes; we have had to build those two large hospitals in recent years, and it certainly was a great call on the benevolence of the people of Ulster and Belfast.

10725. You are not over-hospitalised in Belfast?—Not by any means; yet in fact we were in a most deplorable condition until the last seven years; if it were not for the union hospital it could not be managed at all. The number of sick in Belfast hospitals sometimes goes up to 1,200 or 1,500; of course a great many of the chronic cases will always be dumped there, but I think it is a pity that there is such a waste of fine clinical material as it is at present in the Belfast hospitals. It is bad for the students, because if there was an efficient clinical class there operations would be done on so extensive a scale, and the class of cases we have in Belfast—sub-acute—could be very much relieved and sent much out, and cease to be a burden on the rates. It would be good for the medical students and school and good for the man who has to operate and lecture; it is a great waste of fine arrangements. At present there is a fair amount of work being done, but it is a very small proportion of what might be done, judging from the reports of chloroform cases they had last year, it seemed only to be a little over 100. I would expect them to do at least ten times that amount.

10726. I suppose they don't aim at doing all capital or major operations they can get?—From time to time it has been talked of.

10727. They would rather see them going perhaps to your hospital or the other?—The staff there is not sufficient to contend with the number of cases by any means.

10792. that they have a very good staff—A splendid staff, especially the fever department, which was once provided for by your colleagues, and now very efficiently by Dr. Robb. The staff is very excellent, but the management is not sufficient to develop a clinical school and do the work that is absolutely necessary.

10793. What you regret is that such a good hospital should not be availed of for clinical purposes?—Quite so. In a continental city they would be sure to use that for the purpose.

10794. Dr. BROWN.—The fever hospital is clinical, surely—I am quite aware of that, but it will be reversed in a very short time. I really think the abandoned people should be put to do something in the nature of work. Then in regard to the fever hospital and your general system, I think it is a great pity that any better-class patient who has to go in should have to submit to what he considers the indignity of putting on the workhouse uniform; that is a piece of out-of-date clothing that might be very well dropped.

10795. CHAIRMAN.—They can have a different dress for them if they like, such as serge clothes; it is not at all according to regulation that they should be all dressed in proper grey?—It is a custom that obtains throughout the country.

10796. Dr. BROWN.—Have you anything to say about district hospitals in isolated districts?—I would be strongly in favour of erecting small hospitals there—set at a very great expense—and conducting them as cheaply as possible; they are absolutely essential.

10797. Would you suggest any steel?—It would be in relation to the population, but for acute cases I think you would want very few beds if you deal with your chronic cases in some central place; very few of them would do.

10798. Do you think it could be worked very inexpensively?—I think so. Somebody suggested that some workhouses might be used as sanatoria for consumptives. I am thoroughly opposed to that; the buildings are unsuited, and they are generally in the town, or on the edge of the town; that is not the idea of the open-air treatment at all—it is some place further out.

10799. CHAIRMAN.—Are you aware it has been tried at one workhouse at Cootahill by Dr. Moorhead?—I was not aware of it.

10800. His figures are very encouraging; he has open-air sheds?—There are very few patients there now. It is one of the places that I presume if there was amalgamation would have to go; it is practically in the town; of course it is on a nice elevation, but the fact of those solid walls and the prison-like aspect of the workhouse buildings—

10801. He has them outside?—Of course if you have sufficient ground, and in the country, that objection would be more or less done away with, but not for the sleeping accommodation at night; on a large scale I don't think they would be suitable.

10802. You would like to see some special hospital?—Quite so.

10803. Mr. MURKIN.—Have you seen the fever hospitals attached to the unions throughout the country?—Yes; I have in former days.

10804. Do you not think they would be suitable for small hospital purposes; they are fairly modern?—You have the surroundings—the environment of the old poor-houses there. I would rather start in the new, and not have a poorhouse or workhouse hospital at all; there is a good deal of sentiment about it, I confess, and then, as regards the buildings, they are not our ideas of ventilation, even the most modern of them.

10805. Still they are there, and it would be well to utilize them. Having these houses at hand, would it not be better to make the best of them?—Under certain circumstances.

10806. CHAIRMAN.—You remember the fever hospital at Cootahill; that is on the type of Omaha, Strathmore, and Rushmill?—They do very well; if you cannot do better, but suppose you were able to sell some of these places.

10807. And Lisburn?—They do very fairly. Of course I can well understand that the new boards are very economical, and quite right too.

10808. Even going into these little hospitals with identically high ideas, one may feel satisfied with them?—I think you could deal very well with acute cases in them.

10809. Mr. MURKIN.—You say the very poor don't get admittance into the hospitals here?—There

seems to be some form of differentiating between the extremely poor and the people who are fairly well-to-do; the extremely poor have to go to the unions.

10810. It is for the extreme poor that these institutions ought to be?—Possibly, but the method of obtaining admittance—subscribers write the notes. The extreme poor certainly are not refused here, but there is just that feeling in the minds of the people that they are not exactly for the extreme poor except in the case of accident.

10811. Dr. BROWN.—Is not that partly owing to the dispensary system; they get the lines in the same place that they get the dispensary lines?—Yes; and the two principal hospitals here are largely fed from their extern departments; that is if suitable cases come to the extern they are admitted at once, and in that way all sorts get in, but there is a sort of objection by the people who consider themselves not extremely poor to go to the union, and on the other hand the extremely poor think it is the proper place for them; such a feeling exists although it is not generally expressed.

10812. Mr. MURKIN.—What staff would you suggest for one of those small hospitals?—I think one man would be able to deal with any place where you have up to thirty acute cases.

10813. CHAIRMAN.—The dispensary doctor?—Certainly; I am leaving out of sight that you are not going to confine so many chronic cases in any new place.

10814. Mr. MURKIN.—On the suggestion that we would recommend that hospitals should be retained in the existing places with thirty or forty beds, what staff would be sufficient for such hospitals?—I think one man can very well manage a hospital department with thirty beds and be in a position to call in assistance in case of operations.

10815. With what nursing staff?—Views differ very much about nursing.

10816. Go between the two; take a mean?—You want a night nurse, of course, always.

10817. CHAIRMAN.—A nurse matron?—Of course you want five of a staff, that is including the matron—three for day and one for night.

10818. Nurse matron, assistant ordinary nurse, night nurse, and two attendants?—Yes. That would be my idea. I don't know that you would get an economical Board of Guardians to admit as many as that.

10819. Mr. MURKIN.—That would be a high-class standard?—Yes; some go so far as to say there should be a nurse to every four patients.

10820. A good deal depends on the condition of patients?—It is a movable standard, because if you have one of these cases very troublesome—

10821. CHAIRMAN.—There would have to be that power in the doctor to requisition an emergency nurse?—I think that is done at present.

10822. Mr. ADAMS.—How many beds have you in the Mater?—We have 135.

10823. And how many in the Royal?—Officially, I think there are 305; in the same way we can put far more in as soon as we get the funds; we have sub-space for over 200.

10824. How many in the union infirmary?—I should say they are able to put up 1,500 to 1,600, but the number of acute cases I don't know.

10825. You said you thought the staff was not sufficient; do you mean the staff of the union infirmary?—CHAIRMAN.—I think he explained that he did not mean that.

Witness.—I have nothing to say but praise of the members of the staff. I mean if you commenced to open a clinical school you would have to commence to increase the staff.

10826. Mr. ADAMS.—Do you think the union infirmary is not a clinical school?—I am satisfied it is not recognised as such.

Mr. ADAMS.—I think Dr. Bigger can set the doctor right.

Dr. BROWN.—It is not recognised, but it is largely a clinical school.

Mr. ADAMS.—The Board of Guardians have given it a recommendation as a clinical school.

Witness.—You must be recognised by the licensing body first, and I am satisfied you are not recognised by any licensing body in the world.

Mr. WELCH.—I wish to take exception to the phrase of the doctor that it was a waste of clinical materials.

10827. Mr. Murphy.—Your views are with greater efficiency and also the lowering of the rates?—Yes.

Dec. 17, 1903.

Dr. O'Connell.

Dec. 17, 1902.
De O'Connell.

10814. You see a member of the City Council?—Yes.
10815. You are aware that amongst the officers of Belfast there is a prevalent opinion that the rates are too high?—Well, they are very high; they have been doing a lot of big works.

10816. You have heard general complaints regarding the administration of the Belfast Union among the public generally?—Well, it is a body that we derive a good deal of amusement from reading their performances occasionally.

10817. That amusement may be too expensive to the ratepayers?—I think on the matter of the rates they have done very well.

10818. Since 1899 the City Council has taken over the striking of the poor rate?—Yes.

10819. You have made some very good suggestions regarding the amalgamation of the workhouse and the asylums, would you be in favour of an amalgamation of the Poor Law Guardians and the City Council, the City Council taking over the duties of the Poor Law Guardians?—Some men who are entitled to form a better judgment on the matter than I am, such as Mr. James O'Hanrahan, hold, I believe, that it should be abolished altogether.

10820. CHAIRMAN.—Which, the Corporation or the Guardians?—The Guardians. But I don't go as far as that. I think the committees of the Corporation have quite enough to do if they do their work at present, and if there were more authorised committees in the union I think they could do more work; though they have quite a number of committees, I believe there is only one that is really authorised by the Local Government Board; there is a really weak enough for the Guardians if they do it.

10821. Mr. Murphy.—How many Public Beads are there in Belfast—the City Council and the Poor Law Guardians?—And the Harbour Board.

10822. Would a system of amalgamation of the City Council, the Poor Law Board, and the Water Board—

CHAIRMAN.—That is outside our Commission.

10823. Mr. Murphy.—At present a separate body collects the poor rate, and it is differentiated from the municipal rate; could not the municipal and the poor rate be collected by the same officials of the Corporation?—Decidedly; it would be for economy.

10824. There is a grievance in Belfast regarding the collection of this poor rate, because if a tenant goes into home in the middle of the official year he gets a reduction in his municipal rate, but is charged the whole poor rate. If the poor rate collectors were abolished and the collection of the rates taken over by the City Council and all the rates sent out in one document to the public, would not that bring about a lessening of the rates and more efficiency in the conduct of municipal affairs?—Yes.

10825. Miss Murphy.—Am I right in saying you have accommodation for 500 patients, but have only fifty patients in the Mater hospital?—No; we have beds at present for 255 patients, and we are always very close to our full number; we have cubic space for 300 all told; we have several wards for children that we have not opened at all yet through lack of funds, but we hope in time to have them. Our hospital of 200 beds is considered a right standard for efficiency in size, but at present it is not open for teaching, which I regret exceedingly.

10826. Dr. Bosom.—How many patients have you at present?—We have always over the 100.

10827. Mr. O'Hara.—May I ask you if the Poor Law Board and the Corporation were amalgamated whether the collection of the rates by the two bodies could not be done at the same post?—I don't see why it should not be.

10828. Are you aware that one of the duties of the collectors of poor rate in Belfast is to go from house to house through the entire city and ascertain who is dwelling in each house?—I believe so.

10829. Supposing now the amalgamation had occurred, could the collector of rates in the City Hall collect the rates and visit the houses I have described?—He could do it in this way: a rate collector in the Town Hall at present generally has an office and a staff and assistants, and that sort of thing, and why not one of these do it.

10830. Would that man not require to be paid for his work?—I think we pay them a great deal too much as it is for all they do; you would get plenty of people able and willing to take it up at the present rate of remuneration. I take it you mean about the registration of voters.

10831. Yes; that is one of the difficulties of the Poor Law?—Yes; I have an objection to the entire system of registration.

10832. Are you familiar with the scale of the salaries paid to the Corporation and to the Poor Law at the present time?—I am not in the Poor Law Board.

10833. Would you be surprised to hear that there is no comparison at all between the salaries displayed in the Corporation and the salaries paid in the Belfast Workhouse?—I would give the Guardians of Belfast credit for practising economy in this and other matters; they have reduced the rates; on the other hand you must remember that since the reformed Corporation came in we have reduced the rate very much of our collectors also.

10834. You have given credit to the Poor Law Board for economy; assuming they were amalgamated, would not the scale of fees paid to the Poor Law officials then be modelled upon the scale of fees paid by the Corporation?—I don't know.

10835. Is it not a reasonable assumption that they would?—It is rather a large order that would have to be thrashed out before any conclusion could be arrived at. I did not speak in favour of all of the Corporation swallowing up the Poor Law Board; on the contrary, I said they had quite enough to do their own business; it was Mr. Murphy that asked the questions on which you are putting your questions.

10836. Mr. Murphy.—The Corporation have a staff of collectors for the Poor Law rate, as it is struck by the Corporation or levied; would not one staff of collectors sending out the documents include the poor rate as well as collecting the rates, certainly, but Mr. O'Hara has raised the point that they have other duties besides. There is just one point I would like to draw attention to, that if there is to be any reform instituted on the medical side of the workhouse something should be done for the establishing of an efficient maternity. In Belfast we are in a very bad state for the want of something in that line.

10837. CHAIRMAN.—What maternity wards are there at present?—There is a small hospital down away here which is doing good work, but it is only a drop in the ocean.

10838. Have you a ward attached to your hospital?—No, none, not in the Royal; it is only the union hospital.

10839. Have you any externs?—Some of the students do some work, and they also do some work under the direction of the dispensary doctor and in Ballinacorney in connection with the Women's and Children's Hospital. In Dublin you have the Rotunda, the Convent, Holles Street, and St. Patrick Dun's; they treat quite a number of cases as intern cases; they also attend thousands of extern by sending out pupils to attend after they have seen a certain number of cases in the hospital and always under the supervision of a highly-qualified medical man in a case of difficulty. In Belfast there is nothing of that system at all I think. We have a great many cases in which the General has to draw attention to the number of poor people who are attended by handy women, with deplorable results. If we had a properly established maternity, with visiting students in their fourth or fifth year, a great many of these cases would be efficiently attended to, and do a lot of good in several ways. There is a growing want in Belfast for something to be done to aid and assist in this direction.

10840. Is there a disinclination on the part of the more respectable classes to go into the union maternity ward?—Decidedly, I think so; it is only certain classes that go in there. Of course some of the poor do go besides, but not the numbers that ought to go.

10841. Do you think it would be a good thing when women go into a workhouse for the purpose of having illegitimate children born; do you think it would be a good thing they should be sent to institutions under religious management, and that that class should not be received at all into the workhouse, with a view of rather taking away what is known as the workhouse spirit?—Well, I don't know; it is a very difficult question to deal with. These things exist in a great many cases, and I am afraid you won't be able to stamp it out; it would be well on the first bid to do something.

10842. If religious associations were willing to undertake it?—It would be no harm to try it as an experiment, but it would be in a very limited number of cases I should say.

10843. One would have to begin by testing all?—It would do no harm; it might do some good, but I am not very hopeful. In the same way about the temper-

I don't think they do very much harm. They don't seem to cost very much. I see they are maintained for 1d. and 1½d. a night, and probably they would cost more on the jails. I would not interfere with them.

10844. Mr. McBRIDE.—If that were simply confined to the strolling males; but when you have a lot of children going through the country—Oh, it is deplorable, from a sanitary and moral point of view, but I don't know that they exist in such vast numbers.

10845. I understand they do exist very considerably!—In America they hold public meetings, with thirty or forty thousand attending; they hold up trains and threaten towns; in the freest country in the world they can exist.

10846. America is big, and can stand a great deal!—This country has stood a great deal when it has stood this system of the Poor Law for so many years.

Mr. GOSCH.—The doctor has given us a great deal of information in general, from America to the workhouse, and he says it would be a good thing—as a Town Councillor he sits here and does not know that he has power as a Town Councillor, and should exercise those powers to amalgamate the rate collectors, yet when one of our poor rate collectors died he did not do it.

Witness.—I am only one out of sixty.

Mr. Murphy.—It is the amalgamation of the two boards.

Mr. Gosch.—Yes; the people of Mars!

Dec 17, 1885.
De O'Connell.

Mr. WILLIAM ROBINSON examined.

There are a couple of points upon which I should like to say a few words. The first is the necessity for legislation enabling girls, who have been wronged, to proceed against the putative father for the maintenance of the child; and the second is the maintenance of girls who have fallen for the first time entering the workhouse maternity hospital. The first point may seem perhaps outside the scope of your inquiry.

10847. CHAIRMAN.—That is the assimilation of the English and Irish law?—Quite so. At the present moment, as you are no doubt aware, the mother cannot proceed against the father himself; her father, or her mother, or her employer may proceed in case they are able to prove loss of service. The result of such actions are very unsatisfactory, because it is often found that the defendant has got no goods to be distrained, and practically the last state becomes worse than the first. If the father has promised support the girl may proceed for monies already expended on the maintenance of the child; but the mere fact of the father having admitted parentage does not entitle her to sue him for such monies, but only in case he has promised to help in the maintenance of the child. The girl who experiences most hardship in this matter is, of course, the girl whose parents are dead, or, perhaps she does not want to acquaint her parents. She comes from a distant part of Ireland; and I have many such cases in my own knowledge. I am Organising Secretary in Ireland for the Association for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. She cannot sue the man who has wronged her; she struggles to maintain herself and her child; she works out by day, earns 7s. or 8s. per week, and will have to pay 2s. 6d. or 3s. a week for the care of the child; she very soon discovers she cannot continue to work and she has to seek for the shelter of the workhouse, or, unhappily, perhaps, she enters upon a life of shame; many such cases, I am sorry to say have come under my own notice in Belfast. Moreover, I think the Legislature is guilty of a sort of refined cruelty with regard to such cases. Not very long ago the school authority in Belfast summoned a woman, who was in this unhappy position, because she did not send her child to school; as a matter of fact she was obliged to keep the boy from school that he might earn a little money by selling newspapers in order to help to support himself and his mother. My friend, who brought the case under my notice, told me that the woman appeared in court in about as many clothes as would stuff a rat hole; but unfortunately the case was such that the magistrates had to convict; so that the unhappy woman had to pay a small fine because she was not in a position to allow her boy to go to school. I mention this in order to show that the whole burden is cast upon the mother, and it is a burden, as I had said, made heavy to bear even by the Legislature itself, and yet the same Legislature practically allows the putative father to go scot free. Things are different in England and in Scotland. In England there is the Bastardy Act, 38 and 36 Vic.; and, very briefly, that Act enables, in the first place, the mother to proceed against the putative father in a very simple way. She can bring him into a court of summary jurisdiction; the court is empowered to make an order upon the father for the payment of a sum not exceeding 5s. per week, until the child reaches the age of sixteen years, or, in their discretion, until the child reaches the age of sixteen years. If the father fails to pay on the order he can be arrested and brought before the court. If he refuses to pay when before the

court the court has power to make an order that the amount shall be recovered by distress and sale of his goods, and the father is detained in custody until the sheriff makes his return to the Warrant of distress. If the return is one of "No Goods" the court can commit the father for any period not exceeding three months, and for continued disobedience to the order since any commitment he can be recommitted. And I think, sir, that that is perhaps one of the very strongest points in the Act: that if a man who has been committed, still fails to do his duty, he can be recommitted. That is the law, very briefly, as it applies to England. Then with regard to Scotland, by a very simple process the mother can proceed against the father; if she succeeds in her case an order can be made against the father to pay half the cost of the maintenance of the child; in the case of a boy, until he is ten years of age; in the case of a girl, until she is twelve years of age. At the expiration of the period for which the order is to run, the mother, or the child, if it is not able to maintain itself, can ask the court to continue the maintenance order, and this is done at the discretion of the court. The mother, after obtaining judgment in Scotland, can recover as in the case of an ordinary civil debt. I may add that the statute abolishing imprisonment for civil debts in Scotland does not apply to a debt of this kind, because the sheriff, under 45 and 46 Vic., cap. 42, s. 4, may send to prison any person who wilfully fails to pay such a debt; and, by sub-sect. 3, the burden of proving inability to pay was cast upon the debtor. I mention these points in order to show that in England and Scotland girls who have been wronged have got the remedy within themselves if they wished to take advantage of it, and I ask the question why is this remedy denied to Irish girls? Perhaps on this point I may state, that two years ago I went on a deputation to the Chief Secretary on the very point. Unfortunately we did not succeed as we had hoped to do. It may be asked is there any demand for legislation of this kind. Well, my answer to that is this—it is difficult for those needing such help to formulate a demand, but they have done so unconsciously. Some time ago a girl came into my office in Belfast; she had her baby in her arms; she told me her story, which, briefly, was this—she was a domestic servant, wronged in the house in which she was serving; the person who had wronged her had promised to marry her; after the baby was born he refused to do so; she asked me what she could do; she said her father and mother lived in the extreme west of Ireland; she had come to Belfast to service; she had a baby, and she was unable to work because she had to care for the baby; she would not make known her circumstances to her parents. Unfortunately I was obliged to tell her that she had no remedy within herself. She was very anxious that she might proceed against the young man who had wronged her. I am perfectly certain that if the girl had been in the position that girls in England and Scotland are in on this matter, all she would have had to do was simply to serve a summons in order that her wrong, in some measure, might be righted, because I believe the individual would not have gone into court in the matter. Some time ago I addressed certain gentlemen to fifteen of the Inspectors of this society in Ireland with regard to illegitimate children. The returns which I got showed me that in twelve months 119 children, born out of wedlock, had, so to speak, passed through the hands of the inspectors; in some cases the children were neglected, mostly by the mothers;

Mr. William Robinson.

Dec. 17, 1863.
 Mr. Wm. Staddon.
 Dublin.

In some cases the children were at nurse; but investigation showed that poverty was at the root of it all, and in no one case out of the 119 was the putative father contributing one cent to the maintenance of the child. In one case—I give it as a specimen—there was a girl, aged twenty-one years, a domestic servant; she earned £10 per year. She paid 25 10s. per year for the nursing of her child, and she had 23 10s. with which to clothe herself and her baby. The father of the child was earning 80s. per week and he positively refused to contribute one penny. Now, sir, if the English Bastardy law was extended to Ireland I believe it would do an immense deal of good, and I think, undoubtedly, would mean that fewer cases would go into our workhouse maternity hospitals than do at present. Now the other point I want to refer to very briefly is—I consider it very undesirable that girls who have fallen for the first time should enter the workhouse maternity hospital. I hold that there ought to be a home or maternity house, call it by any other name, outside the workhouse, for the reception of such girls. I deal now especially with girls who have fallen for the first time, and I think that the conditions of commitment to such a home or maternity house ought to be that the girl has fallen for the first time and that her past history would indicate that her case was a hopeful one so far as the future is concerned. Now, I think, sir, such a maternity house would have advantages; in the first place the girl does not become a pauper. Well, of course, I dare say, on that point there is a good deal of sentiment, but at the same time I think it would enable a girl to feel somewhat independent if she felt she had not passed within the four walls of a workhouse. In the second place there is the question of environment. I understand when a girl, about to be confined, enters the workhouse, that for the period prior to her confinement, and for the period or days during her confinement she is associated with some of the very worst classes. She may be associated with those who have come in two, three, or four times to be confined. I think it is very undesirable that a girl who has fallen for the first time should associate with such. Again, sir, when a girl goes into the workhouse, she is lost in the crowd, whereas if she were in a home, such as I have suggested, she would have the influence, and the advice, and the kindly counsel of, say, a lady's committee, in connection with the home, and that would mean a great deal for her; she would be dealt with personally, while in the workhouse maternity she is lost in the crowd. And, further, I think that the ladies would help such a girl to obtain a situation; and the very fact that a number of ladies were interested in her would, no doubt, create sympathy for her, and the situation would be forthcoming. I think the Guardians ought to have power to contribute to the maintenance of such an institution, and they ought to have power, also, to proceed against the putative father. Of course I know they have that power at present, but whether that power would extend to them in the case of homes, such as I have suggested, being established, I don't know, but at all events they ought to have the power to proceed.

Then, sir, I think when the mother secured employment the child should be boarded out, but at the same time I think that the mother ought to contribute, say, 1s. a week to the maintenance of the child. Now you may think that that is placing rather a premium upon the matter of illegitimacy, but I think in this matter you have to look at the case of the girl and, unquestionably, at the case of the child, and I think it would be very much better if the Guardians had the power to board out such illegitimate children. I believe it would mean that fewer of our boys and girls would be lost to us than there are at present. These are the remarks which I have to make on the points that you have allowed me to bring under your notice, and I would commend them very earnestly indeed to the consideration of this Commission, in making its report. As I said before it is a question I am very much interested in, because, unhappily, I have seen some deplorable results following from the state of our law at present with regard to the maintenance of children of putative fathers.

CHAIRMAN.—I am sure the Commission are very much obliged to you for the trouble you have taken in systematising and putting your views before us.

10646. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—You think the existing laws in England and Scotland would be sufficient? So far as I am able to judge I think they would; they are so much in advance of what we have here; we have nothing here.

10649. You have something; not very much!—It is very little; the girl is known; I think the extension of the English Bastardy Laws to Ireland would most probably meet the case; it might be found some slight amendments would be necessary in applying them to Ireland.

10650. CHAIRMAN.—What was the answer you received when you did make a move in this matter already?—The objection was that most probably the Bill would be regarded as being a contentious measure and therefore there would be a difficulty in passing it through the House.

10651. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—There are so many Bills so passed it is very difficult to get them all through?—That was the answer I received; I have the letter of the Chief Secretary to me on the subject.

10652. He showed sympathy with it?—Undoubtedly he did.

10653. Mr. Monaghan.—What is the evidence necessary in England to secure an order of this description under the Bastardy Act?—The evidence required is the evidence of the mother with reasonable corroboration.

10654. I think the section states that it is necessary to show that there has been maintenance by the putative father. The Act should be amended so as to give the magistrates fuller discretion?—May I say it is not necessary to prove previous maintenance; as a matter of fact under the English Act the matter can come into the court before the child is born.

10655. Mr. Murphy.—You are aware that the rule of illegitimacy in Scotland is greater than it is in Ireland?—I believe it is.

Mr. JOHN GILL examined.

Mr. John Gill.

10656. CHAIRMAN.—You are anxious to give some views on the way in which the Lismore Board of Guardians regard this question of proposed assignment?—Yes, sir. Do you wish a few figures relative to the valuation of the unions?

10657. We have these; I don't think you need trouble yourself with them; but merely your personal views?—Respecting the suggestions of the Lismore Board of Guardians and of the Antrim County Council with regard to the abolition of certain workhouses in the County Antrim—that is Antrim and Ballycastle—we consider them worthy of adoption; we consider they should be abolished. Coming into the County Down, as you are aware, there are two Rural District Councils in the Lismore Union—that is Hillsborough and Lismore.

10658. We are not dealing with the County Down to-day you know?—How do you arrange that?

10659. We are not going into the County Down; we are going to have an early sitting next month for that; any views you have to-day will be as regards the Antrim and Lismore Unions; and so far as the rural

district in Lismore, you may say anything about that you know, but I don't want you to go ahead and take the whole County Down?—Lismore Union is in two rural districts—one in Antrim and one in Down.

10660. Anything you want to say about the rural district of the County Down, in your own union of Lismore, but I don't want you to go generally into the other unions in the County Down?—Well I really cannot see how I could keep out of it to give you any evidence respecting how it would affect Lismore Union, the portion in the County Down.

10661. Well what would you wish to say about your own part of the Lismore Union in the County Down?—The Guardians of the Lismore Union are of opinion that the Belfast Union should be the county boundary. The county boundary should be exactly the south of the Belfast Union; that the portions lying around it, which presently take in a larger area or which should be divided equally between Lismore, Larne, and Newtownards.

10662. That is to say that the rural district of Carrickfergus should be divided into three parts?—Yes.

10263. That the county borough should be the boundary?—Yes, quite so; of the Belfast Union.

10264. That the union and county borough should be co-terminous in future?—Quite so.

10265. And the rural district should be divided among the three adjoining unions?—Quite so; Larnagh, Larne, and Newtownards. They believe that it would tend to lessen the strain on the Belfast Workhouse; and there are facilities in Larnagh, Larne, and Newtownards which have not been taken up yet in the way of accommodation in those houses. The Larnagh Guardians are not in favour of too much amalgamation of workhouses. It is contended by some that there should be only one central workhouse in the county; they are not of that opinion; they are in favour of abolishing two in the County Antrim, and Kirkcubbin and Banbridge.

10266. That is what I don't want you to go into in the County Down; we will have that all over again?—That (produced) is a small map I had respecting it; you will see that the unions are pretty near the boundary of the whole county; but that would be getting into the question you don't want to hear.

10267. We don't want to hear it until early next month; we have to take these roads county by county; it is a road very often that unions are in two counties and sometimes in three?—The Larnagh Workhouse is situated in a very large and populous place; a very populous and thriving town; one of the chief provincial towns in Ulster; it is suggested by some that Larnagh should be abolished, but that could not possibly be we consider, because Larnagh is a very growing town; one, perhaps, of the most growing towns we have in Ulster; there are a considerable number of large mills there—Stewart's Mill, Hudson Mill, and other works—we consider that that should not be done. It is easily accessible by rail and road and we would be quite prepared; the staff is sufficient there to meet the present requirements, and a great deal more. That workhouse was built for 1,040 inmates, and, at present, there are not more than 250 in it. The site, as Dr. Biggar knows, is in a very healthy place; stands well up.

10268. We have all had the pleasure of seeing it?—And it stands on fifteen acres of ground; and I see no reason why Ballycunnale and Antrim—the balance of it that has into the Larnagh Union—could not be easily accessible both by road and rail; the roads are very good indeed; they are under a new system of management and the train facilities are tolerably good. It is contended by some that the Antrim Workhouse buildings should be utilised as an auxiliary to the County Antrim Asylum, which is overcrowded. But whilst that is a statement, there is also the counter-statement to be considered; if you abolish Antrim Workhouse that means the abolishing of all the officials on persons, and to make an auxiliary out of it you must have a new set of officials; that would not be reducing the rates. I am giving you the two opinions expressed about it. Respecting Larnagh Workhouse, we are in a position there, if needs be, to use that as an auxiliary hospital for certain kinds of diseases; we would take them in as paying patients; it is only about seven miles from Belfast. We are prepared to take them in on a reasonable per-wherever the charges would be—the staff is there and the workhouse is there, and we would only be delighted to have the establishment taken up so as to alleviate suffering and at the same time not to be a drag on the ratepayers. With respect to the rating, we don't like—I am speaking now of the rural district of the Larnagh Union—the Urban Council are fond of union rating, but the Rural District Councils don't like union rating. I am a Guardian for thirteen or fifteen years, and represent a division in which the last rate struck was 3d. In the 2d last year I was there as an elected Guardian, before I went in as an ex-officio, about eight years ago; the last year I held office there was no rate struck at all—I had so much money in advance—and last year the rate was something like 1s. 1d. in the £.

10269. Eightpence, according to the last published report, is the rate for Poor Law purposes only?—Very well; now we consider there should be divisional rating.

10270. For all Poor Law purposes?—For outdoor relief only; I would go in for union rating for all purposes other than outdoor relief, but outdoor relief, I think, should be divisional rating, because under the old system there was a better regulation. Under your

present system at the end of six months the abstract is made up by orders of the Local Government Board, which shows the amount of Poor Law relief; this is sent to each Guardian; it is like Scotch metaphysics, except you are full of the whole thing you don't know anything about it, whereas under the old system there was a board hung up outside the boardroom door each morning which showed exactly who was relieved inside and outside.

10271. Why is that information not still given? Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Does the clerk not read that out every meeting?—It is printed at the end of every half-year; but whereas under the old system it was hanging outside the boardroom door—

10272. CHAIRMAN.—Why is not that done still?—I asked that question and it appears the Local Government Board does not consider it necessary.

10273. Oh, no; it is a question in your own discretion; if you direct it is to be hung in any certain place for the information of the Guardians you have absolute power to do so.

Clerk of the Union.—The names of the recipients of relief are printed and circulated at the end of every half-year; but under the old state of things a notice was prepared by the clerk, showing the number of persons in receipt of outdoor relief in each particular division, and how many were in the workhouse, and so on, changeable to that particular division.

10274. CHAIRMAN.—Now it is union-at-large rating; you still could give the names of the people receiving indoor and outdoor relief, but you would not be able to give more than the residence.

Witness.—Exactly so; but we consider the old system was much better.

10275. Therefore for outdoor relief purposes you would rather go back to the old system?—I would. Then again outdoor relief has gone up largely with us; in that respect we find that the Guardians don't take the same personal interest in the matter of expenditure—judicious expenditure as heretofore—there are too many of them. When it is union rating one man gets up and says that this woman gets 2s. 6d., or 4s., or 5s.; his brother Guardian seconds this; in all probability this is never thought about, because it is so small, and out of a valuation of £103,192 of the union, it is let pass, whereas under the old order of things when a case did come forward if the Guardian of that particular division was not there the matter was adjourned for the presence of the Guardian, and the relieving officer would be asked for a report and it would be stated at 1s., 1s. 6d., or, in an extreme case, 2s. 6d., whereas now it is a question of 3s., 4s., 5s., or 6s. This is, I fear, too largely done now.

10276. Have any cases come within your own immediate knowledge in which you think relief has been either unnecessary altogether or profuse?—I think there are cases that have come under my knowledge.

10277. Are you speaking from a general impression?—I am speaking from a general impression, but I would not care to put my finger exactly on a particular case; I have come in my mind where, under the old order of things, they would have been satisfied, and the ends of charity would have been fully met, by giving them 2s. 6d., whereas it is now a question of a good many shillings.

10278. Are you aware of cases in which outdoor relief was given, in which, in your opinion, no relief at all ought to be given?—No; I could not put my hand on that case.

10279. You are not aware of people working in mills and factories whose aged parents, residing with them, get outdoor relief?—No; I am not quite aware of that.

10280. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—You don't seem to be very extravagant with outdoor relief in Larnagh; you are only giving about 1d. in the £ on the valuation?—That is all true, but it is not a very poor district; I am not speaking in disparagement of any other district.

10281. Don't you think it an economical way of giving assistance to the destitute when rationed given?—I do; I consider it a very desirable thing; much better than crowding them into the house.

10282. While divisional rating is very generally advocated on the score of economy, don't you think it would work very hard on the people in towns; people frequently have to leave the country and seek employment in towns, and then if you went back to divisional rating you would put the whole burden on

Dec. 27, 1903. the towns?—That may be so, but the town ratepayer has certain advantages that the rural ratepayer has not.

Mr John Gill. 10893. In what way?—He has certain business advantages that the rural man has not; besides, I think the Local Government Act was wrong in abolishing the £4 rating, where the landlord had to pay the rates. It is a fact that the rates are collectible from every person now, and hence obviates the outdoor relief is ostensibly given for the purpose of paying rates, whereas if it had been kept at the £4 business the landlord would have had to pay rates and that would not be taken out of the relief. We are also of opinion that the maintenance of lunatics should be defrayed by the rates instead of locally; I think that that should be exactly a state institution; I am a County Councillor; but I am not too much impressed with everything in connection with County Councils; indeed I would just exactly say this, and I say it fearlessly, that if a vote was to be given and my vote determined it, I would vote back the old grand jury, and I am a man of progress and ahead of the world I hope, but I would vote in the old grand jury and presentment system. We are also of opinion that it would be desirable to introduce a system of payments, by those who could afford to pay, to whom we give shelter, either in hospital or otherwise; there is a way of doing that—relief by way of loan—but that is not very largely taken up under the new system.

10894. You could not graduate that; you could not declare the relief by way of loan as regards one-tenth of your expenditure?—That is so; but I think the respectable poor who have not perhaps very comfortable surroundings at home—I mean sanitary dwellings—I think that if there was a system introduced whereby they could come into the hospital or workhouse and pay their way, it would serve a very useful purpose for a very desirable class of poor people throughout the country; I am strongly of that opinion, and have been for years. Now, respecting the class of society known as vagrants, those men up every day, and the women we have to deal with them are inadequate altogether; it has been proposed by the Licham Guardians to lock these men; that won't work either. You will find a fellow comes forward for his bath and says: "I cannot take it; I have heart disease." Then you have to get the medical officer to examine this man, but the medical officer of the workhouse might be a mile or five miles away. Is the staff going to wait there until the officer comes before this fellow can be bathed? It would require new legislation; a lot of those fellows are purely rogues and vagabonds, and the system of night lodgings is not a good business; they tramp from one union to another; they are continually on the road, and so long as they are able to find a ticket they will go on; it requires very drastic legislation in the way of corporal punishment to be inflicted on those men. I also believe that the old dispensary committees should be again established with all their former powers, save the appointment of medical officer; they were a very useful body of men; they occupied a cotterless district; they knew every person in the district; if the medical officer wanted a ticket enrolled the whole matter was known; the distribution of the necessaries of the dispensary was brought before them at each monthly meeting, and a proper minute book was kept; I am speaking from experience; I was secretary of a committee for six or seven years; the meetings were always held locally.

10895. The Chairman of the Derry Board of Guardians mentioned that he found that owing to the abolition of dispensary committees he got out of touch very much with the condition of the poor, not having an opportunity of knowing who was sick, and various other matters that came before them at dispensary committees; is that one of the points of view you refer to?—That is so. In the old order of things we fixed a certain number for each district; invariably half of those turned up, and where there was a fair in the town the meeting was held on the fair day, and always suited the convenience of the country people coming in; they did come to these places generally, and had control over the whole place, whereas the books are now sent from the dispensary to the workhouse to be examined, and this costs 1s. 6d. each time. Then they are laid down in the boardroom; some gentlemen take the one end of the union from Saltinfield and some Lough Neagh men sign the book, or some central Guardian signs the Lough Neagh book, that don't know a single thing about it.

10896. Mr. MURPHY.—It is a mere routine matter?—It is a farce, simply.

10897. You think the dispensary committees supervised the work of the medical officer, and that they were acquainted with all the needs of the sick poor of that particular area?—I do, and more especially in view of the fact that the Local Government Board are insisting on medical men being put into the country.

10898. There is no inspection now; it is a mere matter of signing the book?—The Guardians don't trouble themselves to look at it at all; they have no time.

10899. So you think it is a retrograde movement?—Yes; I don't think the Government, when passing that, had any mandate from the country.

10900. A great many experienced Guardians have stated the same thing, being of opinion that it was a mistake to do away with dispensary committees?—I would reduce the number of Councils or Guardians to the old figures; I really cannot see why two should be there instead of one; surely one man is able to do the housing of four townlands for Poor Law business. I also think that the Local Government Board should not sanction a very serious decrease of salary to a new medical officer coming in, in the way—the salary of the medical officer is £20, say; you give him one half of that, but if that salary is increased, say £10, you don't give back half of that; you still keep on to your £20; whereas I think that there should be any serious decrease of salary sanctioned by the Local Government Board, because I don't think £20 is a fit and proper salary for any medical gentleman to start his work; the Local Government Board has plenty of money; if they have not they can draw it plenty. I think they should sanction a salary of at least £300, and, while stating that, I claim to be a ratepayer's man, and then give £50 more if they so desire.

10901. Mr. MURPHY.—Don't you think that lies largely in the hands of the Guardians that they ought to start high and get the full half contribution? That is so; but there are always small men in every place.

10902. None in Licham, I hope?—We hope not.

10903. You say you are not in favour of amalgamation except so far as the County Council advised?—Yes.

10904. You have plenty of railway facilities in Licham, and there would be no difficulty in sending chronic cases to a central institution in the country where the reform could have classification and more considerate treatment—don't you think they would be better off in the fresh air with something to do instead of being caged in a day-room as at present?—I think from a humanitarian point of view it would be very desirable.

10905. And you would have no objection to the boarding out of the children?—None whatever, and them all out.

10906. You have forty-five at present in the house?—We are quite willing to abolish the school-teacher if the Local Government Board so directs us. The Local Government Board pay £26 to the school-teacher, and we asked them to increase it by £10, but they refused to do so.

10907. And I suppose you would have no objection in having lunatics sent to a place where they could be better taken care of?—We do desire that. Now, with respect to the old taxation area for sanitary purposes, does that come within the terms of the reference?

CHAIRMAN.—Not at all.

10908. Mr. Murphy.—You stated that you would be in favour of making the county borough boundaries and union boundaries coterminous in Belfast?—Yes.

10909. That would facilitate the amalgamation of the City Council with the Poor Law Guardians in one? It should be decided on in future?—I would rather allow gentlemen of more huge minds than mine to easily give you an answer on that question.

10910. If this scheme was decided on in the future it would facilitate it?—It would to a certain extent, but there was a gentleman, Mr. O'Hare, that I heard of a few questions that I was greatly impressed with—the difference in the salaries paid by the City Council and the salaries paid by the Poor Law Guardians of Belfast—and that is walking through my mind at a salary rate presently.

10911. Do you consider the salary paid by both bodies too high?—I don't like to sit in judgment on anybody, but I have a very great respect for the Belfast Poor

Law Guardians, for I believe they have done an enormous amount of good work recently. The Corporation have yet to do their great work, if you take the tramways, for instance.

CHAIRMAN.—That is entirely too far afield.

1900. Mr. MURPHY.—You have made some suggestions for the relief of the poor; could you not make some suggestions for the relief of the poor ratepayer. You went in for abolishing one thing and setting up another thing!—Speaking generally, I am of opinion that government by the people is always dear government; that is the history of all European nations—where you allow democracy to have the complete govern-

ment there will be increased taxation; that is the history of all first-rate, second-rate, and third-rate powers. The government under the old order of things—take the Grand Jury business—was an unrepresentative body—yet they did their work well and cheaply.

1901. You are a land valuer—I am a Poor Law Guardian and a few other things, and there are gentlemen in this room, who, if you wish to know my character—

CHAIRMAN.—Quite unnecessary; we are exceedingly obliged to you for your very valuable evidence.

Mr. G. R. WHITNEY, Solicitor, examined.

1904. CHAIRMAN.—You have just heard the evidence of our colleague, Mr. Gill?—I have, sir. There are one or two things that I differ with Mr. Gill in, and one is the advantage of districtal rating over union rating. Of course I represent the town of Licham in the Board of Guardians; I don't think it would be fair—I quite agree with the remark of Mr. Murnaghan that people drift from the country into the town and become chargeable on the town. Licham is a large manufacturing town, and the districts of Denham and Barnaby join it. There is another reason. Some time ago a grant was made in relief of rural rating, and one of the grounds that were put forward when it was decided that it should be union rating was that the ratepayers of the town got no benefit from the grant made in favour of the rural ratepayers, and that was one of the reasons why it should be union rating. I think it would be exceedingly hard on Licham that union rating should be done away with.

1905. I think Mr. Gill's objection was as regards outdoor relief only?—That would apply to outdoor relief too, because these people drift out of the country and become subjects for outdoor relief. I happen to be chairman of the Licham Board of Guardians, and I am there almost every day and hear the relief that is granted, and I can assure you there is the greatest possible care taken in every single case, and there is hardly a case in which they don't wait until the member for the division in which that person resides is up there, and it is nearly every case it is the member for the division brings it under the notice of the relieving officer. Mr. Gill is altogether wrong in the amount granted. 2s. and 2s. 6d. would be the amounts in nine cases out of ten; a larger sum than that is only given in exceptional circumstances, and only for a short time, where there is a large family and the head is stricken down by illness. I think if it is wisely given outdoor relief is a very admirable way of relieving the poor at the expense of the rates. For instance, you give a person 2s. 6d.; if you bring them into the house it cost 2s. 6d., and in the infirmary 2s. 6d., but if you give them 2s. 6d. and keep them outside, they are far better than in the workhouse, and cost the ratepayers less. Outdoor relief is not given unless the person is practically destitute, and would have to come into the house.

1906. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—It saves them the taint of the workhouse?—It saves them the taint of the workhouse, and is a good deal cheaper. We give a considerable amount of outdoor relief.

1907. You don't give much for Licham?—There are 324 people getting relief. The valuation is high, and it extends over an area of twenty-two miles by twelve.

1908. Can you account for the increased numbers in the house. In the last ten years they have doubled?—One of the reasons is we have an extremely good dietary scale—one of the best in Ulster. We revised it some time ago, and we have some lady Guardians on the committee, and they are very generous. I don't know that it is too high yet, but I know it has been going up. In 1892 the entire number of inmates was 135; now they are 243.

1909. CHAIRMAN.—Is not the chief increase in the sick wards?—It has increased in both.

1910. Would it be due to a greater confidence in your nursing arrangements?—I would not doubt but it would, for they are infinitely better now than at that time. Then there were no trained nurses, and they are all trained nurses now. There is another thing I feel strongly on: if something could be done to separate the lunatics from the workhouse, that a responsible poor person coming to the hospital should not have to go in as an inmate of the workhouse. No doubt the hospital must always supply the needs of inmates who are sick, but there are a class of persons who come in for three

weeks or a month, and they should not have to go through the workhouse if it could possibly be avoided. It may not matter in a large city like Belfast, but in a country town like Licham, it would follow them all their life. If it was not for the County Asylum Infirmary, I don't know what would happen.

1911. CHAIRMAN.—You began by saying you think the sick who are not paupers ought not to be obliged to come into the workhouse?—Yes.

1912. But if we had not the permanent ones in the house at all?—You suggest that they should be brought to a central home, where they would have open air and everything of that sort.

1913. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—The old chronic cases!—Those people do come in, and they have relatives in the district, and perhaps the greatest pleasure that those old people have. It may be sentiment, but there is not much sentiment about the life of a person in a workhouse, and it should have full weight. On visiting days their friends come to see them, and if you take these people away to Ballymena, it prevents them having visits from their friends, and it is the only bright spot in their lives.

1914. CHAIRMAN.—Have you taken any steps to look up the porter's book?—I see them every morning as I go in.

1915. That might make an impression on you, but have you ever looked at the book?—No; because I see them there waiting to see their friends.

1916. Would you know whether they were going to the sick wards or the ordinary wards?—Yes, I ask the porter where they are going; they go to both.

1917. Our impression is going round and making inquiries into the matter is, that the visits are nearly all to the sick; hardly any to the aged and infirm after they are in the house for a short time?—Very often they take them out of the workhouse when they are dead, and bury them.

1918. That I don't look on as a visit?—It shows they take an interest in them. If you take these people away from their homes the workhouse would practically be a prison to them. They are as well treated in Licham as in any sanatorium. We have fifteen acres of a farm, and these old people are not confined indoors.

1919. You think the healthy people would be more at home in Licham than in Ballymena?—I am sure they would. Licham is the market town for the entire Licham union. The friends of these old people if they could not come by railway would get a drive in a farmer's cart, which they would not get going to Ballymena. In theory that system is good, but it would have a depressing effect on the inmates.

1920. You are afraid it would operate harshly?—That is the chief objection I have to it. I think the children should be all boarded out. If possible there should be no children reared in the workhouse if it could be avoided.

1921. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—You would be in favour of harmless lunatics being put in a place by themselves?—Yes.

1922. When you take as many out what employment would there be for these homes?—I think there are only about twelve children in the school altogether. There is another thing with regard to the classification of the inmates. I think something should be done in that way. There are people who get into the workhouse through their own fault, and they are very respectable members of society, and there are poor people who have been most respectable members of society, and something should be done to classify them. That could be done in a large institution better than in several small ones scattered about.

1923. CHAIRMAN.—It could be done quite easily if

Dec 17, 1908.
Mr. John Gill.

Mr. G. R. Whitney.

Dec. 17, 1903. 790 had one institution for the aged and infirm?—I don't think the details would be difficult to work out in any institution.

10040. You would find it impossible in a workhouse when you have so many different classes?—I would not say impossible; it might be difficult.

10041. Mr. MONTAGUE.—Don't you think it is a waste of money to have so many buildings in the county only partly filled?—I would say that Ballycastle and Antrim could be easily disposed of.

10042. Would you not go a little farther?—I don't know. I think there are difficulties.

10043. CHAIRMAN.—At all events you would stop short of Lismore?—Certainly. I understand that the Belfast gentlemen are going to suggest that Lismore should be done away with. I would personally have the strongest objection to that, and so would the entire of the people of the Lismore Union. I don't think it is a wise thing to make Belfast Workhouses any larger than it is, and it occurs to me the city of Belfast should look after its own poor, and not get up with the country, and I have an idea that in a large union like Belfast the country people would not feel themselves very happy with the class of poor from the city of Belfast who come into their workhouse. I don't want to say anything offensive about them. They are too intelligent many of them. If you bring country people to Belfast you will keep them up in the city, when they have been used to live in the country, and country towns. That objection I mentioned about friends coming to see them would apply in that case too. I am pretty intimately acquainted with the manner in which the Belfast workhouse is managed. There is a very enterprising daily press in Belfast, and it reports the proceedings of the Belfast Board of Guardians, which is always one of the hot-beds looked for in the country. They squabble with one another and with the Local Government Board, and we think in Lismore we are able to conduct ourselves much better.

10044. Mr. MONTAGUE.—You could accommodate 300 or 400?—We could. If you sent the county district of Belfast to us it would be the best plan that

could be done, and let the Belfast city people fight out their battles amongst themselves.

10045. What do you say about the tramp?—It is a very difficult question. We threatened to beat them, and we got hammers for them to break stones with, and they broke the handles of the hammers. If you make such firm rules as preclude them from coming into the workhouse, they go into the farmers' haggards, and malicious burnings have been traced to them. It is a very hard problem unless there was some sort of a salary where they could be compelled to work.

10046. Send them to the police station for an order for a night's lodging?—Then they would not go to the police station; they would go to the farmers' haggards. There should be something taken into consideration for the convenience of those gentlemen who give their time as Guardians. In Lismore the meeting of the Guardians is held on a Tuesday, the market day, and the Rural Council business is held after the close of the Guardians' business, and they can also attend the market. If the meeting was in Belfast, the country people would not go those two days in the week, and the result is it would fall into the hands of the city representatives, and that would mean disfranchising the union of Lismore. And besides the Belfast Board of Guardians hold their meetings on a Tuesday, which is Lismore market day.

10047. Mr. GILL.—Are you aware under the old order of rating that a pauper before he goes to be a small charge was charged back on the old division that he came out of?—I hardly understand what you mean exactly. For instance, a man coming from Belfast, do you mean he would be sent back to Belfast?

10048. No; but the old state of the law was that, where relief was granted to a certain person out of a certain electoral division, although he might have changed his residence for two or three years into another electoral division, yet the law was such that they put him back, that the relief was extracted out of the electoral division he came out of?—I don't know. I was not a Guardian until the passing of the last Act. The deporting of people from Scotland is an astounding source of annoyance to us.

Dr. MATTHEW B. MACKEON examined.

Dr.
Matthew B.
MacKee.

10049. CHAIRMAN.—You were anxious to tell us your views about Poor Law administration and reform?—Well, my views regarding the amalgamation of workhouses are very much the same as have been given to-day and yesterday. I would think that Antrim Workhouses having so few inmates could be made an auxiliary asylum, as Ballycastle is perfectly unable to take the inmates of the other different unions. Also that Ballycastle, having so few inmates, could be used for the reception of children over five and under fifteen. My reason for stating that is, I think it is a very preferable thing, if at all possible, that children should be brought up in an institution, run perhaps on the same lines as an industrial school, and thereby taking the stigma away from them in after life of having been brought up in a workhouse. Then I think Ballycastle Union could drop into Ballymoney; and Antrim Union could drop into Ballycastle, Larne, and Ballymena. Then as regards Lismore, Belfast is in such a congested condition, as I saw by the report of Dr. Rigger the last time, that they have no more space to build on. We have fifteen acres of land, and we have an establishment that was built to accommodate about 1,035, whereas we have only about 250 in it at the present time. This, I think, could be utilized and made auxiliary to Belfast. And if in addition to the Antrim Union we could take part of Belfast, say from Ligoniel right up along by Shankill and Springfield and the Falls on the Antrim side, and from the Albert Bridge, Ballybracken, and Newtownards on the Co. Down side, it would be the means of relieving the congestion of Belfast and utilizing the buildings we have already, because we have buildings that with a little outlay to bring them up to date, could be made commodious for a great many more than we have at the present time. Then as regards our numbers, we have 130 patients in the hospital and infirmary at the present time. If these suggestions were carried out it would enable us to be able to train nurses under Section 63, and we could supply other unions, and the county infirmary being in Lismore, it could be used as an auxiliary, because I think that as it is now the county infirmary's place has been taken.

10050. What do you mean by an auxiliary?—Supposing you could send patients down to it.

10051. From the workhouse, an overflow?—In connection with the workhouse, an overflow, and as regards the county infirmary, county infirmaries were made originally in order to do what the dispensaries and workhouses are doing now. I think by utilizing it with the workhouse, as it is now, it would be a great means of helping the workhouse, and enable us to form it into a nursing school. As regards convalescent wards in workhouses, I think that it is very much more preferable, if at all possible, that, having ground such as we have, we should have shelters instead of convalescent wards. I think having shelters would be a far more salutary mode of treatment than having convalescent wards, no matter how good they might be. In Lismore, we have a sandy soil, good sanitation, and good air, and everything that could be appropriate for the treatment of convalescent patients there. As regards classification, I would recommend that illegitimate children should be taken from under the care of the mothers when over three years of age, and not left with them in order to imbricate perhaps the weaknesses of the mother, and the ill-treatment and the disfigurement that they would otherwise receive from them, and that this class of mother should be separated from the other class of inmates. And I recommend also that old married people—of course it is a regulation of the Local Government Board when it can be done—over sixty, that they should not be separated, because I think that that is a great source of keeping old people from going into unions, simply the idea of separation. Mr. Watkins mentioned about having people in better positions in separate parts of the union workhouses. I find from experience and inquiry that respectable people are in the union workhouses simply because they are neglected by their sons and daughters when they are old, and I think that the fact can be borne out by inquiries from the people; and not only that, but those self-same people that are neglected and brought into this position have done the same with their fathers and mothers, so that I think if you would go into that part at all what ought to be done would be if there was a law brought in that would compel sons and daughters that are in a good position to support their fathers and mothers, and not send them into the union to die, and simply, I suppose, put in the

proper time to get the burial society money, or something like that, because that is what is often done. They know they are cared for and looked after, and whenever they do these people receive remittances by their death. Now, as regards vagrants, which is a very wide question, I think the law requiring any inmate of a workhouse to discharge himself on three hours' notice should not apply to the vagrant class, and that a vagrant or casual coming in at night should not be allowed to leave the union for at least forty-eight hours, on forty-eight hours' notice, and that they should be engaged during that time in appropriate work, work that would not only benefit themselves, but benefit the union at large. Outdoor relief is, I think, a very worthy way of helping poor people. I would not recommend that outdoor relief would be given to thoroughly destitute people, but I think it is much more preferable in the case of honest, decent poor people, who perhaps have lived in the community, been respected by the community, and maybe are receiving a little assistance from friends and neighbors, perhaps from a church, that it would be far better for the Guardians to give them say £1 a week additional to what they are already receiving, say 3s. 6d., and thus it would save them the shame of having gone to the workhouse and fasting themselves paupers. You have had so much evidence that it is pretty well repeating it, and that is all the evidence I would wish to bring before you.

10635. The only thing that struck me in your note is making the county infirmary an auxiliary. I don't know on what basis that should be. You are assuming the Board of Guardians should remain as they are. The county infirmary now has thirty or forty beds; the Victoria Hospital is so adjacent to the county infirmary now; it is within telephone call, and a severe accident occurring in Rathoura mills, Glencore, or Lambeg could be as readily taken to the Victoria Hospital as to the county infirmary—the consequence would be that if these public works would subscribe largely to the Victoria Hospital, it would enable the Victoria Hospital to open wards that they are unable to open now for want of funds, and what I meant by the county infirmary being an auxiliary was that it could be used either for acute cases or convalescent cases.

10637. You would transfer it to the Guardians?—Yes.

10638. And close it as a county infirmary?—I don't think I would close it.

10639. As a county infirmary, you would dissolve the present board of management and put it under the Guardians?—Could the grant not be given to it?

10640. Not if it was an auxiliary workhouse?—The idea I had was that the county infirmary could be appropriated as a sort of an adjunct to the workhouse.

10641. Mr. MURKIN.—Is not the workhouse large enough already?—Yes, of course.

10642. What do you want any more?—For example, in the infirmary now we would want additional wards built to it.

10643. Have you not a lot of space unused in the body of the house?—We have.

10644. What would you leave that vacant for?—It was recommended by Dr. Rigger that we should add to the infirmary. We went over the body of the house and there was not exactly what we wanted. We wanted consumptive wards, but if we would get consumptive

wards through the ground it might do without adding to the infirmary at all. Consumptive wards are the great drawback in the infirmary as it is now. Also we want to have space in order to classify the inmates, but if we could get the inmates wards cleared that would give us the space we want.

10645. By agreeing to amalgamation you would be able to get classification quite easily?—How do you mean amalgamation?

10646. The same centralization and distribution suit better; take the infirm and destitute and put them in one institution; board out the children, provide for the mothers, and get rid of the insane?—Then we would have space enough.

10647. CHAIRMAN.—Then you don't want to annex the county infirmary?—As there is a difficulty about whether it could be done, I only hint the thing; but what I recommend is that we should get additional from Antrim and from Belfast, and get our union enlarged, so that Lurgan would be put in the same position as Lurgan. All we want is a very few extra patients to bring us under the section for training nurses.

10648. Mr. GOSWOLD.—How many consumptive patients have you in your place—three, I believe, is your figure?—I suppose we have four or five now.

10649. You want more accommodation for those by Dr. Rigger's authority?—Wade.

10650. You want to have your workhouse increased and the wards increased for those three, I suppose. You would give each consumptive patient a room twice the size of this?

CHAIRMAN.—I suppose in your union and about your town there is a good deal of consumption?—We would have three or four patients in at a time.

10651. I am not talking about the workhouse; I am talking about the district?—Oh, there is a good deal of it.

10652. Do you think a medical man would recommend his consumptive patients to come into a workhouse if there is no isolation and no special treatment for them?—It is for the consumptives I want special treatment.

10653. Could patients be received in the workhouse at present, there being no separate wards and no special treatment?—Not to have them properly cared for.

10654. If you had such wards, do you anticipate that a considerable number would come in?—I think they would.

CHAIRMAN.—That is the way it works, Mr. Goswold. There is a shocking amount of consumption in the country, and very little in the workhouses, because they are not suitable for their treatment.

10655. Dr. BROWN.—You have no ward at present for consumption?—No.

Mr. GOSWOLD.—I understand Lurgan was built for 1,000 inmates. At present they have something over 200 patients, and why should there be any lack of accommodation if they wanted it?

10656. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you not think it would be better to have some central place for the consumptives where they could be isolated?—Yes, I would go in as readily for that as for a shelter. A common sanatorium would be quite as advisable, but where that is impossible the shelter would be more readily available.

10657. An institution to themselves would be preferable?—It would.

Mr. JAMES B. CAMPBELL examined.

There are fifty-five beds in the County Antrim Infirmary. The average number of patients last year was thirty-five.

10658. CHAIRMAN.—Do you happen to remember the greatest number at any time?—The beds at the same time are nearly filled up, I may say filled up altogether. The average cost is £35. I may be going over some of the figures that our surgeon gave. The cost to the county is £20—that is, we get £500 from the county, and portion of that £500 is paid by Belfast. We get also the surgeon's salary. The rest is made up largely by subscriptions from Lurgan people—the mills and the fishermen of Lurgan—and also by some donations; for instance, Mrs. Rathour gave £1,000. Owing to being so near Belfast, we certainly have the advantage of having some eminent men on the consulting staff. We have four—Professor Sinclair, Dr. Caldwell, Dr. Cecil Brown, and Dr. John Campbell—and these men are always available; they offer their services gratuitously, and it is no cost at all to the infirmary. With regard to the cases of accidents and others, I happen to

be manager of a mill in which we have about a thousand workers. We could not treat the cases, or at least get them treated in the same way as now if the infirmary were not available. We can simply telephone to the infirmary saying the cases are going up, and we can have them up inside five minutes. The same applies to another large mill and several small factories, and Hillside will not be more than ten minutes from the infirmary. Some of the accidents may be treated in other places if the infirmary were separated from the workhouse. A few cases may be treated in the workhouse hospital. I don't know whether the others could or not. We have a splendid operating room—I suppose as good as any in Belfast—and we have a highly-trained staff of nurses. We have six nurses, and the certificate granted by the County Antrim Infirmary is now accepted by the Local Government Board. We get a great deal of help from the people about us. For instance, a lady came in; she saw the rooms wanted papering; she ordered them to be papered at once, and a good deal of money has been spent by local people that way.

Dec. 17, 1900.

Dr. Matthew R. Mackenzie.

Mr. James B. Campbell.

Dec. 17, 1943
 Mr. James B. Connelley

10589. There is a good deal of local interest in it—
There is a good deal of local interest in it; we raised
\$1,800 the year before last.

10660. And you got a present of an ambulance?—
Yes; £1,200 was spent in the renovation of the house.
I don't know who built the house originally; it was a
very old institution. I rather think it was built by
subscriptions. Anyway it has been kept up for the last
thirty years entirely by local subscriptions. There has
been no charge whatever for keeping it up on the county
or on the Government.

10862. Was the county infirmary always at Lisburn? —I believe it is there 100 years and over.

10902. How long has it been in the same locality?—
I believe all that time.

10963. Not in the same house, was it?—In the same house: the house has been enlarged.

10964. Was it built for that purpose or had it been used for some other purpose?—If it had been used for other purposes the house must have been gutted and adapted for the purpose.

Mr. Williams.—It was constituted under an Act of the old Irish Parliament.

Witness.—We now try to get the patients to pay. They pay from 2s. 6d. to 10s. a week, according to their means, but there is no difference whatever made in the treatment, either with regard to the dietary or surgical treatment of the patients.

19965. CHAIRMAN.—What was the total you got for subscriptions last year?

Mr. WILKINS.—The difference between £600 and £1,000.

Witness.—The £15 extra that the patients cost was largely made up by subscriptions.

10666. Do your accounts show how much you got from subscriptions and from patients towards the cost of their treatment?—The subscriptions, including collections, were over £250; paying patients, £31. It would be rather more this year, but our accounts have not been published yet.

Mr. EDWARD HOCKER examined.

Mr. Edward
Meehan.

I am from Lisburn also. I was sent here by the Lisburn Rural Council, and also by the Board of Guardians, but I cannot add very much to what has been already said.

10974. CHAIRMAN.—You heard the evidence that was given?—I heard it all.

19078 Is there anything you would like to explain your views more distinctly on?—Personally speaking, as a representative of the rural constituency, we would like electoral rating. I don't represent Leaburn, and it may be a benefit to us where it is not so advantageous to Leaburn; but it is the opinion of all the Rural Commissioners that if we went back to rural rating with regard to outdoor relief, it would be better for the district and cheaper, because Leaburn absorbs a great deal of the money. With regard to this amalgamation question, I am merely here to represent the views of the Guardians and of the Council, and you have had their views with regard to amalgamation fully before you. There is another point with regard to the Leaburn Union; we have got thirty-four lunatics in the union, and the county asylum cannot accept them; they hang out now

10670. Are they partly from Down and partly from Antioch?—I think the great bulk are County Antioch patients, and we feel it a grievance that we have to pay the county-at-large charges for the Antioch Asylum and support our own lunatics at our own expense. When I see Mr. Clegg here, one of the committee of the asylum, I think he should take a note of it.

15097 Q. You would rather have them all transferred?
 --To Anstein. It would give them better treatment,
 treatment they cannot possibly have in the workhouse,
 and also remove them from the other inmates of the
 workhouse. It is not right to have them associating
 with sane people from day to day. That is one of the
 points that is vexing the Guardians at Lichburn. Bally-
 more, I understand, are getting money from the county
 for the upkeep of their own lunatics.

16978. I suppose a large number of lunatics do go direct from Leilbarn to the County Asylum?—I don't suppose we have sent half a dozen under the new order of things.

10679. I don't mean from the workhouse, but from the spit!—I have no figures.

20060. Is it not likely that there are a great many that reside in the barony, say of Upper Manassas, that

10937. The doctor thought \$160?—I think he is quite correct. Then there is the extern department. A good many patients are treated in the extern department gratuitously. We don't provide medicine.

10960. You charge for these?—No; we simply give them a prescription.

10969. Have you any dispensary where you make up
doses?—No.

10070. What is done with the patients in the house?—We have a contract with some of the local apothecaries. We found that was as cheap as having drugs in the house.

10971. You have some drugs for an emergency?—
Yes, they are all kept in stock.

Mr. BULLOCK:—The number of catenae was something about 700, testified by Dr. St. George, who gets no remuneration for that; there were 1,500 vials. Two or three years ago we applied for an increased grant from the County Council. They are obliged to give us \$2000 as a minimum. They can give a grant up to \$1,400. Two or three years ago we applied to them, and they granted \$150 extra. At that time they wanted to give some figures how our infirmary compared with other infirmaries, and we found it was one of the most economically managed on the island. The only one that was lower was the County Clinic. It was two or three pounds lower per patient, but that is accounted for largely by the fact that the surgeon's salary was not included, or I am sure it would be brought near ours, and there has been a considerable increase since then.

10072. CHAFMAN.—Yonkers is a very nice hospital situated in a healthy part of the town, and anything done to remove the infirmary would be a great loss to the community at large.

10893. You would not care to be affiliated in the way it was suggested just now?—Certainly not; we don't think the work could be done in the same way.

Mr. WILKINS.—In the County Down side there are a great number of factories, and we take the people in

Witness.—They pay.

go to Antrim?—I don't think there are very many. I am speaking of lunatics in the workhouse. That is the point I wish to accentuate. They cannot possibly be properly treated in the body of the home.

19061. Dr. BIGGIE.—Are you a County Councillor?—
I am.

1968. Did you bring this before the County Council?—Frequently; but I am not on the asylum committee. If it could be brought about that Antrim could be done away with as a workhouse, and made it an auxiliary asylum, there might be room got for these lunatics. It is close to where the asylum is, but there is the question of cost brought up before you by Mr. McCann; but it is a very burning question in Loughrea.

10295. Mr. M. K. KAGANIAN, an Eastern European, says: "The Government is about to be in some position as you say; they have an equal number. How can you say other than that? I suggest—The American people would be perfectly satisfied to contribute the Government would be perfectly satisfied to contribute per head for a sanatorium for consumptive if it were established anywhere in the province. They would be satisfied to contribute to the location of it, and pay the way for the patients they send there. Because it is not a property grievance, that consumptive patients are not properly treated in union workhouses. As regards children, send them out; take them away from the associations of the workhouse."

10989. You would be in favour also of having some place to which to send the unmarried about to be mothers?—That is a thing that was not considered at the time that we were looking over the report. I don't think there are many in Lisbon at present. We think Ballynacree would be a proper place to send children to if it were done away with.

10605. Don't you think Antrim could do with less than five workhorses?—Our idea is to get rid of two of them at the present time.

20088. Considering that the number of the infirm is so small, do you not think a lesser number than five would be sufficient?—Certainly; one house would accommodate them all very well, but then there is the sentimental idea after all. I don't know whether we can take sentiment into consideration in treating the poor.

18887. CHAIRMAN.—Certainly!—The removing of them from their own district, where they would not be in touch with their people, would be a hardship.

10082. Mr. MURKIN.—You are to consider the advantage and disadvantages, and let us see where the balance lies?—I should not like to remove these old people away from the district in which they have been living all their lives.

10083. If that view is general there cannot be any change at all. You are willing to take the Ballymena and Antrim people away, why not go a little further?—That is not a very severe journey.

10084. CHAIRMAN.—From Licharn would not be very severe?—I don't know. What first rose in my mind was the small number of people that were in these two unions, and the officials were as many as could have taken care of five times as many. That was what weighed with me at the time.

10085. Mr. MURKIN.—A proper thing to weigh with you, but do you not think it might be carried a little further?—That is the only point I see—the sentimental idea of taking the people away from the district they are living in. Friends come in to see them occasionally, and occasionally they discharge themselves, and go on for a few days and come back again.

10086. Did you ever consider the question of boarding-out aged people?—I have thought of it, but I don't think it could be carried out satisfactorily.

10087. That would do away with the sentimental grievance you refer to?—I don't think it would ever be carried out satisfactorily. They would not get the same care in the country as in the house. Old people are hard to deal with, and if you board them out, the country people could not get up with them. They get fretted in their ideas. That would not arise in the union. They are satisfied with their treatment there.

10088. Have you any suggestion to make about the tramps?—I think if the English system was brought in it might minimise the number of tramps.

10089. The power of detention?—For three days, and give them work to do. I was at the conference at Ballymena, and I was of opinion that it could be got over in another way: if the unions would communicate one with another when certain tramps passed through their union, and were expected to land at another union next evening. I understood the law is they could be arrested as vagrants.

10090. Some unions tried that for a while, but it was not effective?—Ballymena, Ballymoney, and Antrim are better situated for trying it. In Ballymena at the present time they have practically very few tramps coming in and out. I don't know what drastic measures should be taken.

10091. We found that was the case in another union in Cavan?—At the same time I think those tramps

should be either in the workhouse or under some detention. It would never do to have them wandering about the country, sleeping behind haystacks, and in farmyards, and running a chance of doing all sorts of damage.

10092. That is one of the difficulties. Some gentlemen have said it was better as an insurance against these dangers to have a shelter for them?—I am perfectly agreeable to that, but if we could come at any plan to prevent them adopting the profession of a tramp in the first instance, it would meet the evil, but I don't see how it is to be done.

10093. If the practices were adopted that when a tramp became regular in his visits he should be sent to the police station, would not that be a deterrent?—That would, of course. That was the idea we were thinking of in Licharn, but it has not been carried out. A great deal depends on the master of the workhouse and the porter. If a man comes back within a month they can bring him up before the police, but they won't do it. If there was a premium put on every tramp they caught something might be done. I don't care how a man disguises himself, I don't see any difficulty in telling him again at the end of the month, if you look at him particularly in the first instance. I don't see how any two men could not prove to him at the end of the month.

10094. If he makes a big circuit of the country it might be a year or two before he came back?—In a year or two he would be perfectly free, but I don't know; I think the law is that they must not present themselves again within a month.

10095. CHAIRMAN.—Have you ever spoken to the resident medical superintendent of the asylum with regard to your lunatics?—We have sent for forms, and they always send back word that there is no room.

10096. Have you ever visited the asylum yourself?—I have not.

10097. Dr. BROWN.—I think you made one mistake in regard to the lunatics in Ballymena Workhouse: you said they were paid for by the county?—Are there not some sent there?

10098. These are the county-at-large lunatics, and the Belfast lunatics that are paid for, but their own lunatics are a union charge?—That constitutes the grievance.

10099. You are not treated so unfairly?—I don't say we are, but it is a thing that ought not to be.

10100. Mr. O'NEILL.—You say your lunatics are associated with other lunatics in the Licharn Workhouse: is that so?—I understand they are in the infirmary ward, along with those who are not lunatics.

Mr. PHILIP JORDAN EXAMINED.

Not to waste your time and that of the Commission, there is one thing the witness omitted, that is with reference to the deportation of paupers across the Channel.

10101. Mr. MURKIN.—Have you many in your union of that class?—We get a good many now and again that have served their day in England and Scotland, and we have to pay their carriage back again to Licharn.

10102. Does any inquiry be made as to the length of time these people have been away?—If they have one year in any union and five years in the country they

cannot depart them?—They have sent them back after thirty years' service.

10103. Some inquiry ought to be made. It would be worth the while of the Guardians to test a case?—We are powerless in the matter.

10104. Are those cases coming on now and again?—There have been none for a short time.

10105. Have there been any for the last three years?—I won't say. There are none to my knowledge.

CHAIRMAN.—There is a new Act, you know, and very likely that grievance has disappeared.

Mr. Philip Jordan.

Mr. WILLIAM WALKER EXAMINED.

I might say that the evidence to be given by this commission, which is appearing before you to-day, is not evidence which has been confirmed by the Board of Guardians; it is evidence which was taken by a sub-committee who will appear before you to-day. They examined the visiting and resident superintendents, the relieving officer, and school-teachers, and the assistant master, and that, in conjunction with their own personal observation, extending in some cases over 45 years, is what will be laid before the Commission. I may state on this question of amalgamation we are absolutely unanimous that there are no adjacent workhouses called for any purpose that the Belfast Board of Guardians might apply them to. We believe that if the Government, as the Government should, provide special treatment in a specially equipped institution for epileptics, of whom we have fifty-six, and I may say that is within the region of practical accomplishment, because two years ago the Belfast Board was informed by the Local

Government Board that a private subscriber had offered to build a place, provided the several unions would amalgamate for the purpose of maintaining their epileptics, but unfortunately there was no central authority for taking the opinion of the various Boards, and I am afraid that matter has lapsed.

10106. CHAIRMAN.—The offer was renewed the other day?—We don't think the Belfast Workhouse is the proper place to house epileptics.

10107. Dr. BROWN.—Do you refer to some epileptic?—I am afraid it is very hard to differentiate between insane and some epileptic. We include all our epileptics, and if the asylum authorities took over the mentally afflicted, of whom we have 117—and may I say that the accommodation in the workhouse, which is the best that can be given under the circumstances, is an accommodation which accommodates the disease; they are surrounded by four walls; their only method of recreation is on a paved ground, and they sometimes get out

Mr. William Walker.

Dec. 17, 1903.

Mr William Walker.

on a little lawn that has hardly accommodation to wheel a wheelbarrow. We don't think we have the slightest chance to benefit the mentally afflicted, and we think the asylum authorities are the proper people to care for them, and if it is hoped to get an improvement in their condition, the only place is Parkisburn. We think we should be relieved from that class.

12024. CHAIRMAN.—Have the Psychiatric Asylum people been taking any from you?—They take them when we send them, but at the present time there is almost a deadlock owing to the accommodation. They are more than full. The only cases they take from us are dangerous cases, but there are other cases that are medium cases. Then there is a Commission appointed to inquire into this question of an auxiliary workhouse to be used as a sanatorium, and our hope is that that Commission will meet shortly, and that a sanatorium for the Belfast Board of Guardians will be an accomplished fact, before the beginning of the New Year. Belfast has a death-rate of 1,500 per annum of this disease, according to Dr. Whitaker, and the medical officer of health in an county borough over one-eighth. The number afflicted in Belfast is 4,000. We feel the working classes are becoming contaminated with this disease, and are becoming more chargeable on the rates, and we think if an effort was made to stamp out the disease, that by means of the convalescent building which is being erected under the Board of Guardians, in a few years, and with the education which the patients would carry with them, we would be able to stamp it out.

12025. Is this the project of the Guardians?—It is the project of the Guardians. We had a deputation before the Local Government Board. The Local Government Board was sympathetic, but a legal difficulty arose whether we had power to do this. We got the opinion of the Solicitor-General that we had power to do so as an auxiliary workhouse, and the Local Government Board have named a Commissioner to inquire into the matter. I believe the Commissioner is favourable personally, and I hope it will be an accomplished fact. The infectious diseases hospital now being erected by the City Council takes out the infectious cases. The Borough Council up to the present time have shirked the responsibility of infectious cases. That burden has been cast on the Belfast Board of Guardians, who have had to keep isolated from all other parts of the house—a very large establishment—and at a heavy cost to the poor rate.

12016. That has practically disappeared?—There are some of the revenues we allege against amalgamation—we believe that none of these classes we have dealt with are fit cases to be treated in a workhouse adjacent to Belfast. I have visited workhouses in Cork, Kerry, Kilkenny, and Newry, practically the one exception has designed them all; they are not designed to lead people to the better end of their days in a happy frame of mind, but to set as a penal affliction on them.

12017. Mr. MURPHY.—Under gables and mutilated windows?—Yes. I know the additions we are putting up are all fitted with excellent frames; we had those windows removed a few months ago, and have them of the most modern type with excellent frames, well ventilated, well lighted, clean and with modern appliances for lavatory purposes. At the present time the question of destroying the main body of the house, which is a very large portion of the Belfast Workhouse, is simply delayed pending the result of this Commission. Every Local Government Inspector has condemned them as most unsuitable, and the type which stands in the Belfast Workhouse is the type you find in every workhouse in Ireland; and if the Belfast Board of Guardians are desirous of wiping out that type within themselves, I don't think they are anxious to amalgamate with a similar type and have it inflicted on them. On the question of relief, it appears that a very large number of deserving persons are not, under the Poor Law system in force at present in Belfast, relieved as the spirit of the Poor Law Act intended they should be relieved. Might I just read two paragraphs of the relieving officer's evidence. Mr. Mercer was asked, "Are there ever any cases of destitution in your district that you never hear anything at all about unless from the clergyman, or to whom your attention was drawn by some friend or clergyman?"—Yes; that has often occurred. "In many cases respectable poor people?—That has very often occurred." Then it goes on:—"Mr. Walker.—In dealing with this case or case of what you would call deserving poor have you found yourself in any respect restricted by the limits of the

law?" And the answer is:—"No, there is no such thing as that; there is no limit: deserving cases all get very nice treatment, and are well attended to." Then there is the further question:—"Mr. O'Hare: It is not that; do you find yourself embarrassed or twinned by the law in giving adequate help to deserving cases?"—There is no such thing. Mr. Adams: "Then you have power to give a sum of money?—No." "Have you power to give them goods?"—No. "What is your power on the outside relief question?"—You cannot give them either goods or money; you can give them relief only in the workhouse." Mr. Mercer is asked what he does with the people, when they apply to him, so when he cannot give outdoor relief. He advises them to remain out as long as they can. The Committee felt that the evidence given by the relieving officer amounts to this, that when a person applies whose temporary relief would place on their feet again, the relieving officer has no power to give that temporary relief; he says, "Go and remain as long as you can without relief." The person goes to starvation, and comes into the workhouse, afterwards, broken in mind and body and a permanent charge on the rates, whereas, in the first instance, if a little relief were given they would have been enabled to remain out of the workhouse the remainder of their days.

12018. I think that relieving officer ought to be charged; he does not seem to understand the law. He has ample power to give provisional relief in all cases, and if he refuses he is breaking the law. Might I illustrate the position by a case I brought before the Guardians: a woman with three children; her husband was lying with phthisis; he was earning 7s. a week. I brought the matter before the Board, and the Board was informed they had no power to give relief because the woman's husband was alive, but as soon as he died—

12019. That was quite wrong; when the husband was incapacitated, unable to work, the relieving officer and Guardians had ample power to give what assistance they thought necessary—I am afraid the mailing of the Act of Parliament is not that.

12020. Well, the fact through the country is that?—There are five exempted cases, and Belfast is one of them. It is in Mooney's Compendium.

12021. Dr. BROOKER.—It is repealed, I understand?—It is in operation as far as the Belfast Board of Guardians is concerned.

12022. CHAIRMAN.—At all events that is not the law?—That is the legal advice tendered to the Board of Guardians, that unless the person is unfit to be removed, or unless she is a widow with two or more children, no relief can be given.

12023. Mr. MURPHY.—That is not the case. Where the husband—the father of the family—is sick and unable to earn a livelihood for his children, the Guardians have ample power to give what assistance they think necessary?—Two of the children were brought into the workhouse by the Guardians, when they were advised they could not give outdoor relief. To keep those children cost 4s. each, when a relief of 5s. to the woman would have enabled her to keep herself and the third one out of the workhouse; so that the Guardians are losing 5s. a week by not giving outdoor relief.

Mr. MURPHY.—They ought to stop that practice, and give relief wherever it is necessary.

12024. Dr. BROOKER.—Is there any resolution on the subject by the Belfast Board of Guardians?—No; we were advised it was the law.

12025. CHAIRMAN.—I am sure the Belfast Board of Guardians are well able to exercise their discretion?—Classification of indoor paupers. It appears that the indiscriminate housing of all classes of inmates, caused by lack of accommodation in order to classify, is a far to a large number of decent deserving poor, and in addition, the bad influence exercised by some of those who are old gail birds and stunted criminals tends to demoralise those who fall within the associations which the present system fosters. It is suggested, therefore:—(1) That different forms of occupation should be specified for those of varying degrees, both of age and condition. (2) That different wings or blocks of the body of the house should be set apart according to classification. (3) That stricter industrial supervision over those who might be classed as idlers, vagrants, or old gail birds, should be exercised. (4) And that the several positions of comparative trust—we believe that giving a position of comparative trust to a person who is a deserving inmate very often keeps them up morally—which

be carried by pauper labour should be conferred upon those whom destitute circumstance or breakdown of health have forced into the workhouse. It appears, however, to myself, that the present method of dealing with what is, and can only be, classed as a periodic unemployed problem on the one hand, and a chronic destitution on the other, is mainly caused by (1) Such periods of "out of work" as have broken the persons in health and spirits, and indeed their first entry into the workhouse. The case which I mentioned of the woman and her two children is one of these. (2) Drink. (3) A depravity engendered by their early and subsequent environment. I believe this can only be met in a satisfactory fashion by establishing a series of farm colonies by county or district, but under central government, the persons sent to some to be transferred by the several Boards of Guardians to the central authority for a stated period, say, three months, and after that time the failure to remove at the farm unless seeking or obtaining bona fide employment to entitle the central authority to put these persons upon a black list, the object of which would be to prevent their receiving Poor Law relief, unless under an express resolution of the Board of Guardians to which they originally belonged. I find that this is a system which is becoming popular in England, the system of farm colonies. I find the Stratford, Poplar, and other Boards of Guardians have power to board out their paupers. Christian social colonies are throughout England. These men are kept at productive undertakings; they are taught habits of industry; they are not prisoners in the ordinary acceptance of the term; they are kept cleanly, and are made independent of Poor Law relief, and they come back with some occupation at their finger tips, and a desire to keep them from workhouse associations in future. I believe the present system tends to demoralise them. If we take a dozen paupers housed in a small ward, there may be one or two men of some considerable ability, but they have absolutely no chance of exercising it, because the supervision over them does not demoralise; they are all sent to the same occupation, and my personal opinion is, that the four millions of acres which, in Ireland, are absolutely untouched at the present time should be either started with re-stocking, as in Staffordshire, or else used to develop the resources of Ireland in the raising of agricultural produce.

11035. Do you think the Belfast inmates would be helpful material to set to work on?—I do; the Belfast unskilled labourer is an agricultural labourer first.

11037. I mean the men who are now in the workhouse?—I do; they are agricultural labourers who have drifted into town. The land is going out of cultivation in Ireland, and the naturally gravitates towards where there is the biggest chance of casual employment, and that is in Belfast.

11038. Mr. MURKIN.—Have you many able-bodied in the nation?—We have 99 able-bodied healthy men; able-bodied healthy women, 73; infirm men, 511; infirm women, 134. I would put the women on the same principle as dairy farming; I believe it would be a productive occupation, and I believe a woman, after three months' experience of it, would feel herself morally elevated, and she would be inclined to keep at work of that character. At the present time they get no chance of reform in Belfast Workhouse, and I take the Belfast Workhouse as typical of every other workhouse. Then again, I would draw the attention of the Commissioners to the superior women, as done to our industrial, as well as our service women, by offering the shelter of the workhouse as the only refuge. I believe that an old age pension of, say, 5s. per week per head, or 7s. 6d. per week where two persons, husband and wife, are together, will alter the system of the conditions under which the Poor Law system exists, and it also appears that a very little additional cost will be involved, for I find that for the year 1899-1900 the cost in Ireland was £2,269,045, and in England, £15,870,858, or a total of £18,139,903. It appears to me that that is a fearful sum of money, growing up year after year, and with no attempt to grapple with the question, we are not getting to the root of it. I think the farm colony will get at the root of it in Ireland.

11039. CHAIRMAN.—Is there any place in the neighbourhood of Belfast where you could start anything of the sort?—Yes; there is a good deal of uncultivated land about Belfast.

11040. Mr. MURKIN.—Will the Guardians take kindly to an idea like that?—Yes; provided it was under a central government. I don't think we should have the tramps or unemployed from one small union as a farm.

11041. Would county or provincial area be preferable?—I think county government would do better or Down. It appears to me that, given the establishment of farm colonies, and an old-age pension scheme, raised, both financial and administrative, would be afforded that would be bound to affect beneficially the future of Ireland. That is my own opinion, from a study of the entire question, and also observations as a Guardian.

11042. Have you been a Guardian long?—Four and a half years. It is not the length of time that makes people famous.

11043. CHAIRMAN.—Have you been studying the Irish question long?—From 1895. I have been in every borough in Ireland, and wherever I go, I go to the workhouse. I have always managed to get out of it. My own opinion is that that is my ultimate end. Then I deal with the question of children. There are, it appears to us, four systems for the care of children under the control of Boards of Guardians:—(1) Continuing as at present; (2) a separate outside barracks system, i.e., to build a school outside the union premises, and to continue the present method; (3) scattered homes; (4) all children boarded out. I may say at once that a careful consideration of the entire situation compels me to reject the two first methods. The third method is a highly successful one, and is very popular in some parts of England; but I am convinced that the boarding-out of children is the most successful yet adopted, and I desire to call the Commissioners' attention to par. 8 of report 3, page 11; that is the doctor's evidence on the question. The evidence of every person who was examined points to the enormous success which attended the boarding-out of the children. It is the evidence of everyone who was examined before that special Committee, that one out of every hundred only comes back, and then through distressed circumstances; whereas the children who are reared in the workhouse take it as their home, and whenever they are face to face with a hill they won't climb the hill, they will come into the workhouse, and take the first chance of going out and having one or two days' rambling about and coming back again; it is their home. We have children in the workhouse whose parents are in the workhouse.

11044. We have four generations in the workhouse the other day?—I beg to state that in the absence of powers to board out at the discretion of the Guardians, I would advise that industrial outside homes should be established for both boys and girls, so that when suitable employment was found for them there should be some place under an administrative authority, such as the Boards of Guardians, where boys and girls could be kept and supervised, and I would suggest that any deficiency between the net earnings of the boys and girls, and the cost of the upkeep of the home, might be very well taken as a charge on the Poor Rate, as I believe that the want of such a home often prevents children rising to a position of self dependence in the world. We have evidence, not only from our own observation, but from the officers—we know we can get any amount of boys out as messengers in the several shops in Belfast; but the net earnings of those boys would not keep them in the home; they have either to go to a doss house of the lowest character, and associate with boys of the lowest moral standard, or else they have to come back to us. We believe, if we had a home where the Guardians would bear the difference between their net earnings and the cost of the home.

11045. Is there no home for working boys in Belfast?—There is Dr. Bernard's Home; but any home of that character will deal only with particular religious denominations.

Mr. O'NEIL.—There is a home; but it is for boys that have come from an industrial school.

Witness.—The Committee entirely agree with boarding-out; the children get an association with their foster parent that very often keeps them straight. We have boys boarded out that are in positions of trust, not merely in Belfast, but through Ireland and England; and girls who have risen to comparative affluence. On the question of illegitimacy, which is an important one in Belfast, because for the year ended June last, out of 282 births in the Belfast Sanatorium, 283 were illegitimate, or 50 per cent. of those born in the

Dec. 17, 1903.
Mr. William Walker.

Dec. 17, 1900.
Mr. William
Walker.

workhouse were legitimate. I suggest that the law as to the putative father, dealt with so ably by Mr. Madden to-day, might be amended to enable us to adopt powers that Mr. Rodden suggested. In addition, I suggest the establishment of an outside nursery, to which the mother of a destitute child should take the child and herself until re-employment can be obtained, and if such employment is of the character of a domestic servant, that the girl should pay such sum for the maintenance of the child as the Guardians might direct, the mother to be allowed to visit periodically and to be under the paternal eye of an officer of the Board entrusted with that duty, that is, that the officer should have the responsibility cast upon him of seeing that this girl is not keeping the company of vicious characters whilst her child is being maintained at the expense of the rates, the officer should stand in loco parentis, and see that the girl kept absolutely straight.

11036. It would be a rather difficult task—I am afraid the very difficulty of it makes it the more necessary.

11037. If a girl were at service in a private house would it not be rather objectionable having a man as her parent looking around after her?—It could be done in this way: that she should have to report at certain times in the month where the child was, or at some other place.

11038. Mr. MURKINMAN.—Do you not think a reformatory under religious auspices would be better?—I do not; there is too much of a penalty attached to the girl, while the putative father gets off scot free. I think girls who lapse come, not from vicious habits, but because they were raised—girls of that sort should be taught that they are to take their place in society again without any degrading stain on them; they should not be made sensitive to public opinion. A girl who feels herself sensitive to public opinion in these cases never straightens her back again; whereas if she is kept straight for a little while she will continue in that straight path. I am of opinion that day nurseries at present in existence might be utilised for that purpose, the home, of course, being supplied, the Guardians to pay the cost of upkeep and to supervise the children; and in the case of cripples I advise that all cripples should be transferred to a suitable home, where some industrial training should be afforded them. I deal with the question of night shelters. In a big city like Belfast there are always a number of people temporarily straitened: we have had whole families admitted to the workhouse.

11039. CHAIRMAN.—Are there any charitable night shelters?—Dr. Barnardo's Home takes boys and girls in; but there are none who take families in. I suggest night shelters might be adopted in different portions in the city, where persons temporarily straitened might find a night's shelter and a night's food.

11040. At present these people either have to go to the workhouse or else stay outside in the open air?—Yes.

11041. Are they found by the police sheltering in places?—There are not many cases of that sort. They come up and loiter about the gate of the workhouse, and if the relieving officer cannot be found—as he cannot always be found—and the master is not available, they have to remain there until admitted by the night watchman or the master.

11042. Could not the assistant master act?—He could; but the master has the responsibility cast on him.

11043. But these people should not be kept in the rain while the master is spending an evening out?—That is a question of administration in which we are defective. I am afraid we do keep them exposed to the elements. That could be got over by building a temporary hut—a wooden hut at the gate.

11044. In a union like Belfast you would have some officer competent if the master was sick—you would have a temporary officer?—We have an assistant master and matron.

11045. Could not some officer be always present to deal with cases?—That is true in theory, but we don't find it works in practice. There is no regulation for their attending them. If the Board of Guardians framed a regulation that as soon as a person applied to the gatekeeper for admission the master or his representative should be sent for—

11046. The master should always leave word if he was going away.

Mr. Robt.—The arrangement is that some officer is always on duty up to 12 o'clock at night. They are not kept waiting outside the gate up to that time.

11047. Did you ever call the attention of the police to the people?—Yes, and they will take no action. On the question of the treatment of the sick, I desire to say that in the Belfast Infirmary the treatment has early improved both in accommodation, administration, and medical and nursing attendance within the past 40 years. That is the only period for which I can speak from observation. The number of sick treated in the infirmary was 12,050, and it speaks volumes for the medical staff. I would like to take this opportunity of bearing my testimony to the fact that fifteen serious operations are performed by our visiting surgeons per month. They are of the most serious character, and they are performed with a skill unequalled in the whole city. I believe the number of acute cases treated in the infirmary are cases that the patient would prefer to be treated in the infirmary rather than in a general hospital. Possibly one of the points is the absence of that clinical material. They are not clinical material. They are human beings, and treated as human beings, and I think because of that the Belfast poor would prefer to come to the infirmary.

11048. Dr. BROOKS.—Do you not think there are many other reasons?—I think that is the main reason.

11049. CHAIRMAN.—Is it not an important reason that they have not rooms in the others?—They have not rooms in the others, and there is not the same attention paid to them in the others as in the infirmary. I can speak from practical knowledge of both. I have been having a court of inquiry at the Royal Hospital with regard to the alleged ill-treatment of one of my own men. I am connected with a trades union, and I can speak with knowledge on the subject.

11050. Hardly with knowledge of three hospitals—I can compare the treatment.

11051. Mr. MURKINMAN.—How the infirmary of the workhouse a better reputation amongst the poor than the general hospitals?—Very much better; ninety-nine out of every hundred persons will tell you they prefer to go to the infirmary rather than to the Royal Hospital.

11052. CHAIRMAN.—I know it has a very high name, and very properly, but I must say I don't quite like to hear these comparisons made—I am not making a comparison with the object of detracting from the efficiency of the Royal Victoria Hospital, but workhouse infirmaries throughout Ireland don't always bear a high reputation, and care has been made exceedingly efficient through the abilities of the medical staff. One thing, which I think is desirable, provided accommodation could be obtained, would be to classify not merely according to the nature of the ailment, but also in relation to the class of patients, i.e., to keep those whose illness is self-inflicted beyond the power to annoy, as in the case of drunkards, other patients, and to enable the medical officer, with the express approval of the Board of Guardians, to permit patients on discharge to retain the furniture, if the medical officer and the board are satisfied that a sudden change into the person's own underwear would inflame against them. We have cases of persons coming in with pneumonia who have cotton underwear, and they get contrived and desire to go back to work as soon as possible, and the board, under present arrangements, have no alternative but to take the furniture from them and put them back into their own cotton underwear.

11053. In the case of destitute persons the Guardians have full power to provide these persons with an suit of furniture?—That is just the point we were on clear about; I understood it only applied to children.

11054. It would have to be under outdoor relief administration; you could not give away the clothes they wear in the house; that would be taking away the very stock of the house; look into that—I would be very glad if that could be done, and so would the entire committee. We wish to call the Commissioners' attention to the difference in cost to the Belfast corporation of outdoor and indoor relief. We have forty-four persons receiving outdoor relief in Belfast; that is apart from children who are boarded out; and the cost of outdoor relief is £7 10s. 6d. per head, the average, compared to the cost inside of £15 10s. 6d. per head; that covers maintenance and the entire establishment charges, and we think that is an enormous discrepancy—more than double—and it is the opinion of the committee who investigated the whole matter that if outdoor relief was more relied on it would benefit the destitute person and the ratepayer at the same time.

11055. I suppose you have made representations to

(just affect yourself as a Guardian?—Yes; but we have been met with the legal difficulty that Belfast had no power to relieve except under the circumstances I have mentioned.)

11059. Well, there may be some special clause in some Belfast Act that I am not aware of?—It was from one of the public General Acts.

11060. Mr. MURPHY.—That does not apply outside Belfast; in other unions it is given under the conditions named by you?—We would be very glad if it could be applied.

11061. CHAIRMAN.—It is in the discretion of the Guardians to decide in each case whether it should be given or not?—The total number of days of relief for

the last twelve months was 1,170,127; we gave relief to 19,977 and to 3,206 persons continuously resident with us, and when I say that the rate is only 2d. in the £ and it was 19d. four or five years ago I think the Guardians and the administrative staff deserve some little credit for having with efficiency reduced the rate also in the Belfast Union.

11062. Mr. MURPHY.—When was the rate 16d.?—In 1860.

11063. On what valuation was the 11d. rate struck?—The revised valuation has not come into operation.

11064. On what valuation was the 11d. rate struck?—On the old valuation.

CHAIRMAN.—£1,542,000.

Dec. 17, 1903.

Mr. William Walker.

Mr. J. S. OSWALD, Chairman Belfast

Board of Guardians, examined.

To start, perhaps, your time as well as the time of the witnesses present, I may say that prior to the Act coming into force the rate in Ballyhackamore was 1s. 2d. in the £; Greenisland would be 1s. 2d. in the £; and Carramony would be 1s. 5d. in the £; you know the union; you will find that out; those were all different; and Belfast would be 1s. When the Act came into force in 1859 all were amalgamated, and we reduced ourselves to 1s. in the £. It is only to save time I say this.

CHAIRMAN.—It is the same all over Ireland.

Mr. J. S. Oswald.

11065. Mr. MURPHY.—You give to the new administration the credit of doing good work at a smaller cost than its predecessors?—Might I say to you, as a member of Parliament, and one to whom I have looked up for a long time as a wise man, that it would be unfair that the new man should get all the credit, seeing that I am one of the old men, and a member of the board during that time.

Mr. WILLIAM WALKER further examined.

11066. Mr. MURPHY.—What is the amount of poor rate you receive?—The amount of expenditure was £66,000.

CHAIRMAN.—For Poor Law purposes, £66,000.

11067. Mr. MURPHY.—What did you receive from the Poor Law?—I cannot say.

11068. CHAIRMAN.—The Poor Law rate for that year was 2d. We are in the position that the county borough of Belfast, and Antrim, and Down contribute a quota; sometimes they pay within the stipulated time and sometimes they do not. Indoor maintenance, £31,368; establishment charges, £21,687; outdoor maintenance, £1,880; maintenance in extern institutions, £790; dispensary charges, £3,964.

11069. Mr. MURPHY.—You gave some evidence respecting parties being refused relief at the workhouse?—Yes.

11070. You stated you asked under legal advice?—That is the clerk's advice.

11071. You did not take the advice of a professional gentleman?—We took it that the clerk was sufficiently acquainted with the law.

11072. That is the reason these men have been excluded from the workhouse who have been admitted all over Ireland that the clerk is the person to decide on a legal point?—The clerk of the workhouse is the official appointed by the Board of Guardians to keep us straight with the Local Government Board. We did not consult counsel.

11073. You said you had taken legal advice, and you had also read the Act yourself; the sooner you take legal advice on that matter the better?—I am perfectly satisfied with the Chairman's statement that that Act has been repealed or amended.

CHAIRMAN.—Oh, I don't know that.

11074. Mr. MURPHY.—How many relieving officers are connected with the union?—Mercer, Johnson, Morrison, Stewart, and Mitchell—five.

11075. Where do these gentlemen reside?—In different divisions of the city.

11076. A person wishing admission to this Civil Hotel on the Lifford Road must go to these relieving officers?—Or the Master.

11077. I have been instructed that people are excluded there at night and many are taken to the police office?—That is not my opinion.

11078. One person stated that anyone going up there not later than nine or ten would get admission?—The statement was that up to nine or ten the Master or his assistant was on duty, and after nine or ten it was dependent on the policeman.

11079. On many occasions the Master might not be there, and therefore these people would be excluded?—No; the policeman has power to admit anyone when the Master is not there.

11080. I observe that some time ago £17,000 was spent in erecting a boardroom?—That is the first I heard of it.

11081. Has any motion been before the Board to expend a large sum of money for the purpose of erecting a large boardroom?—No. There was a proposal to spend £3,000 on a boardroom and suite of offices, and the contingencies made up to £13,500; that was brought down to £9,000 on the revised plans.

11082. You would have a small parliament there?—We are a parliament, and as a economical parliament.

11083. Would it not now be better, would not the poor get better relief, more money expended on them with a lessening of expense in salaries, if there was an amalgamation of the Poor Law Guardians with the City Council, having one board to deal with civil affairs and having the union under their control; would not that bring about a saving of expense?—Without any inquiry, or, at least, on a very superficial inquiry, the City Corporation are entitled to spend £280,000 on building a new suite of offices for themselves, and we have not been able to spend £9,000 building a suite of offices for ourselves, so I take it if we had been amalgamated with the City Corporation our £13,500 could have been taken into their scheme without an inquiry.

11084. Perhaps they would hand you over the old municipal buildings?—It would be no service to us; we like to be on the spot where the work is done.

11085. Would you, personally, as a ratepayer, have any objection to a scheme which would amalgamate the affairs of the City Council with the Guardians?—If you can transfer the present personnel of the Guardians to supervise under the Corporation the administration of Poor Law relief I have no objection.

11086. How many members are there in the Board of Guardians?—Fifty-four; they are a diminishing number; the ex-officio are gradually retiring under the Act.

11087. Do many of the prominent merchants of Belfast seek election for that board?—Some of them have been beaten, and they have not had the courage to come up again.

11088. Even in the City Corporation some of the prominent merchants do not seek election?—No.

11089. If a central body was established, do you not think it would be calculated to bring into public life in Belfast many of the prominent merchants?—I take it that a successful merchant means a man who is devoting the whole of his time to his own business, and a man who is doing that cannot possibly attend to the business of the poor.

11090. Then all the gentlemen who are Poor Law Guardians are not attending to their own business?—They are sacrificing a little in the interests of the general ratepayer, yourself among the number.

11091. Regarding the collection of the rates, could not this poor rate be collected as an ordinary municipal rate by the Corporation?—Yes, I believe it could. We have nothing to do with the rate collectors—neither appoint them, dismiss them, nor superintend them.

Mr. William Walker.

Dec. 17, 1903.
Mr. William
Walker.

11088. Do you pay them anything at all in your account?—No.

11089. There is an item here—"Postage paid on stamped requisition forms, £122." How does that arise?—It is on the question of the franchise; the Clerk of the Union is responsible for the making of the lists, I believe, until the present clerk resigns, when the office will be transferred, and it is in connection with that; these are requisition forms sent out for the purpose of the franchise.

CHAIRMAN.—I think you need not mind going into that.

11091. Mr. Murphy.—The relieving officers live in different districts in the town?—Yes.

Mr. Oswald.—In their own districts.

11092. Mr. Murphy.—Could there be no means of having a man at the workhouse in constant attendance

—a day man and a night man—who would have power to admit a proper destitute case into the workhouse?—The Master or his representative is there up to ten o'clock, and then there is the relieving officer and the gate porter. I don't see any necessity for putting on an additional man.

11093. How do the mentally infirm come into the workhouse?—They are admitted by us as destitute persons, and on examination they are found to be sick in mind. Being destitute persons, and not dangerous lunatics, the asylum authorities being overworked, refuse to take them from us.

11094. I understand there is an interchange of lunatics between the Asylum Board and the Poor Law Guardians?—There was, but that is done away with; every dangerous lunatic we sent was got a lunatic lunatic instead, but that has been stopped.

Mr. EDWARD COOY examined.

Mr. Edward
Cooy.

I was appointed by the Belfast Rural District Council, along with the Chairman, Dr. Wilson, to give evidence. I may say that the Rural District Council will be very glad to be amalgamated with other districts for all purposes, but we could not see any advantage in being changed for union purposes only. Our district is a district which was mapped out, I may say, by happenstance; it was never mapped out for any purpose; it is a residence of the Belfast Union when the city was taken out of it, and it is a district that for district purposes we consider very inconvenient.

11095. Dr. Broome.—It has been very much encroached upon by the extension of the boundaries?—Very much; if the boundary had not been extended it would have been another thing altogether, and we think that if there is any change to be made the district purposes should be considered as well as the union purposes.

11096. CHAIRMAN.—Your feeling is that you would rather not go to the adjoining unions?—Unless our district was divided up and added to the other districts.

11097. Is not that what would happen?—No; I mean the district as a district for roads.

11098. You would like the rural district to be broken up as well as the union?—Exactly so.

11099. I suppose the only reason the rural district was formed was because it had to be formed, being part of the union?—Exactly so.

11100. And you would like the rural district to be broken up as a separate rural district?—We would. The next point I would speak of is the boarding-out system for children. I happen to know a good deal about it from living in a village where there are a very large number of children boarded out, and I can bear witness that it has succeeded in a very marked manner,

and I would be in favour of boarding out in preference to any other plan. I consider a small home where a foster mother would have a half-dozen or more children would be better than the next best thing, but not near so good as boarding out in individual families. One instance came before me some time ago—a very remarkable instance—in which a boy had been boarded out into a family; the head of the family died, and that boy, who had grown up, actually kept the family together, and it was out of his wages the family was supported until some of the other children reached an age at which they could help. As to persons being sent back to their districts I can get no figures on the subject, but I have come to the conclusion that there are a very large number of paupers in Belfast Union—more than usual—that have never worked in or had any connection with the union, but came into it merely to get into the workhouse.

11101. You mean without having worked in it once straight in here to the workhouse?—Yes; and I think it is unfair that that should be so.

11102. Dr. Broome.—You think they should have some residence in the district before they should be admitted?—Yes. If they had been any time working in the district I would not send them back.

11103. CHAIRMAN.—But you mean when they come straight from another place?—Yes; for the purpose of going into the workhouse. There is one point I wish to mention; if we continued on with the Belfast Union I think there should not be the old system of district rating, but a district rating in which the rural district would be one item, and the city another, and the County Down Rural a third.

11104. For all purposes or outdoor relief only?—All purposes.

The sitting was adjourned.

TWENTY-FIRST PUBLIC SITTING—FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18TH, 1903.

Dec. 18, 1903.

At the Court-house, Belfast.

Present:—Mr. MURTAGHAN (in the Chair); and Dr. COBY BIGGER.

Miss F. F. CLARK examined.

11105. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Miss Clark, we would like to hear your views?—I sent in a paper to the Commission asking some suggestions as regards the children. It is the only department of which I feel I have any real knowledge. The first was as to the extension of boarding-out for children. By the Act passed I think two years ago, all children adopted can be boarded out with the exception of three classes, that is to say, the children of vicious parents, the children of idiots, and children whose parents might be prosecuted under the Criminal Act. The recommendation of the Committee, and I think also of the Board of Guardians, is that it should be further extended so as to allow us to board out all children.

11106. Dr. BIGGER.—All children?—Not all children, that would be absolutely impossible; but that you should board out all children who have been adopted under the Act. It would give us a certain extended number of children, but by no means all.

11107. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—What class would you prefer?—That I would like to come to later on, but that, I think, is a matter that everyone is agreed on. Nearly all your evidence goes to recommend the extension of boarding-out of all adopted children. The second matter I wanted to bring out was scattered homes, and I should like to say that I think I, and most women who have worked at this matter of the children, have been very much disappointed with regard to the evidence about proper children brought before you within the two days.

11108. In what way have you been disappointed?—In this way—all the unions, one after the other, have simply brought up one remedy for the difficulty, and that is, "Board out all the children; don't leave one in the workhouse." Anyone who knows much of the subject knows that is simply impossible.

11109. In what way?—The numbers that would be left. Supposing this Commission was to do what has not been done anywhere, that is, widen the Act so as to allow us to board out all children who have been adopted, that would still leave an enormous number in the homes—in Ireland generally.

11110. Don't you think they could be provided for somewhere else than in the workhouse?—That, of course, would be another question, but they certainly could not be in my opinion be boarded out. Suppose that you were to extend this Act wider than it is extended in England, that would be allowing us to board out all children adopted under the Act, I have no means of arriving at how many children would be touched in that way in Ireland, but I fancy not very many. In Belfast there are seven adopted under the section of which I spoke who are now in the workhouse, and would be boarded out if you were to enlarge our boarding-out powers. These seven children have their parents in the home, and, of course, visit them frequently. But my point is that if you were to extend our boarding-out orders, you would not reach any very much larger number of children than you can now board out.

11111. Could there not be some intermediate course between keeping them in a workhouse and boarding-out?—That is the course I wish to recommend in the shape of scattered homes. But I should like first, taking Belfast, which I suppose is a sample of all larger unions, I should like to point out all the children we could not board out. I quote from a return given in April, 1903, in the school and nurseries there were—widows' children, 35; deserted wives whose husbands were in jail, 32; parents in infirmary, 35; that, at the first point of view, gives 100 children who could not be reached by our legislation or boarded out in any way. Widows' children we could not board out; women whose husbands are in jail or otherwise for different reasons in the workhouse, 32; and those in the infirmary, 35.

11112. Dr. BIGGER.—Could they not be boarded-out for a limited time?—Nothing would more destroy the whole boarding-out system than to begin boarding-out

for a limited time. It would be ruinous to the system. No parents would take children that they would have to give up in six months, or a year or two years. They would not take them. It would ruin the whole system. Then as to time. I only bring Belfast up as a sample union. There were, by the same report, 10 children admitted for the first time on that morning; 70 children in the workhouse who had been in one month; 22 had been in for three months; 40 were in for six months. Now could any reasonable person propose that homes could be found for those 142 children, even if it were legally, morally, or socially right to board them out? It seems to me it is simply begging the whole question and escaping the whole difficulty of Poor Law children by saying board them out. This state of affairs, I am sure, obtains in smaller unions probably to a smaller extent.

11113. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Boarding-out has a wide application. Making provision for them in any other place than the workhouse would mean boarding out to a certain extent?—Yes; but my disappointment lies in the fact that no such proposal has been made.

11114. It is a matter for the consideration of the Commission?—Yes, of course. I am only speaking of the evidence given in the last two days, and what I have been able to gather from the papers, that no proposal has been made beyond simply boarding out, which does not, to my mind, at all meet the real difficulties of the case. No one is a greater advocate for boarding-out than I am, and it has undoubtedly been most successful in the past, but then I would like to have reminded those gentlemen as anxious about it that it has been worked under certain very definite restrictions, and to those restrictions I would attribute in a large degree the measure of success which boarding-out has obtained. If we were to try to board out in a wholesale way, or remove those restrictions, we should simply ruin the boarding-out system in Ireland. If through this Commission we obtain the result we ask for, we will have gone further than in England. You will find that widening this Act would not give us more than twenty in our union, and perhaps ten in most of those other unions that speak of thirty or forty children. I should think you could not reach more than ten probably by doing what all the unions recommend, that is boarding out all who are adopted. I am sure you would not reach more than twenty, if so many, in the Belfast Union.

11115. Still you will admit it is not a good thing to keep these children housed up in an institution like a workhouse?—Certainly.

11116. And it is for us and for the witnesses to find out some suitable means to meet as many cases as possible. It is from witnesses like you we hope to get information?—There are so many witnesses within the last two days who have spoken on so many subjects, and they have not offered any suggestion but the case on this subject.

11117. Dr. BIGGER.—In Dublin scattered homes under a foster mother was mentioned?—That seems to me in Ireland to meet the difficulty very much.

11118. A home with two or fifteen children under a foster mother, situated in a country district?—Exactly. The Board asked the Local Government Board for permission to establish such a home in Belfast, and their answer was that this Commission was coming round, and that the matter would be considered then. The scattered homes, I think, especially in a place like Belfast, would meet the requirements of Ireland much better and more effectively than cottage homes or some of those more expensive systems. All we ask for, and in Belfast we urgently ask for it, is that permission should be given to try a scattered home. It would mean you would take a house at £10 or £20 a year; that you would get into it practically a foster-mother and ten or twelve children from the workhouse

Dec. 18, 1898.

Miss F. E.
Clark.

school. Our idea of trying one scattered home was that we might put into it the older boys who ought to be more or less at work. They might work and return at night to those homes, and their work would go towards their maintenance. Now in the Boys' Home that is here they bring in £200 of money earned by the boys, which goes towards their maintenance, and if we could obtain, which I very much hope, and have always hoped through this Commission, permission to have these scattered homes, I have no doubt whatever the Belfast Board of Guardians would try that system.

11110. Would you propose such a system for all the children that would be left after those that could not be boarded-out otherwise. Would you put them all into scattered homes?—I would hope to do so in time, but that would necessitate a central building, which is more expensive. We would have to use for a while, until the system was tried, the workhouse school. Later on, of course, if the plan were a success, they might have an establishment built where the regular in-and-outs would go for a while.

11110. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you think it is a good thing to have a great number of children kept all in one place?—No, certainly not.

11111. Would you not think it would be better to have them in small rather than large numbers?—Much better, but that is the effect of the scattered homes.

11112. What would you do with the very young?—Put them into the scattered homes to scatter them among the older children. An older girl could have a younger girl in the same home to look after.

11113. How many are there in the home you refer to?—It is the Balmoral Home for Boys. I could not tell you fully about it. Twenty, I think. We tried to get our boys there, but they won't take them. They have not more than room enough for their own boys.

11114. We will likely hear something about how that school is worked?—Yes; but it is not a boy's home we want, or such very strict legislation as that would require, but if you allowed us to have scattered homes it would cover in Ireland the whole district. It is a matter of discretion. If you gave us discretionary power and allowed us to try it in Belfast, the expense would not be very great, because we could take the house, and supposing it failed, could give it up; but we have not discretionary power now and cannot try it. As to expense, in England the expense is about 7s. a week, and in England the expense of pauper children is 5s. 3d. to 7s. 6d. a week, which, of course, is very much larger than our children here cost.

11115. What is the expense of the children here on an average?—As a week, and in the scattered homes, I think—of course it is speaking rapidly—we ought to be able to do it for something like 5s., especially if the Local Government Board would pay our industrial trainer for us. There then would be merely the expense of the house.

11116. Still it would not cost any more than the present system?—Very little more. I would not go so far as to say it would not cost something more, but the present system is so very unsatisfactory I think there would be no hesitation in paying a little more. I am sure there would not be from the Belfast Board of Guardians, and another thing is it would pay in the end. An industrial boys' school, started on the principle on which the Board of Guardians wish to start it, would pay very soon for itself. The boys could nearly pay for their own maintenance.

11117. Supplemented, as you suggest, by the earnings of the boys, it would seem to me rather a saving in the course of a few years?—Yes; but even if extra expense had to be gone to it would be most important, because the history of our large barrack schools is that it is almost impossible to keep the children from returning. One boy who went out in June has been twice back in the workhouse. He has no other place to go to.

11118. You think that would not still apply to the cottage homes?—To a very slight extent to the scattered homes, not cottage homes. By a slight extension of them we might be able to provide for those returns, as is done in some places in England; in any case the boy would not have learned his way through the workhouse gates. There is a girl who is not yet seventeen and she has been in seven situations and has returned to the house between times. We have tried to prevent her returning, but she has been in seven different situations. That means she returns finally to the workhouse.

11119. She looks to the workhouse as her home?—Yes; our experience is that first places are very rarely successful with our orphans. They sometimes stay in the second. I think if we could watch them between the first and the second we could make a success of them.

11120. Having been used to idleness all their lives, they don't care to do any work?—I suppose that is it. The boys are specially winged, because between twice and fifteen they live five boys of a different class. They have their school and playtime and no work such as the working population have. I wish you would let us try scattered homes as an experiment. If the Local Government Board would give Guardians at their discretion power to have these scattered homes, an experiment in Belfast or any up-to-date place would perhaps prove a success, and other unions would adopt it.

11121. Dr. BROOKS.—Would the law give you power at present?—No, it would need legislation. That is the answer we received from the Local Government Board. I would like once more to point out that there would be no expense in building if permission was given to try scattered homes, even including the cottage homes, which might at a later period suit the people. The experiment might be tried, and if it failed there would be no very great expense incurred.

11122. Mr. MURKIN.—But still you believe in the boarding-out system as far as it can be done?—In every possible way. I would never leave a child in the workhouse or put a child into a scattered home that I could board out, but the boarding-out is, after all, very limited when you consider the number of children; the number of homes is limited. And supposing you do what we ask, extend the law beyond any power they have in England or any place I know of—supposing you give a sort of wholesale permission to board out, I don't think anything would be more ruinous to the boarding-out system.

11123. Dr. BROOKS.—I think the intention was now to get the children out of the workhouse by some means of boarding-out as far as possible, and then find some means to deal with the other children?—Yes, but the remainder is so very large.

11124. Either as an institution or some homes, or something of the kind?—It is such a very large percentage, 20 per cent. are not orphans; boys and girls in the school, 240; 20 per cent. of above are not orphans, but cannot be boarded out for various reasons—parental and some in jail; 45 per cent. of above are practically permanent whose parents are in the workhouse permanently from sickness and other causes; 25 per cent. of above children of persons who are workhouse habitues, and take them out occasionally; 10 per cent. of above children of workhouse habitues who are constantly taken out by parents.

11125. Mr. MURKIN.—Of course the condition of Belfast don't apply throughout the country?—It will apply only, I suppose, to Dublin, Cork, or Limerick, or any working city. Any large city where there is a good deal of work the plan might be most successful and most promptly tried. I think at the present time we are bringing up a generation of paupers.

11126. The difficulty as regards boarding-out is not so acutely felt in the country as in a city like Belfast?—I know one country place where they have also children in the workhouse because they cannot find homes for them, and there is a boarding-out committee, and great efforts have been made, but it does not take in that part.

11127. Have they taken any steps to provide homes made it known through the district?—I believe so. There is a ladies' committee, and they have done their best to find homes and cannot.

11128. In some unions there is no difficulty at all in getting homes?—Of course there is the further question of boarding them out at a distance. Supposing you extend this Act, there is the further question of boarding them out in different unions.

11129. Dr. BROOKS.—You have power already to do it. You can go beyond the union?—I know you can do that, but can you pass over the care of your children to another union?

11130. That has been mentioned by Miss Hamilton, and will be considered?—Well, the next point that I wanted to touch on, I don't know whether it properly comes under your inquiry, that is day industrial schools.

11131. I am afraid it does not?—It touches it in this way, that our in-and-outs come in entirely uneducated. In the large school there are twenty-nine in the first class above ten years of age; there ought not to be more above seven years of age. In the infant class there are thirty-six between seven and nine in the boys' school. That shows a great amount of ignorance. The other point I wanted to touch on was the extension to Ireland of apprenticeship or employment of pauper children, which can be done in England, and I think might profitably be done in large towns here; of course almost to suit the times. We send boys out now sometimes to farmers, but our experience is that the fatter they

went them for August and the busy time of the year, and when that time is over the boys come back to the workhouse or go to the workhouse of the union where they are. That might be not if we could send them for a year to the farmers under certain circumstances. I think you will find that the farmers who are anxious to take children don't want them all the year round—I am not speaking of the boarded-out children—but the children who go at fourteen or fifteen, they are very willing to take them at the busy time of the year. I consider it the worst possible thing you can do for a boy is to let him go for a short time to one of these farmers. The extension of that Act would make a great difference in our power.

I am simply speaking of where we find the shoe patches on. There is another point—I don't want to press it, but it would be very useful—the appointment of a visiting officer, that is to say, if the Local Government Board were to appoint visitors for those children, the young girls who go to service, and the boys who go out to employment, if they would appoint visitors, I don't think it would be necessary to pay them, but I think if any lady or gentleman willing to undertake the office were appointed under the Local Government Board it would be a great help, and if the Local Government Board then required a report from them.

11182. Do you think they would act without a salary?

—I think so. I must say I think they might be allowed a small amount for travelling expenses. That is rather hard on them, I think.

11183. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—An officer of the Guardians goes that at present, the relieving officer?—The relieving officer is very unsuitable to go to situations where the girls are at service. It calls attention to the girls, and I think in the same way to the boys, and also with our over-worked relieving officers I don't think it can be satisfactorily done. I know myself that very often, though they are interested in a girl, they won't go to the house itself to inquire after her. Then there are subscriptions to associations. I won't take up your time with these things—notice to be given in certain cases; transmission of the young person to service in another union; duty of supervision to be taken over by the Guardians of the union in which a boy or girl is apprenticed. It would be very useful if there was a father register kept in all the unions as to what becomes of the children. There is no definite register. You cannot find out what becomes of a child except indirectly through separate agencies. There is one more question, as to the feeble-minded girls. I think that was brought up already by Miss Hamilton.

11184. Yes, we had some evidence on that point?—In the workhouse there are five feeble-minded at present; one is a woman with a good many children. Dr. Bell kindly gave me a list of the feeble-minded whom she received into her shelter. The first is aged twenty-eight, with two children in an industrial home; woman now in the asylum. Another now on the streets; another

who is an illegitimate child herself; another on the streets; another on the streets before the birth of her child; another daughter of a well-known blind beggar, himself illegitimate. The girl's sister has two illegitimate children; her mother is an inmate of the workhouse. Next, one on the streets. Next, one born in the workhouse, and, I am afraid, brought up in the workhouse also, on the streets for the past five years; treated in hospital. The last one was also born in the workhouse. That gives a large number of children who are feeble-minded. I remember Miss Hamilton was asked to define feeble-minded, which, of course, is rather a difficult matter; but Dr. Bell defines one case here:—"This young girl would not know the difference between 1s. and 1d." I have had some experience of girls whom I would call feeble-minded. If you tell them to do one thing in a day they will do it that day, but their memory does not seem to carry them to the next day. They are absolutely willing to do whatever anyone asks them to do, and I think that a great protection for themselves and the public would be arrived at if those feeble-minded women could be detained for life along with some other class. I would not like to put epileptics along with them. But supposing an Act was passed allowing such children to be detained, that they then might be classed as in the workhouse you give over to epileptics, and that they should be kept there for life. When one considers the number of children who are brought into the workhouse who are wrong in every way, we could make a beginning by detaining for life those children.

11185. Would you leave it to the discretion of the medical officer to decide as to their strength of mind?—Miss Hamilton, I think, had a correspondence on the subject, and Dr. Rowley wrote to say he has just returned from America—that there they treat them in custodial homes. On the application of a Guardian, stating that the child is feeble-minded, the magistrate can give an order for the treatment of the child and detention in the home. Of course with a medical certificate detention for life in these custodial homes, which can be, and ought to be, nicely self-supporting. These girls are quite capable of working and are biddable working. You could give them a happy life and a useful one, and keep them off the street. I do think we could reach a great number and make an important beginning if we could deal with the feeble-minded women.

11186. You say a system like that exists in America?—Yes, in Massachusetts.

11187. Miss Molyneux.—Might I ask one question: is the word feeble-minded a proper word to use; are we allowed to use that term in reference to children?—I believe it is not used. I don't think it has been recognised; probably it would be recognised in time.

11188. Would they come under imbeciles?—No; they are distinct from imbeciles.

Dr. BRICE SMYTH examined.

11189. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—We would be glad to hear what you have to say?—I have not very much. I have been connected with the Poor Law system for about twenty-nine or thirty years. When I was in the infirmary, or had charge of part of it, the consumptive patients were a source of great trouble to know how to deal with them, and if there could be any arrangement made to have them taken out of that, I think it would be a great improvement. I know they try now as much as they possibly can to keep them isolated.

11190. In some unions there are wards for the purpose?—I don't know if we have them here. I know they were a source of great danger and anxiety to us in the time I had charge there. If there could be some arrangements made, which I believe there could be, for getting them into some healthy surroundings. In my time we got them in the last stages generally—the third stage. The poor people would work as long as they possibly could, and then they would come up to the infirmary almost to die, and they generally stayed there until they died, and they were nursed about through the infirmary, but I understand now they are kept as much isolated as possible.

11191. In some houses they are, but not in all?—I am speaking about Belfast.

11192. Would you think there ought to be a sanatorium in each county, or would one for a province be enough for that class?—I think there should be one for each county.

11193. Dr. BIGGER.—But for a large union like Belfast, do you think it should have one of its own?—I think it should have one of its own, for there is so much consumption among the mill-workers and people of that kind. They are badly fed and live on unsuitable food, and when they get an acute bronchial attack they are not able to resist it. I think Belfast should have a place of its own.

11194. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—Do you think the city itself would be a suitable site, or would you suggest it should be out in the country?—I would rather it went out a bit into the country, because the town is extending so, and if you put it in the outskirts of the town it would soon be surrounded.

11195. Dr. BIGGER.—About the children?—The children both in the infirmary and schools. I believe there is a great improvement in that respect now, but it is so difficult to keep children healthy where they are so crowded together.

11196. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—You think the boarding-out system would be an advantage?—Decidedly, a great deal better. In my time they suffered greatly from skin disease, and eye trouble, and nervous bones, from improper food and care.

11197. And they grow up liars?—They grow up liars. If they could be boarded out. It is generally understood now that hardening a lot of children, or even growing boys and girls, in large public institutions

Dec. 18, 1903.
Mrs. F. F.
Clark.

Dr. Brice
Smyth.

Dec. 18, 1903.

Dr. Byles
Seyth.

when they go into the world they are not able to fight their battle the way they could have done if brought up since under home circumstances.

11153. Dr. BROWN.—They merge into the general population better when brought up outside?—Yes.

11154. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—What would you suggest about the unmarried mothers of children? do you think they should be sent to a lying-in hospital?—The first case, yes, I think they ought to be. I have seen a good deal of that sort of thing. When a woman comes in with her first child and had lost her situation probably, she had no place to go back to, and when she was herded with a crowd of people when she met in the maternity ward, in a great many cases I have found they have gone out not exactly knowing where they were going, and got into a bad way afterwards, and perhaps returned to us in a few years in the same condition. I think if there could be anything done so as to take charge of these young women, a great many of them might be rescued and saved from the after effects.

11155. I suppose you would also desire to see the lunatics taken out of the workhouse?—I would.

11156. And put into an institution by themselves?—Yes. I understand now they try to isolate epileptics and acute cases as much as possible, but it would take a very large establishment to do that up where they are at present.

11157. If there was an institution in each county for such a class?—Yes.

Dr. JOHN MACINTOSH examined.

Dr. John
Macintosh.

11158. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—You are a member of the Belfast Board of Guardians?—I am. I acted as chairman of the committee who inquired into these matters regarding the Poor Law Commission. I may say that regarding amalgamation of unions, that is a question that we have dealt very little with in Belfast. It does not interest us at all, because our work is large enough without entailing any more on us.

11159. We know it does not apply to a city like Belfast or Dublin. It applies more to country places?—I am of opinion that if there were several of these unions amalgamated the ground could be taken. The buildings, I am of opinion, are not suitable for the treatment of the sick, or anything like that, judging from the condition of our own buildings, from the body of the house, and from visits to other unions in and around the district of Belfast, I have come to the conclusion that the buildings are unsuitable.

11170. Have you seen the fever hospital?—I have; there are some of the buildings up to date, and some are not.

11171. There are some of them very good?—Some of them exceedingly good for country districts. I think the ground of these workhouses could be taken over with advantage by the County Councils, and utilised for several public purposes, such as to erect a suitable and fully equipped auxiliary asylum for the treatment of a large class of the destitute poor, namely, epileptics—an epileptic colony in a central position of the province, where all the epileptics from the different unions could be collected. This ground could also be utilised for the erection of a provincial sanatorium under the control of the County Council, where the consumptives from the different unions throughout the province could be directed to that sanatorium and treated properly. In Belfast the Board of Guardians, I am happy to say, have grappled with this question. We hope when 1904 comes we will have a suitable sanatorium for consumptives in connection with our union. There is another thing regarding that. I think that a suitable provincial institution could be erected under military authority on some of the ground in connection with unions outside the city of Belfast, that is for a class of patients or inmates very difficult to deal with in connection with our union workhouses, namely, the aged pensioners. In Belfast we have fifty of that class; men who are drawing a pension of 1s. a day. The cost of their keep does not amount to 6d. The amount of their keep is deducted every month off their pension.

11172. Dr. BROWN.—The full amount?—The cost of maintenance only; that is deducted off their pension, and the upshot is they have a considerable balance. They discharge themselves, go down town, and generally come back to the union workhouse in a very intoxicated condition, causing a great amount of uproar. I think that class should be dealt with by the State and taken to a colony, where they could be treated as men who have served their King and country—well treated,

11153. Or even one for several. If there were not enough in one county there should be power given to the neighbouring unions to send them to one?—Is there no power at present?

11154. Dr. BROWN.—Not for sane epileptics?—I look upon them as rather dangerous characters to have them all herded together. After an attack they are not accountable for what they do, and should be almost as well looked after, and better perhaps, than the ordinary insane, because when a person is insane you know it and are on your guard, whereas an epileptic between the attacks may be perfectly sane and able to go about.

11155. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—You would separate the sane epileptics from the lunatics?—I would.

11156. Dr. BROWN.—It has been suggested there should be an epileptic colony farm?—I think that would be a very good idea, for an epileptic can do a certain amount of work between times, and it is good for them to be kept working.

11157. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Have they any prescription of the seizure coming on?—Well, they have; but it is after the seizure they become dangerous, a good many of them. A few of them have a feeling that they know they are going to become ill, but with the majority it comes on so quickly that they don't know about it.

11158. I suppose you don't want to say anything about the tramp question?—Oh, no; I could not speak anything about that.

in a better condition than they are in the union workhouse.

11174. Do you know that many pensioners stay in the workhouse from choice; they could support themselves outside?

Mr. MURKAGHAN.—They go to the workhouse because it is cheaper?—That is so; outside they would have no surplus money with which to have a regular monthly spree. As a matter of fact we only actually charge for their food and clothing, not for the establishment charges.

11175. I know that very well. We have them in my union?—I hope you will get rid of them. From observation, and so on, I have come to the opinion that there are a large number of respectable aged inmates in our union workhouse, and I think that power should be given to grant these old people at least a small weekly sum, from 6s. to 10s., so that they could be kept clean and comfortable with their friends, who are willing to keep them; but friends at the same time find it an utter impossibility to do so owing to their limited weekly wages.

11176. That is an extension of the boarding-out system?—Yes.

11177. Would there not be a danger to the public funds then?—There is certainly a danger, but there is such a large class of these deserving and respectable poor. I think if carefully inquired into there would be very little danger.

11178. Dr. BROWN.—Do you not think every person of the working class over sixty-five would want to be on that?—I do not. I think the Irish people have more independence than that.

11179. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—You would propose some standard?—Yes; and I think if we had this old pension system it would relieve our workhouses. I was very glad to hear we have power with regard to outdoor relief. I am one of those who have been misled in the past regarding that, but I may say we will have great difficulty in Belfast in doing that, because our machinery is inadequate for the large city of Belfast. We have only four relieving officers, and I was astonished to hear that in such a small town as Rallymore, as compared with Belfast, they have three. There was a slight misunderstanding regarding the relieving officers that I would like to clear up. Our relieving officers meet every morning at the dispensary, and grant tickets of relief. They meet at a central place in the town, such as Glasgow-street Dispensary. Then in the evening they grant tickets from their own residences in the different districts.

11180. Dr. BROWN.—I think we understood that?—There was a misunderstanding, I think. That was a question that Mr. Oswald wanted to make plain.

11181. I think each member of the Commission knew that the relieving officer would give a ticket at his own house where there was a necessity?—Then, as regards children, I am of opinion that as far as possible all

children should be boarded outside the union workhouse, to keep them away from the taint. This system has been adopted in Belfast, and has been very successful. We have 184 at present boarded out, but I think the power in the hands of the Guardians should be extended—that is, we can only take those children and board them out who are orphans and deserted children. There is a large class over and above that who remain in the union workhouses, that is a class who belong to the industrial runners or inmates. I think power should be extended so that the Boards of Guardians could adopt these children, and then board them out away from the influence of friends or parents.

11182. Mr. McBRIDE.—You think that as the Guardians have the responsibility of their upkeep they should have the power of dealing with them?—I think they should have. These children are continually taken in and out of the union workhouse—sometimes fifteen times in six months—for the purpose of begging and selling papers in the streets of Belfast, to give their fathers and mothers, who have been neglectful of them, money to drink. I think the Boards of Guardians should get extended powers in that direction to adopt these children and board them out, to give the children a start in life. Then I think the Board of Guardians should also have the power to support either cottage homes or scattered homes. There will always be a fringe of children that we cannot deal with in any of the ways I have mentioned. I think we should have power to start scattered homes, which have proved very successful in England and also in Scotland. Then I agree with Miss Clark and Mr. Walker that we should also have power to establish in suitable centres in the city industrial homes for boys and girls over fourteen years of age. We find when they come to the age of sixteen they are sent out into the city and mingle with the scum of society. If we had industrial homes such as are in existence in Belfast—there are two at present, one in connection with the Balmoral at May-street, and one in connection with the St. Vincent de Paul, situated in George's-street—if we had homes such as that, and under the careful training of foster parents, I think the children would have a fair start in life, and would not gravitate back to the union workhouse.

11183. But with the scattered homes in existence you would not require those as much?—We would not. Then we have another difficulty in the Belfast Union, namely, the children being sent there on remand from the Custody Court, sent there by magistrates. A boy remanded for a week is sent up to mix with children in the union workhouse. I think that should be stopped. It has a very bad effect on our children in the school, who have to mix with these children when they are on remand.

11184. What would you suggest?—That they should be sent to some suitable place—some industrial home or otherwise—during the time of remand. I don't think the union workhouse is a fit place for them. Regarding the treatment of the sick in the union workhouse, we don't require any change. Our treatment, both in the nursing quarters and also the medical quarters, is of the highest standard; in fact I must express my opinion from observation that it is higher than in the general hospitals outside the city. A great number of respectable citizens of Belfast prefer to go to the union hospital than either to the Royal Victoria or the Mater Hospital. I was very glad to hear we had the power to grant clothing to the deserving destitute poor on discharge, because we have felt it a great want in the past—a man coming in actually destitute, suffering from acute pneumonia and bronchitis, being thoroughly warmly clothed inside our wards and then

discharged outside again in his worn clothes—I was delighted to hear the opinion that we would have power to grant him clothing. There is another class of patients that I think should not be treated in the workhouse, namely, lock patients—patients suffering from venereal diseases. We have roughly 200 on the male side every year, and 180 on the female side. This is a class of patients who are not destitute by any means. They come in to be treated there, and very often they go out before they are thoroughly cured. The female portion of them generally come in from the brothels in the city. I would suggest that these patients should not be allowed inside the union workhouse at all, but proper lock hospitals should be established under the sanitary authority of the city. I don't think they should be inside a union workhouse, that we should have power as a Board of Guardians to detain them there until the medical officer gives them a clean bill of health. Then there is another class we have a large amount of, namely, those suffering from alcoholism. That is another class that is not destitute, and are very often a great amount of trouble to us.

11185. What do you suggest about them?—Send them to general hospitals. Regarding the question of vagrants, I agree with Mr. Walker that we should have established provincial labour colonies such as are in vogue in Belgium, Germany, and America, and also Haddocks. I think these colonies should be under the control of the State, or falling that, under the control of the County Council. I think that is the only solution of the vagrant and tramp question.

11186. Take them out of the hands of the Guardians altogether?—Entirely; put them to productive labour. At the present time they are working at unproductive labour—stone-breaking and tanning rope. Our treatment at the present time is not of a reformatory character.

11187. That would apply to a limited number of people?—A larger number than you think.

11188. Our experience is that the number of able-bodied in workhouse in Ulster is very small?—The number we have is 272 men and women.

11189. How does classification come there?—We classify them as healthy men and healthy women, infirm men and infirm women, and feeble men and feeble women.

11190. It goes up to sixty-five?—To sixty; all over that are classed as feeble.

11191. You know men of sixty that have not been very well nourished are not very strong or able to do much work, so I say able-bodied are not numerous in this country?—The average age of our able-bodied is about thirty-five years; many of them have been in short service in the army; they are men really running from one workhouse to another who are able to work.

11192. Your suggestion about the military authorities would get rid of that class?—It would entirely. Regarding the question of illegitimacies, that is a large question with us; it is a question that I am not clear in the solution of; I must say I was delighted to hear the evidence of Dr. Bell. I think that is a step in the right direction, and I go with Mr. Walker in his idea of establishing nurseries outside in the city for that class. That is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Walker has dealt very fully with the questions, and put before you the unanimous opinion of the committee.

11193. Dr. BOOTH.—It was the finding of the whole committee?—Yes.

11194. So what he gave each member endorse?—Yes.

Mr. DONAL McARTHUR examined.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I was one of the committee appointed to take this evidence, which is before you in bulk. There are one or two matters that I would like to refer to in connection with that that struck me as specially deserving of attention. In the first place, we had evidence before us that on an average there are 20,000 admissions annually to the Belfast Workhouse, and in a great number of the departments we had evidence that almost two-thirds of the admissions were what are known as runners, or habitués. In connection with that aspect of it we got the Master to prepare a return for five months of the numbers who went in and out from the body of the house, and especially of the women who took their children with them when they went out. I would like to put that return in

There are about 200 of them who went in and out of the workhouse over three times during the four months selected by the Master, and he did not take any particular four months, but merely took it at random. We find that those runners were not confined to any particular department; we find them even in the infirmary, but they largely exist in connection with the schools and the body of the house. If some legislative power was given to the Guardians for the purpose of putting a stop to this system of running in and out, dealing with it under the different heads, as I desire to suggest, I think a very great deal of good would be done, and the Belfast Board of Guardians would have better facilities for classification than they have at the present moment; in fact the place is so congested that

Mr. DONAL McARTHUR.

Dec. 16, 1905,
 Mr. Daniel
 Mackintosh.

new that classification is quite impossible. The first matter that attracted my attention was the question of the children; the evidence which you have dealt very exhaustively with that aspect of it, and we came to the unanimous conclusion that the true solution of this problem in regard to the children was to board the entire of them out in the same way as we board deserted children and orphans. The evidence given by the relieving officers showed us that out of every 100 of the cases boarded out there was only about one case turned out badly; that is a very excellent result. They also informed us that their experience was that these children who had been boarded out contracted an affection for the foster parents which lasted long after the period for which we allow them to be boarded out, and that some of the children who had gone away and obtained good situations were in the habit of sending to their foster parents money for their support, as if they had been their natural children. One case we had where a gentleman, who is at present a clergyman in America, was boarded out from the Belfast Workhouse, and another, whom I know personally myself, occupies a very high position in one of the leading mills in Belfast. The teachers inform us, and we were in accord with them, that this system of running in and out interferes with discipline of the children, and the medical doctors put us evidence that it interfered very much with their health; that in fact a great amount of the skin disease, eczema, and eye disorder was attributable to the children who were going in and out, bringing this disease with them. The mothers of these children who are in the schools are in the habit of taking them out frequently, and when they return to the workhouse the Master will tell you they are generally in a pitiable condition. They are sent back to the school, and as you will see from that return of the Master, in a very short time, in the course perhaps of a fortnight or three weeks, the mother takes them out again. And we find that in some instances there are children in the school of fourteen years and upwards who are only learning their alphabet. Of course the mothers who take them out don't send them to school outside.

11195. Mr. Macintosh.—Then you believe the Guardians should have power to adopt any cases such as this?—I think the powers should be extended so as to apply to all children, and I would go further and say in the case of widows, we are entitled to give them relief under the existing laws, but widows with legitimate children I would put them in the same position as we put the foster parents under the boarding-out powers we have. Of course the scale of allowance in such a case would have to be a fluctuating scale according to the needs of the person who is to get the relief in that way. I think we should also put the mothers of legitimate children—mothers who have been deserted by their husbands—in the same position. That is a class we are not able to deal with now except by bringing them into the workhouse, and that is a class that suffers very much from the existing state of the law. If there is an extension to include them under the section which enables us to give a widow with legitimate children relief I think it would be a great advantage. And in that case I would advocate that the powers should be even further extended; that where there was any purely temporary destitution we should be empowered to give purely temporary relief until work was got; in a case, for instance, where the head of the house was out of work there was a mother and small children, and the only alternative to starving outside or depending on outside charity is to come to the workhouse. In such a case I think we ought to have discretion to allow something to tide over the temporary difficulty for the purpose of preventing these people coming into the workhouse. I think the experience of older men than I am—I am only a rear Guardian, but I think in that time I have gone, like our friend, Mr. Gill, at a military rule—the experience of the older Guardians is that once they have found their way into the workhouse they come back again, and I think it would be cheaper in the end to give some temporary relief—not of a very extensive character—to deserving cases of that description.

11196. You know they can get it now, provided the head of the house is sick; you would wish it extended to a temporary want of employment?—Yes; there is a great deal of unskilled labour in Belfast, and the people engaged in that unskilled labour are not connected with any union, and they are not in a position to receive any contributions from societies; that class would be very much benefited, and properly so, by an extension of the Act in that direction.

11197. With regard to the case of deserted wives with

children, I know a case of the kind myself, and we think at our Board of Guardians that it was a great hardship we could not give her any relief; she had to come into the house—I had one case myself—a very deserving case—of the same description, where the husband had been in the army, and left the wife with four little children, and, of course, as a rule, the religious charities won't contribute to a person of that description either, so they have to rely on personal bounty; any funds in connection with the various churches are not given out except in the case of widows, following the policy that has been adopted by the Guardians themselves. In connection with the boarding out of the children, I think that home influence is one of the chief advantages, and I think that it is absolutely essential advantage, particularly in regard to young girls. The girls who are kept in our workhouse schools until they are fourteen or fifteen years of age, when they go out into a city like Belfast, are not trained to resist the temptations and the difficulties of life. I think when they are sent out to be boarded with respectable citizens, and I don't think there is any lack of people of that description in this city, that the home influence fits them very well for any companies they may have to go to in after life, and as I have pointed out before, the affection seems to me almost as great and sometimes greater than between natural relatives.

11198. That view is very general over the country; I don't think there would be much difficulty in this regard—I am very glad to hear that; it is one of those things that gives me far more cause for thought than any other subject connected with the workhouse. With regard to the cost of boarding out, we find the average rate is 4s. inside the union and 5s. 5d. for the boarded-out ones per week. I am not an advocate of these other systems, such as cottage houses or scattered homes, because I consider them all as being workhouses on a small scale, and I don't think the children would get rid of the taint of the workhouse where they are congregated in numbers and put under foster parents, as in scattered homes with fifteen or so. I don't think they get rid of the taint of the workhouse. I think the children of the school they are sent to would be able to point their fingers at them and say, "They come from such and such a house," which was a workhouse home.

11199. Dr. Brooker.—Of course, that is a personal opinion—I think it is the opinion of the entire committee.

Miss Clark.—No, I don't think so. It is entirely against my opinion, and also, I think, against Dr. Macintosh's.

Without—I am very sorry to know that Miss Clark is not quite as radical as I am on this subject. I know that Mr. O'Hara, Dr. Macintosh, Mr. Walker, and myself had a conversation in reference to this particular matter, and the other systems were alternatives to this one, and in the event of this one not meeting with the favourable consideration of the Commission the other systems were to be advocated. So far as I am personally concerned I don't advocate the other systems at all, because where I think right is right I advocate that right, and don't take any substitute for what I think is right.

11200. Mr. Macintosh.—There is very little difference between you and Miss Clark; she said that in every case where children could be boarded out she advocated that, and she gave instances where a child could not be sent out, and she said rather than leave them in the workhouse send them to scattered homes—I don't anticipate any routine to be dealt with in that way. In connection with the children arises the question of the putative fathers; that is a very difficult question to deal with, and I quite agree with other witnesses that too much of the penalty is on the women.

11201. Dr. Brooker.—You heard Mr. Rodden's evidence yesterday?—Yes. I perfectly agree with his evidence, except I think that we should try to get the second section of the English Bastardy Act amended so as to give the magistrates a discretion, which is really given to them by the fourth section, because they have only to be satisfied. The second section provides that a girl in this position, even before she is confined, may take proceedings, or within twelve months after confinement may take proceedings against the putative father at Petty Sessions, but it goes on to say that in order to obtain an order she must prove that the putative father had contributed towards the maintenance. It seems a very inconvenient and rather extraordinary section because a girl who is using her mar-

because during her sickness, prior to confinement, of course could not prove that there was any maintenance given by the alleged father for the support of the child.

11202. Mr. MURKHAM.—Until there was need of maintenance?—Yes; the necessity had not arisen; and I would direct your attention to that section of the Act. I think if that section were amended to agree with the powers given under section four, where in actuality cases below the coast, the case would practically be met. I think there ought to be some corroboration. If there was not I am afraid there would be very great abuse by some women.

11203. Blackmailing?—Yes. I don't think that blackmailing is a prevalent thing in Ireland; there might be isolated instances, but my experience, and I have a very extensive experience from the legal aspect, is that the blackmailing would be almost the other way, for, although you could not call it blackmailing, the extortionist generally exists on the other side.

11204. You put all the blame on mankind?—I am only giving the result of my experience, and I am not giving any professional secret when I say that on a number of occasions I have been asked to get a declaration of innocence while playing over a case.

11205. Dr. BROWN.—You don't say you were a party to that?—No, Dr. HUGHES. I don't think I would be a party to anything of the kind. The next question I considered was the question of the tramps; that is a very difficult question to deal with, and the country Guardians appear to come in with a light heart with regard to 1860; I don't think they are very much troubled with them just now; they are on the march in Belfast when they visit the adjoining unions. Belfast has a reputation for treating their tramps and other inmates very well, and the result is we have a very large number of them coming to us to show their appreciation of the manner in which we treat them. I think in order to put an end to this tramp question we should have power to make it a condition for admission that the person to be relieved should be resident in the district for one year or have contributed towards the rates; if such a person were not resident within the district and had not contributed towards the rates that we should be in a position, at the expense of the State, to send him to the union where he had so resided or paid rates, or, in the alternative, to the parish of the union in which he was born. I think it would be a good thing to trace the history of all tramps, and if we found they were of an incorrigible disposition—many times decent people are on tramp for work, and may be suitable for people who are not decent—I think we should have power to investigate the history of these people, because it would be a sure way to exterminate that species, and in the event of finding they were of the incorrigible description I think if they were sent to a farm colony it would be a very excellent thing for them and for the country. I would say provincial farm colonies would be sufficient to deal with all the tramps that Poor Law Boards have to deal with at present. There should be four such colonies in Ireland. In connection with the infirmary and hospital I have only one thing to say. In regard to the hospital I think no case is abused. In Belfast there is no fever hospital; we have no hospital for infectious diseases; the Belfast Corporation have not up to the present time exercised these discretionary powers vested in them.

11206. They are exercising them now?—I believe they have commenced to build a fever hospital, and when it is completed I would advocate that all the fever patients should be sent from the workhouse hospital to the fever hospital to be erected by the Belfast Corporation.

11207. You can do that within yourself?—We should, of course, pay for the patients we send there; at the present time we have sixty per cent. that are really not destitute sick or poor sick, and out of that sixty per cent. I think we can only succeed in recovering from about ten per cent. We have a very humane Master, and he uses a very humane discretion with regard to the admission of these cases, and we won't turn away any fewer cases, because we consider for the time being all of them, in the absence of any other hospital, that we are the representatives of the ratepayers from the public health standpoint; although the power is not really vested in us, in the absence of any other hospital we think it right to admit all those cases.

11208. Mr. MURKHAM.—That disability would disappear shortly?—Yes. Dr. Macintosh this morning

referred to those Lock patients; I don't think they should come within the jurisdiction of the Board of Guardians at all, and I don't think they do as regard to sixty per cent. of those whom we treat. I was rather astonished at the evidence of Dr. Smyth that there were some hundreds of cases of syphilis treated. A number of those people from the female side come from houses of ill-fame; the people who send them there are very well able to afford to keep them, and before they get better they use all influences—legitimate and illegitimate—to get them out again. On the male side we find our experience is that the men go there for the purpose of hiding themselves from their own relatives, and we think it is an imposition on us as Guardians of the poor to have to treat patients of that description. I don't know whether under the Public Health Act the sanitary authorities have even discretionary power to erect a Lock Hospital. I know there is one in Dublin, and I think in a large city like Belfast there ought to be mandatory directions given by some legislature enacted to the Corporation to erect a building for the treatment of such cases, and, of course, making them pay what they are able to pay. Under our law they are placed in the same position as the poor, and can discharge themselves on two hours' notice, and that is a very serious matter for the public, because they very often discharge themselves when they are not fit to go out among the public at all. In our infirmary a very large number of patients discharge themselves before they are fit to go out, and we think that they do so deliberately. They go out and get somewhat worse, with the result that in two or three days they return and are admitted again to the infirmary, where they get better treatment than in the body of the house, and they have a better time of it, because they have not to work any. I think, in regard to those patients, the doctors ought to have power to certify, or ought rather to be compelled to certify when a patient was fit to be discharged, and until that certificate was given we ought to have the power to compel them to remain.

11209. That would apply only to infirmary patients?—Yes. In regard to the question of out-door relief I have already expressed what my views are. I think it should be extended in the way that I have indicated. There is another matter that has given us very great thought; that is the question of pensioners. At the present time I think we have from eighty to a hundred pensioners in the workhouse. I have not traced the history of each man, but I think there are very few of them belonging to Belfast. The result is that we are maintaining those pensioners, who I think, ought to be maintained in other unions. They are in the receipt of pensions from the Government varying from 8s. to 1s. a day, and in isolated cases they have 1s. 6d., and in one case 2s. 6d. a day. Those who are in the body of the house are charged 4d. per day and those in the infirmary 7d. a day; that is the net cost.

11210. Surely the Guardians have that in their own hands, by raising the charge?—I thought we had no power. I thought all we are entitled to do is charge them the actual cost of maintenance.

11211. Dr. BROWN.—Why do you admit a person who has 2s. 6d. a day, 10s. 6d. a week, and no person depending on him?—That is a matter that, personally, I could not answer truthfully, because I don't know. It has occurred to me sometimes that some of these men should not be admitted. There is only one case of 2s. 6d., and the question you put to me I put to our relieving officers, and they said it appeared to them that the man was destitute at the time. I think it is a falling with men who have been in the army that when they get some money in their pocket they go on what is called "a burst," and after that is done they throw themselves on our mercy. At the end of the month Mr. Murray, who is the relieving officer appointed for the purpose of receiving these pensioners, gets the pensions from the local paymaster. The other part of it is paid to the pensioners, and a few of them go out and have a spree on their own account; discharge themselves immediately. A number of others have women in the house whom they will marry; they arrange with these women to go out, and they go out for three or four days, and at the end of that time come back in a state of destitution apparently. There are others of these whose relatives see living from hand to mouth until the pension day comes round, and they are up there to get them out; when they get them out and their pensioners gone they are back again. I am afraid unless there were some restrictions made by legislation in regard to old age pensions that would be very much abused and treated in the same way as the pensions of

Dec. 18, 1908.

Mr. Donald Macintosh.

Dec. 18, 1903.

Mr. David
MacArthur.

penalizers. I think we ought to have power to charge men of that description something more than the actual cost of maintenance. Of course if the suggestion I throw out as to admissions was acted on half of these pensioners, at all events, would be sent to the unions which ought to support them.

11212. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—But still the evil would continue.—The evil would continue, and the only way to put an end to the evil would be to allow us to charge a fair sum—to give the Guardians discretion to charge what they considered a reasonable sum over and above the cost of maintenance, having regard to the person received by each pensioner. The next matter that occurred to me was in reference to the insane and feeble-minded and epileptics. I agree that the insane ought to be transferred to the county asylum. With regard to the epileptics, I think if there was a provincial institute for these people, where they could get light employment to suit their condition, with proper classification, under the control of a medical man, it would be a very great advantage to this class of patients. The case of the girls especially is very distressing, and I don't think they should be cooped up in the workhouse at all. I don't think it was the intention of the legislature that they should come under the designation of the destitute poor—poor afflicted by the act of God should not be regarded as destitute poor.

11213. You think an institution of the kind would have advantages from moral and economical points of view?—Yes; I think it would be most economical to have one institution in each province which I think would meet the demands. We have fifty-six epileptics altogether and 117 lunatics. The next matter is in regard to the consumptives, and I am very glad to say all the Guardians are unanimous in this matter. We have all taken a very deep and, I think, a very energetic interest in it.

11214. Dr. BOGGER.—You will be present at the Inquiry?—Yes; I have hopes that the efforts we have put forth in reference to this will bear fruit after that Inquiry has been held. I hope we will be in a position to satisfy the Inspectors who are sent down that what we intend to do is not only desirable but in the present condition of affairs absolutely necessary. We have also done a great deal in connection with the Belfast Corporation in trying to get them to recognize what their duties are. I don't wish to make any reflection on the Belfast Corporation as a body; they have had very large schemes that they have been carrying out, but none of these schemes, as far as I can see, have been for the welfare of the sick of the city of Belfast. The death rate from consumption is a very, very high one, the conditions of labour foster the disease very much in Belfast, and I would like to state my opinion with regard to one aspect of it, that is with regard to making it a notifiable disease. I think none of the authorities will ever be able to grapple with the question properly until it is made a notifiable disease. I should say the Guardians some time ago instructed their dispensary medical officers to notify voluntarily, as they do in Liverpool, all cases of consumption; we made an effort to get the medical practitioners of Belfast to follow the example of the private medical practitioners in Liverpool by doing the same thing, but we failed in that, and the reason given by them was that there was a good deal of sentiment in regard to this particular disease, and private patients did not like the public to know that any member of the family had suffered from consumption because of the exploded theory that it was hereditary, which seems to cling with a tenaciousness that is remarkable among all classes of people in Belfast.

11215. I am afraid that is outside the scope of our Inquiry; it is more a public health matter.—I would suggest, respectfully, that it is within the scope of the Inquiry with regard to the consumptive poor.

11216. I don't mean to say that it is not very desirable, but I don't think notification is within our province.—There are many of the poor who are consumptives who don't come to the workhouse, but would be compelled to come to the workhouse for treatment if the disease were made notifiable. In connection with this I would like to direct your attention to the fact that two years ago the Local Government Board addressed a circular letter to Boards of Guardians pointing out to them that it could not be circulated too freely among the inhabitants of the various districts that fact that consumption was an infectious disease.

11217. That has been circulated by every Board of Guardians, and the Local Government Board are most anxious about it, but it is a public health matter, and

does not come within the scope of the Inquiry.—Except as regards the destitute poor. And in the interests of the public health of Belfast we are desirous to get hold of all the people we are entitled to deal with; it is only in that aspect I press the matter about notification. What has been done has consisted in the issue of circular letters and some other things that have not taken any practical turn; what I want to do is to do something that will have a practical result. We have 237 consumptives, epileptics, 56, lunatics, 117, and the children, 240, that is 580 altogether, and they would be taken away from the union if the suggestions we have made were given effect to by legislation. In addition to that we have insane men, 611, insane women, 124, feeble men, 240, feeble women, 250. If these were removed we would be in a position, without taking down any of the old buildings, to carry out a system of classification in the Belfast Union, and the Belfast Union accommodation would be ample for all our purposes. There was a movement to reconstruct portions of the body of the houses at one time, and I was responsible for a motion to adjourn it until the result of the efforts of this Commission was made known. Dr. Madden referred to those children who are remained on criminal charges; it is a very and matter indeed that these should be sent to the same dormitory with the children we have; there are some sixty or seventy annually, but under the new conditions we cannot expect any legislation could deal with that. In the meantime, pending whatever legislation is passed as the outcome of your investigations, we will have to put up with the state of affairs that exists.

11218. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—But you think something demanded?—I think something is demanded. I think it is our duty to not put them in a dormitory with the children, but, unfortunately, in the present financial state of the house we have no alternative. If these other cases were removed we could deal with them and set aside a ward specially for them. We are in such a cramped state we cannot set aside buildings for religious purposes. In the meantime they might be sent to the industrial schools. I think that we have some time ago by the magistrates, but I don't think that is a matter you could give effect to. We don't go into the question of amalgamation; we don't think it affects me. I should, personally, like to see Belfast being a union by itself, being a county borough, and I think they would have ample material.

11219. Dr. BOGGER.—Managed by the City Council?—No; my experience of the City Council would not lead me to give an opinion in that direction. With regard to the Belfast Workhouse—I don't say it is in any exceptional spirit—I am not responsible for its management, except within the last year, but I certainly have employed my time while I have been there to the best of my ability in the interest of the people I represent, and I cannot speak in too high praise— notwithstanding the little squabbles there are occasionally on hard days—I cannot speak in too high praise of the manner in which the institution is managed and the Poor Law administered. I think it is done with very great discretion, and the amount of advancement that has been made there, taking into consideration the small rate we have struck, is sufficient evidence without any comments from me at all in regard to that aspect. I don't think it would be desirable to invest the Belfast Corporation with any additional powers; I think they have far too much to do at the present time, and if they had less to do it would be done as efficiently as we do our work at the Board of Guardians. I would like to see the Austin portion divided between Larne and Loughburn, and I should also like to see the urban district of Holywood and the Castlereagh Rural District sent to Newtownards. I think the Poor Law administration should, as far as possible, be confined within the county. Personally of course I speak more on behalf of my constituents, the Holywood district—the people there are in favour of Newtownards.

11220. Will you appear at the County Down sitting?—I don't think so. I expressed a wish I should not be appointed to represent the Urban Council; the Urban Council themselves are equally divided on the question.

11221. The Rural Council?—I don't know their opinions, but I am closely in touch with the electors, and I know what their opinions are, and I don't set very much value on the opinion of a small body, comprised of nine men, who constitute the Urban District Council. I don't think they are in a position to give evidence on matters relating to the Poor Law system. I think that in order to be in a position to give any evidence of that kind a man has to get special training and special experience. Of course if we were charged

to Newmarket the rate, we think, would be less. I would advocate district rating in regard to outdoor relief only.

11222. District or divisional—Divisional or district; whatever you like. I represent the district. I think it would be a check upon any possible extravagance, and I don't think it would affect the poor in any way putting such a check on them.

11223. District rating would be very hard on the women?—It would be hard on a place like Belfast, but I think the wealthier classes are fairly well distributed all over Belfast.

11224. Mr. Murphy.—Who strikes the poor rate for Belfast?—I had rather a newspaper yesterday that Mr. Murphy held a brief for the city of Belfast.

11225. I do not. I hold a brief for a large number of ratepayers in Belfast. I ask you who struck the poor rate?—I would like, before submitting myself to examination by Mr. Murphy, to know what solicitor instructs him, and whom he represents.

11226. I am instructed by Mr. Peter McGinn, solicitor, and I represent a number of ratepayers in the city of Belfast. I represent one ratepayer who took a very important part in questioning the rate struck by the Corporation, Mr. Pat McCusker, and a number of others. (Witness).—Who are the others?

11227. Who strikes the poor rate?—The poor rate is struck by the Poor Law Guardians. We arrange the figures.

11228. Who makes the rate?—The Corporation of Belfast.

11229. Why did you not say that at first. If the Corporation makes the rate, what is the use of the existence of this Board of Guardians at all?—Mr. Murphy, I am not going into a discussion about the use of the Board of Guardians. I think that is apparent to every man who has got intelligence, and every woman too, and possibly every child in the Fifth ward.

11230. You heard the evidence of Dr. O'Connell yesterday?—Allow me to answer your question first.

11231. Now you are making a speech?—I will answer your first question. You asked me who struck the rate, and when I answered the Corporation you asked me what did the Belfast Board of Guardians do. The rate is struck upon the information given by the Belfast Board of Guardians.

Dr. Brogan.—I think it would be better if you confined yourself to matters arising on the issue of reference. This is not an inquiry into the maladministration of the Belfast Union.

Mr. Murphy.—It is under Reference 5. I spoke to the Chairman about it, and established my locus standi. I am trying to show that it would be an administrative change that would be beneficial to the ratepayers if this body of Guardians was abolished.

Witness.—As far as I am personally concerned, I would advocate strongly the appointment of a barrister to every office vacant in the Council from this forth.

11232. Mr. Murphy.—Are you in favour then of the suggestion I make that the Corporation should take over these duties?—I have got too much feeling for the poor of Belfast to adopt any suggestion of the kind.

11233. You heard the evidence of Dr. O'Connell yesterday?—I did.

11234. Do you consider Dr. O'Connell an intelligent man?—Yes.

11235. Did you hear him say that this Board of Guardians afforded considerable amusement to the public?—Yes.

11236. Is it not rather expensive for the public to have to pay a rate to keep up a Board for amusement?—There are professional men who do the very same thing, and the city of Belfast Council is not exempt from structures of the kind, too. We all admit we have little tills occasionally.

11237. Would you not be in favour of bringing about efficiency and economy in the administration of municipal affairs?—I would certainly, and the question suggests that it wants it.

11238. If by an amalgamation of the Poor Law Board and the City Council such efficiency and economy could be brought about, would you be in favour of it?—Do you mean that if the Poor Law Board became merged in the City Council that efficiency would result?—I really believe it would.

11239. There would be a consequent reduction in salaries?—I don't know about that. It would depend on whether the City Council or the Guardians were in the majority.

11240. Things are in such a jumble regarding the sharing of interest of these bodies. For instance, the poor rate is collected by poor-rate collectors of the Council, and the municipal rate is collected by a body of other collectors. Perhaps you are aware that there is a great grievance amongst the public regarding the collection of the poor rate?—I heard you were engaged in a case the other morning in reference to this matter.

11241. Would you not be in favour of the poor rate being collected as a municipal rate?

Dr. Brogan.—I think this is altogether outside the lines of our inquiry. It is a matter that can be arranged between the Guardians and the Corporation.

Mr. Murphy.—It could if they were one and the same Board.

Witness.—I have no objection to give my opinion in regard to all matters outside the scope of your inquiry that I can give an opinion on, but I feel I should not be a party to trespassing on your time.

11242. Mr. Murphy.—What amount of salaries do you pay?—There are some of them we cannot find out how much our officers get.

11243. Have you a clerk of the union up there?—We have; and the office is about becoming vacant, if that has any interest for you.

Mr. MURPHY.—Really, I don't care to interfere to prevent gentlemen having a free hand, but I think we are going a little too far.

11244. Mr. Murphy.—Will you retire him on a pension?—He has not retired yet.

11245. What person is he to get?—I think I am going to ask counsel that question when it arises.

Mr. MURPHY.—There are several witnesses here anxious to give their evidence. If you have anything pertinent to ask, of course we will hear you.

Mr. Murphy.—You will not finish to-day, for I have a great number of witnesses to examine. I don't know whether you have compulsory powers to make witnesses stand.

Mr. MURPHY.—We have not used them anyway, and hope not to do so.

Mr. Murphy.—It may be necessary for me to compel the attendance of the Town Clerk, the four city Members, and a few others.

Witness.—The panic-stricken season is very near at hand.

Mr. J. W. ROSS examined.

There is just a word of explanation in reference to a statement of Mr. Walker, which I was very much surprised to hear. He said the Guardians had no power to give outdoor relief. Mr. Walker was uninformed, and afterwards found out. Not only have they power, as you are aware, to give outdoor relief in the circumstances mentioned, but they exercise the power. Under the 1st section of the Poor Law Relief Extension Act they have given relief last year to the extent of £269 to cases qualified under that Act.

11246. Mr. MURPHY.—A very small sum of money for a city like Belfast?—They have a resolution, adopted a great many years ago, that where a person is fit for removal to the workhouse outdoor relief is not to be given.

11247. That was illegal?—I would not go exactly the length of saying that.

11248. Every case of absolute destitution is entitled

to relief?—It is an understanding with the relieving officer, and customarily it may operate very harshly, and the evidence given by one of the relieving officers seems a misinterpretation of the law altogether. The case under consideration was that of a man who was sick and in hospital, and the wife and children were at home, and the wife applied for outdoor relief. I certainly think that is a case in which it would be most desirable not to break up a home, but to enable the woman and children to struggle through until the bread winner was restored to health.

11249. Quite so, and the Guardians had ample power to give them relief?—Yes; and there seems to be a misinterpretation on the minds of some of the Guardians which I did not share.

Mr. Walker.—The schedule to the 10 Vic., cap. 33, refers to Dublin, Cork, Limerick, Belfast, and Waterford.

Dec. 18, 1902.
Mr. Donald Macarthur.

Mr. A. W. Roth.

Dec. 18, 1905.

Mr. J. W.
Reids.

Mr. Reids.—The schedule refers to the previous Act. Mr. MURKIN.—I think you will find in a case of absolute destitution the Guardians have power to grant outdoor relief.

(Mr. Walker reads notice).—The case I referred to does not come under any of these. The wife was not a destitute poor person really according to the provision, old age, infirmity, bodily or mental defect. She was not a widow with two or more children. The husband was receiving indoor relief, and the destitution of the child of the union was that this woman did not come within the scope of the Act.

Mr. MURKIN.—It is a matter of common practice in other unions to give relief where the breadwinner is not able through sickness to supply food for his wife and children.

Witness.—I find the exemption of the five towns relates to a section dealing with rating and valuation, and it deals with a former Act of Parliament, which is repealed.

Mr. MURKIN.—The law is of general application.

Witness.—I would like to make a remark about the evidence of Mr. Coey regarding the proposal to transfer the Belfast Rural district to adjoining unions. The proposal relates only to Poor Law purposes, and he rather would confuse your minds as to the decision of the District Council. They wish the district to remain intact as a rural district, but to be transferred for poor law purposes only. I would think, having regard to the convenience of the poor, say at Whiteabbey, which is a large manufacturing centre, it is more desirable to have them brought to Belfast for treatment than sent off to Larnie. It is a manufacturing suburb. It is not, except technically, a rural district; it par-

takes too much of the town. With regard to the other side, the Larnie road direction, the union workhouse is situated within 1½ miles of the union boundary, and consequently a considerable number of people drift from Larnie Union into Belfast. I would also draw your attention to the fact that the Larnie Workhouse is situated within six miles of the Belfast Workhouse, and I may venture to say that I formed the impression, from the trend of the evidence given at the Inquiry, that Larnie Workhouse, as a fully-equipped establishment, will come to exist in the near future, and in that case it might be made available later on for union purposes in another direction. Another thing is that there are a considerable number of villa residences in that district. The people living in them earn their money in Belfast, and don't contribute to the Belfast poor rate. I think that is a reason for extension also. I very heartily concur in a great many of the proposals the Guardians have made, and especially in the idea in some of their minds that there may be ample accommodation in a short time in Belfast Workhouse. Dr. Bigger, in a very valuable report which will be under consideration this afternoon by a committee, points out the crowding of the site and the unsuitability of having further buildings there. That will be objected of the Guardians acquire premises for the treatment of consumptives, and if the fever hospital comes to exist by the transfer of all infectious diseases to the new infectious hospital where built. I remember discussing that matter with Dr. Bigger many years ago when he was visiting medical officer. The transfer of lunatics will afford further accommodation, and the proposal to erect schools outside will leave the schools available for accommodation.

Dr. Kirk examined.

Dr. Kirk.

11250. Mr. MURKIN.—What do you wish to say on this question?—There is only one point I want to bring under your notice, and that is the question of cottage hospitals in the country. My work takes me down to country towns and villages pretty frequently to perform urgent operations, and the more experience I have the more convinced I become of the great usefulness of the present cottage hospitals, and the urgent need of more of them.

11251. Where situated?—For instance, in Ballymena, or in Larnie, or Bangor, places like that. They are quite distinct from the infirmaries; small cottage hospitals, simply that have a small operating room and a few beds in it.

11252. Some have three or four beds, and others a dozen. You favour that?—Very much indeed. In some country towns you have no such place to take a patient to for an urgent operation or an accident, and you cannot do the cases right. There are cases you cannot remove to any distance. You must operate on the spot.

11253. Dr. Bigger.—Have you any particular class of cases in your mind?—Accident cases, or cases of a bad rupture that has to be operated on at once on the spot—a case that you cannot remove to any considerable distance, say a case in which a man's life or death may depend on an hour or two. These hospitals at present are an absolute necessity for every member of the community, whether rich or poor.

11254. You would have them open to all?—Open to everybody.

11255. And those that are able to pay you expect payment from?—Yes; at present the poor are taken in free, and that handicaps the hospital tremendously. Most of the hospitals are simply struggling along—the bulk of them are in debt—and they have to rely for their expenses largely on subscriptions. What I would urge on you is that the local authorities ought to be empowered to pay for the support of the destitute poor in these hospitals, that is to say the sick who cannot be removed to the sick infirmary, and in that way the difficulty of supporting a number of existing infirmaries would be met to a very great extent. Take a place like Ballymena; that was the last place I was at. A poor person had to be operated on. There was no cottage hospital there. I had to do the operation in a small kitchen—a very badly lighted place—it was at night, and I was handicapped, and the patient had to undergo the operation at a great disadvantage. In Ballymena or Larnie you take your patient to the cottage hospital. There are all the appliances there—a good operating room and a good light, and a nurse there, so that the patient has a fair chance.

11256. What management would you put them under?—What I would suggest is—at present these hospitals are managed by a committee consisting of people resident in the district, and one or two of the doctors of the district. That management seems to work very well, and I would suggest that the local authorities, if any districts are sent in, should simply pay the committee for the hospital charges. The other point is that in some districts that are very thinly populated, or in any place if you have these cottage hospitals, the nurse or nurses that are employed in these hospitals could go out and do very valuable work as district nurses in the district. At present there is a system of Jubilee nurses, and they are all over the country. These hospitals could be made the headquarters for these district nurses; you could combine the two positions.

11257. Would you recommend that more particularly for the thinly populated places?—Yes; we would want only a few beds.

11258. What would be the smallest hospital?—In some districts thinly populated you might only want two or three beds with an operating room. It is not as if there were operations going on constantly, and the appliances would not cost very much. The cost of keeping these places up and equipping them I don't think would be very much.

11259. You could not give the chairman an idea of the cost of a small hospital?—I could not.

11260. Mr. MURKIN.—What staff would be necessary in an intermediate hospital?—In the Bangor Cottage Hospital there are, I think, six beds. It consists of two semi-detached cottages, with doors that have been made between them, and one of the kitchens is used as an operating room; the other is used for cooking the patients' food, and there is just a nurse in charge of the hospital, with a surgeon. It meets all the requirements. I often have to do operations there. There are a few benches, and water has been laid on in the kitchen, and they have lamps suspended over the operating table, and it is perfectly satisfactory.

11261. The cost in connection with such an institution would be very modest?—It is apparently very modest. This system is, I believe, worked in England to a great deal, and there the local authorities pay for the poor. These hospitals are an absolute necessity for everybody, and they are bound to come, but they are handicapped by having to take in the poor people.

11262. And not getting any aid from the public purse?—No aid from the public purse; so I think you would be helping everybody if you enabled the Guardians to contribute the charge.

11253. Dr. Brown.—In a district in which there are very few well-to-do people, would not the hospital require to be almost entirely under the control of some body, and the whole support provided out of the rates?—I should imagine so.

11254. Take a district in Donegal, where there are no well-to-do people?—Yes; it would not be a very easy thing to run that.

Mr. WILLIAM O'HARE continued.

11255. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—What would you like to say?—The first thing I would say is, that I give my most hearty assent to the evidence by Mr. Rodden in regard to the application of the English Act. Mr. Rodden talked about the impropriety of girls confined for the first time going to the workhouse. What may apply elsewhere; I don't think it applies in the case of Belfast, because we do not put a girl who has given birth for the first time to a child among the general class. We have a healthy nursery—a separate department—and in the healthy nursery are the respectable married women, who have been confined in the workhouse, or girls who have given birth for the first time to a child; so as far as that is concerned Mr. Rodden is labouring under a misapprehension. I may add that misapprehension in relation to the Belfast Workhouse is very common in Belfast, and I should be delighted if Dr. Bigger would induce the Chairman of this Commission and yourself to visit the workhouse.

11256. We intend to do that?—And I should be very glad if the leading editors of Belfast would induce their minds of what the Belfast Workhouse is, and what it is doing. I could not speak too highly, or too strongly, of the enormous labours that have been successfully undertaken by our lady Guardians in relation to these girls procuring proper nursing for the children, and good nursing for the girls themselves. Coming, now, to the general subject, I give my hearty assent to the evidence given by Mr. Walker with special reference to the treatment of tramps. I believe the true solution of the tramp question will be found in the establishment of such a scheme of farming and other industrial pursuits for that class as is indicated; but I would say, in relation to the tramps, that the question is not very well understood by even the Guardians. It is not, in this country, the great question that it seems to be thought. As a matter of fact, according to the Local Government Board Report to the House of Commons for the 31st March, 1900, which is the last one I consulted, the total relief given throughout the whole of Ireland was 226,764, that is, every person visiting a workhouse and remaining over night, getting supper going in and breakfast coming out; the actual cost for these released would amount, altogether for the entire kingdom, to £1,600, or £2400 per province.

11257. The money item is a small one; in some unions it does not amount to £5 a year; but what is desired is to put an end to vagrancy?—I quite agree with that, and therefore, in the absence of a scheme being put in operation such as that suggested by Mr. Walker, I know no better plan than the application to Ireland of the Poor Law Act of England dealing with that.

11258. That is the power of detention?—Yes.

11259. You think that would be sufficient?—I do.

11260. You would not go for stringent measures, such as sending them to the police station, or having them prosecuted?—I don't see where the advantage is to arise, either to them or to the community; their help will cost as much, if not more, in the prison than with us, and I don't know that they are likely to be much improved. I know that in Belfast Workhouse there is not a single able-bodied inmate, male or female, who is not kept constantly employed; in point of fact, the number of able-bodied male and female inmates in the workhouse is often inadequate for the work that we have for them to do; it is no unusual occurrence for the Committee in charge of the work to be applied to, especially by the matron, for paid cleaners to come in. We ourselves are perpetrating an illegal act every day in relation to the inmates. The enormous numbers we have in the house, the numbers coming in and the numbers going out are of such a character that if we allowed them to go out whenever they gave three hours' notice, the master and other officials would have their whole time occupied attending to the inmates' admissions and dis-

11261. You would advocate a district nurse to be in these hospitals that would be available in the district?—Yes.

11262. And if there are cases in the hospitals, you could requisition another nurse?—Yes.

11263. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—In fact you would utilise the hospital as a home for district nurses?—Yes.

charges, and the Guardians of Belfast, with the tacit approval of the Local Government Board, have fixed an hour in the day when, and only when, inmates can take their discharge. I think any amending Act should have regard to that, and make our illegal act a legal one by conferring on the Guardians a right to fix an hour in the day when the inmates may take their discharge. I think it is not necessary, in view of the information you have on the subject, to return to the question of the upkeep of casual paupers. I wrote, some two years ago, to a number of unions in the vicinity of Belfast—some seven or eight—and the uniform reply I got in reference to the relief that casuals got coming there was, 5 c. of meal and one-third pint of butter-milk for supper, and like ration in the morning; and then it is to be remembered that every one of these men and women were put to useful work for the three or four hours they were kept after getting their breakfast. For instance, in Lismore the master wrote to me:—"About 4,000 men, women and children call at this house annually and remain one night. They are admitted between 6 and 9 p.m., and discharged at 10 a.m. next morning. Their diet is 5 c. of oatmeal and one-third pint of butter-milk for breakfast, and the same for supper. There are fifteen acres of land, and at different seasons the men are employed at digging and turning manure and covering potatoes, and when not so employed they are put to pump the sewage tanks. The women are employed in the laundry." And the same may be accepted as regards the unions of Newry, Downpatrick, Larne, Coothill, Antrim, and Newtownards. I am thoroughly in accord with the witnesses who have preceded me, on the question of boarding out children; but I don't know what means your Commission recommends for the proper dealing with the children of ins and outs. It occurs to my mind that we should have control over them the same as over orphan children, and that the Guardians should have power to take the children of ins and outs and adopt them, and put them out to board. The Legislature enacted in relation to that matter should contain stringent clauses to prevent their parents or any person interfering with the children while under the care of the Guardians. If that were not so the parents and their friends might give untold trouble to the foster parents.

11274. You think there would be danger of their going to the house and coaxing their way?—There is no doubt about it; we experience it in relation to the orphan children—nurses and grandmothers and others, anxious to get them away; so I respectfully submit this Commission should make some strong recommendation in relation to that matter, and also with regard to their duty as to pay to the Guardians for the support of their children or the part support, according to their ability, and furthermore, that if these people called runners or ins and outs give up their evil habits and become good citizens at the end of a period to be named, the Guardians could restore the children to them, having been satisfied that they had become good citizens, and were willing to take proper care of their children.

11275. Do you think that would be an incentive to reform?—I do; because we cannot at all surmise that parental affection is dead in the breast of all these poor people. I think there is scarcely anything that has caused the Guardians more pain than to see a mother coming in with three or four children, who discharged herself four or five days previously; the children go out healthy and comfortably clad. They go out, and go through some course of dissipation, and they bring back the children in rags, faint with hunger, dirty and probably affected with some skin disease. We should have power to take these children from their mothers, whose so-called parental authority is simply law empowering them to injure themselves and the children. If we could come on the children it might be a means of bringing that woman to her senses, and if she has a husband, the husband to his senses. I

Dec. 18, 1902.

Mr. William
O'Hare.

think, also, that fifteen years is too early an age at which to relieve the Guardians of their control over the children. I don't require to tell you that it is one of the most critical periods in the life of a girl or boy, just coming into womanhood or manhood. Whilst children boarded out with foster parents have undoubtedly turned out well in 98 cases out of 100, yet I think that the Guardians, while they should cease to contribute to their support at that age, should yet have their authority continued for a longer period in order to safeguard, if that were necessary, the children from any abuse that might arise. For example, the foster mother or father may die, and the children are cast abroad perhaps too young. I think we should have power to look after these cases for a more lengthened period.

11276. Do you approve of the suggestion made by one of the witnesses, that the Guardians should have power to apprentice these children out to farmers, or so on, for a stated period?—I certainly do; and to other trades.

11277. It would be better to send them to the country, if it could be done?—Certainly. With regard to the amalgamation of unions, Mr. MacArthur, in the termination of his evidence, expressed his desire to separate the rural part of the Co. Down from this union. I am strongly opposed to that for two reasons—first, in the interests of the poor themselves; and, second, fair play to Belfast. Hollywood is a very short distance from Belfast; the road to Belfast is a very good road; moreover, we have the apparatus for removing rapidly the sick poor of the Hollywood district to the Belfast Union; whereas the road from Hollywood to Newtownards is a very much longer journey, and the road is a bad one. Again, those in the vicinity of Hollywood have the advantage of connection with Belfast; the farmers in the district have the advantage of the Belfast markets. The poor can be better treated, and more rapidly attended to, from Belfast, and those who are living in the Rural Dis-

trict of Hollywood have the advantage of connection with Belfast. I also disagree with Mr. MacArthur in suggesting district rating. I say that the merchants of the centre of the city, and others who are in the centre of the city, and do their business principally outside the boundary of Belfast, but enjoy the advantage of Belfast as a centre of trade, that is to say, that the part of Belfast in which they are located should have a less rate than the poorer districts of the town, would be utterly unfair, because the ratepayers of Belfast to them arises from Belfast being what it is, and they should take their part, and bear an equal share in the relief of all distress in the city. I think it would be very unfair to inflict upon the poorer section of the community a higher rate for the relief of the poor themselves. I think, therefore, that district rating, as applied to Belfast—while I think it is not a good thing in any part of the country—would be especially unfair in the case of Belfast. Supposing that the Rural Districts connected with Belfast Union were separated, a portion of Greenacres would have to go to Larnah, and portions of the Orange-road would have to go to Larnah, and portions in Belfast would have to go to Newtownards. That would be an enormous disadvantage to the poor.

11278. Mr. Murphy.—You would be in favour of any change that would lighten the load of taxation to the ratepayers?—Certainly; I think every ratepayer would.

11279. Would the merging of this Board of Guardians be calculated to bring about more efficiency?—No; I think it would be the very reverse; it would enormously increase the cost.

11280. Centralization generally in local bodies brings about an improved state of government?—Quite the contrary. My knowledge of the history of this country is, that breaking up large bodies and conferring powers on a district is a great advantage. London used to have one Mayor and Corporation; how many Mayors and Corporations has it now?

Colonel James McCleave, J.P., examined.

Colonel John
McCleave.

As paupers come continually from Lisburn to Belfast Workhouse, I consider it would be advisable to extend Belfast Union so as to take in the town of Lisburn, thereby enabling us to send our old and infirm to Lisburn Workhouse, which is capable of holding 1,040 inmates—these figures I took this time last year—and had only 245 last winter. I consider the county is overcrowded with workhouses, and that several of these might be closed with great advantage to the ratepayers, while the destitute poor need suffer nothing. I don't favour the idea of auxiliary lunatic asylums, as I consider all lunatic paupers should be treated in the county asylums, as they are much better looked after, and get the full allowance from the Government. I have long thought that the children in such a large institution as the Belfast Workhouse should have an establishment to themselves, and I would instance Antrim as an ideal house for this purpose. Of course, I think that boarding out is a very good thing, but I think we ought to have a large school to send the children to whom we don't board out, and where they could be taught trades. This Antrim Workhouse accommodates 766 paupers, and last winter it had only ninety-eight; so I think that is one that might be closed up and given to us. And in certain circumstances I consider that arrangements could be made for the maintenance of certain classes of paupers in other unions by paying. As I favour amalgamation, I would be strongly in favour of combining a number of convenient workhouses for the purpose of poor house relief.

11281. Mr. MURKIN.—In what way would you do that?—I would close up one or two of the workhouses and let them go to the others.

11282. That is amalgamation pure and simple?—Yes; I think, really, if it were not for the inconvenience of the thing, I think one workhouse would be almost enough for the Co. Antrim. It would be inconvenient sending paupers so far, but two would be certainly enough, and would save an enormous lot.

11283. Considering that they stay a long time in the institution—considering that the railway facilities in the Co. Antrim are fairly good, there would not be much difficulty?—No. There are several things which would be capable of improving, but on the whole the management, as constituted, should work fairly well. The law, however, should, in my opinion, be

altered, to give the Guardians more control over casuals and women having illegitimate children; in fact, all women who are not capable of looking after their children. I endorse everything Mr. O'Hare said about the children.

11284. Dr. BROWN.—Did you hear Mr. Roddie's evidence yesterday?—No, I did not.

11285. Mr. MURKIN.—Miss Clark was still more exhaustive and clear in the same direction?—We should have complete control over these children whose parents are not capable of bringing them up properly.

11286. What about the mothers of illegitimate children—have you any suggestion to make as regards that class?—I would not allow her to take the children out when she goes out; I would keep the children and educate them properly.

11287. You would ask a further extension of the powers of the Guardians in that respect?—I would. I consider it a great hardship that we have not the same power as that possessed by English and Scotch Guardians, to deport the paupers who do not belong to the union. I think that if paupers came to us from England or Scotland, or even from other counties in Ireland, we ought to be able to send them back.

11288. It is outside our reference; I am afraid we cannot enter into that. An effort was recently made in the House to have some changes of that kind?—It is very unfair that we should have to support them. At the present time we have some Englishmen in the house.

11289. That is so; but I am afraid it is not a matter for our consideration?—There is a thing the master and I were talking about the other day, with regard to militiamen; he is very explicit on it, and I would like him to state what he thinks. I will take one case in April. There was a militiaman and his wife and all his children were in the workhouse last spring when the regiment was called up in Tyrone. This man had to walk from Belfast to the outside boundary of Tyrone, as the Government only pays from the outside boundary to the headquarters of the regiment. By law we had to turn this poor woman out and all her children. I think that is a very great hardship, particularly when he is serving his country. That is a law that ought to be altered. And that woman had to walk just from one workhouse to another, tramp it, she had no money to pay her train; of course, when she was coming back he got his bounty. Except in

Relief the accommodation is more than sufficient in all the other unions. I consider all persons who avail themselves of the fever hospital—in fact, of anything—and who have means to pay, should pay in full, and those who cannot pay in full should pay as much as they can. I think steps should be taken to decrease the number of tramps and criminals, and with this end in view I would propose a certain amount of work to be done before allowing tramps and criminals to leave the workhouse, and those who present themselves frequently should be treated as prisoners; and to secure sanitation I would have them photographed, and have these photographs sent to the different unions in the neighbourhood. I know that has been done in different places. I have a note of some of the workhouses in Antism. Ballycastle holds 567, and there are only 77 in it; Lisburn, 3,040, and there are 843 in it; Ballymore, 765, and there are 143 in it; Lanes, 706, and there are 170 in it; Ballymena, 1,366, and there are 337; Antism, 766, and there are 86.

11228. You think there is a waste of space and expenditure in connection with the staff, that might be done away with—I do, indeed; I think it is a fearful keeping up a staff for nothing; I think a great number of these workhouses could be made use of in the way of schools and hospitals.

11229. Do you favour the idea of a county farm for old chronic cases that makes their home of a workhouse?—I think it would be a very good thing, free labor.

11230. You believe in taking the children out of the house—I do.

11231. Send them out as far as possible—I do.

11232. And where not possible provide other means?—A sort of public school, where we send our own children to and have them taught. Even if we took a workhouse, the same as Antism, I would be in favour of having foster mothers in it, and let them bring up their children as much as possible in a sort of cottage home in the workhouse, and let the children go to the National school outside, and give them less idea of workhouse life. I have had some children out of the workhouse down in my own place, but they generally ran away.

11233. A suggestion was put forward here that the Guardians should be ashamed to apprentice children to trades, or farmers, for a stated period, because the practice is now when they go out they only remain a few months and return to the house. Would you approve of such a change in the law as that, to enable the Guardians to send the children for a year or two years?—Certainly I do; I thought they could do that really.

11234. Dr. BROWN.—You mentioned that if a workhouse was taken over you would make it a school, with a number of foster-mothers. Do you mean to divide the workhouse into so many houses?—Yes, like cottages; beds, and have kitchens.

11235. All built within itself?—Yes; so that the girls could learn housekeeping, and make it score like a home.

11236. Not all the food cooked together?—No.

11237. Would you keep the children separate from each other?—I would, unless for playing, and let them go to the National schools as much as possible.

11238. Mr. MURPHY.—Do you not think an institutional life a bad one for children—do you not think that sending them over the country is better?—Yes; but they would mix if sent out to the National schools.

11239. But if you had them housed together they would know little of home life—I would rather let them be educated out in National schools.

11240. And mix with the population, and forget the associations of their early days?—Exactly; but I think if they were taken away from workhouse associations, and sent to a nice country place like Antism, it would be more like sending our own sons to boarding schools; they would not have the same associations as they have in the workhouse.

11241. Dr. BROWN.—You are interested in the question of a sanatorium?—Very much indeed; the sanatorium would give us great relief; I think it would be a splendid thing.

11242. Have you any suggestions to offer as regards the county?—I am not a Guardian for the Co. Antism; it is the Co. Down I represent.

11243. You would not think that one of these workhouses might be made into a sanatorium?—I do not think they could; it would be a great pity not to use them for something; it is a great throwing away of money to pull them down and build others, and structural alterations can make great improvements.

11244. Mr. MURPHY.—Is there anything else you would wish to say?—Mr. Walker said, yesterday, there are no homes for boys going to learn trades; there is a fine one in Margaret.

Mr. Walker.—That belongs to a separate institution; that is the Balmoral school.

Mr. MURPHY.—We had evidence on that point yesterday, and the merits of that institution were fully recognized by the witnesses.

Mr. Walker.—It would not cover the case of our boys.

11245. Mr. MURPHY.—Have you any views on the matter of boarding out the old, instead of keeping them in an institution?—I have not thought very much of that.

11246. The question how to provide for the infirm is perhaps the most important we have to consider. What is your view?—I really think they would be taken better care of in an institution like ours; some would be better off than ever they were in their lives.

11247. One of the most sympathetic professional men we have met, Dr. Mooshead, of Cootanhill, said one of the things that these people sighed for was the freedom of outdoor life—I daresay it would be a very good thing, and I don't think it would cost more if proper regulations were made as to the persons entitled to such assistance.

11248. Have you anything to say about the tramps?—I think there ought to be something done about them. I believe it is the law that we can detain them.

11249. Only a short time?—I think we ought to be able to keep them. Their photographs ought to be taken and sent through the country; and give them cold baths; they don't like that when coming in.

11250. Mr. MURPHY.—You have always taken a very active part in endeavoring to keep down expenditure?—I have, to a certain extent.

11251. I may say you are the only Guardian that was opposed to the expenditure of some £13,000 in making a new debating room?—You are referring to the board-room. I think I was the first; but I got a great many converts afterwards.

11252. I believe you succeeded in getting it postponed until there was an election pending?—I think the Local Government Board very wisely did that.

11253. And there was a big correspondence in the public press about it?—Indeed, if it had not been for that I think it would have been passed.

11254. And that board-room has not been built?—No.

11255. Were you present yesterday when a Guardian suggested that examinations should take place for the officials of the union?—I did not hear that.

11256. Some time ago, the proceedings at the Guardians were very noisy?—I think at all his boards they are sometimes noisy; people get excited in their debates.

11257. Mr. MURPHY.—You seem to disapprove of auxiliary asylums?—I would much rather have them sent to the local institution.

11258. Perhaps a method could be adopted cheaper than that?—No, I do not know one.

11259. For instance, the present asylums are all full; new buildings will have to be erected?—We are building very extensively at Downpatrick.

11260. And if some of these buildings that might be disused in case of a change could be put in a proper condition for the reception of these patients they might be kept at a lower rate; it would not require so many attendants to look after them. Do you not think that if this class had a home to itself it would be better, not only for the outpatients, but the patients themselves?—I think it would be better for the outpatients; but I question very much if the patients would be better. I am only speaking of the one I know. Dr. Nolan, at Downpatrick, is a model doctor, and I don't think any institution could be better than he has it.

11261. Don't you know that there is very little attendance required, and consequently less cost per head?—He does not give the harmless ones the same attendance as the dangerous ones; he has them classified.

11262. Don't you think the surroundings of noisy inmates is injurious to their peace and comfort?—I suppose it is; but it is a very large place, Downpatrick Asylum, and he has the harmless working on a large farm, and they don't hear the others.

11263. Dr. BROWN.—The Co. Down has built additional blocks to the asylum?—Yes; we have spent

Dec. 14, 1883.

Colonel John
McGowan.

£20,000 or £20,000 taking over lunatics out of the workhouses. I don't think we ought to have any lunatics in our workhouses.

11320. Mr. MURKIN.—But in the case of asylums that have not the space yours has—?—Yes; I quite agree with you that these distressed workhouses could be utilized as auxiliary asylums or schools.

11321. Then your objection to auxiliary asylums is simply confined to the Co. Down, where you have plenty of accommodation for all the demented?—Yes; I only know about the Co. Down. I think it would be a very good plan, if you had these auxiliaries, to have them under an experienced man like Dr. Nolan, who could go to visit them. These lunatics should be looked after very carefully, as they cannot do anything for themselves. Dr. Nolan has brought up cases where the ailments had threatened patients. In Ballymena there are a large number of lunatics received from Belfast, and they are kept at a loss.

Mr. Murphy.—I was instructed to appear before you on behalf of a large and representative body of ratepayers engaged in commercial pursuits who are distressed that the burthen on their shoulders may be lightened, and a central authority established for the collection of the rates. Some of these gentlemen consider more economy might be effected by the assignment of local bodies in the city, and having regard to the fact that the Poor rate is now, under the Local Government Act, levied by the Corporation, they think there should be a merger of the Guardians, say that of the Water Board in the City Council. And if there was thus established a central body some of our leading merchants might be interested to take a part in the work of the municipality. I have been furnished with a long list of witnesses, but, acting on my advice, they don't intend to present themselves for examination, as I consider it will be necessary to promote a private Bill in Parliament.

Mrs. PATER examined.

Mrs. PATER.

11322. Mr. MURKIN.—I suppose you have heard the evidence of Miss Clark?—Yes.

11323. Do you approve of what she has said on the matter?—Quite so; especially the taking of children from vicious parents. I may give you an example of one case, where a father took out a child who had been ill in the infirmary, and he walked it round, to cure it of whooping-cough, from Belfast to Lismore, and from Lismore back again. Of course, he brought it back again to the workhouse in a very bad state. I really think that children should be taken from parents of that kind.

11324. Have you any other suggestions to make?—Regarding the first case, I have had a great deal to do in that matter, and I don't think these women should come into the workhouse; I think, if possible, they should be taken outside into a maternity home.

11325. Dr. HENNESSY.—You think there would be some chance of reformation?—I think there would be some chance, because when they come into the workhouse they seem to be forgotten, unless any Guardian will take them up and find a home for their child and get them a situation. Many cases I have taken up in that way; but without we do that they are forgotten.

11326. I believe you and other lady Guardians have done a great deal in that way regarding Belfast?—Yes; I have taken up a great many cases myself, and recently we had a first case, where a woman had twins, and she told me a great number of untruths, and after spending about three-quarters of an hour with her she told me the truth, and told me who the father of the children was. I traced him, and placed the matter in the hands of her minister, and when she left the maternity hospital she was married, and they are living together and are quite happy. They really want some lady who will take them up and do what she can for them, and I think that can be done through some maternity home.

11327. Mr. MURKIN.—You think that would be better than through some religious institution?—I am afraid there would be a difficulty in getting them to go to the religious institution; I think they would go more readily to a home such as Dr. Bell speaks of.

11328. You think ladies could be induced to look after them at a maternity home?—I think so; I think we should find we had ladies who would take that sort of thing up. I agree with what Mrs. Clark said about scattered homes and working boys' homes.

11329. You approve of the practice of boarding out?—There are some children that I don't think we can board out—the children of widows; I don't think we should take them from the widow. I think the working boys' home would be a good idea; we should then be able to get the boys right. We have quite a number that we don't know what to do with; they are in the schools, and we cannot obtain situations for them, because we have no place to put them in at night. I have been making inquiries from a home here, and I find they have twenty boys, and find it most essential. It is in connection with the Belmarsh Institution.

11330. You think if that system was extended it would be good?—Something of that kind. They say it is most successful, and they started because they did not know what to do with their boys. They have a very good mother, and they have a small boy earning from 5s. to 10s. will contribute 7s. a week to the home; a boy earning 6s. or 7s. will contribute 5s. 6d. They received, last year, £200 from the boys. The boys seem to be most successful. And they are plumpers and openers among them; and there are very few failures. We have twelve or thirteen boys that we don't know what to do with.

11331. Dr. HENNESSY.—Do the boys from that home do well afterwards?—I am told very well indeed; there are very few failures.

Dr. HALL examined.

Dr. HALL.

11332. Mr. MURKIN.—Well, doctor, we would like to hear your views.—There are just one or two points I would touch upon. I am of opinion that Poor Law infirmaries and hospitals should be open to paying patients, and that Guardians should have the power of charging such a rate either in excess or below the average cost, which may not, in the individual case, be the actual cost, having regard to the requirements of the case and the ability of the patient to recomp the Guardians. A sliding scale of charges could be arranged by the Guardians to cover these points.

11333. Do you think that would be a beneficial charge?—In our institution very frequently we have patients who are well able to pay, and yet they are only charged the average cost. We think that is a hardship.

11334. Dr. HENNESSY.—Do you mean the cost of maintenance?—The cost of maintenance and treatment. Generally, a person is in a position to pay coming to a Poor Law infirmary must be strictly ill and require operative treatment, or he would not be there. So he is likely to cost more than an ordinary patient.

11335. What is the amount you would charge?—Up to one guinea; but I have that entirely in the hands of the Guardians.

11336. What do you charge?—About 6s. in the infirmary. But a case of acute illness, or requiring operative treatment, would cost the Guardians much more than that.

11337. Mr. MURKIN.—You think in the case of patients who were able to pay the Guardians should have power to fix a sum?—I do.

11338. Dr. HENNESSY.—In the same way as the county infirmaries?—Yes. I am also strongly of opinion that consumptive patients should not be treated in workhouse infirmaries. Structurally they are unsuitable and impossible of reconstruction, built as they are, or three-story blocks on the general ward system, and for large numbers of cases. This renders the attention so essential to the satisfactory treatment of the various stages of this disease impossible; while their presence in the same building is a very grave source of danger to patients suffering from other ailments, and therefore in a low state of vitality. Further, I consider that when a large number of consumptive patients

are concentrated in any one building or portion of such they become a source of danger to each other.

11343. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you think there should be isolation—I do; that they should be separated and a sanatorium erected outside the town.

11344. Do you think it would require one for each county or would a provincial sanatorium be sufficient?—A large city like Belfast would require one for itself, or it may be two, because if a sanatorium were started some consumptives would be treated. In counties like Antrim or Down it would require two or maybe three. We find in the infirmary that mill-workers compose much more than half of the consumptives, so in any manufacturing district you may count on a large number.

11345. Would you establish these out in the country?—Out in the country, free from towns.

11346. Near the sea?—It may be, or it may be inland; it would not matter much, provided it was in a healthy district, and you had shelter from the most prevalent winds.

11347. There has been something of the kind established in Coochibill by Dr. Moorhead on a small scale—sheds, movable houses that can be shifted about?—That would exactly meet with my idea. Therefore, all cases of pulmonary tuberculosis should be treated in a sanatorium especially established for the purpose. There is a decided hope for them if they are got early.

11348. Would you go as far as some of the witnesses, and say that the disease should be notifiable?—I am also strongly of opinion that the compulsory notification in pulmonary tuberculosis would be of material assistance in the endeavour to stamp out, or at least

lessen this disease; the local authorities would then know accurately where the disease was most prevalent, and would be much better able to take preventive or curative steps.

11349. Dr. BLOOM.—As far as Belfast is concerned the Guardians are not the sanitary authority—I know that; but the Local Government Board have a considerable amount of power, and if they suggested it should be a notifiable disease I am sure it would be enforced. There is one point with regard to school children. I think that the school children should all be removed from the workhouse; I think it is a most unhealthy surrounding for them. When they come to the age of fifteen they are sent to the body of the house, which is a great mistake, because up to that time they are not taught any trade. My own idea is that the schools should be removed to the country, and they should have various workshops, where the children should be taught trades, and the Government should permit the age to be increased to seventeen or eighteen before they go to the body of the house. By that time the children would be pretty well advanced in a trade, so that the Guardians would appreciate them outside, and by so doing I believe it would decrease the rates very much, and be a decided benefit to those people.

11350. Mr. MURKIN.—You agree in the view put forward that the Guardians should have further power as regards the apprenticing of the children?—I do; I think it would be a decided advantage to the community.

11351. To be enabled to send them for a term to learn a trade or work on the farm?—Quite so; I am in entire agreement with it.

Dr. LUNN examined.

11352. Mr. MURKIN.—We would like to hear your view—I am of opinion that workhouse infirmaries and fever hospitals should be separated from the workhouse proper, both structurally and in name. By structurally I mean that the buildings should be so arranged that intercourse between the inmates of the workhouse and the patients in the wards and grounds of the infirmary or hospital would be impossible. The workhouse infirmary is, without doubt, obnoxious to the respectable poor of the community, and I believe that many of this class are deterred from seeking the treatment that is necessary to their disease, and only wait for them in our infirmaries until it is too late to be of much value to them, chiefly by a sentimental repugnance to a workhouse institution. I therefore suggest that some terms, such as district infirmary and district hospital, be substituted for these now in use. However, I do not wish it to be inferred that in suggesting a change of name I consider any change in the board of management desirable. I am not saying that it would not be desirable in some cases; but the management that we have had in Belfast does not lead me to think that any change would be desirable here. We get very assistance as medical officers from our Board. I agree with Dr. Hall that paying patients should be admitted to the infirmary and hospital, and that they should be charged at a sliding scale of charges, both extending above and below the average cost of maintenance. I also agree with him and the other witnesses who have recommended the removal of consumptive patients from the workhouse, and also, I believe that notification of consumption would be a very good thing if it could be accomplished by any means. A class of patients that I wish to speak of, as I have a great deal to do with them, are those suffering from simple alcoholism. I think in the infirmary they should be treated in isolated wards. A great many of those patients are able to pay well, and, I think, should be charged above the average cost of maintenance. These cases that are admitted a certain number of times to the institution, I think should be sent to institutions for incurables and detained there for a period regulated by expert medical opinion. We have a very large number of cases that come in habitually, and if they were sent to institutions where they could be detained it would have a very good effect on them. There is, however, a class of alcoholic patients which is very troublesome in large towns. I refer to cases of acute drunkenness combined with delirium. Individuals of this class do not often suffer from delirium tremens; they have not money enough to drink long enough for that result. They indulge in a severe bout of drinking, and have usually sufficiently recovered in a few days to seek discharge from the infirmary. When they have passed enough

money they return, or are brought in again in a state of intoxication so severe as to require medical treatment, and often with injuries directly or indirectly caused by drink.

11353. In what condition are they when they appear at the workhouse?—More than ordinarily drunk—acute alcoholism, verging on a state of coma, constantly helpless; frequently in that condition. When they are admitted to the infirmary they are a source of annoyance and danger to patients who are really ill, because even though we have separated them at present their noise and language can be heard at a considerable distance.

11354. And do any of these have means?—This class specially are mostly destitute, and in the case of their readmission they very often come in with slight injuries, broken heads, cuts, and contusions, and have to be treated surgically as well. I take the numbers for one year, 1901. The number of cases for that year of simple alcoholism was 355; in addition to this number there were 178 cases admitted of alcoholism associated with some surgical injuries, usually very slight, making a total of 533. A large proportion of these cases were readmissions, people who had been admitted several times before. I think that a certain number of admissions of this sort should constitute an offence, for which the individual should be sent to jail, or at least some place where they could be detained; detention seems to be the punishment that has most effect on them. I am strongly of opinion that mothers admitted a certain number of times in this condition should be deprived of the charge of their children. Such a plan would undoubtedly be of unspeakable benefit to the children, and would, I think, tend to lessen the propagation of those habits of vice and intemperance which are the main cause of pauperism. About that question of the separation of mothers from the children, I think if any one were round Lichfield-road or Victoria-street after 10 o'clock at night, especially on a Saturday night, he would see a sight that would impress him with the importance of taking the poor children from those parents. They come up there in a shocking state with the children, sometimes one in arms and one able to walk—a most pitiable sight to see these children being brought up on a cold night to the workhouse gates.

11355. Do the officers for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children not look after such cases as that?—I dare say they do, in a certain number of cases; in fact, I know they deal with a large number; but they are evidently not able to deal with all, because it is a thing of very frequent occurrence. I think that a certain number of admissions on the part of a woman to the infirmary in that condition should constitute an offence whereby she could be legally deprived of the charge

Dec. 18, 1902.

Dr. Hall.

Dr. Lyson.

Dec. 18, 1906.
Dr. Lysons.

of her children, and the Guardians could then adopt them. I think every large infirmary throughout the country, especially in large towns, should have isolation wards for the treatment of infectious eye cases. There is a disease called trachoma, which is very infectious, and has been stamped out in some countries entirely; it is a matter for regret that it is prevalent in Ireland. I also think that convalescent departments with associated sitting spaces should be established in every infirmary. Open-air exercise hastens recovery, and therefore tends to shorten the stay of patients in hospital. With regard to venereal cases, I think they should be detained in isolation wards until pronounced free of disease. Some of the Guardians have mentioned that we have not power to detain these people; they can discharge themselves, and it is a matter for great regret that we have not the power to detain them until they are free of disease. It is recommended that there should be city lock hospitals; I suppose that is a matter of public health, too, to a large extent. But I think Mr. MacArthur's statement with regard to fever patients would apply to our relations to the lock cases. He says the master in a humane way admits these cases, because there is no other place to take them. There is no other hospital for lock cases, and I think, instead of rejecting them, every infirmary should be offered to girls suffering from the disease to come in. The care of the disease would not be the only advantage gained; I believe, in a certain number of cases, by the discreet and benevolent efforts of the nurse, assisted by other ladies who are interested in this work, a change of life on the part of the patient would take place. In fact, I know this has been accomplished in our institutions. On the question of rejecting them from our institutions, at present, I think I may mention a thing that is not, perhaps, fully realised, that their going out is a source of serious danger to the community, and it is a well-known fact to medical men that children and other innocent persons have contracted syphilis by using the same eating utensils and drinking vessels and using the same towels, and therefore, to discourage these people from coming in to the infirmary would be very questionable wisdom at the present time. As regards children, I agree in the main with the recommendations made; I think very strongly that the children of violent parents should be removed from their charge. School children over four years of age should be removed from the workhouse entirely. I am not quite sure that I can express any definite opinion on the treatment of children under four. I think, for the first year of infant life, unless there are very good reasons for it, the child should be left with the mother. I think the relation would be mutually beneficial, and unless the mother is extremely unworthy or physically unfit to nurse her child, the child should be with her. When the child is over a month old I think the mother should be separated from the child for certain intervals during the day. She should be made to do some other work, and be allowed at intervals regulated by the medical officer's opinion, to visit the child.

11258 Dr. Broom.—You have some opinion like that in the Belfast Workhouse?—Yes. I will tell you briefly what we have been trying to do. Children over two years, while in the institution, are completely separated from their mothers, who, I believe, are allowed to visit them once a week, and day and night they are under the charge of an experienced nurse. Children over twelve months and under two years should be with their mothers at night only, while in the workhouse; and at night they are all under the charge—that is mothers and children—under the charge of an experienced nurse. By an experienced nurse I don't mean a trained nurse; I think it would be perhaps wasting material to employ a trained nurse for this purpose; I think a woman who has had a family herself, and is skilled in the management of children, would be all that is necessary. Children from one month to a year should be visited by the mothers at intervals during the day, and should at other times be under the care of able-bodied women, an experienced nurse acting as superintendent of the Department, of course. I think mothers with an infant under a month should be with it constantly for the first month after birth. With regard to women giving birth to a first illegitimate child, I think her case is very hard indeed, and I am very glad to hear of the institution over which Dr. Bell presides, and I think it is regrettable it is not better known among medical men in this city. I was not quite clear as to whether in this home the woman is kept during her confinement.

Mrs. Poyne.—She is kept in the home.

Dr. Broom.—And before her confinement also.

Witness.—I don't know whether that is exactly the plan that the Guardians should be asked to approve of or not. I propose to recommend that the Guardians should have power to assist in paying for the expenses of the child for a time, and the support of the mother until such time as she is able to support herself at any rate. I think the Guardians, in that case, should have a good deal to say to the management of the home during the confinement. In the maternity department of our infirmary at present, we have one of the best equipped maternity hospitals in Ireland; the women undergo a very thorough training, and pass a very difficult examination, and the cases that are treated in that institution are by no means all uneducated women, some are respectable women, and they are well treated there, and I think to take all the respectable element from the maternity department would be a mistake. I speak without hesitation of that department, because I am not connected with it myself; but I know it is very thoroughly equipped and well managed, and to have it simply for cases that are giving birth to a second or third illegitimate child I think would be rather a pity. Of course, I thoroughly agree with the scheme of not taking the girls into the workhouse at all before the confinement, and as soon afterwards as they can be sent away they should be. I think the scheme of taking a home, where they can be looked after and situations provided for them is an excellent scheme indeed, and cannot be too highly praised.

11259 Dr. Broom.—Speaking generally on that subject, do you not think it a most desirable thing that all these cases should be treated outside the workhouse?—As a general principle, I think it would be better if they were not taken into the workhouse at all. I don't know anything about the home, but I have a good deal of experience of gynaecological work, and in one of the large hospitals, and I know what would most cases to these hospitals is the want of care and proper treatment at the birth. The home is a small one, and could not adequately treat all these girls, and unless there was a proper maternity hospital, I think it would be a great pity that these poor women should be deterred or discouraged from seeking the help and good treatment they can get in the maternity department of the Belfast Union Infirmary; that is my position. There is just one other matter. I think it is a matter well worth of consideration whether it would not pay the Board of Guardians to subsidise these charitable bodies who supply district nurses to the sick poor. Undoubtedly there are many cases of disease that are best treated in hospital; but I think that, on the other hand, many patients are admitted to hospitals and infirmaries who could be very well treated at their own homes, and who would gladly be so, if a sufficient number of visits could be paid by district nurses. These nurses should not be permitted to attend any case without the sanction of a medical man. The reasons are obvious: they might be attending infectious cases and others who were not at the same time. I simply mention this as a possible means of assisting the sick poor without increasing the risk of promoting a spirit of pauperism, and a means of administering efficiency of treatment that would at the same time tend to secure economy.

11260 Mr. Munnaghan.—You think some change of that kind might be brought about that would be beneficial?—I think it would. I think it would tend to economy, and meet with the wishes of the poor people, to be treated in their own homes. We at present have in Belfast a society for providing district nurses for the sick poor, and I think it is not very well known, and its operations are very much limited. I think if the Guardians had power to subsidise such bodies it would be a very valuable thing for lessening the number in infirmaries, and also meeting the wants of the sick poor.

11261 Dr. Broom.—Did you hear Dr. Kirk's evidence?—I did.

11262 Do you approve of it?—Thoroughly.

11263 He mentioned about district nurses in rural districts, where the population is sparse, and one nurse living in a small hospital with, perhaps, only a few beds. It would be a home for her, and at the same time she might do a great deal of good in the district when there were no cases in the hospital. Quite so.

11364. You approve of that?—Thoroughly; if operative cases were admitted she would be able to procure assistance.

11365. Of course, one doctor might be in charge, and they might get a doctor from an adjoining district?—I think it is a very excellent scheme.

11366. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Your suggestions might be utilized by this system?—Quite so.

11367. Mr. WALSH.—You have a great number of serious operations to perform?—Yes; there are a large number of major operations done every week.

11368. Have you ever had a serious operation which

you have had to send out of the infirmary because of lack of facilities for performing it?—No, we are very well equipped as the infirmary in that respect; we have a theatre which is not facilities; but I believe the Guardians are going to make a fine new one for the infirmary in the near future. We have a full set of instruments and a very well-trained nurse, and I have never had anything sent to the infirmary that I could not deal with in the institution—never had any case sent out for an operation since I was there.

Mr. MURKAGHAN.—I may say that everything we have heard since we sat here with regard to the Belfast Infirmary has been of a very high character.

Dec. 16, 1905.

Dr. Lyman.

Dr. McLean examined.

I wish to give evidence with regard to the lunatics and epileptics. I quite agree with everything I have heard stated by other witnesses, that the sooner the lunatics and epileptics are removed from workhouses the better. It is quite obvious it would be very expensive to provide anything like proper accommodation in each workhouse for them.

11369. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—You think the workhouse is not the proper place for them?—Not at all; we have acted on that principle in Belfast, and in the last five years we have sent 367 to the District Lunatic Asylum.

11370. The asylum is now pretty full; something will have to be done to relieve it, either by extension of buildings or taking over some disused institution?—Yes.

11371. Another was suggested as a suitable place for an asylum. What do you think of that?—I don't know the buildings of the Antrim Workhouse well; I think in some cases, generally speaking, disused workhouses might be used for the reception of these lunatics. It would be an architectural question whether the necessary alterations would not be more expensive in some cases to make the buildings suitable than to build new places; and in all cases it would be an absolute necessity there should be a large quantity of land and a farm attached to whatever place is used as an asylum.

11372. You think exercise and occupation is one of the things that ought to be looked for?—It is one of the most important features in the treatment of insanity, and it is the only possible way to keep lunatics contented and quiet. There are about four different lines on which you could dispose of the surplus lunatics—there are about 4,000 in Ireland. In Scotland they board out lunatics; over 20 per cent. of all the lunatics are boarded out with farmers.

11373. Do you approve of that?—I don't know that I would. In some cases it might be used; but it is rather objectionable to have these lunatics mixing with the ordinary population, especially with young people, especially in such an ornate country as Ireland. The other plan suggested was to build auxiliary asylums, say four, one for each province. I don't think I would approve of that very much; it would be merely making four more large asylums, with nearly a thousand inmates in each, and it would be much better to have them on the lines of the ordinary county asylums. I think the best plan of all to dispose of these lunatics in the workhouse would be to send them all to the present county asylums, and to take new land in connection with the asylums and build new buildings in connection with the present district asylums, that is, to build annexes, and probably build them on the cottage plan. My reason for thinking that is largely from looking at the treatment of insanity in general, and the lunatics who are in the workhouse are merely part of all the lunatics in Ireland. The present accommodation in the district asylums is quite inadequate; not only is it insufficient to house the people, but it is not up-to-date; they are largely out-dated dismal structures. My plan would be to build annexes on a cottage or villa plan, and make a selection from the present lunatics in the asylums who would be most benefited by that form of treatment, that is, the patients where there was a chance of curing, and put them in the new buildings.

11374. The hospital cases?—Yes; I would build new buildings for them in connection with the present asylums, and put the demented and the hopeless lunatics from the workhouse in the present asylum buildings.

11375. Do you see no objection to a great gathering of people in one small compass?—You would want, in that case, to take a large farm.

11376. Would it be well to have 1,000 or 2,000 people gathered together?—You only want to accommodate 4,000 additional inmates, and they would be divided through twenty-two asylums in Ireland.

11377. Most of the asylums are already taxed to their full capacity, and it does not seem a very desirable thing to gather together a very large number—to go over 1,000 in any institution is disapproved of by men whose opinion has been gained by experience?—It would not be wise to have too many; but it would be better to have these additions put to the present asylums, because you must have additional accommodation given to them for their ordinary working purposes.

11378. Do you not think auxiliary asylums would be more advantageous than erecting new buildings?—I think they would be better if you built them on a proper system.

11379. Having them by themselves, you could adopt a system of classification; you could utilize their labour, give them more exercise, and elbow-room?—If there were proper additional asylums built that would be all right; but the suggestions I have seen for these additional asylums are to build them in a cheap way and run them in a cheap way.

11380. That would be all matter for consideration and detail?—It would be most satisfactory if you build proper new asylums.

11381. Auxiliaries, instead of keeping them all together in a great district asylum?—Yes; but I would not lock on them as people who are to be shunned merely, I would run them on the lines of the present asylums.

11382. But they would not require very much attendance, or watching?—My experience has been that that class of lunatics are the cases that require the most attendance.

11383. I am referring to idle and harmless lunatics?—There are a class of them who are not very troublesome; but they would have to be very carefully selected from the present asylums, and put the demented and the troublesome cases in the present asylums when you take them out of the workhouse, and in all cases it would be a wise plan that there should be a large quantity of land attached to the asylums, and they should be under medical superintendence, too. It has been suggested to put them under lay superintendence; but I think that would be a mistake, because the circumstances and treatment of lunatics is a mental study, and I think a medical expert is the most suitable man to look after that class of patients.

11384. The idea is to keep them under medical supervision. I was not aware anything else had been suggested?—It has been publicly stated. We have 117 lunatics altogether left at present, and 51 of those are females; of those 51, 27 do work, that is, 14 work in the laundry, 9 as scabbers, and 4 as seamstresses.

11385. Dr. BROWN.—All in their own department?—All in their own department. The remaining 23 are old women, and one idiot child. The 14 laundry girls wash all socks, flannels, woollen scarves and shawls for the whole institution, except the fever hospital; and also the bed linen and night clothing of the lunatic officers. Of the 56 men, 45 do more or less work, 11 work out on the farms; they do weeding, and that sort of thing—of course, we have not near sufficient ground—and 5 do the carrying from the stores of food and so forth, up to the lunatic department and from the kitchen, and 8 of them do scrubbing, and 19 pick oakum.

11386. Is that a penitential business, the picking of the oakum?—Oh, no, just merely to keep them employed; we cannot afford to set up an establishment for picking the hair of mattresses and beds, although the picking of oakum is much more healthy than picking hair

Dec. 17, 1898.

Dr. McLeish.

mattresses, which is carried on largely in anyhuts. I think the objection to picking cotton is purely sentimental, because it used to be used in prisons, but really it is not a laborious work at all, and, I think, much more healthy than the picking of hair mattresses.

There are 29 male epileptics, and they all do some work, except 5 old men. Twenty-nine female epileptics, and besides scrubbing they do all the darning and repairing of clothes of the male convalescent and male and female lunatic departments; that is, they work for 300 people. We have no pauper cleaners or attendants in the male and female epileptics or male and female lunatics, except one, who acts as assistant to the landlady. They do all their own cleaning, and run their own establishment.

11387. Mr. MURKIN.—Is their treatment the same as the ordinary inmate in the body of the house?—They get much better; there is a special lunatic diet. Then about the visiting of friends. Out of 55 male inmates there are 19 who are visited by friends, that is, they are visited by friends from once a week to once a month, and those who don't come to see them oftener than once a month, as a rule don't come to see them at all.

11388. So that two-thirds of them are almost forgotten?—Yes; although they will have friends who generally turn up when they die to see to their burial; that is about all the interest they seem to take in them. Out of the 51 females 17 receive some visits—some of them once a week regularly, some once a fortnight, some once a month. And the epileptics—out of 29 males there are 10 who receive visits; and of the 20 females there are 14 who receive visits.

11389. Do you think any special treatment ought to be provided for epileptics?—Unquestionably; I am even more strongly of opinion that they should be re-

moved from the workhouse than the lunatics. Nearly all the epileptics we have are more or less sane.

11390. Did you hear the evidence of Dr. Macdonald on that subject?—I did not. We have sent nearly all the insane epileptics to the asylum. I think the colony system would be the best treatment for the epileptics, and I think they would soon approximate to; and the colony system, with small cottages of from six to twenty in each cottage would entirely suit the requirements of the epileptics as a whole. Epileptics are of a very nervous, nervous disposition, easily offended, touchy sort of people, and the home life they would get in a colony, and the varied occupation which would suit every one of them, would be most useful.

11391. You think the system would be not only humane but economical?—I do; if there was a large enough colony taken they could largely contribute to their own maintenance by their work, and most of them undoubtedly would work, practically all of them.

11392. Dr. BROWN.—How many of the epileptics might be some of the fifty-eight?—All except about six. Of course, we have sent a good many insane away.

11393. It has been roughly estimated that there would be about 300 sane epileptics in Ireland. Do you think they might not all be treated in our institution?—There might be a difference as to what a man would call a sane epileptic.

11394. That is according to a return from the medical officers of the different institutions?—There are epileptics who may be bad tempered, some may have in attack of acute mania, either before or after an epileptic attack; but some are bad tempered about the time and might be considered insane.

11395. You would hardly call bad temper insanity?—No.

Mr. ROBERT H. WILSON, Master, Belfast Workhouse, examined.

There are one or two matters I wish to bring before you with a view to bringing about greater efficiency, more economical administration, and especially better classification of the inmates, and to broaden the sphere of utility towards the respectable poor of the Poor Law system in the Belfast Union district. I would say, on this matter, that any reference I may make is not in any way to be interpreted as a reflection on the system, but merely what came under my own observation as more or less defective arrangements.

11396. Mr. MURKIN.—Have you had long experience?—I have been thirteen years serving the Board, and three and a half years master. I would suggest that a number of unions be combined for the purpose of relieving and maintaining that class of adult paupers who may be termed able-bodied and imbecile, and suggest that they should not be allowed to enter the workhouse at all, the workhouse to be reserved for the sick and infirm only. In the Union of Belfast, according to the evidence taken after the last investigation, it is clearly shown that, owing to this class of inmates taking advantage of the lax state of the existing law the Guardians and their officers are in a greater or less degree prevented from giving the necessary attention to the respectable poor and accommodating them as they should be, the relieving officers' evidence being that their business in regard to dealing with applications for admission to the workhouse is practically turned into a farce.

11397. In what respect do you suggest it is turned into a farce?—That these sane people apply time after time to them, only to discharge themselves after remaining for a short period in the workhouse, and then to re-apply for admission.

11398. Do you think the suggestion of Mr. O'Haire would meet that?—Yes, fully. I would suggest that these persons should be dealt with in the same manner as the class termed tramps or casuals, which, if done, would leave not only the officers who act as inspectors of the poor or relieving officers more time to inspect and ascertain the cases of the respectable destitute poor, but would have the effect, also, of giving greater accommodation at the Guardians' disposal for housing and maintaining them.

11399. You heard the evidence of Dr. Lyneux about the number of these people coming continually drunk to the workhouse after having been about three or four days, and that they had to be housed in the infirmary, thereby taking up the accommodation in the

infirmary, which, if they were dealt with in a more stringent manner under the law, they could not do so. I believe that would go a long way towards giving greater facilities to the Guardians for accommodating the respectable poor. From the point of view of accommodation it is a very serious matter for the Guardians, as the ranner class and their children have very often to be sent to the sick wards, owing to their continually and habitually going out in the most inclement weather and coming back, mostly after 9 o'clock at night, and in many cases after midnight, and the hardships inflicted on the children are obvious to all, and in some cases they become a permanent charge on the rates.

11400. Do you mean the children?—Yes, sir. I would be in favour of boarding out all the children, and in order to do so permission should be given to the Guardians to adopt them, and at the same time extended powers of control and detention of parents should be permitted to allow of the system being practicable. Miss Clarke gave you the percentage of children under the different headings.

11401. Would you extend the boarding-out any further than the children?—I deal with the sick and infirm afterwards. I do approve of that, to some extent. The lunatics should be removed, also the consumptives, as neither for the sake of these inmates themselves nor the other classes, is it desirable to have them in such an institution as the Belfast Workhouse. I may say in respect of consumptives, what I feel very strongly about is that in an institution, especially a large one, such as we have, it is not tending to the good government of the other parts of the workhouse to have a class such as the consumptives housed in the same building, and going about the same establishment, as the consumptives are a class we desire to treat luxuriously—in fact their condition demands that—and to treat them in the same establishment as other inmates who are expected to do an honest day's work for their living under good government almost an impossibility.

11402. You think good treatment is one of the requirements for a cure?—Yes; our medical officer recommends it.

11403. And you think these people ought to be put in a place where they could have the best food and fresh air?—They could not get better food or more luxuries treatment than they get; but my point is, that treating these luxuriously in the same establishment with other inmates—very often, treating one in that way

Mr. ROBERT H. WILSON.

who has entered the workhouse in company with another man who has to be dealt with in a more stringent way is not a good system.

11404. You think there ought to be better classification in that respect?—I think consensitives should not be in the workhouse. Another class that could with advantage be boarded out is the infirm, who have soldiers with whom they could live, and who are in the workhouse only on account of their very old and infirm condition. There are almost 300 such in the Belfast Workhouse. We have made personal inquiries from the inmates of the infirm wards, and we find that about 50 per cent. of those classed as feeble and infirm have given the addresses of relatives, and have stated that they were willing to go to these in case they were boarded out, and granted a pension of 5s to 7s a week. I think it would be a very good thing if such could be done, but with proper safeguards.

11405. Do you think any check could be devised?—I think an officer similar to a relieving officer could distribute it to them weekly, and that would take away the objection to army pensioners. I would give them goods in lieu of money.

11406. But you would approve of the method if there was a sufficient check?—Yes; I think it would be a splendid thing. I desire the strongest terms to represent to the Commission that the system which permits of army and navy pensioners being lodged in the workhouse is, in my view, the most objectionable possible from all standpoints, the Guardians being only permitted to charge their pensions with the actual cost of food and clothing given to them, the pensioners receiving the balance due quarterly. This system results in the good conduct and control of the establishment being practically upset once a quarter by these men discharging themselves, often returning drunk and in a shattered condition of health, so that many of them have to be treated in hospital, and deaths have resulted owing to this cause, and inquiries held, and the jury regretted that such a system should prevail. I have made inquiries from these men themselves, and find that even the worst offenders in this respect would gladly welcome a scheme which would allow them to be lodged in a hostel under military or civil control, and in which various articles of food, and such comforts as tobacco, &c., might be given them from day to day at a certain price, and in quantities varying according to the rules of their pension, so that they would have nothing left at the end of the quarter. Such a system would give these deserving men greater privileges as to leave of absence, lengthen and cheer their lives, and in many cases save them from cutting short their career by their own conduct. It has imposed itself on me that they do not short their lives.

11407. How many have you in Belfast?—Fifty.

11408. Are there many in the country?—I think we have a greater proportion of them than we really should have. Whether the state of the particular departments in which they are housed is new to their liking or not I cannot tell; but I know they have come from a distance to us to be housed. I don't think, either from a public point of view or a personal point of view, that it is a good thing to have the habit of pensioners attached to soldiers who have served their country, and I don't think the public would object to the Government paying wherever was necessary in order to keep them out of the workhouse. The fact of the matter is, we are charged in the workhouse with the upkeep of these men; they upset the establishment, and the workhouse authorities are made as it were to blame.

11409. You think the War Office ought to provide for these men?—I do. I myself have seen many of these old men outside in company with ordinary workhouse inmates; they do not get in any degree the comforts that they should get from the amount of the pensions they receive, or the balance; it is practically taken from them by these other people.

11410. Connections or relatives?—Yes, when they have not in the workhouse. With regard to illegitimate children the results of the law as to liability of parents fathers in this sense are expensive, and seriously affect the well-being and after-life of both children and mothers. During the twelve months ended March, 1893, 183 illegitimate children were born in the Workhouse Maternity Hospital. Of this number, as far as could be ascertained, 140 were first cases and 43 not. Thirty-seven of the mothers, with their

children, subsequently drifted into the nursery department of the workhouse. On inquiry, I have found that there is, at any one time, an average of fifty women with their children being maintained there by the Guardians, or over 100 persons in all. Owing to the state of the law the Guardians are compelled to maintain, on an average, 300 inmates in the establishment, and if better arrangements were made for the maintaining of these women and the care of their children, I believe that could be prevented. Of all the questions affecting the poor and the ratepayers I consider this one the most serious, and at the same time the most intricate and difficult to successfully deal with. The most serious because of the after effects on the poor, both children and adult, and from the ratepayer's aspect, and the most intricate and difficult owing to the very great delicacy and the proper safeguards necessary to be adopted, so as to meet such first cases as are helpful without encouragement to do wrong.

11411. You think if the treatment was too kind it might induce others to go wrong?—That is my own personal view. I have long felt that if the Local Government Board could see their way to order and authorise a Ladies' Committee, not necessarily members of the Board of Guardians, but similar to that ordered by their regulations, Article 17 of the Pauper Children Act, 1868, for children boarded out, that such a committee could quietly and unobtrusively assist these women to obtain suitable employment, and in addition, if the Guardians were empowered to have their children looked after in properly equipped day nurseries, many of them would be saved from ruin, the children's lives in many cases saved, and the Poor Law expenditure considerably reduced. I have, in my own experience, found such to be the case in those cases which the lady members of the Board have taken in hand as my recent. I tried to trace what became of these first cases afterwards. One case, M.J., born 10th April, 1892, went out within fourteen days, was readmitted with the mother 5th November, 1892, and child died 3rd December, 1892. Another case, born 12th May, 1893, discharged shortly afterwards, was readmitted October 9th, 1893, and discharged 16th of October, 1893; the child being ill, the mother took it out contrary to medical advice. Another case, born 18th of May, readmitted 28th June; child died shortly after that. I have had many consultations with the Deputy Coroner of the city, and we really don't know what to do with them. He has informed me that the number of infant children on whom he has to hold inquests is increasing in the city of Belfast. I have found that the lady members of the Board, in any cases they have taken in hand at my request, have been able to cope with them successfully, that is, assisted them in having the children looked after and obtaining employment for the mothers, and no one was wiser about it. Mrs. Payne, Miss Clarke, and Miss Magill have been very kind in that respect; but they have so much business in hand in connection with Poor Law work that I think an outside committee of ladies would be invaluable.

11412. Do you not think it would be well to remove that class from the workhouse altogether—have a house elsewhere?—It is a very delicate point. These girls very often come into the workhouse in the dead of night; apparently they don't want anyone to know where they are going. I have made it a rule to receive them; in fact, I have had one or two object lessons to teach me to do that. One respectable girl from whom I had an application told me, after I had decided to admit her, that it was just as well I had done so, for had she been turned away she would have thrown herself into the river. Belfast is peculiarly situated with regard to this matter, owing to the fact that there are a considerable number of young girls from the adjoining counties, employed as servants, factory and warehouse workers, &c., in the city, whose parents are in the country, and with whom almost invariably the girls refuse to communicate when they are obliged to seek shelter in the workhouse for confinement or after confinement. I can assure the Commission with the greatest respect, that I have often watched these girls going out with their children on to the streets of the city when they were discharged at their own request, and having told me, in reply to my enquiries, that they did not know what they might do or where they were going, and I have been disgusted to think that the state of the Poor Law permitted such a thing without protection.

Dec. 22, 1893.

Mr. Robert H. Wilson.

Dec. 15, 1903.

Mr Robert H. Wilson.

11413. What would you do in such a case?—I don't know; unless we can assist the mother and protect the children. I don't know what the ultimate result will be.

11414. You have no suggestion to make?—No; further than I think the Ladies' Committee could give great assistance in the matter. There should be extended powers given to the Guardians to assist the mother and take care of the children. One means of employing these women might be to give them employment under the Guardians themselves, and pay them as serivants in the infirmary.

11415. That might be perpetuating the evil?—I think, for the first month or two months, when the Guardians were caring their children, it might be well done, and for the first year when it could be permitted, that they should go to the day nursery at certain times; it would only be a temporary thing, until permanent employment was obtained for them. I would suggest that in accounting for the expenditure of the establishment, separate accounts should be kept for the infirmary, the hospital, and the workhouse proper, which, besides being desirable for public purposes, would be a very valuable incentive to the officers primarily responsible for the administration of the different departments, and judging from the results of the Nursing Order of the Local Government Board, would lead to greater efficiency in other respects. I strongly recommend a scheme of keeping separate accounts of expenses. It would let both the public and the Guardians and their officers see how the expenditure was going from time to time. At present the establishment charges are all grouped in one sum, and it is calculated to lead both the Guardians and their officers and the public astray in the matter.

11416. Have there under different headings?—Yes, sir. As to the treatment of the vagrant poor generally known as tramps or casuals, in many cases I think this class of the vagrant poor are judged too harshly and too harshly, as, for instance, in the case mentioned by Colonel McCann, of adult males who may happen to belong to a militia regiment, as many do, and who have their wives and young children dependent on them in the workhouse. The present state of the law requires that he must take all such with him at his discharge from the workhouse. Suppose he belongs to the Donegal regiment, stationed at Letterkenny, he only obtains a travelling permit from Derry to Letterkenny; so that he is obliged—and his dependants with him—to tramp from Belfast to Derry, and in the spring and summer months a large number of such cases are tramping over the country for that reason. Is it any wonder, when a man must report himself on a certain day at Letterkenny, that he disregards weather, the state of his children, &c., and continues his way? I think the tramp nuisance through Antrim, Down, Derry, &c., might be considerably reduced if a different system were adopted in regard to these people. If they were permitted to discharge themselves temporarily, leaving their wife and children in the workhouse, when we have sufficient information that they are going up to their militia regiment, a communication could be established with the headquarters of the militia, so that they should receive from the point of departure a permit to travel by the railway. Then there are others amongst them—but a small proportion—who have been unable to retain their employment, and who are really anxious to find honest work. Many such cases have come under my own notice of men who could really not obtain employment. I have obtained employment for some of them, and a very large proportion of them have turned out well. And in that respect I must say that the law very often works out harshly to the man who has been engaged in such work as brickfield work, and has a large family depending on him—a season of bad weather comes and work is stopped; he is obliged to come into the workhouse with his wife and family, and before he can go out again, having been in for a month or two, he is obliged to take his family out. I think, in such a case, with a proper safeguard, a discretionary power should be left to assist that man.

11417. By outdoor relief?—No; he should be allowed to leave his wife and children temporarily in the workhouse.

11418. Would it not be better to leave them all out-give them a weekly sum?—I dare say it would. I have known at least one dozen such cases within the past twelve months, and very often they have large families, and their houses are broken up, and they have the greatest difficulty in getting on their feet again; in

fact, were it not for private benevolence sometimes placed at my disposal, they could not start again. I don't know whether workhouse masters can be sufficiently trusted to have a little money at their disposal to give to such people; it would save the rates enormously. Then there are others who habitually tramp about from one union to another with no definite object. With such I would class the runners, who run habitually out and return to the same workhouse. I have felt permission from the Guardians to prosecute under the Vagrancy laws such people as run in and out of the workhouse, but owing to the Vagrancy laws applying only to those who go from one union to another we are powerless under that law to deal with them.

11419. What change would you suggest?—I would suggest that the Vagrancy laws should be extended to us not only to include such cases as leave one union and tramp to another, but also those who are habitually running in and out of the same workhouse. Then there is the question of night shelters. I think such night shelters should be established in different districts of the city and suburbs; the dispensary buildings might be economically used for the purpose. The Dispensary Committee formerly met in the board-rooms of these dispensary houses, and they are, under the present system, unused for that purpose. There is a caretaker usually residing in the dispensary, and by a very slight modification of the present arrangements they might be well utilised for such a purpose. These houses are practically idle, unless for three or four hours during the day. Tramps or casuals should get a time for admission, where they would be inspected by the police periodically. Then, in addition, these shelters should have intercommunication one with another, so as to find out where a man had been the night before, so that he should not be going from one place to another.

11420. Do you mean by telephone?—That would be a very good way. In addition to that, and in connection with it, I think it would be advisable to have a central labour bureau at the most central one, where an inspector would be able to receive applications for unskilled workmen for the city and surrounding districts. I know that many farmers in the surrounding districts and suburbs cannot obtain men to do the work which they require to do about their farms, and yet when you come into the city you find there are numbers of the poor anxious to get work, but who say they cannot find it. Really, I think they should be assisted rather with a view of keeping them out of the workhouse, than by appointing a labour master afterwards in each union to deal with them.

11421. You think through such a bureau the farmer could get the help they are looking for, and the men can get the labour?—Yes. If it were proved, after a fair trial, that they did not damage employment, a central colony of control would be the ultimate home for them. I am in full accord with the other witnesses that this should be a farm colony; I would not have any penal law attached to it. One other thing that would strongly reduce the tramp nuisance would be if the dietary were made uniform at each meeting shelter, and the same hours and conditions of labour were imposed in each meeting house, so that there would be no inducement for tramping from one to another. In no case should any of the class termed tramps or runners be allowed to enter the workhouse at all; or runners be allowed to enter the infirm and sick. A I would reserve it solely for the infirm and sick. The great saving would be effected by having the night shelter. That has been proved in the evidence you have before you, both on the statements of the infirm officers and in the opinion of the Guardians themselves. Very often a man applies for a lie to the workhouse for a night. He comes into the workhouse and finds, for some reason or other, that he had better stay there—whether it is that he is made more comfortable there—of course, they endure many hardships before they come there, and I think that the Guardians would find—in fact the Committee are of opinion that it would very considerably reduce the rates and relieve the congestion in the workhouse, if they had proper night shelters in the city. By thus taking out inmates into other institutions were suitable for them, the workhouse would be relieved of almost one-third of the present population, and would thus leave ample room for classifying the sick and the infirm and aged poor into two classes: those who are inmates through no fault of their own, and those who may be deemed to have brought poverty upon themselves by their own

conduct and actions, a classification which should, in my opinion, be carried out generally as being necessary and desirable.

11432. With whom would you leave the classification?—As a matter of ordinary practice it is carried out by the officers. With respect to our own infirm ones, in whom I have taken some little interest, I myself classify them from time to time, having previously gone into the history of each one, as far as I could ascertain it, and we endeavour to keep the respectable feeble and infirm located in a separate building altogether; but with the present congestion it is impossible to carry it out thoroughly. And the same should be done in the sick wards, where, owing to lack of accommodation, we are not able to do it. One matter I wish to bring before you is that of authorising the Guardians to establish a home for working boys in Belfast. The most crucial time for these boys is between fourteen and sixteen, and in fact we have very little difficulty in looking after the children until they come to that age; then we find the real difficulty begins.

11433. Dr. Brown.—I think that has been already pretty well gone into. You agree with the other witnesses?—I do. And as to apprenticing these boys, I would be very much delighted to find that in any arrangements we would have the power to send them specially to country districts for a term. I think it would work out very well. The best results we have obtained in sending boys out to service are in those cases where we have sent them to respectable farmers, who have taken an interest in the boys. Another question that has been dealt with previously is the question of sending "Police children" to the workhouse. I don't know whether a system could be adopted to enable the magistrates to send these children temporarily or provisionally to the industrial schools pending their permanent commitment, in the same way as we are empowered to relieve in the workhouse provisionally pending a meeting of the Guardians. We have had very well conducted children made into bad boys and girls through the influence of such children being sent to the workhouse from time to time. I have an order of the Board of Guardians not to permit such children to go with the other children.

11434. Can you not carry that out?—But the law also is that children between the age of five and fifteen

must be in the workhouse schools. It is impossible for me to do it, unless I have a separate school and separate teachers.

11435. Could they not be put into a separate position, and sleep and play in separate places?—It would be impossible with our present population and accommodation.

11436. If you had the accommodation the law would not prevent you?—It would not.

11437. Mr. McRannan.—The trouble would disappear if the change was made, and the children were put out of the workhouse?—It would. Arrangements should be made for the care and maintenance of blind pauper inmates, either by the State or by some central home in each county, established by the county authorities or Guardians. We have thirty-seven such cases in the infirm wards of the workhouse, and were it not for the kindly assistance of other inmates who take an interest in these people, and lead them about, I do not know what their condition would be. I have in my mind one man who has walked up and down the same pathway for many years, until he has worn a decided mark in one of the blue stone walls of the building with the end of his stick. I don't know whether the Guardians would have the power to send them to a blind institution. And another class is the class of crippled children; the Board are very anxious to be permitted to send such as the medical officer might recommend to a convalescent home to recuperate after undergoing operations or having received infirmity treatment. The Guardians applied to the Local Government Board for permission to send such children to a convalescent home at Bangor, after amputation of legs or arms, and they were informed the state of the law was such that that could not be permitted. I may say, in respect of the whole matter, that I don't think any officer was ever assisted by a Committee who more earnestly desired to do everything that was necessary in order to have any difficulty that we considered was a difficulty brought under the notice of the Commission and removed.

11438. Mr. Walker.—Does Mr. Wilson suggest that persons applying for Poor Law relief who are able to work should be registered at the labour bureau and compelled to take the first offer of labour?—No, sir; but I say they should be given an opportunity of accepting it if they wish to do it. I would have it entirely voluntarily.

Mr. J. C. C. PAYNE, J.P., examined.

I am not here as a member of the Board of Guardians; but I take an interest in the general matter of children. The Master of the Workhouse has attended to the children who are committed from the police courts temporarily whilst on remand. Now, as one of the magistrates of the city, I have seen for some time past a very great objection indeed to sending children to the workhouse. Many of these children have never been inside a workhouse, perhaps, in their lives; but the difficulty that the magistrates were under was this: we could remand them to the jail; but that is more objectionable than the workhouse. We can remand them to the workhouse, or we can remand them to one of the houses registered under the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act; we have four in the city—Dr. Barnardo's Home, St. Vincent de Paul Society. With regard to the shelter in May-street both boys and girls can be taken there. Dr. Barnardo's home is the same; but in Great George-street only boys can be taken; consequently those girls who happen to be Catholic girls have no place to be sent to but to the union workhouse. The magistrates, of course, are anxious that these children should be sent to a place of safety; they feel satisfied that the children will be well looked after when they are sent to the workhouse. But if they are sent to any of the other homes which I have mentioned to you, the committees of these homes have to support the children during the period,

which is usually, perhaps, four or five days. In Belfast it is the custom to consider all cases for commitment to the industrial school only on Saturdays, consequently a child brought in for some petty theft must remain in the place to which it is sent until Saturday. My idea is this, that these children would be much better off if the magistrates had power to send them to an industrial school, temporarily, of the same religious denomination to which the child belonged. In Belfast we are very well off in that respect: all the religious denominations have industrial schools, both girls' and boys', so that there is no difficulty whatever; I think that if by some means either an order could be made, or, when you go in for your amending Act, which, I presume, is the idea of this inquiry, if permission might be given for the State to pay for the child in an industrial school when it is there temporarily, until it is finally committed. In most cases the children that are remanded to the workhouse are sent to industrial schools. That is the suggestion I would make about—we must send them to one of two places where they are paid for by the State: we must remand them to the prison or the workhouse. We prefer to send them to the workhouse as the lesser of two evils; but we would rather not send them to either place if we could send them to an industrial school of the same religious denomination to which the child belonged.

11439. CHAIRMAN.—The only difficulty is the question of money?—Yes.

Dec. 18, 1903.

Mr. Robert
H. Wilson.

Mr. J. C. C.
Payne, J.P.

The sitting terminated.

Jan. 14, 1904.

TWENTY-SECOND PUBLIC SITTING.—MONDAY, JANUARY 11TH, 1904.

At the Courthouse, Belfast.

Present:—Mr. MECKS (Chairman), Mr. MURKAGHAN, and Dr. COBY BODGE.

Colonel JOHN MCCANCE, A.M., examined.

Colonel John
McCance.

11432. I am Chairman of the Castlereagh Rural District Council. I am of opinion that there are too many workhouses for the number of poor in the Co. Down. The poor could be as well looked after at considerably less cost. Some of the workhouses should be converted into auxiliary asylums, cottage home schools, or cottage hospitals. In Benbudge Workhouse there is accommodation for 940; there are only 157 inmates in the workhouse, leaving unoccupied space for 783. In Newtownards Workhouse there is accommodation for 1,802, and there are only 876 inmates, leaving unoccupied space for 926. In Downpatrick there is accommodation for 1,033 inmates, and there are only 179 inmates, leaving unoccupied space for 854. In Newry there is accommodation for 905 inmates, and the actual number of inmates is 295, leaving unoccupied space for 610. In Kilkeel there is accommodation for 332, and the actual number of inmates is 123, leaving unoccupied space for 209. Portion of Lisburn Union is in the county of Down. In Lisburn Workhouse there is accommodation for 1,040 inmates. There are at present 243, leaving unoccupied space for about 800. A great number of paupers in the present Newtownards and Lisburn Union come to Belfast. I am of opinion Newtownards and Kilkeel and Lisburn Unions should be dissolved. Belfast Union should be extended on the Co. Down side, so as to embrace Bangor, Newtownards, Comber, and Lisburn. Newtownards and Lisburn Unions should be dissolved by reason of their proximity to Belfast, and Newtownards and Lisburn Workhouses should be handed over to the Belfast Union as auxiliary workhouses, and thus remove the congestion at present in the union workhouses in Belfast, as Dr. Bigger reports that no further buildings should be erected on the present workhouse grounds, the present ground being fully covered. The Co. Antrim portion of Lisburn Union could be added to the Belfast Rural District. The Belfast Workhouse is at present very much congested. Further accommodation is necessary, and auxiliary workhouses must be provided for the purpose of removing congestion by some means. Newtownards and Lisburn Workhouses could be managed so as to admit urgent cases from the neighbourhood. The services of dispensary medical doctors will be available as at present, and such nurses as will be necessary. I am of opinion that the alterations proposed would not inconvenience any one, owing to the excellent railway and other accommodations. I am also of opinion that the proposed alterations would lead to the better treatment of patients, as the patients would receive better medical and other attendance under the proposed scheme at Belfast, than they possibly could in rural districts. Another advantage in having considerable distances between workhouses is that the same facilities will not exist for tramps and vagrants finding shelter, and this should tend to stop the tramp nuisance. I am very strongly of opinion that parents who are of intemperate character, and are the inmates of workhouses, should not have the custody or control of their children, and that the habitual criminals and tramps should be detained until they have completed a certain amount of work, and that they should be fed on the very plainest food. Photographs of tramps should be taken, and the Guardians should be empowered to send back persons to their own districts.

11431. To Mr. MURKAGHAN.—The old and respectable poor might be boarded out instead of being maintained in the workhouse. Possessions also might be so treated, the person being retained and the cost deducted. I do not, from my own experience, think favourably of the proposal to have unions confined strictly to counties. Downpatrick and Newry Work-

houses would be sufficient for the Co. Down, and would keep all classes in those workhouses. I would keep local hospitals in every union as at now exists. I would be in favour of enabling Guardians to board out the sick in other hospitals than their own. I am in favour of boarding out children; but in a well-managed institution, when children attend National schools, I do not see how institutions could be dispensable.

11433. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Have you any suggestion to make on the score of illegitimate children as to what should be done with them?—I think immoral parents should not have the custody of their children. If the mothers of these illegitimate children are immoral I would not allow them to have control of them.

11435. As regards the mothers themselves, should something better than the workhouse be provided for them—more of a reformatory character?—Yes; anything that would give them a chance. They should be taken away from workhouse associations. I think the good thing should be to get the children properly brought up. This class of mother is not a very desirable person to bring up children. Women who were not really led, but who had been led into temptation, should not be sent to the workhouse.

11434. Don't you think it would be better to give the Guardians power to arrange with some religious community to make provision for these children?—I think that is a good idea.

11436. Our idea is to get rid of an evil so glaring as that in the country?—I quite agree with you.

11436. Would have you to say on the question of tramps—would it be enough to give the Guardians power of detention?—I think habitual tramps should be treated as prisoners and criminals.

11437. You think they should be brought under police supervision?—I do. Their photographs should be taken, and if they were proved to be habitual tramps they should be placed under police supervision.

11438. Mr. Harper.—Have you known instances where the Guardians have ordered the prosecution of parents for the desertion of their children, and where the parents were arrested and punished?—Yes; they were sentenced to from one to three months' imprisonment.

11439. Do you think it right that such parents, when they came out of jail, should be given the care of their children?—No; and that is the reason I have offered a suggestion on the subject.

11440. And don't you think it desirable and fair that the State should have some control over such children, and have them sent to some institution analogous to an industrial school?—Yes.

11441. You think there should be power given to detain the children?—I do.

11442. And also some power to make the father contribute towards the support of his children?—Yes.

11443. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—What course do the Guardians adopt in order to place themselves in less perilous cases?

Mr. Harper.—You will get that from Mr. Robb, the clerk of the Castlereagh Rural District Council.

Witness.—I remember, a short time ago, while the Commission was sitting, being at Belfast Workhouse, and being struck with one or two cases. One of these was that of a nice young woman who had three illegitimate children, and she was admitted to the house. She told me she had been housekeeper to a farmer in Carlow, who was the father of two of these children, and she was going from one workhouse to another. She stayed three days in the workhouse. On the fourth day I was driving to Holywood, and observed this unfortunate woman with three little children at the

road. On being asked why she had left Belfast Workhouse she stated that she came out to look for some work, and not being able to find any was returning to the workhouse.

11444. Mr. MURPHY.—Should some power be given to the Guardians to enable a woman to follow the father of the child for its support?—Certainly; I think so. But I believe they can do so.

Mr. MURPHY.—It is difficult under the Irish law; but the English and Scotch have more extensive powers.

Mr. Harpur.—In Ireland they can in theory, but not in practice. The woman can get a civil decree; but it is worth no money.

CHAIRMAN.—There is no practical remedy?

Mr. Harpur.—No practical remedy.

11445. Mr. MURPHY.—And in such cases there is a difficulty in convincing the magistrates.

Witness.—It is a matter that would have to be gone about with great discretion.

CHAIRMAN.—In such cases corroboration would be required.

Jan. 11, 1904.

Crispin John
McCauley.

Mr. J. W. Ross, Assistant Clerk of Belfast Union and Clerk of Rural District Council of Castlethorough, examined.

11446. CHAIRMAN.—What do the Guardians do with children whose parents are bad characters—do they ever pass resolutions placing themselves in loco parentis?—I don't know that they have actually taken any action. The matter is generally left in the hands of a Committee.

11447. Have the Guardians passed any resolutions on the subject?—They have not passed any general resolutions. If they pass a resolution it is one dealing with a particular case. My opinion is they have in such cases placed themselves in loco parentis as far as they were able.

11448. And have placed themselves as loco parentis where the parents were criminals?—Yes. I remember cases where they have taken advantage of the Act of Parliament, and have boarded the children out.

11449. Mr. MURPHY.—Was there any trouble in connection with these children so boarded out?—Yes; that is the difficulty in boarding out that class of child. The parents haunt the places where the children are kept and cause annoyance to the foster-parent. There should, in my opinion, be some provision made for restraining them from giving annoyance in this way.

11450. Mr. Harpur.—The instances where foster-parents have received trouble in this way are very few. —Very few. (1) I am of opinion that the existing unions in the County of Down should be dissolved and be re-arranged, and for this purpose that Newtownards, Kilkeel, and Lurgan should cease to exist. The workhouses at Banbridge, Downpatrick, and Newry would afford more accommodation for inmates than would be required. Having regard to the proximity of Newtownards Workhouse to the Belfast Union Workhouse the former appears to me to be superfluous. In adjusting the boundaries of the new unions I suggest that the dispensary districts of Coleraine, Newtownards, and Bangor should be added to Belfast Union. The reason I suggest that the transfer should be by dispensary districts is to avoid claims for compensation which might be made by the existing officers, whose positions would otherwise be injuriously affected. If the dispensary medical officer be transferred to another authority no claim for compensation could possibly arise. Speaking of compensation to officers, I am of opinion that the compensation payable on the abolition of a union will not be a loss, but, on the contrary, a saving to the ratepayers; the amount of the compensation will be necessarily less than the salaries and emoluments receivable by the existing officers, whilst no great increase will be required in the salaries of officers remaining in the workhouses which are not to be abolished. I have to point out that the Belfast ratepayers have to support a great many persons coming from adjoining unions. It would not be correct to describe these persons as "tramps" or "casuals," as I find that many of them remain for very considerable periods in the Belfast Workhouse. I have had statistics taken from the workhouse register for a few weeks at random with the following result:—Week ending 6th May last, 308 persons admitted, of whom 36 did not belong to the Belfast Union; there were 8 from Newtownards, 4 from Downpatrick, 7 from Lisburn, others from Newry, Lurgan, Larne, &c. Week ending 13th June, 36 similar cases out of a total of 357. 11th July, 48 out of 330. 8th August, 47 out of 334. 21st September, 37 out of 333. With regard to the Lurgan Union, which is situated partly in County Antrim and partly in County Down, I am of opinion that it also should be dissolved, and that the dispensary districts of Drumerray, Ballyhenry, Drumming, and Lurgan should be added to Belfast Union. I would direct attention to the proximity of Lurgan Workhouse to Belfast Workhouse; they are not more, I should think, than about six or seven miles apart,

and it seems to me wasteful to have both institutions fully equipped for workhouse purposes. Of course, in the event of the abolition of Newtownards and Lurgan Unions taking place a portion of such workhouses should be retained for the purpose of dealing with emergency cases, accidents, &c. Newtownards Workhouse is certified to accommodate 1,248 persons; there are only 276 inmates at present. Lisburn Workhouse accommodates, I believe, 1,040, and at present there are only 243 inmates. (2.) I doubt whether any portion of either Newtownards or Lurgan Workhouse would be considered suitable, according to modern ideas, for the purpose of a lunatic asylum; but this is a matter I leave to medical authorities to decide. (3.) I am of opinion that Newtownards and Lurgan Workhouses could be utilized for the accommodation of a certain class of paupers, viz., the aged and infirm in Belfast Workhouse. I do not quite understand the suggestion in Query No. 3 (b) as to combining unions for the purpose of Poor Law relief; nor do I understand for what purpose or purposes such combination would be advantageous. With regard to the boarding-out of workhouse inmates I do not think that it is at all practicable for any class other than children. I should be glad to see the power to board out children largely extended, notwithstanding the objection to relieving parents of their responsibilities. I am strongly in favour of forcibly depriving parents who are unable to properly maintain their children of the custody of such children—I refer to "casuals" and the habitual pauper class, who never do anything for their offspring, but who spend their lives in roaming over the country or in dwelling in workhouses at the cost of the ratepayers. (4.) I am strongly in favour of union rating as it exists at present for all poor law purposes. To make the ratepayers of an impoverished electoral division solely responsible for the maintenance of the poor of that division is, in plain English, to tax the poor for the support of the poor, thereby allowing the richer ratepayer to escape his proper share of taxation, and tending to make the poor still poorer. (5.) Existing Poor Law Relief Acts provide for the repayment of relief by persons who are able to contribute wholly or in part for the cost of their treatment. I am not aware that any extension of this principle is required. (6.) With regard to the treatment of "tramps" and "casuals," I am of opinion that persons of this class should be detained for increasing periods in workhouses. I am aware that it may be, and is, argued that "tramps" are not necessarily criminals, and that their personal liberty should not be interfered with, but having regard to the fact that they are a burden on the State, and that their existence is a constant menace to the safety of property, I fail to recognise that they possess any rights whatever. It is certainly better to house them in a workhouse than to have them roaming over the country in a state of semi-starvation, with every temptation to steal anything they can get their hands on, and I therefore am strongly of opinion that they should be forcibly detained in workhouses.

11451. CHAIRMAN.—In regard to these cases you speak of sending to Belfast Union from adjoining unions, and for which the Belfast ratepayers have to pay, are they sick?—No. I have here a case from Downpatrick, which remained in the body of the house for 102 days.

11452. Any sick treatment?—No. There is another case, where two persons from Larne and Lurgan remained in Belfast Workhouse for 135 days.

11453. Did you look into these cases to see their object in seeking admission?—Time would not permit me to do so.

Mr. J. W.
Ross.

Jan. 11, 1904.

Mr. J. W.
Bobb.

11454. Dr. BROWN.—How many from Belfast are in adjoining unions?—I don't know; I don't think any poor person would go from Belfast.

11455. But did you make any inquiry?—I had no means of ascertaining. The treatment in Belfast is admittedly superior. I don't think you would find many from Belfast in other unions. I have been the case of a person aged sixty, infirm ward, from Lisburn, who remained thirty days in Belfast Workhouse. A woman and child from Crumlin stopped 225 days; one person from Newlands 161 days; two persons from Killybegs, 48 days each; three more persons from Newlands, 60 days, 25 days, and 18 days, respectively. There were also cases of a similar nature from Lisburn.

11456. Mr. MURKIN.—And what do you suggest regarding that?—As the Belfast ratepayers have to pay for the maintenance of the Newlands folk I suggest an extension of the boundary in that direction, and also towards Lisburn.

11457. CHAIRMAN.—An extension of the union boundary?—Yes. The proximity of Newlands and Lisburn Workhouses to Belfast seems to me an extravagance. There might be a saving effected to all the unions named by removal of the staff. Then there is the question of providing another workhouse in Belfast, for, as Dr. Bigger has pointed out in his report, the city of Belfast Workhouse is overcrowded, and we cannot erect more buildings there.

11458. Do you consider it necessary to keep a workhouse in Lisburn, where there is a county infirmary?—I have covered that. I am making a general argument. As to Query 2, we have 1,300 of that class.

11459. This is a time of year when you have more of this class?—We have a large number of them constantly.

11460. Mr. MURKIN.—As to infirmary inmates, has the question ever been decided as to the power of the Guardians. You seem to be under the impression that the Guardians can charge for maintenance or the actual cost of the inmates while in the infirmary if the Guardians so desire?—I do think that.

11461. Are you aware it is not the case in practice?—I am aware they do charge.

11462. Dr. BROWN.—What is the actual cost?—The average cost of medicine and medical treatment, £s. 10d. per week.

11463. That is not near the cost of maintenance in some cases?—That is only the average cost.

11464. Do you think £s. 6d. is enough to charge a person going in there—a stranger—for treatment of law—a person who paid no rates? Do you think that is fair to the ratepayers?—I do not.

11465. CHAIRMAN.—Would you approve of an extension of powers in this connection?—Yes.

11466. To enable the Guardians to recover the full cost?—If that is the intention of Query 3 I would be strongly in favour of an extension in that direction for special cases.

11467. Mr. MURKIN.—We are informed that it costs at least 14s. a week to provide the necessaries for a hospital patient. The Guardians don't charge anything like that at present?—They have no power.

11468. Dr. BROWN.—The Guardians have only power to charge to the extent of the average cost, and a case may go into the infirmary requiring an operation, and involving a cost of several pounds. The query is—How far, in the case of people not destitute, it would be desirable to expect payment? I say there is a system of payment in force, and the query was prompted by me.

11469. CHAIRMAN.—It is to enable the Guardians to recover all the expenditure on cases?—If that is the meaning of the query that is very desirable—to give the Guardians a discretion in the matter. I may say, with respect to the query, that it prompted the Guardians.

CHAIRMAN.—The query is a general hint to open their minds.

Mr. Morger.—There could be a scale fixed by the Guardians, with the aid of the Local Government Board.

CHAIRMAN.—Without a scale, supposing they expended £7 or £8 on an operation, they should have power to recover that from people able to pay.

11470. Mr. MURKIN.—At present Guardians cannot recover more than the average cost—and you think there should be an extension?—I do.

11471. As to tramps, what would be the maximum time you think they should be detained?—It would be hard to say.

11472. CHAIRMAN.—Would you say up to six months?—Certainly.

11473. Mr. MURKIN.—Would you think that ample?—For an inmate employed seasonably.

11474. Are you troubled with many of the vagrant class in Belfast?—A large proportion of the vagrants given apply to vagrants. With regard to the proposal to have the boundaries of the county borough and the union intermingled, I am as a rule to find any reason for that as this part of the country. Before was made to other parts, where boundaries are. I have never heard of a hardship, financial or otherwise, here. I think the hardship is with the Belfast ratepayers. A person who lives a short distance outside Belfast enjoys a ready market and high prices, and his poor rates are diverted to adjoining unions instead of coming into Belfast, where which he derives his means.

11475. CHAIRMAN.—You mean people who have business places in Belfast?—Adjoining farmers. The Baggot, for instance, which is occupied by Belfast mechanics. If they lived in the Belfast Union territory they would contribute to the poor-rate of the Belfast Union; but, instead of doing so, they contribute to Newlands. It is in Belfast these people make their money. That is certainly no hardship to them.

11476. They would have to pay more in Belfast than in Newlands?—Perhaps so.

11477. Mr. MURKIN.—Surely, the county in which they reside has a claim upon them?—"County" is only a geographical expression.

11478. Do you think it is entitled to whatever benefits there are rather than that they should go to a neighbouring county?—This is a poor-rate question affecting county rates in any way.

11479. There must be some limit, and county boundaries are well defined. The county has to look after its roads, and why should it not look after its poor also?—The Board of Guardians is not a county authority. In a case where the union is situated in two counties there would be great difficulty.

11480. Don't you see something in it to recommend it to you as a man of business that a county should manage its own affairs as far as possible?—In our county affairs.

11481. Is the Poor Law not a county matter?—I don't think so.

11482. They have to strike the rate and collect it?—They have.

11483. Is that not everything?—Is not the provision of the money everything?—It is. They collect it automatically, but they don't administer it, except in roads, and they do not come under Poor Law administration.

11484. CHAIRMAN.—We have not got the case of a large county borough until we come here; we have had a county with small towns?—That is very different.

11485. It was put forward that the County Council should be the head authority for everything in the county. Here you come to a city large and wealthy, but small in area, which makes it a difficult question here—a case in which a large number of business people live outside. The objection you seem to have to the union of Belfast being intermingled with the county borough is that so many people of the county borough live outside it?—That is one reason; and also the proximity of the farmer to the Belfast market.

11486. The union of Belfast was never formed as a being in all the people who get benefit from proximity to markets?—Quite so. The union was formed under circumstances which have considerably altered. The growth of the city has brought about these changes, and the people have been forced to go to the suburbs. So long ago the city had to be extended on the old taxation question: people living just outside the old boundary were escaping from payment of rates. I find no physical reason for the suggested change—that the union of Belfast and county borough should be made continuous.

11487. Mr. MURKIN.—Would it not simplify accounts very much?—I don't think so; in the present accounts at any rate.

11488. Would it not economise it?—I fail to see how economy could be effected, as far as I can think of anything.

11489. Don't you think one authority is better than two in a matter of that kind?—If it was proposed that the County Council of the borough should be the Poor Law administration there might be something in it; but you would always have two authorities. I have

not heard any proposal to the contrary. You will always have the Board of Guardians separate from the City Corporation, I take it.

11490. Mr. Harpur.—The District Council of Castleknock is exclusively for Down, and works in harmony with the County Council of Down?—Yes; and possesses a local knowledge the county does not possess.

Mr. J. M. TROTTER, Newswaterford, examined.

Mr. Trotter.—I desire to say, in a word by way of prefix, that the statement I have to make is as from myself personally, and I wish to state that the answers to the queries submitted to the Newswaterford Board of Guardians are simply answers adopted by the Guardians. Any statement made by any other Guardian will be practically on his own behalf.

11491. CHAIRMAN.—Are you one of the Guardians nominated to give evidence?—No.

11492. Have any Guardians been nominated to give evidence?—Yes; two. When the report of the Committee was before the Guardians it was only considered for a short time—some fifteen minutes—and the views apparently held were that the Committee, having considered the matter, that was sufficient. It was merely for the Guardians to adopt a certain course. I hold views diametrically opposed to some of the answers to the queries, and I propose to give my reasons.

11493. You might mention your views?—In regard to Query 1, which is as to the question of the amalgamation or dissolving of unions, I don't think any question or difference of opinion can exist—that is, that the workhouses are too numerous. But owing to what has been said at some of the inquiries, I consider that the case has been very much altered, because, as I understand it, a recommendation will be made by you that the workhouse will be for the purpose of the infirm and destitute old, and that children will be boarded out. That being so, I fail to see any necessity for the workhouses in Co. Down as they at present exist, and I, personally, would be in favour of the workhouses, and the property of the workhouses, being disposed of, and the proceeds properly invested. To my mind workhouses in a county for infirm and destitute old would be sufficient. The question would come to us as making provision for the sick, and I would be entirely in favour of extending the principle or adopting the principle that is being urged—that is, to have district hospitals. Some call them cottage hospitals; and I think people using them who were able to pay should pay the whole of the expense incurred by them, and that in respect of the poor who at present go into the workhouses, the district should pay a certain sum against the treatment they would receive. I am of opinion that that sum would not be more than, but perhaps very much less than they cost the ratepayers at the present time, and that these patients would be better treated.

11494. Regarding the aged and infirm, you would approve of having them in one workhouse?—I would; I think the grievance in regard to this question is a sectional one.

11495. In Co. Down could you get a central workhouse?—Downpatrick would be the most central, if you consider geographical position.

11496. What about people from Newry?—There is the other consideration regarding that which I approve of. If it were more convenient for the people in Newry to go to an adjoining workhouse let the charge be a charge on the district whence they came.

11497. Would you approve of another course, which would enable the Guardians to keep the aged and infirm either in an institution or board them out?—I hardly see how you could board out aged and infirm.

11498. Take the case of one of your own unions—Rushridge—where out-door relief comes to nearly £3,000 a year; it is very difficult to keep all classes in the workhouse. Do you not think it might be better for the Rushridge people to decide whether they would keep them in an institution or adopt boarding out universally, because they are virtually putting into operation a system of boarding-out there and keeping up two systems at tremendous cost?—A patient going in to a district hospital must be charged on, say, the electoral division.

11499. I am speaking of the aged and infirm, not of the sick?—Well, I would have one institution for them,

11491. CHAIRMAN.—For public health and road business?—Yes.

11492. Mr. Harpur.—The rate is struck by the County Council of Down?—Yes; and placed to the credit of the Rural District Council or the Board of Guardians, as the case may be.

Jan. 11, 1904.

Mr. J. W. Rebb.

Mr. J. M. Trotter.

and whether few or many, I would have them over the county. I would not give a discretionary power to the Guardians.

11500. Would you give a union discretion to come to a resolution in general terms as to whether they would adopt in-door or out-door treatment for the aged and infirm, and I ask you to consider the union of Rushridge, where they spend nearly £3,000 in out-door relief?—But that out-door relief is not—

11501. It is for the aged and infirm?—That is the difficulty; but if the out-door relief means supporting the infirm and destitute old then I would be in favour of these coming into one central institution.

11502. Would you put them into Downpatrick?—Yes, undoubtedly; if it was decided to have a new institution erected. You have Lurgan and you would have to get some railway centre.

11503. For people who could travel by railway?—Yes. That is the reason I suggested Downpatrick; for the railway from Ballymore to Newswaterford will soon be made, and the facilities for travelling will be greatly improved.

11504. If you were to have a large institution for the aged and infirm it would be necessary to have side by side with it or close to it a hospital capable of treating a large number of sick?—I see no objection to making provision for these; but the question of these infirm and old is different.

11505. You want to get rid of the number of institutions?—Clearly. If you run them down to hospitals you will have a comparatively small staff, and if you lump in the same building the sick and the aged and infirm all over the country, you practically leave things as they are. I want you to get one central institution for the infirm and destitute old.

11506. The difficulty I am getting to you is this: you are moving to one central institution in the county for the aged and infirm; that is a class of all others, who are poor and destitute. These people will soon get sick, and when they get sick would you propose they should be moved back. They might be incapable of removal, say, from Newry to Downpatrick—you would have to treat them as sick in the immediate neighbourhood of the aged and infirm?—Yes.

11507. You would have a large county hospital under the Poor Law as a sort of overflow place?—Yes; I would have such accommodation as would meet public requirements.

11508. It would of necessity be large?—I would hope it would not.

11509. You would propose that the aged and infirm, when they become sick, should go into the Downpatrick District Hospital?—Yes.

11510. And to what district would you say they should be charged?—To the old district. It would be only a transference from one institution proper to another institution proper at a different rate of charge.

11511. Mr. MURPHY.—Would you continue the same area of rating?—As regards the area of rating my opinion is that you must adopt the principle of area for taxation and for management, and the whole question is what that area shall be. I am perfectly indifferent as to what area may be adopted, but the area, to my mind, should be a fair and reasonable one, and I fail to see why the administrative county areas should not be the areas for all purposes.

11512. CHAIRMAN.—For the administrative county?—Yes.

11513. You would be strongly in favour of that for the sick, at any rate?—Yes.

11514. And for the aged and infirm?—Yes; I would adopt the principle of administrative county areas for all purposes.

11515. Including out-door relief?—No; I will modify that slightly. For all purposes I think the areas should be co-extensive, but for out-door relief purposes I would not make the whole of the administrative county the area for that charge. I would break that up; it is absolutely necessary it should be broken up, for

Jan. 11, 1904.
Mr. J. M. Thomson.

otherwise you will not have sufficient control, and I consider that the out-door relief may be administered in such a way as to press most heavily on certain districts. It was felt by some, and by me very strongly, that the out-door relief was going up, and we wanted to know where. We had, in Newtownards Union, the figures gone into, and taking three years, and comparing one and a half years with another one and a half years, we found the out-door relief went up by £519 lbs. 6d. We further found that in the urban district of Bangor, where the population had gone up considerably, that the out-door relief was actually down. Now the system adopted in Newtownards is thus, as far as my observation goes. There is an application for out-door relief, and if the Guardian for the district from which it came recommended it it is passed as a matter of form. I think an application for out-door relief so recommended should not be questioned. I would not question it for one.

11535. You would accept infallibly the recommendation of an individual representing the locality?—I would, even if I doubted the case. I would hesitate questioning it, because I would say the individual Guardian of the locality should know best all the circumstances of the case, and I would not say one word against it.

11536. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Even if it were a union charge?—Even so.

11537. Why would you do that?—Because any one who adopted such a position would find himself absolutely of no value either to his own district or to the union.

11538. How would that work out as a guide to follow?—In this way; the Guardians might put their heads together and decide to block, say, Mr. Thomson's recommendation, and it might be carried to such an extent that Mr. Thomson could not look at the minute book of the Guardians.

11539. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Would it be fair to other portions of a district to allow one man to have a voice as to the use of the general money for a particular locality?—I think it altogether fair, and absolutely necessary, that there should be different areas for taxation for out-door relief, because otherwise there would be no adequate control over out-door relief.

11540. You would revert to the old system of electoral division relief?—Clearly. In connection with that I would make the expenditure in connection with the hospitals just the same.

11541. Electoral divisional test?—Yes.

11542. CHAIRMAN.—For hospitals?—Yes.

11543. I don't see why you propose to make the hospitals the same?—The hospital, in the sense in which you refer to it, is different to what is passing through my mind. Where it would come in would be where people who are not destitute poor, but contributed something towards the expense of going to the hospital or infirmary. At present the patients, or some person on their behalf, paid only the average cost of treatment, which I took upon as a very great injustice. The Newtownards Guardians had a question put to the Local Government Board whether they could not charge a larger amount than the average cost, which I felt was totally inadequate to charge certain people who were both willing and able to pay.

11544. You would be in favour of a fair extension of the law to enable them to charge?—Yes; and I would extend it to the case of a poor person or persons who could contribute something. I would apply that charge to cases in which the persons might go to the district hospitals, which would practically take the place of the present infirmaries. But in the case to which the Chairman refers, where a person is brought from, say, Newry to Downpatrick, or Newtownards to Downpatrick, or Bangor to Downpatrick, I would make the expenses a county-at-large charge.

11545. Are you in favour of making every in-door as well as out-door expenditure an electoral division charge?—I don't think it would be worth it.

11546. I don't see why you seek to bring in the sick?—It is the sick who are able to pay something.

11547. And you seek to bring in only those?—Only those.

11548. Would you include the destitute sick?—I would make the destitute sick a county-at-large charge—administrative county instead of union-at-large.

11549. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—And rely to the paying persons you would limit the electoral division charge?—Yes; add to the out-door relief. As to Query No. 3, the answer of the Newtownards Guardians was that the workhouse in the dissolved union should be used as an

auxiliary asylum. I am entirely averse to that. I look on an auxiliary asylum in a county as meaning two sets of officials. An auxiliary asylum would not be equipped as well as the principal asylum, and that entitles the patients would not have the same benefits. I would be more in favour of extending the asylum.

11550. Dr. BOGGER.—Has the Co. Down already arranged to do so?—They were about to expend a large amount of money.

11551. To take in lunatics from the whole county?—I think that to be the intention; but I don't know sufficiently of that to be able to say.

11552. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Do you think it would be advisable to take away from the asylum the lunatic lunatics, and put them in a place by themselves, where they would get some fresh air and exercise, free from noise and trouble?—Yes; if you had some sort of a local or subsidiary place.

11553. Could they be kept at a smaller cost?—Clearly; I am in favour of that; but if you say an auxiliary lunatic asylum that carries with it, to my mind, the idea of a separate staff.

11554. A separate staff on a less costly scale?—I don't think you could have a separate staff in the interests of the outpatients. I don't think the book would be anything much.

11555. It has been tried in the South of Ireland, where it has been found they can be kept for £10 per annum?—That is a question on which you will get the information. I would like to see the expenses laid down; but I would not advocate, here or anywhere else, anything that was not calculated to benefit the position of these people, for whom every consideration should be shown. In that connection, some time ago a person was going to give a large sum towards providing a central institution for epileptics, but the project has fallen through.

CHAIRMAN.—It has been renewed again lately.

Witness.—I am glad to hear it. I don't see for the life of me how a county workhouse could be converted into a sanatorium for consumption. If it could be I should be glad; but a proper site should be obtained for consumptive patients, and they should be subjected to treatment suitable to their disease. Take, for example, Newtownards Workhouse. I fail to see how it could be converted into a sanatorium for consumptive patients.

11556. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—What about Killybeg?—I don't know sufficient of it to say anything about it. As to No. 3 query, I have practically answered it. When inmates came from one union to another the union from which they came should pay. The only difficulty I see in connection with that would be the boarding out of children. There is no difference of opinion as to the necessity for boarding out children as far as possible, in the interests of the children themselves, and for the benefit of the country at large. I do disagree with some of those who have given evidence. Mr. C. Macanaball gave evidence as to providing a little cottage, and giving sufficient to keep old people who had gone past their day for work. I am wholly averse to that sort of thing, and I don't think that plan should be adopted at all. There may be, and I make no doubt there are, cases where people suffer hardship—people who have lived respectable lives, and are entitled to better treatment than the workhouse; but I say, on the other hand it would be practically impossible to draw the line between those who are really deserving and those who are not, and I am fearful a Guardian who gave expression to his opinion honestly and truthfully against perhaps some two old people, getting the contempt of the people of the locality. It would not work out in practice.

11557. It would be difficult to find a standard to meet requirements?—I would not attempt it. As to Query 4, the answer of the Guardians is that Article 15 in the old system might be abolished, and that the dispensary books should be inspected by a dispensary committee. That is really the reply to that question. Now I consider that the whole Poor Law administration should be amended. The law, as I am informed by the Local Government Board, is that a member of the Board of Guardians has got no right to go into the clerk's office and ask to see the minute book of the Board of Guardians, unless when the Board is sitting. In other words, that the Board of Guardians are trustees for the ratepayers nominally, but practically had no power except in meeting assembled. That is what the Local Government Board told us.

In proof of that I will tell you what took place in Newtownards. An affidavit was placed before the Board of Guardians, and it was ordered to be sent to the Local Government Board without ever having been read to the Guardians. I proposed a resolution that the Local Government Board should be asked to furnish a copy of that affidavit. I did not carry the resolution. I wrote to the Local Government Board on the subject, and they informed me it was not usual to supply copies of their documents. There is a case in point in regard to which I speak of my own knowledge, and as regard to which there was a surcharge.

11541. CHAIRMAN.—Was the surcharge paid?—The surcharge was paid.

11542. You made objection?—Yes. I give you that as a practical illustration of how the Guardians have no control. Say, for instance, one Guardian, or two Guardians, want certain information, and the majority of the Guardians, as their wisdom and judgment think it is desirable that they should not have the information, they have only to say "No." I hold every Guardian has a right to inspect every book and document in connection with the business of his Board, the same as in the case of two or three members of a firm, where every member of the firm has a right to investigate all books and documents, with this proviso, that any examination or inspection shall be reasonable, and shall not interfere with the officers in the discharge of their duties.

11543. Mr. MURMAGHAN.—Did you press the question?—As far as I could.

11544. CHAIRMAN.—You pressed it with such success as to get a surcharge made and paid?—This was subsequent. I have not addressed any member of Parliament on the subject.

11545. Except Mr. Murmagan?—No. The law should be altered. The responsibility should be either with the Guardians as a board, or the Local Government Board should act, because the Local Government Board are all powerful.

11546. You propose that each of the Guardians should have the same power of inspection and overhauling as the Board of Guardians, as a whole?—Certainly. Why should a member of the Board of Guardians have a lesser privilege or right than the ordinary Local Government elector has in connection with the books of every Urban Council, Rural Council, and County Council?

11547. He has his powers in that capacity?—Not as regards a Board of Guardians.

11548. Mr. MURMAGHAN.—You want the Guardians put on the same footing as the Urban Council?—Clearly so, for they are equally, if not more important. I wrote in the Local Government Board on the subject, because I was confident regarding the law.

11549. I hope they supported the law?—Oh, yes; they support the law where it suits them. They wrote me on the 24th December, calling my attention to the provisions contained in Section 29 of the Poor Law Relief Act.—That no Guardian shall have power to act in virtue of his office, except as a member at a meeting of the Board of Guardians, and also pointing out that under Article 10 of the Union Accounts Order "there is no provision giving local government electors a legal right to inspect documents belonging to Boards of Guardians." That section refers to the duty of the clerk to the Urban Council sending to the clerk of the union a copy of the poor rate portion of the rate book, which shall be open to the inspection of ratepayers at all reasonable times. Agreements are not open for inspection—agreements under which payments are made. That seems to me to be a really business. Payment is made under an agreement, and I may happen to know that that agreement is not being carried out either by the law or the spirit, and yet I, as a Guardian or ratepayer, have no right to see that agreement. That is the law as carried out in Newtownards.

11550. CHAIRMAN.—Your suggestion is that the existing law should be changed in order that individual Guardians should have more rights and privileges as regards inspection?—Precisely. With regard to Query 5, it is practically answered in the other. You would require a rearrangement of your hospital accommodation, except as regards the fever hospital; and it is all-important. On last Saturday I saw by the newspapers there was a communication regarding the fever hospital. That has been considered time and again. There is an epidemic of small-pox in Glasgow, and communications are received at Newtownards and Bangor "to take precautions against it." I think

there should be in every county proper accommodation, and I look upon it as a very serious responsibility that the representatives of the people are not discharging their duties, and that proper arrangements in this respect are not made. The cost would be comparatively small—the cost of constructing an isolated hospital. They needed an officials for such an institution, except in the case of an epidemic. Look at the risk the people run without such a hospital, apart from the expense. As to Query 6, a more economical system would be to go back to the system of clerical division. It won't work against the deserving poor.

11551. Mr. MURMAGHAN.—There is something to be said against the present system?—There is everything to be said against it. There is every reason why the rich should assist the poor, and the strong should assist the weak; but there should be a limitation. And if you go in for extended areas why not have national taxation instead of administrative counties or smaller areas. That is where, to my mind, the abuses might be. Take Bangor or Malpas for one-door relief and some other purposes. Clearly, to my mind, the urban district should be the area, and in other cases it should be electoral division.

11552. You are aware that many poor leave the country and go into the towns to find work, and afterwards become chargeable to the towns?—The towns have benefited more largely than the rural districts.

11553. The only benefit the towns have got is that of union rating, and in the matter of roads?—I am not so sure of that. If people leave the rural district and go into the towns they can have their families educated and put to learn trades, and then they can enter the mills and factories. In that way Belfast, for instance, benefits. They are a source of revenue and profit to those who employ them, and if, after many years, they become destitute, I say the towns have every right to pay for their keep.

11554. That may be in the case you instance; but take the case which happens frequently of a farmer who has been, perhaps, foolish or extravagant. He has to go to the town, is unable to provide for himself and gets outdoor relief. Would it be fair to tax the town for the support of that man?—Certainly; because that is an exceptional case.

11555. Take the case of an agricultural labourer. He becomes incapacitated. A farmer won't employ a man who is not strong enough to do a day's work. He has to go to the town. Would you put the burden of his support on the town?—I would take the benefit the towns generally has derived, and I would not compare his hardships in the town with those of the labourer in the country, and those of the small farmer. The people in the town know nothing of the lives of the people in rural districts.

11556. The poorer class in rural districts are comparatively happy compared with their fellows in the towns?—I live in country and town, both. The people in the country work harder, and sometimes can hardly earn what will provide the necessities of life. You find the people in the town leading a very different life. I agree with you that there may be more happiness in the country, but that is because the people conduct themselves in a different way from those in the town, where the people are paid better for their services.

Mr. MURMAGHAN.—In the country the people are free from the mental worry and absolute destitution felt, say, in Belfast.

Witness.—You don't suggest that the labourer in town or country has much mental worry?

Mr. MURMAGHAN.—In the country the people have no absolute dread of hunger; in town they have, which is mental worry of a very severe kind.

Witness.—You think the labourer in the country has no mental dread of being provided for?

Mr. MURMAGHAN.—Not of absolute hunger.

Witness.—And that man goes from his position of happiness in the country to the town to have a mental dread of going to the workhouse?

Mr. MURMAGHAN.—He has to leave the country by ill-health or increasing years.

Witness.—I must put you there right away. Say that a person living in the town becomes destitute; unless he has been in the town for a certain length of time he will be a charge on the district from which he came.

Mr. MURMAGHAN.—There is no qualifying period now.

Jan. 11, 1906.

Mr. J. M. Thomson.

Jan. 11, 1904.

Mr. J. M.
Thomson.

Witness.—I take it this Commission will recommend what should be done—firstly, in the interests of the ratepayers, and secondly, and equally in the interests of the destitute poor and sick, and that you will formulate or recommend that which will result in economy to the ratepayers, with benefit—at least without loss or hardship to the destitute poor or sick. It is viewing the Commission from that standpoint that I have expressed myself as I have done. But to keep the ratepayers right you must of necessity curtail your areas of taxation for out-door relief.

11567. CHAIRMAN.—If it were thought that the electoral division would be too small an area what would you think of the dispensary district?—Adopt some other name; and instead of adopting the whole of the dispensary district divide the present dispensary districts into two parts, and call them "Dispensary, North," and "South," and so on, or call them the urban and rural portions. A dispensary district might be made up of three or four electoral divisions. In that case you could alter the boundaries and recast them.

11568. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Your view is, not to let the town have the benefit of the union rating?—As it works out in Bangor, the rating there for Poor Law purposes, before the 1896 Act was passed, was, perhaps, 7d. or 8d. in the £ at most.

11569. CHAIRMAN.—For Poor Law purposes only?—Yes; that would include the public health—7d. in the urban district and 8d. in the rural, and under the union rating it was about 1s. in the £. In making this statement I have not been informed one way or the other as to whether, in a rearrangement, it would work out favourably one way or other. I consider the principle right, and whether in actual practice it would work out in favour of Bangor would not influence me.

Mr. GEORGE DUNN examined.

Mr. George
Dunn.

11571. CHAIRMAN.—You are Chairman of the Newtownards Board of Guardians?—Yes; I may say, before you ask me any questions with regard to the statement made by Mr. Thompson of nothing being done by the Newtownards Guardians with regard to an isolated hospital, that there has been nothing left undone that was in their power to do. An arrangement was made by the Bangor Urban Council and the Newtownards Urban Council and the District Council, and two members of each were appointed to consider the matter and bring it to an issue. Through the illness of some of the gentlemen they could not get a meeting. A meeting was summoned for last Friday, and I was the only member of the six who put in an appearance before Mr. Clithero. One of the Urban members for Newtownards, sent a letter stating that he had received a telegram that his mother had taken suddenly ill, and another member of the Committee—Mr. Conroy, Chairman of the District Council—had been laid up for a week. The recommendation of Dr. Clithero was put before the Guardians on Saturday last, a contractor has been written to, and in a short time I hope steps will be taken to provide an isolation hospital.

11572. What are the views of your Board on the question of amalgamation, or the breaking up of unions?—Having regard to the decrease in the population of Ireland, and the enormous expense of keeping up the different workhouses, we consider it essentially necessary that there should be amalgamation of unions; and in the county of Down, that three workhouses would be quite sufficient, as, for instance, Newtownards Workhouse having been built to accommodate 1,200 persons, and having an average of 254, it is quite apparent that amalgamation is necessary.

11573. What do you look on as Co. Down workhouses?—The existing six or seven in the county.

11574. Banbridge, Downpatrick, Kilkeel, Newry, and Newtownards?—Yes; and Lisburn and Lurgan, and Belfast is partly for Co. Down.

11575. Your idea is that Banbridge, Downpatrick, Kilkeel, Newry, and Newtownards should be reduced to three?—Yes.

11576. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—You don't consider the question of Lurgan and Lisburn?—No, we have that with the Commission. Having heard the evidence in the different parts of the county you can arrive at a better conclusion than we could in our isolated district.

11577. As regards the breaking up of unions what

or whether Holywood, by being joined in Belfast, would be in its favour or against it, or whether Holywood would be benefited by being joined to Newtownards. My principle is that you should adopt areas for taxation in administration, and once you adopt the principle you will find you are not wrong, although there might be more expense in the working of it out in actual practice as regards out-door relief. I am confident that the Commission, when it completes its taking of evidence, will be able to formulate a plan far better than anything I can propose; but no plan you may formulate will be adopted in its entirety, or satisfy every person. As to tramps, I don't think the law as it stands has been carried out to the extent it might be. As I understand it tramps can be called upon to do a certain amount of work.

11578. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Only for a few hours. That is so.

11579. Don't you think the power of detention should be extended?—I think the feeling is that there are very few tramps would work these hours in the day. If they did three hours' work at breaking stones for three or four days in the week, they would have no reason to tramp about. If you do away with two or three workhouses in a county there will not be the same facilities for tramps going from one workhouse to another. A suggestion has been made as to tramps being made to report themselves, and I think that is a splendid idea. It would be well to have them under police supervision, and masters of large workhouses should be in a position to send them to the police barracks, and to get a ticket or intimation that they had been there and had reported themselves to the police. That would give the police a knowledge regarding tramps who committed crime, and it would be of great benefit.

are the views of your Board?—The vacant workhouses could be handed over to the County Council or other public bodies to be utilized as they thought best. We would recommend strongly one in the county as a sanatorium for consumptive patients. We think Kilkeel would be a proper one for this purpose; but regarding this question we do not specify any unions.

11580. What is your reply to Query 3?—We recommend any scheme that would tend to avoid the separation of old couples, as we are strongly of opinion that such should be allowed to remain together.

11581. CHAIRMAN.—You urge the boarding out of children?—Yes. With regard to the recommendation put forward that there should be provided a neutral situation for them we think that would be a repetition of the present system, and that it would be far better to get a home in the rural district, and let them attend the ordinary National schools, which are the basis of public education.

11579. You would rather have them attend these schools than have them brought to an institution?—Yes.

11571. As to Query 4, what is the answer of your Board?—Rule 5 of Article 25 of the General Rules for the government of dispensary districts respecting the examination of dispensary medical officers' books, we consider unsatisfactory, and we recommend a return to the old system of dispensary committees for the better examination of the books, records, &c. Our reason for that was this: when this law came into force doctors' books were sent to the workhouse, and signed by the Guardian of the district who was present, and the Guardians came to the conclusion that it was only a farce passing a thing they knew nothing about. The old system in Newtownards was this: we met once a month, and if there was any abuse of the system they knew it; but at present we have not all opportunity of finding out. We do the next best thing—we send the relieving officer to the dispensary to go over the books.

11572. As to the examination of the books the only thing you want is the old dispensary committee back again?—That is one of the things we want.

11573. The dispensary committee used to appoint the medical officer?—We don't touch that at all.

11574. It is for efficiency in the work you make the recommendation?—Yes.

11575. Mr. MURKIN.—And to give the Guardians knowledge of how the doctor is doing his business?—We have one of the hardest working men in the Co. Down. It would have that effect.

11576. CHAIRMAN.—What is your Board's reply to Query 61.—The treatment of the sick in this infirmary is of a satisfactory character. There is not available means for the proper treatment of insane, idiotic, or puerile in an ordinary workhouse.

11577. You recommend they should be sent to asylums?—Yes.

11578. Have you any insane or idiotic people in your workhouse at present?—Only one or two insane and epileptic. We think no institutions could be better for the insane than the asylums, which are set apart for their treatment. As a matter of fact, the Down County Council added to their farms sixty acres, which are bringing in a large revenue at present.

11579. You are a member of the Asylum Committee?—I am.

11580. What is the reply to Query 71.—We are of opinion that it would be very desirable to introduce a system of payment for the treatment of persons who are not destitute. This matter was discussed, and we were told all we could charge an ordinary patient was an ordinary outlay, which is 1s. 11d. a week. We are of opinion that it would be better, and that the public would be better pleased—if, when they went into the workhouse hospital they would pay what they thought would be right and fair. We have diphtheria and scarletina patients, and all we can charge in respect of them is 4s. a week.

11581. You think that within reasonable limits the Guardians should have absolute discretion to charge

whatever expense was been *de* incurred?—I don't think it fair that the ratepayers should have to keep up people who were quite willing and able to pay for themselves. Jan. 11, 1904.
Mr. George Deane.

11582. The only other question is as to tramps. What have you to say regarding it?—That has been a serious question with us. We recommend that tramps or casuals admitted, say, on Monday, be detained in the workhouse over Tuesday, and discharged on Wednesday; but if admitted twice within two months that they be detained two clear days, and that in each case a task be given; and we strongly recommend that for the making the breaking of a certain quantity of stones each day, or other approved of useful work, and the task for the females be left in the hands of the master and matron, the Guardians having the power to authorise the master to discharge a casual the day after admission, if he (the master) considers he is a bona fide workman seeking employment. Provided the casual or tramp does not perform the task set him, the master should have the power to bring the delinquent immediately before a court of summary jurisdiction to be dealt with for insubordination. It is from Belfast we get all our trouble with tramps. We have from thirty to forty from Belfast. They come in the morning and return in the evening. If this question could be dealt with satisfactorily it would be a great relief to the Poor Law.

11583. Is there anything else you would like to say?—Not that I know of, at present.

11584. Mr. J. M. Thompson.—Does your statement as to the examination by the relieving officer of the dispensary apply to the Newtownards Dispensary only?—I am speaking only of the Newtownards Dispensary.

Mr. J. H. DICKSON, Deputy Chairman, Newtownards Board of Guardians, examined.

It has been recommended to do away with the workhouses at Newtownards and Lisburn. That is not my idea; I think it would be better to do away with Banbridge and Killadeen Workhouses. By joining Newtownards to Belfast we would be largely increasing our rating, for the expenses of the Belfast Guardians are very heavy.

11585. Mr. MURKIN.—Is Belfast not large enough?—I think it very much too large.

11586. You have heard that the Belfast Guardians have no ground on which to erect more buildings?—Yes. As to dispensary districts, I think if there is a redistribution of unions there should also be a redistribution of dispensary districts. With regard to Mr. Thompson's statement as to inspecting documents, I have been a member of the Newtownards Board of

Guardians for twelve years, and I have never been refused an inspection of documents.

11587. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Thompson has seen a good deal thereof?—He has only been a Guardian for two years.

11588. During that time he has managed to see a good deal?—Yes; more than the ordinary Guardian. The officials are most willing to show anything they can to members of the Board. I have always found them so.

11589. Mr. MURKIN.—No doubt Newtownards is proud of having such a member as Mr. Thompson?—I will make no comment.

11590. You think it would be better to revert to the old dispensary system and have an examination of the books at the dispensary?—Yes.

11591. Instead of at the workhouse?—Yes.

The Sitting was adjourned.

Mr. J. H.
Dickson.

Jan. 13, 1904.

TWENTY-THIRD PUBLIC SITTING.—WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 13TH, 1904.

At the Courthouse, Banbridge.

Present:—Mr. MICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURNAHAN, and Dr. COBY BIGGER.

Mr. T. B. WALLACE.—I act as Solicitor for the Banbridge Board of Guardians, and the Board have nominated a committee to act with me in this matter, and to come before you to-day and give any evidence or

assistance that may be considered necessary. I propose to call Mr. John Johnston, who is a County Councillor, and a Guardian of long experience.

Mr. John
Johnston.

Mr. JOHN JOHNSTON EXAMINED.

Mr. WALLACE.—The County Council of Down sometime ago met and discussed this matter with representatives from various unions, and they have adopted a report. Our Committee have met and fully discussed and gone into that report, and they have substantially adopted it. They propose to come here to give evidence with regard to some matters in the report; but in the main they approve of it.

11562. CHAIRMAN.—Query No. 1.—This is the County Council report I have here now. The answer of the County Council to the first query is:—"The County Council has, through a special committee, had interviews with, and representations from several Boards of Guardians wholly or partly comprised within the county. The County Council would point out that the state of the county in all its conditions, both material and economic, differs essentially from the state of affairs existing at the period, now sixty-five years ago, when the previous Poor Law system was inaugurated. At that time the population of the county was over 360,000; it is now about 265,000. There were no railways then; at present the county is fairly well covered with a network of railways. It was then considered necessary to provide in seven unions, wholly or partly contained in the county, accommodation for 4,656 inmates. Taking the total of these seven workhouses, the number of inmates at present in these institutions is only 1,617. In the three unions wholly within the county (Downpatrick, Newtownards, and Kilkeel), the 1838 scheme provided accommodation for 2,677 inmates. There are now 534 in all, counting all classes in both hospital and workhouse. From these figures Belfast Union has been omitted, the county generally since the inauguration of the present Poor Law system having decreased in population 43 per cent., whereas the city of Belfast has in that period increased in population by 500 per cent. The valuation of the city has increased from £579,100 in 1851, to £1,304,436 in 1901. The County Council, whilst making no definite proposals as regards dissolution of any union, submit that the time has come when some amendment of the arrangements made prior to 1838 should be effected, and suggest that so far as possible the unions should be coterminous with the counties." Do you agree with that view, that the unions should, as far as possible, be coterminous with the county?—Yes.

11563. "Any one with a map of the County Down before him showing the boundaries of the unions and population of the workhouses, will have no difficulty in seeing where boundaries can be rearranged and amalgamations effected with advantage to the poor, and also to the ratepayers. The County Council would specially point out that the city of Belfast has recently extended its area from 5,956 acres to 16,304 acres, taking in by this extension all lands surrounding the city that were not of a purely rural character. The purely rural portion of Belfast Union should, with the exception of the townlands of Cregagh, Ballynacorney, and Carrickmore, be detached from the present union and attached to that of Newtownards. The portion referred to is entirely similar in its interests to the adjoining rural district, and has no similarity of interest with the great city of Belfast, which requires an institution of the size and extent of that at present existing in that city, and which is being continually added to." Virtually, your view would be that the county borough of Belfast should be the area of the

union?—Yes; we think Belfast Union is quite large enough for Belfast itself, and should be separated from the county.

11564. "The County Council would represent that the portion of the Lurgan Union situated in the county of Down should be detached from that union and joined to that of Banbridge. This portion consists of seven electoral divisions, and the district in question is nearer to the Banbridge Workhouse than much of the present mountainous portion lying to the east of Banbridge, and has much better means of communication with the workhouse, both by road and rail, than the portion of the union above referred to." You want to take portion of the Lurgan Union?—That is a portion known as the Moora district, and it is all in the County Down; it is the portion of the Lurgan Union in the County Down.

11565. You would take all the County Down part from Lurgan?—Yes.

11566. Then the report goes on: "The County Council further recommend that the portion of the Banbridge Union situated in the county of Armagh, consisting of the electoral divisions of Ballyshel, Malnahood, Mullighbrick, and Tandragee, should be detached from Banbridge Union and added on to some union or unions in the county of Armagh. The large towns of Lisburn and Newry are situated almost half and half in the neighbouring counties. The County Council does not make any definite recommendation as regards these unions, but recommend that some system of amalgamation should, if possible, be effected, whereby the County Down unions should be entirely subordinated within the county. Considering the great reduction in the population and the growth of railway accommodation, the County Council would draw the attention of the Commission to the attached map, showing the boundaries of the unions of the county and the existing railways, from which it would appear that if considerable modifications in the boundaries of existing unions were made great advantage would accrue to the administration of the Poor Law." Have you anything to say about either the union of Lisburn or Newry?—Lisburn is about half and half in the County Down and the County Antrim, seeing that they are so closely divided we left that an open question.

11567. And you are not disposed to say anything about Lisburn?—No.

11568. And as regards Newry?—The same thing. The only change that we ask in the County Down is that the Moora portion of seven electoral divisions should be added to Banbridge, and the four shires of Banbridge Union situated in Armagh should be given up to Armagh.

11569. You would give up the Tandragee portion to Armagh for the purpose of keeping within the county?—Yes.

11570. Then as regards Query No. 3, the answer is: "In this county the question of auxiliary inmate systems has been settled by the County Council, who are making large additions to the existing system including, which will meet all requirements as regards accommodation for the inmates, and the greater number of inmates have already been removed to the system from the workhouses. It is the unanimous opinion of the County Council, and every person that has been consulted, that should any workhouses be closed, the site of which would be suitable, it should be made into a

sanatorium for consumptives, an institution for which there appears to be a great need, and which should have wards for pay patients." As regards lunatics there is sufficient room in the County Down Asylum at Downpatrick for housing all the lunatics in the county.—They are adding very largely to it.

11601. And as soon as these additions are made there will be ample room for all the lunatics.—Certainly; and not only that, but a large number of lunatics have been removed from the workhouse already, and a provision made for extending the buildings very considerably.

11602. That we are aware of: that a considerable number of lunatics have been taken from the workhouse. As regards an institution for consumptives, you suggest Kilkeel, or some suitable place?—Something of the kind is very desirable, and not only should we have it for the poor and paupers, but certain wards for pay patients, who could be admitted on reasonable terms. We would like to take in a class who could not afford to go to a sanatorium and pay a very high price.

11603. You would take them in for what they could afford to give, from 1s. to 30s. a week?—That is the idea.

11604. That is an idea that the Commission would view with favour themselves?—And we would go further—whether the union be dissolved or not we think a sanatorium ought to be provided.

11605. Your answer to Query No. 5 is: "There appears to be an almost unanimous opinion that, so far as possible, children should not be brought up in the workhouse, and that arrangements should be made for separate accommodation for aged married couples to live together." That is two recommendations: that all the children should be excluded from the workhouse, and better provision should be made for aged married couples to enable them to live together?—Yes, as far as possible. A difficulty arises with regard to the children. At present epileptics or deserted children can be boarded out, and in this union every child that comes under that clause is boarded out.

11606. We saw three that were not; but we were told that they would be?—Yes; we put out all we can.

11607. Would you be in favour of the law giving the Boards of Guardians or the governing bodies a discretionary power to declare parents unfit for the bringing up of their children, and to take their children from them?—Yes, sir; having that discretion it would require to be worked pretty carefully; it would require something like that to carry out the recommendation.

11608. Do you see any other change that would carry it out; say an amendment of the law, enabling the local bodies to transfer any of the children that they may deem fit to be under their control?—I do so, and, I believe, a good many others, would not like to see children placed in what we call a better position than honest working men's children.

11609. That would never be done in the case of boarded-out children?—According to what length it might be pushed.

11610. Would your idea be that these children should be reared to become farm labourers?—Yes; but I would not go the length at all of saying that they should be kept at the expense of the State or the ratepayers, and placed in a better position than the children of ordinary decent people who are labourers or artisans.

11611. That would seem to be an absurd arrangement?—It would have a tendency to make people say, "If we send our children to the workhouse they can be reared better than we can rear them." But, subject to that being safeguarded, I think it should be done.

11612. That would be a matter for the discretion of the local body, would it not? Do you think any further safeguard would be desirable—would you leave it to the discretion of the local body, or do you think there ought to be any further check, we will say such as an order of the magistrates in petty sessions—do you think that before children are taken from a parent the Guardians should get an order transferring the children to them in loco parentis?—I can scarcely answer whether that would be necessary or not; but suppose it was left to the Guardians, with power of appeal to magistrates or some other court.

11613. Yes?—I would agree with that qualification.

11614. Mr. MURKIN.—You don't think the Guardians would have any desire to take away from a person a child if they thought that person was able to provide for the child?—I don't think so; but just to

safeguard it; and perhaps the Guardians might act without having full knowledge. I think it would be better to have them safeguarded in some way.

11615. CHAIRMAN.—Is it your idea that aged married couples should be maintained together in workhouses or cottages outside?—We left that an open question; as a matter of fact the Banbridge Board of Guardians are going as closely to carry out that idea as possible, because they give, and some people think perhaps too freely, out-door relief to old people: we don't like to bring them into the house and separate them.

11616. You have a great number of old people in the house, though?—I think there are very few who are separated; the house is made up altogether of old people and persons on the infirmary.

11617. I suppose there are persons who would have no one outside to look after them, if you gave them out-door relief?—We don't like to give out-door relief unless there is someone to look after them.

11618. Take the large number of old men and women whom we saw this morning in your workhouse, who are not in hospital or in the doctor's charge; would you be in favour of still further extending your out-door relief by virtually boarding them out with people who would be bound to take care of them, for a sum less than it would cost for them in the workhouse, with the object of doing that part of the workhouse which is devoted to the care of people who are not sick. You would get out the children and the aged and infirm: you would have nobody except persons who came in to the hospital sick or to have illegitimate children?—I understand the question very well, and I hardly know what to say.

11619. Do you think there would be any danger of abuse; do you think that people who are distinctly above the rank of destitute would be tempted to try to get aged relatives provided for in that way?—I think there would be a little danger.

11620. Do you think the local body would be strong enough to cope with that danger?—I would scarcely like to give an opinion; I have not thought it out.

11621. Mr. MURKIN.—The milk of human kindness is too strong in Banbridge?—I don't know that, sir.

11622. CHAIRMAN.—Query No. 4—the County Council have no suggestion to make. Had you any discussion on the question of chargeability?—That is a question there is a considerable difference of opinion on.

11623. Naturally, at the County Council you would have differences of opinion?—No, no; I refer to the Guardians when I speak here; a member of the Guardians would like the chargeability to be returned to electoral divisions.

11624. That is, the rural men would?—I don't know whether it is confined altogether to the rural men; but in working it out I may admit that for a very considerable time I thought it was a mistake to change the chargeability from electoral division to union-at-large, and I am beginning to change my mind now.

11625. What division do you represent?—A rural division, three or four miles out—Banagh.

11626. That is where your property is?—No; it is just touching; my own is Quilly.

11627. It is rural?—Yes.

11628. Therefore, really all your interests are rural?—Yes.

11629. Still you are inclined to prefer the union at large?—Hardly any man would, I think, are worth consideration. Not very long since there was a very serious outbreak of typhoid fever at Lanelwala, in Banbridge Union, which cost the union £1,000. Under the old system that would have come off one or two divisions. That is a very serious thing.

11630. Are you referring to the actual expense of curing the people?—The actual additional cost to Banbridge was £1,000. Had that been under the old system of electoral divisions that £1,000 would all have been charged to one or two divisions.

CHAIRMAN.—When the rate reached a certain point would it not have been spread over the union?

Mr. Wylie, Clerk.—No; under the old system it would be an electoral division charge.

CHAIRMAN.—Under the Act of 1875.

Mr. Wylie.—We never had such a case before.

CHAIRMAN.—I did not understand that point. I thought the chargeability, whether the sum was large or small, would have gone to the electoral division.

CHAIRMAN.—No; there is a safety valve to prevent its smashing everything.

Witness.—I am very pleased to hear there is.

Jan. 12, 1904

Mr. John Johnston

Jan. 12, 1904.

Mr. John
Johnston.

11531. CHAIRMAN.—Is your view modified by hearing that?—Yes; what might the turning point be?

11532. I think it is in the £ in-door; if it went over 6d. you would have it spread over the union—I was not aware of that.

11533. Mr. WALLACE.—How long are you a Guardian?—I became a Guardian in 1877; but there were a few years I was not a Guardian during that time.

11534. CHAIRMAN.—We were talking about the question of chargeability.—The point you have raised has rather upset me; I scarcely know which side to take.

11535. Some witnesses have been in favour of not interfering with in-door expenditures or establishment charges, leaving them to be union charges. They suggest that the other expenditure should be divisional or dispensary districts. What would your view be of making the maintenance of the sick a county charge in the same way as asylum maintenance. Very few people become sick under the Poor Law who are not really sick; therefore you will have just the cases of necessity coming in to be dealt with, and of necessity only. Would you think at all well of making their support in the hospital a county charge. It might reduce your expenditure in some ways; you would have a system of county nurses, instead of telephoning to Belfast for a nurse, and they would go from one place to another as their services were required, wherever there was an epidemic, and you would not have these very high fees for occasional nurses.—If I thought it would reduce the expenditure I would go for it; but I am not sure it would.

11536. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Do you not think that by widening the area you lessen the power of supervision, and therefore have the matter open to the danger of extravagance?—I think there is very considerable danger of that.

11537. Do you not think that if you widened it to a county charge that people would seek the benefits of the hospital without pay, who were well able to pay, thinking that no one would know about it in their own locality?—I don't know; I think, perhaps, the thing could be as well watched as at present; I think if you extended it to union chargeability it would not be desirable to go further.

Mr. Wallace reads Sec. 3 of the Act of 1895.

Witness.—That would refer to indoor expenses only; but in our experience we pay not only for indoor, but considerably for out-door, because when members of a family were brought in suffering from typhoid their families had to be supported outside on out-door relief.

11538. CHAIRMAN.—Was the cause of that outbreak a defective supply of water?—I believe it was.

11539. Would it not be cheaper to get a good supply of water?—They have been trying since, all they can.

11540. Dr. BROWN.—With reference to the idea of chargeability for hospitals, what benefit do you receive, in Banbridge, from the county infirmary in Downpatrick?—I don't think we receive any at all. I scarcely ever heard of a patient being sent there.

11541. But Banbridge pays its proportion to keep up Downpatrick. Would it not be well to have all hospitals on the same basis?—And the County Council pay towards Newry. Neither of these hospitals comes under the Poor Law system.

11542. But they come off the ratepayers, and come within the scope of this Inquiry?—There is another in Lisburn; but I think it all comes off the County Antrim.

11543. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—How many workhouses do you think would be sufficient for Down?—I would not like to answer that question.

11544. It appears on this list before me that there are about 600 inmates in the County Down workhouses; half of these are in the infirmaries, the remainder children and lunatics?—Does it take in Newry.

11545. Banbridge, Downpatrick, Kilsed, Newry, and Lisburn; there are, in all, 900 people. Of that number 200 are children, and 50 inmates. That reduces the number to 750; 360 of these are in the infirmary. That would leave between 300 and 400 of the class known as infirm and aged. Do you not think that one house could accommodate 300 or 400 people?—It might accommodate them; but I think it would be a very inconvenient thing to drag the aged and infirm people from one end of the county to the other. I think there should be far more than one place in the county.

11546. But the idea is to retain a place for the sick. Get the children banded out, as far as pos-

sible; put the lunatics either in an asylum or the asylum; few remain but the infirm. What great knowledge would there be to send that class to some central place. We find that they remain in the houses for years and years, and are rarely visited by their friends. Do you not think that would be a desirable change if it could be done without any great extra costs?

CHAIRMAN.—The same evils as in lunatic asylums.—Yes. But there is a difference between lunatic and aged people; the lunatics are not supposed to know much of what they are doing; but old people have the traditions of home, and don't like to be sent so far away.

11547. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Did the County Council express a view as to the number of workhouses that would suffice for Down?—They did not.

11548. When we are trying to do a good thing we might do it as well as possible, and if it is well to cut down a few workhouses would it be better to do it on a large scale, if, in the localities where the workhouses exist, provision were made for the sick, contrivances and distributing the other classes?—I am afraid there would be great difficulties in carrying it out.

11549. In what way. As has been indicated?—I would doubt whether there was much economy in it.

11550. You would be getting rid of a staff which is a great expense, besides the cost of fuel and the repair and upkeep of the house. It is by doing something on these lines that you can effect efficiency and economy?—I would rather not express any opinion further on that point.

11551. There was a suggestion made by a witness at another place that it would be well to have paying patients in hospitals made electoral division charges instead of union or county at large charges?—I don't think it would be worth while making.

11552. The suggestion was that out-door relief and paying patients in hospitals should be confined to an electoral division charge?—I disregard altogether that about out-door relief. You may get a division here with the smallest valuation having the largest out-door relief, and it would be a great grievance to change the system. Sometimes a person comes and settles down in a division. They may have been away for their lifetime, and they must get out-door relief, and it would be unfair to charge that division with their support.

11553. What are your methods in giving out-door relief? How do you proceed—some Guardians make application, then what occurs?—The relieving officer should look after the case as soon as possible.

11554. Do you consider the question at every meeting or only once a month?—Every meeting. And I would just say that I think there are far too many meetings of the Guardians; and I think we have too many Guardians. We have thirty-four Guardians in Banbridge Union; and I think they would feel the responsibility far more if they were fewer in number, and would do their duty better. Because there are so many it is not worth my while to stand, or you to stand: they don't attend, some of them, unless there is something they want doing.

11555. The number on out-door relief in Banbridge is very large. Is there any special reason for it?—The special reason is, that the Guardians do not like to press the old people to come from their own homes to the workhouse, and they are carrying out by out-door relief pretty much this system that you want yourself, of boarding out old people outside; that is practically a good deal of the working of the Banbridge Union.

11556. CHAIRMAN.—You did not think that was put forward as an expression of opinion by the Commission?—Oh, no.

11557. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Asking a question does not indicate necessarily that we approve of it; we want local opinion?—Oh, no; but the question was asked about boarding out old people. I say the system in Banbridge Union is practically putting that into force, to a considerable extent at all events, and that accounts in a large measure for the large sum spent on out-door relief.

11558. Do you think the Asylum Committee is enlarging the asylum to an extent sufficient to accommodate all the lunatics in the County Down?—Yes; I have no doubt about it.

11559. There is a large number insane in Newry, and there are fourteen or fifteen in Banbridge?—I think £20,000 is being laid out in enlarging Downpatrick Asylum.

11660. I suppose the Asylum Committee considered that matter fully when they sent these answers to the queries?—Yes; in fact, I was one of the committee that prepared those answers.

11661. Dr. Brown.—I think it was discussed, and considered that that was the cheapest way of doing. The Chairman went into the relative cost of keeping lunatics in the workhouse and the asylum, and taking of the asylum grant, they come to the conclusion that that was the best thing to do?—Yes; but it was not only on account of the cost. Another point was that they were better provided for and taken care of by an efficient staff of doctors and nurses.

11662. And then the numbers were ascertained by the County Council that were in the different workhouses?—Yes; and provision made to receive an extra number if required.

11663. As a matter of fact, they have taken nearly all the male lunatics out of the workhouses?—At any rate, the feeling was that it was better for the lunatics (not workhouses were not proper places for them, and that they could not be properly attended to without a great deal of extra nursing.

11664. Mr. MURKIN.—Better under existing conditions; but would not they be better provided for under a change—an intermediate system. Supposing there was an institution with a considerable amount of land, where those people could be kept employed, away from the noise and excitement of the violent in the asylum. Do you not think it would be better to have them apart from the noisy ones, and engaged at an occupation beneficial to them and helpful to the ratepayers?—I think the asylum people are carrying that into effect so far as they can. They brought a large farm of land at Downpatrick for the purpose of giving employment to the inmates.

11665. Hereafter lunatics could be kept at a lower rate than dangerous or suicidal. If an unoccupied workhouse were taken, having a good deal of land about it, and the institution brought up to a reasonable standard, do you not think it would be well to get this class to a place like that?—Certainly.

11666. Preferable to enlarging one asylum for the whole county?—It is a question of degree; there would

be a difficulty in classifying when a person is dangerous and when he is not; and who is so good a judge of that as a doctor and a nurse.

11667. Do you wish to have epileptics, idiots, and dotty people placed in conjunction with those noisy people. Don't you think something should be done for humanity sake to take them away?—And we are doing that.

11668. Large institutions are not considered desirable; when an institution has reached a thousand it has about the maximum?—I did not know what the opinion of experts was; but I have already expressed the opinion that I don't like too great gatherings, and I referred to the Belfast Workhouse.

11669. Dr. Brown.—You mentioned something about a consumptive sanatorium?—It has not been very fully considered; an expression of opinion has been given that something ought to be done, but it has not taken any form.

11670. That opinion is very generally held by representatives and ratepayers?—I believe it is.

11671. Do you know, is consumption prevalent in this district?—I do not; but I think there are very few families that do not suffer from it less or more.

11672. As far as you know the representatives of the ratepayers would be strongly in favour of a consumptive sanatorium being established?—It is an idea that, I believe, is growing.

11673. And would pay their share of it?—I think they would. Some of the Councilors would take their chance of whether they would be re-elected or not. Perhaps I should say that in making any changes for hospital accommodation there is a strong feeling to have accommodation for paying patients at moderate charges.

11674. CHAIRMAN.—Would you be in favour also of giving Guardians or the managers of any hospital power to fix what sum ought to be paid by any person who could pay at all?—Yes, sir.

11675. Something from 1s. or 6s. a week up to the full cost—would you be in favour of giving the managers power?—I would; I scarcely know who else should have the power.

11676. At present they have not. You would be in favour of having that power given by law?—Yes.

Mr. THOMAS LOCKHART examined.

11677. CHAIRMAN.—What is the view of the Guardians about the tramps. You think it is a nuisance that requires to be abated?—Certainly it does; I am very confident as to that opinion.

11678. You think it is bad for the ratepayers and bad for the poor people themselves?—I am quite sure of that.

11679. Have you personally, or have the Guardians as a body, any definite view as to what might be done?—The Guardians have had that matter under consideration very often since I became a Guardian; but in face of the law restricting the penalty only to a hen's work in the morning the hands of the Guardians were tied.

11680. But now that an amendment of the law is under consideration have you any suggestion as to what should be done?—I have not.

11681. Would you be in favour of extending to the Guardians the discretion which the Guardians in England have of detaining of tramps for a day or two?—I would.

11682. Do you think that would be sufficient?—It would be a help no doubt.

11683. A reduction in the number of workhouses would be a further difficulty in the way of the tramps?—It would, certainly.

11684. Some witnesses have expressed the opinion that it might be useful if the Guardians and the constabulary would co-operate, and if the duty of preventing vagrants or tramps who are habitually so were placed on the police?—Is not that power already placed on the police; we have been doing that occasionally.

11685. But you have been working through your workhouse master?—Decidedly.

11686. If some extra duties were put on the police to help the Guardians?—It would be a good idea, I am sure.

11687. They could collect information as to the men walking the road: they are in a specially good position for collecting information and evidence?—Yes; I would be certainly in favour of giving the police some extra power.

11688. Mr. MURKIN.—Some people think that if a severe law was enacted in regard to these tramps that perhaps they would become a danger to the public by going to farmers' houses at night, setting fire to barns, or robbing him rosets. Do you see any danger of that?—I don't think they would.

11689. Have you many tramps at Banbridge?—A tremendous lot.

11690. CHAIRMAN.—You had fifteen or nineteen this morning. They were a very pitiable sight?—Strong, healthy men doing nothing.

11691. Mr. MURKIN.—Witnesses suggested at other places that it might be well to make tramps go to the police station and get a ticket, which would entitle them to a night's lodging. Do you think it would be better to keep them under the eye of the police rather than of the relieving officers?—I think it would. Relieving officers are inclined to be too lenient.

11692. With regard to unmarried mothers, would you extend the law so as to enable the Guardians to take children away from parents who failed to take proper care of them?—I certainly would; I think there was a recommendation with regard to that by some witness somewhere else, that immoral mothers should not be allowed to retain the custody of their children.

11693. The mother at your house spoke of the hardship she often sees of children brought to the workhouse in a half starved condition?—Yes; we have met

Jan. 13, 1904.

Mr. John Johnston.

Jan. 12, 1904.
—
Mr. Thomas
Lynch.

such cases; and I would be inclined to take such children from the hands of their parents and provide for them elsewhere.

11594. CHAIRMAN.—You heard the very interesting evidence that Mr. Johnston gave us in great particularity; it would be quite unnecessary to take you over the same ground again—I could not add anything to it.

11595. Is there anything in which you differ from him?—There was one question raised as to the aged and infirm being taken to some central place. I would not at all agree with that; I think they are better provided for at home. Old men and women would not care to leave their own home to go away.

11596. Do you think it would make any matter to a woman from Drogheda whether she went to Newtownards or Banbridge?—If any person went so far being ill—

11597. We are not talking of the ill at all, but of the old and infirm?—Most of them come into the workhouse to die.

11598. They don't come in a dying condition, but rest their work, mostly owing to old age or disease?—Some of these people stay a very short time. If a man or a woman come in for two or three days, and we have them sent to Downpatrick, how are they to get home?

11599. The cost of transport would come in then; but I don't think, in your aged and infirm, you will

find such short intervals between admission and discharge?—We have it here.

11700. These would be townspeople hopping in and out?—There are some from the country, too.

11701. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Your idea is not to do away with any workhouse, or, if so, provide for these people at home?—People must be taken somewhere.

Mr. MURKAGHAN.—It is a question of how to do it best.

CHAIRMAN.—We visited recently a union in which were inclusive from a workhouse which had been closed—Gortin—and they were better pleased to be in the new union they went into.

Mr. MURKAGHAN.—It is fourteen years since it was amalgamated, yet there is no complaint whatever on the part of the Guardians, or anybody else.

Witness.—I was afraid, when I heard the suggestion, that that difficulty might arise.

CHAIRMAN.—They don't like it at first; they move in a wrench to an old person; but once it has taken place the view from one workhouse is so similar to that from another, the order of architecture is the same, and it is difficult for them to realise that they have been moved.

Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Guardians who, in 1886, were opposed to the amalgamation of this particular workhouse, are now quite pleased with the change.

Mr Arthur
Atkinson.

Mr. ARTHUR ATKINSON examined.

11702. CHAIRMAN.—The Commission will be very glad to hear your views on the question of old married couples and tramps?—My notion with regard to the old people is to treat them with kindness. I don't approve of the Boards of Guardians constituting themselves a Divorce Court; our system is not the same as in England; and what has increased our out-door relief to a great extent is that we do not wish to separate men and wife who have lived a number of years together.

11703. Are you sure that has increased your out-door relief?—To a great extent. I am speaking for my own division—the Urban. An application is made through myself or some of my brother Guardians for out-door relief for old people that are past their labour. We have no alternative but to bring the case before the Board. Our Board is very generous; they do not act harshly towards these old people; the figures are a proof of that. If there was a provision made in the workhouse to extend the comforts of the aged people and improve the surroundings, that they could live in quarters of their own, that the aged people could assist one another, it would do a great deal of good, and, I believe, would relieve out-door relief. Give them more liberty; don't make the place like a jail.

11704. Do you know how many married couples you have in the workhouse at present?—One.

11705. Do you happen to know how many cases are on out-door relief, or were during a recent period—how many married couples?—I do not.

11706. I have a record of it here. Your average weekly number of persons is 786; your number of married couples with children who were on out-door relief is 37, that is in the Banbridge relief district, and in the Drogheda relief district, 14. Then without children you have a great deal more—58 in Banbridge district and 48 in Drogheda.

Mr. WILSON.—Mr. Johnston points out to me that these two classes don't take in all; there are widows.

CHAIRMAN.—We are talking of the separation of married couples. Indeed, I find I have added two years together. It is the half of what I said. There are 138 single women on out-door relief and 86 single men in Banbridge, and in Drogheda there are 145 single women and 53 single men. The number of married couples is much smaller than I said; it is 58 in Drogheda and 41 in Banbridge.

Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Seventy-one only.

Witness.—It is these seventy-one that arouse my sympathy. Where there are children there must be a doctor's certificate to show the bread-earner is not able to earn. That must be temporary; and we say it is not worth touching them.

11707. CHAIRMAN.—They are the proper cases for out-door relief, in every one's opinion, where the breadwinner is temporarily incapacitated?—That is my

opinion; and in the case of old married couples I would try to make the homes in our union more comfortable for them.

11708. What would you do for married couples that become destitute—would you maintain them with out-door relief, as at present, or give them quarters in the workhouse, or give them cottage houses?—I would leave that to be decided locally.

11709. What is your view?—I don't like to break up a home; I would rather build up a home. Sometimes we have to act cruelly to be just.

11710. You speak of old married couples without children. There is not much building up of homes there?—They have little homes; but the out-door relief they get is not sufficient to maintain them properly.

11711. What do they get?—3s. to 5s.

11712. That pays their rent for them?—And then they have to provide coal, and live on charity to a great extent. It is a degrading position in which to place respectable old people.

11713. Then the out-door relief is really not a provision for the destitute, but something to supplement the deficiencies of the poor?—That is my own opinion; and I would like to see that altered that there should be some consideration given to them.

11714. You would rather give them larger relief outside in their own homes?—If we could establish something like local charity, 5s. for the deserving poor; and there could be something supplemental added by Government grant, or from other funds, 3s. or 4s. more.

11715. That would be really an old-age pension scheme?—Yes; that was my idea.

11716. You would throw that to the extent of 5s. a week on the local rates, and try to raise the balance off some more extended area, either the county or the United Kingdom?—That is my opinion.

11717. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Do you not think there would be some difficulty in distinguishing the deserving—who would be the judge?—We have no difficulty in distinguishing that, we pride ourselves; our clergy and our local Guardians, through the relieving officer, are competent to judge.

11718. Have the ratepayers nothing to say to that?—We are returned by the ratepayer, and if they don't wish us they can turn us out.

11719. You act differently here to other places in the matter of out-door relief?—We do; our out-door relief sometimes is challenged, but it is approved of for petitions are largely signed on behalf of certain parties, and presented to the Board of Guardians, so get them out-door relief when we refuse.

11720. A petition is not a hard thing to get up?—It is not; but it shows the ratepayers approve of our action.

11712. But do you think it is a good thing to scatter public money and prostrate the people, by giving money without proper inquiry and supervision?—We exercise that.

11722. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think that all your payments are within the law?—Sometimes we have been overcharged—once in five or seven years.

11723. Do you think that a great deal of your ordinary expenditure is illegal?—We have never had our attention drawn to it that we were wrong.

11724. Mr. MURKIN.—Suppose a man dies, and leaves a couple of children and a widow; the widow young, strong, the children not babies—six to eight years old; the woman strong and able to get remunerative employment, perhaps at 2s. 6d. a day or 2s., do you not think it would be better that that woman should go and seek employment than to come to the Guardians and get 4s. or 5s. a week?—You are supposing a case that never was in existence. There is no such thing as a woman earning 2s. or 2s. 6d. a day in this neighbourhood.

11725. CHAIRMAN.—Say she could earn 10s. or 12s. a week!—That is only supposing; there is no such thing in existence.

11726. Mr. MURKIN.—If it did exist would such a case be a suitable case for outdoor relief?—No; and we don't do it either. We cannot supplement a widow woman's earnings; the law will prevent it.

11727. CHAIRMAN.—You said to me that your outdoor relief was not an adequate sum for the support of the destitute, but supplemented their other means?—That applied to the aged and infirm. Mr. Murkin referred to a person earning 2s. a day; we could not entertain that.

11728. I was going back to your statement just now. I asked you whether a large portion of your expenditure was not probably illegal, and I asked you that question having regard to what you said a couple of minutes before to me, that the outdoor relief given was not a provision given for the adequate relief of the destitute, but a provision to supplement the deficiencies of people. There is no such charitable power given to Boards of Guardians?—No, sir; and as I said in my statement, this small pittance of outdoor relief is supplemented by the charity of the neighbours around; that is not coming.

11729. Now about the tramps?—That is a vexed question; it has puzzled the brains of all the Guardians in Ireland.

11730. Well, can you settle it for us?—I would say that those stringent measures that several Guardians have put forward might be a hardship; I would be afraid it would touch a really deserving man or woman seeking employment from one town to another.

11731. Would you not have the discretion of the Board of Guardians and relieving officers—they would not be bound to administer it in a uniform way?—The relieving officer! If you had his position—

11732. I don't mean the relieving officer—the workhouse master?—Once he gets a line from the relieving officer he must admit the person.

11733. But the treatment when he is admitted; whether he is to be detained compulsorily?—If you give an unlimited discretionary power to the master to use his own discretion to discriminate between the deserving tramp and the vagrant.

11734. Would you suggest that he should have power to consult with the Guardians living nearest to the

workhouse?—Our master has enough to do without leaving his own place.

11735. All he would have to do would be to send a slip of paper down to the Guardian to attend at the workhouse?

Mr. WATSON.—Mr. Alderman is the Urban Guardian, and he would not like the job of inspecting twenty tramps every morning.

CHAIRMAN.—It would only be in a case where a difficulty arose.

WITNESS.—When the tramp comes into the porter's lodge after receiving the ticket of admission, an attention out of twenty cases he is either a tradesman or a labourer.

11736. Or a stroller?—He never says that. If he is a tradesman he gives in his trade to the porter; if he is unskilled he says he is a labouring man. A man that asks a night's lodging in a workhouse should produce a discharge from the last place he wrought, endorsed at the nearest police station that it was a genuine discharge, and that discharge would state on it what the man's occupation was, and how long he was in his last employment.

11737. And the reason of his discharge?—Yes. If that man should happen to return again inside a given period he could be detected and asked where he wrought last. If each of them was asked for this discharge very few would turn up.

11738. One gentleman proposed that all the tramps should be photographed, and the photographs given to the police, who could send it along their line of route?—Some of these men are very clever, and could alter their features in one night.

11739. Mr. MURKIN.—Would you go so far as to change the law, and to give the Guardians power to turn these men over to the police?—I would in the case of the vagrants, if it could be wrought up; there is a law now which I would put strictly into force; the vagrants should be treated as vagrants, and the minimum should be a month in jail.

11740. Giving the Guardians power to detain anyone they thought necessary up to two or three days?—I would not go that far; they might punish the wrong man; a person bona fide seeking employment might be detained.

11741. Don't the Guardians always lean on the tender side?—But the Guardians are not there constantly; that would have to be left in the master's hands. We only meet once a week. If a tramp came in on a Monday night he would be detained until next Monday before we meet again.

11742. CHAIRMAN.—Have you any other suggestion to make about the tramps?—That would be a good idea that they should produce a discharge initialled at the police station.

11743. And if they had no such document?—I would hand them over to the police to treat them as vagrants. Then with regard to the children of tramps, I would take them from them, for they are only cultivating a new generation of tramps. They make use of these children to solicit alms, and then as soon as they get the money they go and drink it, and in nine cases out of ten they come into the house; they know they have a home to come to.

11744. In the interests of the children, and for the good of the community, you would take charge of the children from them?—I would; for I believe this is a disease, and could be stamped out.

Mr. ROBERT FRYER examined.

11745. CHAIRMAN.—We would like to have the benefit of your views?—My Council—the Urban Council—appointed myself and Mr. McIlroy to attend here before you. On the whole, my Council quite agree with the answers that have been given by the County Council.

11746. Do you think the Banbridge Workhouse ought to be closed or kept open?—My Council think it ought to be kept open.

11747. Have you considered what workhouses ought to be closed?—We considered that question, and my Council were not in favour of closing any workhouse. In the first place, with regard to administration, the idea that was suggested by a question of one of your members, of doing away with all workhouses save one—I did not quite gather whether it was intended by that

question to do away with all the Boards of Guardians save one.

Mr. MURKIN.—Not necessarily; you may still have the same management.

WITNESS.—That is, the Guardians for Banbridge could still—

Mr. MURKIN.—Administer the Poor Law in their own particular area.

WITNESS.—Following up that question, would it be intended that, although the Banbridge Workhouse would be closed as a residence for old people, still the buildings would be used for other purposes.

Mr. MURKIN.—That would be a matter for consideration. When we put a question you must not infer anything by it more than that we want to get the views of local people on the subject. You must not

Jan. 23, 1891.

Mr. Arthur Atkinson.

Mr. Ro-
Fryer.

Jan. 15, 1904.

Mr. Robert
Fryer.

take it that because I throw out the suggestion that one workhouse would be enough I have any fixed idea on the subject.

Witness.—My Council are not in favour of closing any of the institutions.

11748. Then you don't agree with the County Council, because the Council are say some of the houses might be closed?—As far as I know the opinion of my Council they do not.

11749. CHAIRMAN.—Is there any change at all you would suggest?—They would support the proposition put forward by the County Council of taking the Co. Down part of the Lurgan Union.

11750. Keeping the counties together?—Keeping the counties together, they think the final arrangements could be more easily managed.

11751. Mr. MURKIN.—Could you suggest any improvement in the way of economy by retaking the present workhouses and existing staffs?

CHAIRMAN.—Suppose, for instance, Banbridge were selected as the county workhouse, would you be in favour of closing up all the rest?—My Council were not in favour of closing up any workhouse. The particular question you asked me was not put before my Council.

11752. Would Banbridge be in a fairly central position to act as the county workhouse?—Yes, it would; and it is very favourably situated with regard to railways; we have direct communication with Newry, Belfast, and Ballymore, which is being extended to Newcastle, Downpatrick, and Newtownards, and we would be connected with almost every portion of the Co. Down.

11753. Except Killead, which is connected with no place?—No; and is hid behind the mountains. There was one point my Council was very unanimous about, and that was that there should be a sanatorium for consumptives. All the newspapers in our district would be anxious for that.

11754. And if no workhouse was suitable they think some good place in the Mourne or other district should be selected?—They do; they were strong on that point.

11755. Mr. MURKIN.—Did they express a choice as regards an auxiliary asylum or asylum proper?—They did not; that was not discussed.

11756. Have you any suggestion to make on the subject of tramps?—My Council thought the tramp nuisance was a thing that should be suppressed if it could possibly be done, and they were in favour of taking the children of persons known to be tramps away from them. These children are being trained and brought up in the habits of their parents—they think tramping is just a habit; and if the children could be taken from the parents it would be a good thing.

11757. You would be in favour of giving the Guardians power of taking children from dissolute parents?—That is confined to the case of tramps.

11758. CHAIRMAN.—Not in the case of dissolute people who go into the workhouse?—That was not considered.

11759. Would you make any distinction?—It would be liable to abuse.

11760. Would you approve of the reservation that was discussed by Mr. Johnston, that if people were dissatisfied they would have a right to go to petty sessions

for an order upstopping the decision?—That might be a check; but it would not be sufficient.

11761. Mr. MURKIN.—You don't think the Guardians are very anxious to get the care of these children if they could avoid it?

CHAIRMAN.—They would only act from a sense of conscientious duty?—I dare say they would.

11762. Mr. MURKIN.—Is it not the inclination of the Guardians to get rid of the children as much as possible?—Yes, it should be. I am not a Guardian. My Council were strongly of opinion that the present area of taking—union taking—should be continued.

11763. CHAIRMAN.—I should be very much surprised if they had any other opinion?—They think the poor, when they become destitute, come into towns like Banbridge, and the towns are supporting to a large extent the poor of the rural districts. They think it would not be fair to make the towns alone support them.

11764. We had very interesting evidence in Belfast. One view put before us was that if a strict account could be taken it would be found that the town benefited by the services of these people, even if they ultimately become destitute and fell on the rates. Would you agree with that, when you consider the money these people spend in the town?—These people, as long as they are useful members of the community, and able to give service, stay in the country, but once they become destitute they drift into the town and look for support.

11765. You are speaking of agricultural labourers chiefly?—I am speaking of people who get out-door relief. They will be living in the town of Banbridge, for instance.

11766. These people who get out-door relief who are living in the town are really not real residents of the town, but who came in recently?—Yes.

11767. Under the old state of things would these persons get out-door relief and be charged on the electoral division of Banbridge?—Yes. The particular instance that came up in Mr. Johnston's evidence rather astonished that. In the rural electoral division of Londonderry, where the epidemic broke out, when the rating exceeded a certain amount the town came to its relief.

11768. Every part of the nation?—In an urban district, where the valuation is large, they would have more trouble and expense.

11769. Mr. MURKIN.—The rural Guardians complain that they suffer a disadvantage by the change. They say town Guardians gather together and vote the grant, while they have to pay for it?—I don't see how that can be; because Banbridge has only five out of sixty-two Guardians. They could easily out-vote us.

11770. But whatever is the cause, the fact remains that out-door relief has increased since the passing of the Act?—I think that would be due more to the lowering of the electorate.

11771. CHAIRMAN.—More people to advocate particular cases for out-door relief?—A Guardian is more amenable to canvassing for out-door relief for particular persons.

Mr. Johnston.—There is a 1940c misapprehension. As a matter of fact paupers must have lived four years out of five before any out-door relief given to them could be charged on a particular division; consequently the drifting into towns did not increase the town rates.

Mr. JAMES McILROY examined.

Mr. James
McIlroy

11772. CHAIRMAN.—You have heard the views of your Chairman. Is there anything you would like to add as regards keeping the workhouse in Banbridge?—I endorse the views of the County Council, that there might be fewer workhouses.

11773. But you think Banbridge, owing to its situation, is a desirable centre for a workhouse, no matter what other one is closed?—I do; I think it would be a great hardship for the manufacturing towns round Banbridge, Downpatrick, and Gilford, if it was closed; and the friends of the inmates would have to go a greater distance to see them. My own opinion is, that I don't think the workhouses would accommodate, under the present sanitary arrangements, the numbers that are set down for them.

11774. They would not; you are quite right?—I think that itself is misleading.

11775. The Commissioners are quite alive to that?—If paupers were taken away ten miles to another workhouse, it would only entail additional expense on the friends who might wish to see them, and the staff would have to be increased in the other workhouse; and I don't think it would lessen the expense.

11776. Mr. MURKIN.—Don't you think an average workhouse in Down would accommodate from 300 to 400?—They might do that.

11777. That is the present number of the infirm class in Down?—They might do that.

Mr. G. B. McCoswell examined.

Jan. 13, 1904.

Mr. G. B.
McCoswell

I am a Guardian for the Rural District of Gifford, which is coextensive with the township of Gifford; and I am also a Town Commissioner, but my powers are very limited. I may say I am in general agreement with the views of the County Council; and I certainly say that the unions should be coextensive with the county. I think it would be a very wise thing to include the seven electoral divisions at present in the Lurgan Union with the Banbridge Union, and that the four electoral divisions in the Co. Armagh, round about Tandragee, should go to Armagh—possibly two to Lurgan and two to Armagh. But that is a question for the Co. Armagh people.

11778. Dr. BROOKS.—How far is the most remote part of the district which would be joined, from Banbridge, of the seven Lurgan divisions?—I should say it would be seven English miles. And they might suffer a little hardship; but on the other hand there is another portion that comes within two and a quarter or three miles of Banbridge.

11779. CHAIRMAN.—Even if there were an emergency case, in which it would be a hardship for a person to be taken from within a very short distance of Lurgan to Banbridge, owing to an accident, do you think it would be a wise thing to have a legal provision that the expense of such a person brought to the nearest hospital should be charged to the union from which he came?—Yes, I think so.

11780. If you got these seven divisions, and if a man met with a very bad accident, and it was a question of his bleeding to death?—Drive him into Lurgan, of course, and charge it to Banbridge.

11781. That would practically meet all questions of inconvenience and hardship?—I think so.

11782. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you agree with the County Council as regards lessening the number of workhouses in the county?—I am hardly prepared to go into that question, though from my knowledge of them I think it would be a hardship that any of them should be suppressed. But I would rather fall in with the idea that if any alteration were made at all they should be all abolished except one, supposing the Guardians would retain their power each over their own union.

11783. You would be in favour of boarding out all the children?—Certainly.

11784. You would be in favour of having the lunatics sent to the asylum or an auxiliary asylum?—I would; and I would strongly favour harmless lunatics being sent to a place where they would be away from these institutions in which violent lunatics are confined.

11785. Some witnesses have suggested that it would be well to have arrangements that mothers of illegitimate babies should be sent to a reformatory or some place free from workhouse contamination?—I think

that would be a very good thing; it would give them a chance again.

11786. If the sick and other classes were taken care of there would remain 300 or 400 infirm to provide for?—Yes.

11787. Don't you think provision could be made for them in one of the workhouses?—Yes; I think your figures are very strong. The only objection is that an old person going into that institution would be very far from his friends; and although their friends may not visit them frequently they are kept in touch with them by the visits of local Guardians. I know local Guardians are very good in that way.

11788. There are other advantages. If this class were put in an institution by themselves they could be better taken care of?—Yes; and their surroundings could be broadened by books and papers. The only objection I see is the one I have mentioned.

11789. Do you not think the advantage would more than compensate for that?—The suggestion is a very strong one. I am hardly prepared to say so.

11790. Travelling arrangements make it practicable here?—Yes. I am strongly in favour, so far as out-door relief is concerned, of going back to the old system of divisional rating. I rather think the Guardians are somewhat profuse in this union in giving out-door relief, and by returning to the old system of divisional rating you put such division on its heels. If we were rather niggardly in giving out-door relief I should be in favour of union rating; but I am more in favour of divisional rating when I see there is that relief under the Act of 1875.

11791. CHAIRMAN.—That does not affect out-door; it applied to in-door relief?—I may say I totally disagree with Mr. Fryer, in thinking the towns would suffer by old people, once they become destitute, coming in and asking out-door relief, because I find in Gifford, which amounts largely to a manufacturing town—I find that families come there to get employment, and perhaps the father will be a pretty good man, and he will give his employment for what it is worth for some time, until he becomes infirm and destitute, and in the meantime his family has grown up, and some have children of their own; and I am sorry to say I find there is a lamentable lack of spirit on the part of the children supporting their parents, and these are the cases that I refer to; I find a lamentable lack of kindness in supporting their aged parents. Mr. McMaster, chairman of the Town Commissioners, asked me to apologise for not being able to come to-day; but I think his views will be in accordance with mine.

Mr. Wallace.—The only other witness I have is one of our relieving officers, who thinks he can give some assistance in putting an end to the tramp nuisance.

Mr. G. B. McCoswell further examined.

I would be strongly in favour of a change in the law that would enable us to give supplemental relief; and I believe that is the best way to give out-door relief.

11792. CHAIRMAN.—You would be in favour of removing destitution as the test and putting deserving poverty?—Yes.

11793. That would be an old-age pension scheme?—Really? In that spirit!

11794. Do you think that ought to be confused with

a question of hard-and-fast Poor Law relief for destitute people?—In view of the fact that I don't think it is likely we are going to get old-age pensions, and in many of the cases in which we give out-door relief we might be legally overcharged, though we should not be morally overcharged, I think there should be a change in the law.

11795. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you think the rates could bear the strain?—I don't think, if the law were changed, it would make much difference in this union.

Mr. SAMUEL BECK examined.

I live a short distance out of the town of Drogheda.

11796. How far is that from here?—Eight stations miles. Occasionally tramps call on me, and I meet them in the most friendly manner. I say, "I am glad to see you; come in, and I will give you something to eat, and then give you some work." I take them out into the field, and I say, "I will pay you by results"; and in about an hour's time I find they have gone and left the tools.

11797. That is a confiding thing?—They would be too heavy for them to take. And I have two beds in the loft, if they come late.

11798. Do you find many who put in a day's work?—They never do more than an hour's work.

11799. You kill them with kindness?—It has always succeeded with me. I would suggest that in each police station the police should keep a book, and any bona fide workman or woman calling on the police, the police should give them a pass to wherever they wish to go, and, passing a workhouse, they should be taken in and kindly treated; and any person going from one place to another without a pass I would bring them up before the magistrates.

11800. Your idea is rather good about putting them

3 G 2

Ans. 12, 1904.

Mr. Samuel
Parks.

to work. Then every relieving officer should have a small piece of ground to employ tramps on?—Unless he had ground, how could he test them in the line of work? I test them to perfection, and it has a grand effect on them.

11801. You have been trying that for a long time?—I have tried it thirty years, and it has a grand effect; and I send no tramp in here except under a doctor's certificate.

11802. What they come to you for is an order of admission?—I say I am glad to see them—"I have plenty of work for you"—and I give them a meal's meat first and give them a tool in their hand, and after a while they look all round them and take the nearest way out.

11803. Mr. MURPHY.—Could you not get your colleagues to adopt the same method?—He lives in the town here, and has no ground.

11804. Could he not take them up to the workhouse and test them?—He would not have time to do so.

11805. Could not the master do it?—The master has his hands full with thirty or forty tramps in the morning. The Guardians could never deal with them the way the police could. In the case of a person *bona fide*

looking for work, and going from one place to another, I would be kind and good to that person and assist him. Dr. BRIGGS.—How many of that class do you test?

11806. CHAIRMAN.—There are a large number of persons who have to change about?—There is no doubt there are honest persons among the tramps, but they come into town here; so many of them don't come to me.

11807. Do you see many passing through Downside who are honest, well-intentioned workmen?—They all look well side to work.

11808. Do you see many tradesmen or bona fide labourers who are anxious for work?—They would ask you for work, but when you test them they won't work. In my opinion there are a few, but not very many. A fortnight ago I met a man on the road. He asked me could he get any work; that he had been working on the railway, and the work was slack, and he wanted to go to work at a new railway in Armagh. He stayed with me for a fortnight sinking weeds. He was a first-class man, and he said, "Now the new year is I will go to the railway work. He had about 2s. a day, and I gave him a free bed."

Mr. J. C. MAGINNIS, Tanderagee, examined.

Mr. J. C.
Maginnis.

11809. CHAIRMAN.—You were examined in Armagh, and your view was that the Co. Armagh portion of this Union should go to the Armagh Union. That is very strongly held by the residents?—Yes; and also that we should have divisional rating or dispensary rating.

11810. For what purpose?—Outdoor relief and the sick.

11811. You would not approve of putting the expense of the sick on a larger area than it is?—I quite agree with having a central workhouse for the whole county, where the number would not exceed 300 to 400, and give outdoor relief to those who should get it, and board out the children. If outdoor relief is given on a division that division is accountable for that, and the division will soon bring these particular Guardians to book. Our old rate for the five divisions for the three and a half years previous to the passing of the Act was 7½d.; since we became a union-at-large charge it is 10-4-6d. If we belonged to the union of Armagh our division would have saved £200 a year. If we had divisional charges we would have saved £400 a year. We are supposed to get a grant of £340, and yet we get none of the grant for our division, because we have to pay 550 odd to make up the deficiency. The old rate was 7½d.; the half of that was given back on the rural portions by the landlord, so the agricultural portion was paying 3½d. Now they are paying 7d., and they are supposed to get a portion of the agricultural grant; but the agricultural portion of our division has benefited nothing by the agricultural grant; we have to pay about 280 odd over and above our old amount.

11812. You are not benefited by the change in the law?—No; but I believe it will be a step in the right direction to have dispensary or divisional rating for outdoor relief. I don't think it will make much difference about those who are inside. I agree in having a central place for the infirm. If we have an accident at Tanderagee, that case can be brought to Armagh; and yet it is out of the way to bring a pauper, who can be brought by train or conveyance. And, also, the greater part of our division is nearer Armagh than Banbridge.

11813. How far are the borders of Armagh near Scarva from Armagh city?—Twelve miles, probably.

11814. Dr. BRIGGS.—Is that the most remote part that you wish added on?—Yes.

11815. CHAIRMAN.—What is the distance between Banbridge and the most remote part of the Co. Armagh portion of the union?—Probably about the same thing. If you take the central part of our division, as the crow flies, it is only about a couple of miles distance. The greater weight of the population is on the Armagh side.

11816. Mr. MURPHY.—How are the railway facilities?—Any part of the outlying district near Scarva can be either brought to Scarva station or by Portadown—two ways. I certainly think there should be restrictions on the tramps. The idea of getting a relief ticket from the sergeant of police and having a registration of the person he is giving it to would be a check on them.

11817. Mr. Wallace.—You say you have been paying £200 a year more monthly?—Our rate was 7½d. before the passing of the Act, and since the passing of the Act it is about 10d.

11818. Do you attribute that to your connection with the Banbridge Union or to the working of the Local Government Act?—I attribute it to both.

11819. In your calculation do you take into account the fact that you had an epidemic that cost the union of Banbridge £1,200?—I have taken into account that that epidemic made no difference in that year's rating.

11820. Do you know how much in the £ it would mean over the whole valuation?—I cannot say.

11821. I believe it would be about 2½d. in the £. If you had been as you were before how much would come off the Tanderagee district?—I have just been informed that is provided for under the safety valve in the Act of 1876. We would have saved fully £400 a year for five years, and if we had paid for this epidemic we would have had £200 to the good.

11822. So if you had been away from the Banbridge people you would have saved £400 a year?—Yes; I should say the epidemic was an accident.

Mr. MURPHY.—Anyhow you would wish your portion to be taken to Armagh, and the Banbridge people wish to give you up, so there is no question at issue between you.

Dr. TAYLOR examined.

Dr. Taylor.

I wish to tender any evidence that may be useful to you with regard to the relationship between the Tanderagee Dispensary District from a medical point of view.

11823. CHAIRMAN.—Is your district altogether in the Co. Armagh?—All together.

11824. Are you the doctor for the whole of the Armagh portion of the Banbridge Union?—Yes.

11825. You have no public appointment in the Co. Armagh—no other dispensary district?—No; here is a map (produced) which shows you the density of the population and the relative distances.

11826. Would your view be in favour of the transfer?—Yes.

11827. You agree with the Guardians and your own District Council that the transfer of the Tanderagee Rural District would be beneficial?—It would, undoubtedly. All the urgent cases that I have of accidents and had surgical cases are treated, with the exception of the very poorest, by Dr. Palmer. I have often five or six patients in the county infirmary; and the people prefer going there.

11828. And patients that would not be cases for the

Jan. 12, 1904.

Dr. Taylor.

infirmary—do you think there would be any considerable hardship to the sick in sending them to Armagh rather than to Banbridge?—It means the same thing. With a proper ambulance they could be as easily removed to one as to the other.

11829. Is it immaterial to a person whether he is carried five or six miles further when once he is in the ambulance?—Yes.

11830. Dr. Brogan.—Provided the ambulance is good?—Yes.

11831. A four-wheeler?—They have got one here now. I am rather sorry to leave Banbridge, for I had a great deal of trouble to get it.

11832. Is there much consumption in your district?—A great deal. I had a very small death-rate last year—twenty deaths; but there were seven of those from tubercular disease. I think it would be the greatest boon to people if we had a sanatorium that all cases could go to who could not afford to go to one themselves.

11833. Have you been medical officer of the district long?—Twenty-five years.

11834. Do you notice any increase in the death-rate of consumption?—For a time there was a lull; but within the last two or three years there has been, I think, an increased proportion. For about five or six years we had a great lull.

11835. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose you are aware that a great many operations in the county infirmary are tubercular surgery?—I send them a great many tubercular cases and cases of bone disease.

11836. Dr. Brogan.—Do you isolate your cases of pulmonary tuberculosis?—As far as possible.

11837. CHAIRMAN.—Is it possible?—It is not possible in the country. For the last twenty years I have been trying to enforce on them the necessity for the destruction of spits. We are now in the way of improving their dwellings; and I think perhaps that has a great deal to do with it.

11838. Dr. Brogan.—Was the typhoid epidemic in your district?—Yes.

11839. Did you find out the cause?—Water; the accidental erosion of a pipe.

11840. CHAIRMAN.—Have you not some cases in hospital at present from that district?—Yes; very remarkable cases indeed. We had, in 1890 and 1881, an epidemic of 226 cases of typhoid fever in the village

of Tandragee connected with the water supply of the mills. Two or three of these cases occurred in a house from which patients who were sick were removed. A second family lived in this house, and in 1887 typhoid fever again occurred.

11841. Dr. Brogan.—Did the first family remain in the house all the time?—No; they had left for some time; and then the next family came in, and they took it at that time. I told them not to use this water, which I considered was dangerous.

11842. CHAIRMAN.—Was it pipe or well water?—Well water. It is in the middle of the demense, and the ground is saturated with animal matter, which would be likely to feed the bacilli. This family came to the house about two or three months ago, and although their neighbours told them at the time that I had forbidden their predecessors to use the water they used it, with the result that these two cases have so far occurred, and probably more.

11843. Dr. Brogan.—Would it not be a good thing to get the sanitary authority to close up the well?—It is not a public well. It is not exactly a well; it is a running stream that there is a hole in.

11844. CHAIRMAN.—It is a place for watering cattle?—I think not; it is in the demense.

11845. Are there any cattle in the demense?—I don't think they can get there. It has not been used since 1887. It is in a larch wood; a cover for pheasants.

11846. Mr. MURKIN.—Could you not cover it in?—You would have to cover the whole stream.

11847. Dr. Brogan.—Is there any other good water supply convenient?—There is; the neighbours would have given them water. But this man said it looked beautiful water, and he had often drunk worse. The epidemic at Lourdes was a matter no person could have foreseen. A few years before it occurred this water was analysed and gave an exceptionally good analysis. It was an iron pipe conveying the water. It passed near a sewer and happened to be eroded; it passed through a stableyard of Mr. Synnott's. About eight months previously the coachman and one of the stable helpers took typhoid fever, and I believe that supplied the bacilli. It was very interesting medically; the outbreak covered an area of twenty-five square miles.

Mr. Wallcut.—The Banbridge Board of Guardians have considered the County Council report, and have substantially adopted it, with such variations as you have heard in the evidence to-day.

The Sitting was adjourned.

Jan. 14, 1904. TWENTY-FOURTH PUBLIC SITTING.—THURSDAY, JANUARY 14TH, 1904.

At the Courthouse, Newry.

Present:—Mr. MEUKS (Chairman), Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. E. COWY BIGGER.

Mr. Alexander Gortlan appeared for the Newry Board of Guardians.

Mr. F. B. Wallace appeared for the Banbridge Board of Guardians.

Mr. Gortlan.—I appear for the Guardians of the Newry Union. I am their solicitor, and I need not tell you that we will facilitate in every way your duties. Mr. Small attended at Armagh and gave you

fully his views, and if you wish him to add anything to the statement he then made, he will be glad to do so. The Chairman of the Board of Guardians here is Rathfriland, and Mr. Toman is a very busy man and not able to attend. We have, however, the Vice-Chairman here, and we have the clerk of the union, and Dr. Martin.

Mr. JOHN McEVoy examined.

11848. Mr. Gortlan.—You are the Vice-Chairman of the Newry Guardians?—Yes.

11849. And I think you are also Chairman of the Rural District Council, Newry No. 1?—Yes, the Co. Down part.

11850. How long have you been connected with the Guardians?—Six years.

11851. And you have been a Guardian during all that time?—Yes.

11852. Have you any suggestions to make to the Commissioners for improving the system?—I would be greatly in favour of an amalgamation of unions. I think at the present time there is ample accommodation in any one union to accommodate the inmates almost of three unions, as far as I can see—two anyhow. Besides I think it would be a great advantage to the ratepayers.

11853. You think it would be more economical?—I think it would.

11854. Killeel is a very small union?—Yes.

11855. It is bounded between the sea and the mountains?—Yes.

11856. And, as we know, the number of inmates is very small. In your opinion, would it be desirable to amalgamate Killeel with Newry?—I believe so; amalgamate it with Newry and Downpatrick.

11857. That is going south from this. The Union of Newry extends also near Banbridge?—Yes, within five miles of it.

11858. In your opinion would it be desirable to extend the Newry Union by taking off a portion from Banbridge?—My opinion is that Banbridge Union should be dissolved also. It is a very long narrow union; scattered very much. I think portion of it might go into Armagh and another portion goes close to Downpatrick. I think it would be very convenient indeed to be put into Downpatrick, and the other portion might go into Lough, and by doing so it would be to the advantage of the ratepayers, and I think there would be no inconvenience to the Guardians to attend, nor to the sick poor. All these divisions are within five miles of Newry.

11859. Your idea, of course, would be to make Newry the centre for all that district?—Yes, extending into the Co. Armagh; that was inquired into at Armagh.

CHAIRMAN.—We had all that before.

11860. Mr. Gortlan.—Have you any other suggestions to make for improvements?—There are a good deal of little things that I might suggest. Insane people, I believe, should be removed to the asylum, but there are some of these people that, for my own part, I should not like to have removed from their native unions—that is the imbeciles, or harmless lunatics.

11861. Assuming Killeel is dissolved as a workhouse, would it, in your opinion, be possible to utilize it in any way?—Sanatoria are greatly looked after at the present time, and it might be utilized for one.

11862. How would you propose to deal with Banbridge Workhouse?—I should think that Banbridge, or a portion of it, might be utilized for a district hospital.

11863. The remaining portion could be used as an auxiliary asylum?—Some other useful business. I cannot say what it should be used for.

11854. What do you say about boarding-out the inmates in workhouses?—I don't think I would go for that.

11855. CHAIRMAN.—Do you mean children or grown up?—I would board out children, or I would send them out to schools, that is children under fourteen years of age; but able-bodied inmates or old people I would not board out at all. I think you could not get them boarded out.

11856. Mr. Gortlan.—Is it not the fact that the Newry Board were the first in the North of Ireland to send out children?—I don't know whether they were the first in the North of Ireland.

11857. At any rate they were early in the field. What about the imbeciles?—If they were insane people I would send them on to the asylum, but there are a class of imbeciles that I think it would be a hardship to move them away. They are quite satisfied when they get their bit of food, and it would be a hardship to take them away from their people.

11858. Then, in your opinion, they should be kept in the same place as the other paupers. You have a great deal of trouble with tenants?—We have; but the very fact of dissolving the Banbridge Union would be a means of doing away with them, for it is on the boundary between Newry and Rathfriland, and it is an easy lodging-house for them. It might help to dissipate them a little.

11859. Another matter is the desirability of pauper paying who are able to pay for the relief they get in the workhouse?—I think that is a very good system. Paupers become sick by accident or something else and are not fit to support themselves, but still they are able to pay a little, and when they are taken into the union, I think the Guardians should have power to charge these paupers even more than the average.

11860. That is the average cost of maintenance?—Yes.

11861. There is no hospital for infectious diseases in this union except the workhouse?—No.

11862. There has been a great difficulty experienced in recovering payment even from men who were well-do for their maintenance in the hospital?—Yes; we had some bother with that before, and there are some of these people well able to pay.

11863. And I believe they would not pay?—Yes; they found out that the Guardians could only charge the average maintenance.

11864. You would be in favour of their being allowed to charge these people according to their circumstances?—Yes.

11865. Such a sum as would cover the cost of maintenance, and also a fair proportion of the doctor's salary and other officials?—Quite so; that would be my idea. There is just one thing in connection with the attendance of Guardians that I think might be amended. Some Guardians don't give a good attendance. A six months' limit is too long. Two attendances in the year would qualify a man to sit.

11866. CHAIRMAN.—But his constituents would call him to account for that perhaps?—But it takes three

Mr. John McEvoy.

year to bring that about. I think that might be absorbed to some degree. It is scarcely fair to the constituents or to the Board, more especially in the case of one-door relief.

11877. Do you find there are too many Guardians?—I suppose a great deal less would do the business just as well, but representation is a good thing.

11878. You don't think business is impeded by the number?—I would not say so. I think the Guardians might have more discretionary power in the matter of taking children from certain parents. We have often cases of parents who neglect their children, and I think in a great many cases the Guardians should have power to take away the children.

11879. You would increase the Guardians' power to take away children from parents who cannot bring them up properly?—Yes; after proper discussion and inquiry.

11880. We had that explained at Banbridge yesterday, and one Guardian suggested that that might work badly. The facts might not be fully before the Guardians when they passed their resolution, and a suggestion was made that it would be a good thing if the parent had power to appeal to the Justices at Petty Sessions to have a review of the case—would you be in favour of that?—I would be in favour of the review of any case; very often facts are not brought out properly in the first instance. I have many times thought it a great hardship to let children remain with some of these parents, particularly of the tramp class, for they are trained up to the same life their parents are leading.

11881. Have you any views about unions being confined to particular counties. Do you think the Armagh part of your union ought to be taken away from you, or do you think a union can just as well remain in different counties?—I think so. I never saw any difficulty in that business. I would rather not give an opinion.

11882. Mr. MURKIN.—Guardians elsewhere have complained of the unfairness of allowing other counties, having the richer portions of their territories, depriving the poorer portions of their help for Poor Law purposes. Do you think it would be well, where it could be done without hardship, for every county to be self-contained, that is to say, that the Poor Law administration of the county should be in the hands of the people of the county. Would you approve of that as a general system?—As a general system it might work better, but I never studied the business. I never thought of it.

Mr. Gordon.—As a matter of fact our workhouse is in the Co. Armagh, while the whole of the town is in the Co. Down.

CHAIRMAN.—The boundary is just between the workhouse and the town.

Mr. Gordon.—It is. This is a case in which it would be very hard for you to confine it to the county, because it could not be decided in which county it should be.

11883. Mr. MURKIN.—Your District Council deal four workhouses are required in the county?—Yes; that is the prevailing opinion with all the people.

11884. The County Council think three would be enough; could you not go a little farther in that respect. The number of inmates in the county is 400; do you not think that one institution would be sufficient to accommodate 400?—I would not like to give any opinion on that.

11885. What we want to get at is a real reform, not a patch-up business. Don't you think one of your workhouses could accommodate 400 inmates?—I am sure it could accommodate them, but it would be very difficult for the Guardians and such like, and for the removal of the poor to it. I believe that would be the only drawback to it.

11886. As regards the management, it could be left to it. The Guardians might still continue to perform their duty as now. Suppose there was left in the institution where workhouses are now a hospital for the sick; and a system of boarding-out the children provided; the lunatics provided for in an asylum or military asylum; the mothers excluded, then you would have only one class, the infirm. If an institution for this class was provided in the county, where these old people could be better provided for, and have

better attention, and classification at no more cost to the ratepayers, don't you think such a change would recommend itself to the ratepayers?—I believe it would help to cut down the rates.

11887. Not only cut down the rates but benefit the poor?—It would be a long stretch over the whole county for one institution.

11888. Is not Down well served with railways?—Very badly at this end.

11889. You have good roads?—Yes; but you have not good railway accommodation from here to Downpatrick.

11890. The people in Banbridge say they have excellent railway facilities there?—So they have, a great deal better.

11891. Do you think the asylum at Downpatrick will accommodate all the idiots and weak-minded in the county?—I don't know whether it will or not, but it is the place for lunatics.

11892. You think the present system of rating satisfactory?—I would be in favour of union rating; a great many are in favour of it. The electoral division I represent myself, if we had district rating, it would be a great deal better for them, for they have very little poor from it; however, I think it is the fairest way to have union rating. The poor belong to the people all over.

11893. And I suppose very often they have to come from the country into town?—Very often they do.

11894. Mr. Wallace.—Would it be in order for me to ask a question. I appear for the Banbridge Board of Guardians. The Newry Board of Guardians have already, in their opinion, practically dissolved the Banbridge Board of Guardians. They have wiped us out altogether, but before they were finally dissolved the Guardians thought it better to put in an appearance. You are fairly well acquainted with the Banbridge Union district?—I know the district as far as Banbridge, and some places beyond.

11895. And you have just said there is very bad railway accommodation into Newry?—From Banbridge? To Downpatrick, I said.

11896. Are you anxious when you say that Newry would be a very convenient and central place for a workhouse for the entire Banbridge district?—Not for the entire.

11897. What part of it?—Any portion of it lying at this side of the town of Banbridge.

11898. You would not go further than Banbridge?—I would not lay off the districts myself; but it is my own opinion.

11899. Do you know how much is that part that you would like to take in?—I think there are three divisions, known as Scarva, Glashmore, and Anneslee.

11900. Most part of Scarva is in the Co. Armagh?—Yes.

11901. And you think Newry would be suitable for that?—Yes.

11902. How would you deal with the portion in Drogheda?—I would not think of taking that; I would send it to Lisburn.

11903. That is, you would send people from Drogheda, in the Co. Down, about ten miles into the Co. Antrim, to Lisburn?—It would not be too far; we have divisions in Newry lying out ten statute miles.

11904. CHAIRMAN.—How far is Drogheda from Banbridge?

Mr. Wallace.—Six Irish miles.

CHAIRMAN.—How far is Drogheda from Lisburn?

Mr. Wallace.—Ten statute miles.

Witness.—There would be only about a mile of difference.

11906. Mr. Wallace.—Do you know the Banbridge Union extends to Ballynure and Leitrim. Would Newry serve that?—I think Anneslee would not be too far to come to Newry.

11907. How would you get a person from Ballynure to Newry?—Send the ambulances for them. It is not more than seven or eight Irish miles from here.

11908. Don't you know that from Ballynure and Keshbridge they can get into Banbridge in a few minutes by rail?—I do.

11909. And you think that district could be better served by coming in by ambulance to Newry?—Some of them might be nearer to Banbridge; but this point is the saving to the ratepayers.

Jan 14, 1904.
Mr. John
McEvoy.

Dr. S. E. MARTIN examined.

Jan. 14, 1904.

Dr. S. E.
Martin.

11909. Mr. Garfield.—You are Medical Officer for the workhouse?—Yes; upwards of twenty-six years.

11910. You, of course, know the union intimately?—I know the workhouse.

11911. And the people who come there?—Yes.

11912. In your opinion could some of these unions be dissolved? Have you accommodation in the workhouse here for far more inmates than there are at present in it?—I don't think there is anything like the accommodation there is supposed to be. In the last fact newspaper that I was reading last night it was said that the accommodation at present in Newry was for 985, and the number of inmates was 285. I think if the master had to provide accommodation for the difference between 285 and 985 he would have great difficulty, at present, in the Newry Workhouse.

11913. CHAIRMAN.—What do you think you would have room for—what is your fair space?—I don't suppose we would have accommodation for more than 500.

11914. Mr. Garfield.—Supposing the workhouse was to be relieved of a great number of these inmates and tramps and children, with accommodation for 500 don't you think you could suit the requirements of a much larger district than you serve at present?—Certainly.

11915. The workhouse was burned down some time ago and was rebuilt?—Yes; but that would not increase the accommodation.

11916. No; but was not the workhouse built on the most modern system?—It was on a modern system.

11917. It has been suggested here that Kilkeld and Banbridge would be the two unions that should be amalgamated or dissolved. What do you think about that?—My own opinion is that they could be dissolved.

11918. Would you suggest that Kilkeld should be divided between Newry and Downpatrick, and Banbridge between Newry and Lisburn?—You should divide the district so that they would take the most convenient unions on either side.

11919. Supposing that was done, how would you suggest Kilkeld should be utilised?—It would all depend on what is going to be done with the lunatics. If they are not to be taken to the asylum of the county then I think Kilkeld would make a very good auxiliary lunatic asylum; if they are all to be transferred to the asylum Kilkeld would make a good sanatorium.

11920. What would you do with my friend Mr. Wallace's clients—would you suggest Banbridge should be made a district hospital?—They certainly should have a hospital there for urgent cases.

11921. What do you say about this question of boarding out inmates?—I think the children should be removed from the workhouse altogether—either send them to Banbridge or board them out.

11922. CHAIRMAN.—From your experience of the treatment of children in workhouses, would you rather have them in an institution or boarded out in the country?—I think if there was a central institution I would as soon have them there as boarded out.

11923. Why?—They would be under better management. You run a risk in sending a child out, in my opinion; you don't know everything connected with the person to whom you are sending the child.

11924. Does not every child run a risk of having a negligent or careless parent?—If it was in a central institution, with people to watch over it, I think they would be better off than separately boarded through the country.

11925. Do you speak of their physical health or fitness for after-life occupation?—Both.

11926. Do you think the health of children in an institution is as good as the health of children outside?—No, certainly not; I believe the open air of the country would be better for a child as regards health.

11927. As regards fitness for work in after-life, do you think an institution-reared child is as useful and handy and intelligent as a child reared up in a family and taught to take its little share of work from youth?—Not as you put it; I think it would be better in a family.

11928. Then why do you prefer an institution to home life?—Because I think you would have a difficulty in getting a sufficient number of people to take these children.

11929. If you could get a sufficient number of people?—That I would be in favour of it.

11930. Mr. Garfield.—I believe there is no hospital in Newry for infectious diseases other than the workhouse?—No.

11931. The result is, that when there is any outbreak of small-pox or any other disease they are all sent into you?—They are; at least those who go to hospital are.

11932. Don't you think it is a hardship on the present system that the parties that are able to pay cannot be made, under these circumstances? Have you not had cases, particularly of small-pox—sent to do merchants in the town who sent their families there, and afterwards refused to pay what the Guardians thought would represent the full amount of the treatment? Do you not think there ought to be some charge made in the law as regards that?—I do.

11933. To enable Guardians to charge in their discretion what they think proper?—Yes.

11934. Mr. Garfield.—You remember the case too where the county court judge threw out a doubt whether the Guardians were justified in receiving people of means?

CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Small mentioned this case.

Witness.—I heard about that case. It was a question whether they should be admitted to the hospital or not.

11935. Mr. Garfield.—Would you suggest the house should be sent to an asylum?—I think it would be much better to send them to an asylum than to an asylum.

11936. Mr. MURKIN.—Why?—I think they would be better treated. The asylum is the place for lunatics.

11937. The standard of treatment would be pretty much as in an asylum?—That would alter my opinion. But then the auxiliary asylum would be practically an asylum.

11938. An auxiliary asylum, with a large amount of land, on which these men could be employed, the cost not very much larger than in the workhouse—don't you think that would be very much better?—I think two asylums would be better than one in the county.

11939. You think it is not well to have a large number of people congregated together?—I do.

11940. Of course, in any change that is to be made care will be taken that proper provision is made for the sick of the different localities, and the question we put in regard to the removal of workhouse has no relation to the case of the sick in the future?—That is the reason I say I think some provision should be made for acute cases in Banbridge or Kilkeld.

11941. As there are only 350 to 400 of the aged and infirm in the Co. Down, don't you think an institution for the county would be sufficient to accommodate that number—see any Newry could accommodate 600?—That is of the sick and infirm.

11942. Not the sick; the aged and infirm—the chronic old cases?—Yes, I think one institution would be sufficient for these; there would be no danger in transferring them. Of course it would be a distance; but we have the difficulty, at present, in the Newry Union. Away beyond Rathfriland they have to be brought here.

11943. And you foresee no hardship in such a reform as that?—No except one of sentiment: of people being taken away from their own locality.

11944. Don't you think there would be the practical advantage that these people could be put in a house to themselves where they could be better treated, and better looked after?—I do; but I think there would be a difficulty in getting them to come into a place like that.

11945. If they are absolutely destitute they would be bound to go. What is your view of out-door relief?—I have never been very favourably disposed to it; I have not gone into it very deeply. I don't think the advantages are altogether equal in the expenditure.

11946. There are a large number of children in the Newry Workhouse. Thirty-six on the list below, but it was made a year ago?—A good many of these would be infants.

11947. You would be in favour of boarding out all children you could get proper homes for?—I would be in favour of consolidating—getting the different classes into different places, where they could be better taken care of. The Newry Workhouse is a jumble of everything—a sanatorium, a hospital, a National school, children's nursery, and lunatic asylum. But one of those can be brought up to the proper pitch because it is all a jumble.

11948. Under the change outlined, don't you think you could get rid of that?—Yes.

11049. Mr. Gordon.—Have you not a number of children in the unions that are not of the class the Commissioner speaks of; people that go up there with their children. Take a case we had here yesterday—a woman named McKeivitt and his wife.

11050. How many children have they?—Three or four. But I am sorry to say I think those children would be better in an institution, taken away from their parents.

11051. You would not take children from their parents because they are temporarily out of work?—I think it is a very great hardship that if a woman is brought up for being drunk and disorderly, and she happens to have a child of two years old in her arms, she is sentenced to a month in jail, the police take her to jail and send the child to the workhouse, I think that women has the best of the play; she is kept comfortably for a month; she has no trouble and bother, and the child has the worst of it.

11052. And the community will get the child later on badly reared as a criminal?—Yes.

11053. You would rather take away the child from that woman?—Yes.

11054. Do you know that large additions are being made to Downpatrick Asylum?—Yes; I filled up two acres for troublesome cases a short time ago to Armagh, and I got word that morning that they cannot receive them. Our workhouse is in the Co. Armagh.

11055. Dr. BURGESS.—Does that prevent you sending cases from your workhouse to Downpatrick?—If they become insane in the workhouse we must send them to Armagh; but if they come in insane from the Co.

Down we send them to Downpatrick, and they have never yet refused to take them.

11056. Mr. Gordon.—I believe you sent five the other day to Downpatrick?—A few weeks ago.

11057. Dr. BURGESS.—Have they taken in your male lunatics?—I think there were two males and three females sent within the last three months.

Mr. Bell.—We have thirty females and eighteen males, at present.

11058. Mr. McNEAGHAN.—Why have you so many of them?—We cannot get rid of them. They are Armagh cases.

11059. That shows the necessity of additional asylum accommodation?—Very strongly, I think.

11060. Dr. BURGESS.—Do you think a workhouse is a proper place in which to treat consumption?—I do not. I think there should be a general sanatorium for a certain district.

11061. Do you think consumptive patients would go a certain distance—at least cases that would be benefited by treatment—the early cases?—I do. And I think they would be very likely to remain to receive the benefit of the treatment, because in the workhouse, if any little thing annoys them they give notice and away they go, and they come back after a time worse than ever.

11062. Is there much consumption in the district?—There are four cases in the workhouse at present.

11063. CHAIRMAN.—Do you know the death-rate from consumption in the neighbourhood?—I do.

Mr. Bell.—I am the Superintendent Registrar. The death-rate for consumption is very high in this union, particularly in Rathfriland district, where the people carry on stitching and linen work.

Mr. JOHN KERO FORSTER examined.

Mr. John Kero Forster.

11064. Mr. Gordon.—You are a Guardian, and some time a district clerk for the Banbridge Union?—Yes.

11065. How long have you been connected with the Board?—Five or six years.

11066. You have heard the evidence of the Vice-Chairman, that in his opinion Banbridge and Killead might be dissolved?—I feel very strong about Killead, at any rate; but I am not quite so sure about Banbridge.

11067. You think Killead should be dissolved?—Oh, yes; it seems quite sensible.

11068. And turned into a sanatorium?—Yes; it is such a nice healthy place; it would be a good place for that.

11069. What do you say about Banbridge—don't you think that if they are going to do away with any workhouses they might fairly enough do away with Banbridge?—I believe strongly in having a union of unions.

11070. Mr. McNEAGHAN.—What do you mean by a union of unions?—That I believe in having less unionism.

11071. How far would you go in lessening them? Do you think one workhouse for Down, embracing the six and children, would be sufficient?—How would the Guardians get away down there to look after the business.

11072. They could administer affairs at home; they would have a hospital still?—One great difficulty we have is to get our old women and men to come into the workhouse at all; they would stay out in starvation. It is most difficult to get them into the union at home, and it would be more difficult to get them to Downpatrick.

11073. Once it is known that the new house is no larger a workhouse but a home, they will go readily?—We don't like to see them go that far.

11074. At present the name workhouse is a deterrent?—I have known cases where people were as helpless and destitute as they could be, but we had no power to take them into the workhouse and keep them there. I wish we had that power.

11075. You say there ought to be four workhouses in the county. Is it not better to have still fewer if it can be done without injury to the sick and other classes, and with advantage to the ratepayers?—I believe there would be a great difficulty to get the people to go there. The old people about here are very strong-minded and like to stay at home.

11076. If the infirm and other healthy classes were taken out of this workhouse, the hospital could be put into better condition for the sick?—As far as my own opinion goes, I believe you are quite right in that, but the people won't like it.

11077. People like anything that is good after they have tasted it?—It is seldom the taste comes back.

11078. Mr. Gordon.—Newry at present is the centre of a district which includes a good deal of Armagh and Down?—We are strongly of opinion, no matter what other places are dissolved, that Newry should be left. We have spent a good deal of money on it, and made it very comfortable for the sick.

11079. I suppose you agree that it is not right that people of means can go into the hospital and be treated for infectious diseases and get off scot free?—It is a very bad system; they should pay according to their means.

11080. Have you any remedy to suggest about tramps?—They are a great nuisance to our union, and in fact everywhere. It is a great pity to see such a lot of young women and children travelling the road and coming into the workhouse for a night and going on again. After they are known to be Seditious tramps, I think they should be put into some reformatory and made self-supporting. It would be far better than to put him in jail. A couple of months in jail does not do him much good at all. If he were a couple of years in a reformatory where he could learn a trade he would be useful afterwards.

11081. CHAIRMAN.—You would make vagrancy an offence and put him in jail to try and cure him?—It would be going to the root of the matter, because it is idleness and drink is the cause of the whole thing. Then talking about children being educated and taken from them—that would be a very good thing too. If the thing was taken up in five years you would not have a tramp at all. They would not start to be tramps. It would learn the old ones some industry, and the new ones would not begin.

11082. Mr. McNEAGHAN.—Don't you think the lessening of workhouses would have a good effect?—These fellows are very clever, and they are good walkers, and I believe if they could not get workhouses they would stay about farmers' places, and we might have a lot of accidents. There is nothing but dealing fairly with tramps.

11083. Their boarding-houses would be far apart?—They would be about the farmers' places and beg. Every place is their home.

11084. CHAIRMAN.—You think if there was no workhouse at all you would have that class?—You would; the lessening of the workhouses won't make a bit of odds to tramps. Of course they are rather comfortable for them.

11085. About the boarding-out of children?—I think it is a great job to get a child out of the workhouse and

Jan. 14, 1904.

Mr. John Kidd
Poree.

learn industry, and be brought up with other children in a country life. It is a better thing for them always. They become good servants and step in the country.

11586. You know children that have turned out well?—Yes, and I have known two or three brought up in the workhouse and they are not worth anything; they are very stern and vicious. Children brought up in a country place are far better.

11587. Do you know whether the people with whom these children are boarded-out get to like them?—They are so fond of them as of their own children, and I have known these children give wages and money to their adoptive parents; but the Local Government Board is very particular where they are put, and sometimes we cannot get things up to a proper standard.

Mr. WILLIAM BRADY examined.

Mr. William
Bradford.

11592. Mr. Gardiner.—I believe you are the Deputy Vice-Chairman, and you are one of the oldest Guardians at the Board?—I believe I am.

11593. How many years have you been connected with the Board?—Some twenty or more.

11594. You are on the borders of the Banbridge Union?—Yes.

11595. Don't you think it would be possible to get rid of Killybeg?—I think it would.

11596. And you think you would have plenty of accommodation in the Newry Union for any you would get from that district?—Yes.

11597. I suppose you would divide it between Downpatrick and Newry?—I would leave that to the Commission.

11598. What do you think about Banbridge?—I think there is a part of it we could accommodate very well—from Scarva to Rathfriland, the direct road; the coach road.

11599. What do you suggest should be done then with Banbridge?—You would put the rest of it to Lisburn?—I would not give any opinion about that. I am only speaking about the part I am conversant with.

11600. And you think you could stand to all the wants of the poor in that increased area?—I believe I could.

11601. Have you formed any opinion about these children?—I believe the children would be much better if they were in charge of a number of competent persons.

11602. CHAIRMAN.—Boarded-out?—Boarded-out.

11603. Mr. Gardiner.—Would your idea be to have them boarded-out or in an institution for children alone?—I would prefer an institution for children alone. Farmers who are in a position to treat them fairly well, and give them a good education, and bring them up properly, refuse to accept them or take them into their charge at all.

11604. And therefore they would be better in a home or institution for children alone?—Yes.

11605. CHAIRMAN.—Have you had any experience of children that were reared in a workhouse?—Yes, Mr. President, I agree with what Mr. Poree said, that they come out lazy and useless, and children that are brought up in the country districts always turn out, with a few exceptions, useful in after life, useful to themselves and the parties who employ them.

11606. Then did I understand you correctly in thinking that you said that you would prefer an institution for children to boarding-out?—Yes.

11607. I don't exactly understand why you should prefer it when you think the children who are reared in the country are better citizens than the children reared in the workhouse?—Yes, Mr. President, they are better for the farmers, but they will not be better for themselves in future life. They will be better to be all in the one institution, reared together.

11608. How would you propose to push on these children in life if they are reared in an institution. What would you make of them?—Put them to trades suitable for their requirements in life.

11609. Would you put them in a better position in life than the children of labourers or small farmers?—According to their intellectual capacities.

11610. You would?—Yes.

11611. Do you think that is a proper use of public funds?—I think it would be useful both to the funds of the public and also to the children that are brought up. I don't think the public funds would be injured by the system of having them brought up together in an institution.

11598. It only wants cleanliness and proper food, and ordinary kind treatment?—They would like a cow wherever a child is to be.

11599. You would not like to rear a child on milk. But many a one who has not a cow could get milk about the place.

11600. But there is no rule about the cow as long as a child gets milk?—I thought there was; it is a really good system.

11601. Mr. Gardiner.—You mean, as far as possible, the Guardians always like to send out children when there is a cow, where they would get plenty of milk. I thought they would not be allowed to be sent when there was not a cow.

11602. And getting children of the lowest class in the community put into better positions than the lowest independent class outside?—I did not say that.

11603. Is not that what it would come to?—Perhaps it may. These children will be under the charge of the Guardians or whatever party they are under. The other children that you refer to, I presume, are children brought up under their parents. Well, let their parents bring them up as they please, according to their means, but when children are left under the care of a responsible party such as the Guardians, I think the Guardians have a right to look after them, but I would not go so far as to dictate to the parents of children fit to bring up their own children how they are to bring them up.

11604. Don't you think these parents would feel rather sore if they found the workhouse children being put into a better position than their own children?—They may feel sore, but would it not be a stimulus to make them bring up their children as well as the Guardians do?

11605. Their means might not enable them to do so?—Some parents don't bring up their children according to their means.

11606. Mr. Gardiner.—I suppose you agree that a person who goes into a hospital should pay the full cost for his maintenance if he is taken in at all?

CHAIRMAN.—At the discretion of the Guardians of the Hospital think they can pay up to the full cost?—We adopted a sliding scale for those parties according to their means, and when they availed themselves of the opportunity, one or two refused to pay, and the solicitor of the Board—I don't say that he objected to prosecute them—

11607. Mr. Gardiner.—He was not successful?—But you have to get your fee whether you succeed or not.

11608. What would you suggest about the tramp?—My opinion is that they should not be permitted to get a ticket going up to the relieving officer at 10 o'clock at night, and then disobeying the commands of the officer in the morning. They should not be given a ticket after 7 or 8 o'clock in the evening, and they should be detained in the house until they work compensation for what they have used in the house; and further than that, there was a resolution on the books that if they returned inside three months they were bound to be prosecuted. I don't believe that has been carried out, but I think they should be prosecuted for vagrancy. I meet them occasionally on the road here, and one of the reasons I would say why Banbridge and Dundalk should be done away with is that the tramps would have a little further to travel.

11609. Mr. Weller.—Do you want to bring Dundalk into Newry too, as well as Banbridge?—I don't want to bring them into it. I only want a part of you's.

11610. If Banbridge Workhouse was done away with, how would Banbridge and Gifford be served?—That is your own look out.

11611. All you want is for Newry to get a whack of it?—As a matter of fact we are not very particular.

11612. Mr. MURPHY.—Supposing we had a clean slate for the Co. Down and had no workhouse at all, what would you do in regard to providing it with Poor Law accommodation, forgetting local interests. There are only 400 at the most of the class known as aged and infirm. Supposing provision was made for all the other classes, don't you think one house in the county would suffice?—I think one house would be quite sufficient to contain them all; but then the difficulty would be the attendance of the Guardians.

12023. Supposing the Guardians continued, as they do at present, to manage their own affairs and provide for the wants of the poor wherever placed, would you see any objection in a change such as that?—No, I would not; but the principal reason why I appeared before you is that I think there are too many Guardians at the present time. I believe half the Guardians would be quite competent to do the work of the entire Guardians. I believe further than that, there should be a limit made to the attendance of these Guardians, and I certainly feel very sure that Guardians come in here and take the chairmen and they don't attend only when there is a motion brought forward, and some gentlemen come up and say, "I am not satisfied with that; I

give notice to rescind it." And then these Guardians that don't attend for weeks or perhaps months come in and swamp the Guardians who attend regularly.

12024. Mr. Gardin.—What would you suggest?—I would cut down the number of Guardians.

12025. And then if they attended themselves for a certain time, did not attend more than once a month, would you let them go?—I think the law says once in six months.

12026. Would you disqualify them for not attending once a month?—Yes.

12027. CHAIRMAN.—Even in the highest representative assembly I believe the attendance is not as good on some occasions as on others?—That is quite so.

Mr. JOHN FRANCIS SMALL, Solicitor, examined.

12028. Mr. Gardin.—You gave a statement already before the Commission in August?—Yes.

12029. Is there anything you would like to add to that?—I wish to say I think there is a misapprehension as to the attitude of the Newry Guardians. There appears to be an idea that the Guardians have set out on an imperial policy of annexation of neighbouring unions. They did not propose to dissolve any unions. They were asked certain questions and they answered them. I believe the Kilkeel people don't want their union to be dissolved, and we don't ask that it should be, but if it is dissolved without action on our part, then we say that certain portions should be attached to Newry and certain portions to Downpatrick. If Kilkeel is dissolved seven of the electoral divisions ought to be annexed to Newry and three to Downpatrick, Bryansford, and two other divisions; the three that lie close to Newcastle. The five divisions that form the barony of Mourne and the two Banbridge divisions could very conveniently come to Newry. As regards Banbridge, we never really took seriously into contemplation the dissolution of the Banbridge Union. It is a very large one and extends considerably east and west, on one side almost to Market-lili, Armagh, and on the other side nearly to Castlewellan. It must be twenty miles across. I don't say that Banbridge ought to be dissolved, but if it is dissolved, I don't think we want the entire of it to be its union; it would be very inconvenient to us.

12030. Banbridge itself is only ten Irish miles from us?—Yes; it is a very important centre, and has very good railway connection with points that Newry is not so much with.

12031. It is only on the supposition that it is to be dissolved?—On that supposition Banbridge and the divisions between might come to Newry, and the portion at Drumgoolan might be attached to Downpatrick and Donaghmore to Lurgan. I have heard the evidence of the Vice-Chairman and other members—with most respect I agree; with other persons I would not.

12032. CHAIRMAN.—With what portion do you disagree?—I do not agree with Mr. Bradford's statement about sending children to institutions. I think the boarding-out system is vastly superior. I don't think children brought up in institutions, even where the children are selected with the best possible intention, turn out as well as children brought up in homes. There is too much repression in some and in others too much evasion of discipline. I have been about four years a Guardian now, and I was a year a Guardian some years ago. The boarded-out children, with one exception have turned out remarkably well. The people, when they get possession of the children very young, get very fond of them and treat them as their own children.

12033. Mr. Bradford seemed to think that if sent into an institution they would be taught trades, perhaps even taught?—Yes; I prefer boarding-out.

12034. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you find any difficulty in getting persons to board them?—No; this union is very thickly populated. I think, perhaps, there should be a closer view kept on the sanitary arrangements.

Mr. WILLIAM BRADFORD further examined.

There was just one point I intended to refer to. When I became Guardian first it was divisional chargeability, and now it is union. My humble opinion is that we should revert to the former for all purposes, for when it was divisional chargeability every Guardian was anxious to look after his own division; but when it is union chargeability the Guardians take very little

interest in it, especially those who have the greater number of out-door and in-door recipients, they are very anxious to get on every one they possibly can. Where the division is very poor they come forward and say, "This is a case that deserves out-door relief," but if it was a divisional charge these Guardians would say, "Oh, they can dispense with it for a short time."

3 H 2

Jan. 14, 1904.

Mr. WILLIAM
Bradford.

Mr. John
Francis Small

Mr. William
Bradford.

Dr. ELEANORE BELL examined.

Jan. 14, 1896.

Dr. Eleanore Bell.

I was eight years assistant clerk.

12043. Mr. GORDON.—You are a daughter of the late clerk?—Yes.

12044. So you are very intimate with the affairs of the union here?—No; the girls that were children then.

12045. I think you have already given evidence before the Commission?—I did, in Belfast; but only about the Maternity.

12046. What would you suggest should be done about the old people in the workhouse?—It is not the old people in the workhouse I am interested in, but to keep them from coming in; and I think it would be better to extend out-door relief. A central building would be very nice for old people who had no friends; but as many of them have friends, and if the Guardians gave out-door relief, they might be kept among their friends and die there.

12047. Out-door relief at present can only be given to certain people?—If the old people had kept out until they were fifty and past work I think they should get out-door relief.

12048. CHAIRMAN.—You don't think a person at fifty is past work?—No; but some people are; some labourers at fifty I would say were sixty.

12049. Mr. GORDON.—What would you do with the children?—I would keep them out of the workhouse; but I would not have an institution at all. I know about institution-reared children. I would not put a child in an institution; I know girls reared in the best institutions—I come across them in service, and they don't know anything, and don't want to know anything. I know one who says, "I can only black grates," another can only scrub floors. I know a girl who said, at 5 o'clock, "If I was in the institution I would be playing now from 6 to 7."

Mr. W. R. BELL, Clerk, Newry Union, examined.

Mr. W. R. Bell.

12050. Mr. GORDON.—Supposing there was amalgamation, could you provide additional accommodation in the workhouse?—I am quite satisfied we could provide for Kilkeel and the inmates from the Banbridge portion of the union which would come to Newry. The Guardians of this union were the first Board of Guardians in the North of Ireland to board out children, and, so far as I know, only one child of about 300 ever returned to the workhouse that had been boarded out—one girl; she became a factory girl in Banbrook, and went wrong.

12051. How long have you been connected with the workhouse?—I have been clerk for ten years, and before that assistant to my father for many years.

12052. CHAIRMAN.—You have not known any of the boys to come back?—Not one.

12053. Mr. MURKIN.—Have you a record of many?—We have a great many—about 200 during the last twenty years. I have often spoken to my father about this very matter, and he told me he had followed them since the system was adopted, and, as far as he knew, not one of them had come back; but that boys and girls reared in the workhouse in almost every case came back.

12054. CHAIRMAN.—When you say almost every case perhaps that is going a little too far?—I don't think so.

12055. Dr. Bell referred to cases who had done well—who had been working in the office?—I know the case she refers to—one boy; but he was not the usual type of boy; he was not born in the workhouse. I also think the children of violent parents should be taken from them altogether, because they are bound to grow up as bad, if not worse than, their parents.

12056. Mr. MURKIN.—Are there many of that class?—A great many.

12057. CHAIRMAN.—Have you thought of the objection that exists, that it may make it too easy for parents to get rid of their children?—I think, under all the circumstances, it would be best.

12058. I asked the last witness about the girls—what course of life they take up as a rule. Have you many girls who go to factories?—Almost all the children boarded out about Banbrook have become factory hands.

12059. They begin by being half-timers, and their earnings go to their foster-parents?—Yes; and as a rule they reside with their foster-parents, and give them their earnings until they get married.

12060. Mr. MURKIN.—And the parents treat

12061. What about the boys?—I don't know so much about the boys. I would be inclined to give most of the boys trades. Of course, farm labourers are wanted; and if they are reared in the country they could go to that; but some boys should be put further on. I knew some boys who had in the office, and they are in good positions now.

12062. Mr. MURKIN.—Won't that same opportunity be before them if they are sent out into the country?—I am sure any exceptionally bright boy would be put on to business and put himself on. Some of the highest men have risen from the lowest rank unaided. I am sure they could rise.

12063. Mr. GORDON.—What would you do with a girl from twelve to sixteen?—Those are really the most critical cases. I think they should be very well nursed. Whatever recommendation the Ladies' Committee make about the boarded-out children should be carried out by the Board. I know a girl at present in domestic service, and she would make a splendid dressmaker.

12064. CHAIRMAN.—Do you know many of the girls boarded out by the Newry Union?—No; but I know girls that have come out of homes as before.

12065. Do they turn out chiefly as farm servants?—They do. I know the girls that were in the union at school when I was in my father's office, and, really, I see a lot of them on the streets in Belfast, and going about with one or two illegitimate children—drunks and beggars.

12066. And they used to be in the workhouse?—Yes. I could count a lot of girls I knew then; they are about the same age as myself now, and they really have gone to the bad. And I know gentlemen that were reared in the Newry Workhouse—a graduate, and one illegitimate child marrying another illegitimate child.

12067. And, with the greatest attention, I might mention one particular case. A boy was placed at nurse with an old woman in Newry. He is now twenty-four or twenty-five years of age, and his foster-mother told me a short time ago that up to the present he gives her his wages every week, without keeping a penny for himself.

12068. CHAIRMAN.—As regards the agricultural part of the union, do the girls become farm servants?—They do; or domestic servants.

12069. Do they get married?—They do.

12070. And get absorbed into the ordinary life?—They do.

12071. Mr. GORDON.—Would you extend the out-door relief system?—I would, in some cases.

12072. The Guardians cannot give any relief other than to parties who are over sixty years?—Yes, or disabled from labour.

12073. And, also, there is a restriction about lunatics?—Yes; we have one case, in which the auditor suspended the relieving officer £5 or £20, for an old man in the top of Slievegallick who is rated for 1 acre 1 rood 4 mountain land—rated at 10s., and the house at £4. He is confined to bed. The doctor certifies he cannot be removed with safety to the workhouse hospital, and the auditor says the Guardians have no power to give him relief.

12074. CHAIRMAN.—Has he any family?—He has; but the people are very poor. For the last ten or twelve weeks I have guaranteed to the relieving officer that he will not lose anything by it; the Guardians, of course, will subscribe the amount. The Board of Guardians give relief to a class I think they should not; old men and women residing alone in dirty, filthy hovels in the country. The proper place for them is the workhouse; they have no friends; no one to look after them.

12075. Mr. MURKIN.—Are they couples?—No; single persons.

12076. Perhaps it is easier to give them out-door relief or let them starve?—I think they might be persuaded to come into the house.

12077. Does not the relieving officer usually try to persuade them?—He does; but I think the law should enable the Guardians to compel them to come into the house. There is this old man, O'Hara.

12078. CHAIRMAN.—These cases that we have in view

—what have the single people? Have they the use of the house free?—In some cases, yes; and no other means.

12076. A little garden, perhaps?—Very few cases.

12077. A simple house?—Yes; a very bad one at that. They go round to the neighbours to get potatoes and meat. They don't live, they exist for a time. The Guardians give such cases 1s 6d or 2s.

Mr. Smith.—A great many of these cases are reported to me afterwards as cures. The people are found dead in their beds.

Witness.—In the case of O'Hare we are giving him nothing now, to try and get him into the house. In regard to the system of rating, I believe that the present system of union rating is much to be preferred to the old system of divisional rating. In the division represented by Mr. McEvoy the average poor rate was 4d. in the £; in a poor division in Armagh the average rate was 20s. in the £. Under that system the poor people had to pay for their own poor, and had to pay 20s. in the £, and the rich people down here had only to pay 4d. That is not a fair proportion.

12080. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Would you extend that to everything?—I would.

12081. Same witness suggested that it would be well to revert to the electoral division in the case of outdoor relief and paying patients in infirmaries?—I would not agree with that. Our outdoor relief now is less than it was five years ago. Mr. Braden thinks the Guardians do not look as clearly as they used after outdoor relief, but I think they do. We give 25s a week outdoor relief. The total amount expended during the last year was £2,700.

12082. Do you think there is proper supervision under the present system?—I do; ample supervision.

12083. Do you think the hands of the relieving officer should be strengthened in some way?—I don't think so; my Board of Guardians never interfere with the relieving officer, and we have three very good men.

12084. The amount of out-door relief seems large?—The population of the union is large.

12085. What is the valuation?—£176,000.

12086. CHAIRMAN.—How much of the £2,700 would be spent in the town of Newry?—About £1,000 a year; and that is bound to be, because the poor people flock into the town from the country.

12087. Dr. BROWN.—What is the valuation of the town?—£34,000. The poor rate for the present year is 1s. in the £, and the average rate in the country is much less than that; it is slightly over 3d. on land and 7d. on buildings. In both counties the poor rate is very low in the rural districts. There is one other matter. I take a very keen interest in the casuals, and I believe if casuals were compelled to perform a certain amount of labour there would be a very large decrease in the number seeking admission to the workhouse.

12088. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—You would give the Guardians power to detain them, and make them work for a specified time?—Quite so. Under the English system

they have power to keep them in for three days, and compel them to do a certain allotted amount of work. I would increase the punishment every time they came back. But I would not do that with deserving casuals.

12089. CHAIRMAN.—It would be discretionary?—Yes; and it would be very easy to know an honest man looking for work. At least I would have no trouble.

12090. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Witnesses have suggested that in the case of the habitual tramp he should be turned over to the police, who could furnish him with a bed and breakfast in a lodging-house. Do you think that would be feasible?—I would not. I would lock him up, but not hand him over to the police to give him a bed and breakfast.

12091. CHAIRMAN.—It has been suggested that these gentlemen should be photographed, and the police should communicate with other stations and exchange photographs?—That would be a very good system, if not too expensive.

12092. Mr. GARTEN.—What proportion of these casuals are deserving?—We would have, on an average, between eighty and ninety casuals in a week, and I am satisfied we would not have ten deserving cases in the week; we might not have five.

12093. In those deserving cases the Guardians should have a discretion?—Quite so; and I would treat the deserving people looking for work differently. The Guardians have here rebuilt the workhouse, and when all the workhouse will have been completed they will have spent £8,000. The workhouse was burned down; and I think it was the best thing that ever happened the Newry Workhouse, because now we have the best workhouse hospital in Ireland.

12094. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Perhaps you would not care to express a view as to what you consider would be a sufficient number of workhouses in the county?—I would; although I don't agree with the evidence of Mr. Robt. in Belfast. I don't see how you can do away with Newtownards; Belfast is quite too large at present, and should not be made any larger.

12095. CHAIRMAN.—But if you take the majority of the people out of it, children and lunatics?—I think they have sent away almost all their lunatics already; we have fifty lunatics at present. I don't see how you could do away with Newtownards. But I think three unions for Down would be sufficient—Downpatrick, Newtownards, and Newry.

12096. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Wouldn't fewer suffice?—I don't see how you could do without Newtownards.

12097. Supposing the Guardians had the power to board out in neighbouring unions inmates, would not the trouble of distance be got over in that way?—You could; but I don't see how you would send aged and infirm people from here to Downpatrick; I think it would be too far. If it were for the public good I would say the number of workhouses should be greatly reduced, even if Newry were to be abolished.

Mrs. MARY GRAY examined.

I beg to submit the following statement to the Commissioners:—I am a Guardian for the West Ward of the town of Newry, and am the only woman Guardian on the Newry Board, on which there are fifty-seven members. I think that for the due administration of the Poor Laws, and for the well-being of the inmates of the workhouses and infirmaries, it is absolutely necessary that there should be a much larger proportion of women members on the Boards or on the Committees, in which the exercise of most of the powers of the Guardians might very properly be vested. I believe that under the Local Government Act the Guardians have authority to appoint committees consisting partly of outsiders, but these committees are only for purposes of admission to the house, and even the limited authority has, in the case of County Boards, at any rate, apparently never been exercised. The division of unions into urban and rural districts, with the evidence of one set of districts ineligible for election in the other, and the fusion of the duties of District Councils and Guardians in rural districts have necessarily operated very injuriously against the election of women members. I think very few such have been elected in country districts. In Newry Union, on the recent rebuilding of part of the workhouse, large and very much improved wards have been provided for the infirm patients—wards which have been said to compare

favourably with those in some metropolitan hospitals. But the same improvement has not been made in some of the accommodation given to a class just as deserving, "the old and infirm." In their case their sleeping wards are much more crowded and worse lighted and heated, and their day-rooms are cheerless and uncomfortable. Arrangements ought to be made in all workhouses to afford some competition to each of the inmates as are able to do any work. It is very disagreeable and disheartening at present to see the listless, idle way in which the inmates pass their time. This is a matter in which Local Government Board Inspectors with proper qualifications could give great assistance. The officers of the Local Government Board in reference to the nursing arrangements in the infirmaries, have in some respects created an uncertainty as to the limits of the authority of the different officials, which (so long as the different departments are contained in the same building) is undesirable, and have affected discipline. I am in favour of boarding-out children. The system has worked very well in the Newry Union. The foster parents, as a rule, become fond of the children, and adopt them. Indeed the treatment of boarded-out children contrasts very favourably with the treatment sometimes given to hired-out children. The Guardians, however, ought to provide for surprise visits to the homes of the boarded-out children as an annual in-

Jan. 14, 1894.

Mr. W. R. Bell.

Mrs. Mary Gray.

Jan. 14, 1904

Mrs. May Green.

spection at the workhouse on a stated day, when the children are brought up with their faces well washed and their best clothes on, is not satisfactory evidence of their condition. There ought also to be provision made for visits by the Guardians to the boarded-out children. This task should also be added to the duties of the Local Government Board Inspectors of boarded-out children. I hope that before long the Local Government Board will place on their staff a sufficient number of lady inspectors. It is scarcely necessary for me to point out that it is just as essential to have such inspectors to look after the internal management of the workhouses as it has already been found essential to have them to see to the boarded-out children. In the case of idiots, the accommodation in Newry in some respects is not suitable. One of the day-rooms was condemned some years ago. There has been so much reference to the removal of these inmates that the Guardians have hesitated to enter upon expenditure. I presume, however, that even in the event of the removal of some, those who are herelike and indolent, and at the same time incurable, would probably be left with us.

12006. CHAIRMAN.—You mentioned the bringing of the children once a year to the workhouse. Is that general?—Yes.

12009. Do you think that is a wise thing?—It is not; it is much better to visit them.

12010. Don't you think it brings before the children the fact that they are workhouse children?—Yes.

12011. Mr. Gordon.—They have actually discontinued it?—Yes.

12012. But you say there should be surprise visits, and the inspectors should visit just as they do in other cases?—Yes.

12013. CHAIRMAN.—Do individual Guardians or committees visit these children?—Yes.

12014. Do you think they are not visited sufficiently often?—They are not.

12015. How often would they be visited?—Once a year by the committee.

12016. Where the committee know they are in good hands the less they inspect and put themselves in evidence as Poor Law officials the better, but when there is doubt you would like to have frequent inspections?—Oh, yes.

Mr. Bell.—In the Donaghue district the Ladies' Committee visits frequently.

Dr. BROWNE examined.

12017. Dr. Browne.—You are the Medical Officer of the Newry Fever Hospital?—Yes.

12018. It is really now a general hospital?—Yes.

12019. Would you tell the Commission how long ago it was changed from being a fever hospital?—I should say it is about six years since really there was any infectious case admitted into that hospital.

12020. Was the hospital established entirely as a fever hospital?—It was originally.

12021. And in that way did you receive a grant from the county?—I cannot be certain if there was a grant from the county given originally. I understand it was under a particular Act of Parliament those hospitals in Ireland were built.

12022. That was before the Poor Law. It ceased about six years ago to admit any cases of fever?—Probably it did.

12023. How did that come about?—Because it was impossible to nurse and treat an infectious case in the same building by the same nurse as ordinary cases, and it was a question, having to be either one thing or the other, what hospital it should be.

12024. And the committee thought that because there was another fever hospital there was no necessity for this?—Yes.

12025. CHAIRMAN.—And the circumstance that Downpatrick was so difficult to get at from here made the people here anxious to have another county infirmary for their part of the county?—Yes.

12026. It is a county-at-large charge?—Yes.

12027. Dr. Browne.—You get a grant of £400 a year from the county?—Yes.

12028. How do you admit patients?—They are admitted by ticket from a subscriber or one of the committee.

12029. Would any poor person get an order for admission?—No.

12030. CHAIRMAN.—Is there any definite rule?—I am not aware of a definite rule or any particular restriction. It is the practice, and it has been understood that it is for the working classes, not for the destitute or a person without any means of livelihood.

Dr. Browne.—Although they may have been respectable paupers the year before.

12031. CHAIRMAN.—It is pretty much on the same basis as the county infirmary?—I think so. Our secretary, Mr. Mullin, is here and perhaps can tell you better.

12032. Dr. Browne.—What is the area of usefulness of the hospital?—There is no particular area; just for the neighbourhood round about. They come in from the Co. Armagh.

12033. Are they treated just the same?—Yes.

12034. Although your grant is entirely from the Co. Down?—Yes.

12035. CHAIRMAN.—But you have subscribers in the Co. Armagh?—Yes.

12036. Dr. Browne.—Do you think that is fair to the Co. Down?—I don't think so. I think the Co. Armagh might assist us.

12037. Then it is more for the immediate neighbourhood of Newry?—Yes.

12038. Would a person from Banbridge be eligible?—I don't think so.

12039. Although the county-at-large pays a large sum?—

CHAIRMAN.—What is the greatest distance you have ever had people in from?—They come from Kilskeel and Rathfriland and Mayo Bridge.

12040. Dr. Browne.—The Kilskeel people are as near Downpatrick as here?—But there have been persons admitted from as far off as there.

12041. From Banbridge you don't admit any?—We would admit them, I am sure, if there was a person here from Banbridge.

12042. CHAIRMAN.—Have you ever excluded any person owing to their locality of residence?—No.

12043. Therefore for all practical purposes there is no limitation?—There is.

12044. Dr. Browne.—Can you not admit anyone?—I can admit anyone who comes up with a ticket.

12045. Any agent case?—Yes, with or without a ticket.

12046. Do you also take cases recommended by outside doctors?—Yes, from any doctor in the county.

12047. In your absence, would the superintendent admit that case?—She would, if there was a line that it was recommended to the hospital by a doctor.

12048. Do you do many operations in the hospital?—Sometimes there are.

12049. CHAIRMAN.—You have got a new operating-room?—We have.

12050. Dr. Browne.—What assistance do you get?—I am assisted by the medical men of the town, Dr. Stewart, Dr. Connelley, and Dr. Martin. They are very kind in assisting me on every occasion without fee or reward.

12051. Do you admit pay patients?—There is no actual rule; it has always been considered that people who are able to pay should contribute.

12052. CHAIRMAN.—We heard to-day that Mr. a week at the highest payment you ever get?—Yes; except we could accommodate a patient with a private ward, which is seldom done. Then we would expect a guinea a week.

12053. Dr. Browne.—Do you get a large proportion that pay something?—I am sorry to say there are not a large proportion who do it. Some of them are very willing, and do subscribe a little towards their expenses.

12054. What is your nursing staff?—A lady superintendent, a head nurse, and three probationers.

12055. They receive three years' training?—They receive three years' training or one year's training, according as they come for it.

12056. You are not hampered in the way of instruments?—We have a large supply of instruments, and are practically allowed to get any instruments required.

12057. Are you hampered in the way of funds at all?—Since this increased grant we have been, certainly, fairly—

12058. How do you mean increased grant?—The original grant was £200; the County Council increased it to £400, and since then we are fairly solvent.

12152. CHAIRMAN.—But anything beyond necessities, have you had to get those provided by subscriptions and special wards?—Yes.

12153. Dr. BROOKS.—Do you take in all classes of medical and surgical cases?—All classes of medical and surgical cases. They are mostly surgical accidents and operations; but, of course, there are also a variety of chronic cases, such as chronic ulcers.

12154. CHAIRMAN.—You don't keep those people in very long?—No.

12155. Dr. BROOKS.—Do you find a large number of tubercular cases, bone disease, requiring operative interference?—Yes.

12156. Mr. MURKIN.—Am I to understand you to say that the very poor of your locality don't find assistance into your hospital?—They have never been refused; the poorest person coming has always been admitted, if a suitable case; but I have understood always that it was more for the working classes—the better-to-do working classes—that the hospital was never intended. At the same time the poorest man has never been refused.

12157. Do you think it is a proper distribution of public money given specially for the benefit of the very poor, to close the doors of the institution against them?—The doors have not been closed. Jus. 14, 1901.
Dr. Beattie.

12158. You say in practice?—Not in practice; but I think it was understood, as half the funds of the hospital were subscribed by the inhabitants of the town, it was primarily subscribed for the working men, and not for the pauper.

12159. That may have been the original intention of the founder; but since the county has come to the relief of the institution by a contribution equal to half the outlay, don't you think the poor ought to have as ready admittance as any other class?—I think so.

Mr. Small.—Dr. Beattie's hospital is largely a voluntary hospital, and they can make their own terms, and won't receive contagious cases; our hospital is the only one in which contagious cases can be received, and there is no doubt about our power to charge.

Mr. R. A. MULLAN examined.

12160. Dr. BROOKS.—Could you tell us why the hospital was changed from being a fever hospital to a general hospital?—As I understand it was built under the Grand Jury Act for the purpose of providing accommodation for fever patients after the Famine.

CHAIRMAN.—Oh, long before.

Witness.—It was built about fifty years ago.

12161. Dr. BROOKS.—But you were in existence before that, I understand, in two or three locations?—It was in a very small way originally, in another part of the town in a house; but the accommodation was very small. Then the necessity for it as a fever hospital, practically ceased after typhoid ceased to be a prevalent disease in the country, and then it afforded facilities for the sick poor and accidents.

12162. What about your up-keep—what is your average yearly expenditure?—The total money received would be about £700 a year.

12163. Does that keep it going?—It keeps it going with difficulty; between £700 and £800.

12164. How is that made up?—With private subscriptions—£245.

12165. And paying patients?—That includes them. The paying patients for the year ended 31st of December, 1902, were 245 12s. 10d. Then the employees of the merchants contribute by boxes in the parks, 234 12s. 10d.; church collections, £28 15s. 11d.

12166. Then you have £400 from the County Council?—Yes; it was originally £200 granted by the Grand Jury.

12167. Have you the number of patients last year?—For the year ended 31st of December, 1902, 1,622.

12168. How many were your intern patients?—246; 136 men and 110 women.

12169. Mr. MURKIN.—The average number daily—what would that be?—I could not give it to you.

12170. I understand it is something like from twelve to fourteen?—I have not the figures.

12171. Dr. BROOKS.—Have you the site free?—No; it is held under two leases. It is the property of the Marquis of Downshire, and it is conditional on its being retained as a hospital that we are entitled to hold it.

12172. What is the yearly rent?—£30.

12173. CHAIRMAN.—Of course it is a valuable property?—It is; but it is no use to us as a security; we tried to raise money for an extension. We had to go into debt for the purpose of meeting current expenses.

12174. Dr. BROOKS.—How do you propose to raise the £1,600 you have asked for?—We applied to the County Council to borrow it for us, and they arranged

to raise the money from the Board of Works. They have got authority for the loan, and the plans are being, at the present time, approved of. Mr. R. A. Mullan.

12175. Your hospital intends to pay this back?—They will deduct from the annual grant such a sum as, with interest and sinking fund, will repay the loan.

12176. CHAIRMAN.—How do you propose to raise enough income in the future?—We will have to make some special effort; the Ladies' Committee are very much interested, and will try to get up a bazaar to pay the loan off; but at the present time it is an absolute necessity on account of the sanitary condition of the hospital.

12177. Dr. BROOKS.—I think you intend to make extra provision in the way of staircases?—We do for floors; and also the position of the lavatories and baths is objectionable in the centre of the house; we intend to place them in annexes. Formerly part of Newry was in Armagh, and we received contributions from the Great Northern Railway and Bewbrook, and we did not feel justified in excluding patients who were sent in by subscribers. A subscriber of £2 gets four tickets. He signs them, and the doctor admits a patient if he thinks him suitable. We did not consider we were justified in admitting a class of people who could be dealt with by dispensaries or in the union. It is really for the deserving poor, who are not subjects of charity. A large proportion of working men contribute to their employers' yards, and in the chapels and churches, and we did not consider we were justified in taking in those of the poorer class. We prescribe medicine, and they get the prescriptions filled in chemist's shops in town on favourable terms. If the applicant was not able to pay for the medicine we thought they were subjects for a dispensary, and did not give them a ticket. As regards the question of Armagh and Down contributions, Armagh declined to contribute, but the County Council of Down could, through the Local Government Board, compel the Armagh Council to contribute.

12178. CHAIRMAN.—Are you sure of that?—I am. We have looked into that; we considered it very carefully in connection with the question.

12179. Would you kindly let our secretary have a statement of the grounds on which you think you can do that?—I will. The hospital is very largely aided by.

12180. And popular in Newry?—Very popular. Dr. Beattie is very popular, and the matron is very kindly and attentive.

12181. And it is an institution highly valued in Newry?—Yes; it is contributed to by all creeds and classes. I believe it is a most excellent institution.

The sitting terminated.

Jan. 15, 1905

TWENTY-FIFTH PUBLIC SITTING.—FRIDAY, JANUARY 15TH, 1904.

At the Courthouse, Downpatrick.

Present:—Mr. MILES (Chairman), Mr. MURKAGHAN, and Dr. CONY BIGGER.

Right Hon. THOMAS ANDREWS, P.C., examined.

Right Hon.
Thomas
Andrews

12179. CHAIRMAN:—The County Council of Down have considered the queries that were issued by this Commission?—They have, sir.

12180. And their answer to the first query is to what effect?—The answer here is rather prolonged. I believe it has been furnished to you. If you wish I will be very glad to read it to you, or I will answer any questions upon it.

12181. I think it will be perhaps unnecessary to read it; we have it here before us. Coming to the recommendation, how many workhouses do you think might be closed?—That is a very delicate question, which the County Council refrained from going into. Our body is composed of representatives from every part of the county. Each district, of course, wants to stand by its own workhouse, and it would naturally have provoked much discussion and probably difference of opinion if we had begun to recommend the closing of any workhouse.

12182. You would not have had a substantial majority you think for any recommendation?—I won't go quite that length. I think we would have had a substantial majority, because I think it is so apparent the workhouses which should be closed, if you decide to close any; but our answer to that was if you, gentlemen, spread the map before you and had a list giving the population of the workhouses, you would be in as good a position to judge that matter for yourselves as we would be.

12183. Do you wish yourself to offer an opinion as to what workhouses might be closed?—On the whole, I would prefer not; if you were in a position to tell me how many workhouses you would allot to the Co. Down.

12184. That, of course, we are not in a position to do until we hear the evidence?—If you did I would have no hesitation in telling you those which I personally think should be retained.

12185. We may come at it in another direction. Would you be in favour in each union of having a hospital?—Undoubtedly; that I can answer for the County Council. We are quite unanimous on that point.

12186. That would dispose of the sick in each union?—Quite right; and if I may mention, sir, where you are on the hospital, we have a strong opinion that it would be very desirable that there should be a ward allotted to pay patients. The thrifty poor object naturally to go into a pauper workhouse even when they are sick, and it would be of immense importance to them that they should get over that little loss of prestige, and get a ward open to them when infectious disease is in their family or neighbourhood.

12187. Or even ordinary disease?—Or even ordinary disease, especially infectious.

12188. Now we have dealt with the sick. The next class we may take up would be children. Would you be in favour of excluding children from the workhouses as much as possible?—I would, and I think I may answer that for the County Council.

12189. Is boarding-out the best system?—On the whole I am inclined to think it is. There are only two systems; one which prevails in Limerick at the Gl'n schools. I had the pleasure of being through those schools and thought very highly of them, and in fact I may say I came away rather impressed with the idea that when a good opportunity was afforded I would recommend that system to the Co. Down. I have, however, since then had considerable difficulty in retaining that opinion, if I have not dropped it altogether, and at present I would be rather disposed to recommend the boarding-out system. The Gl'n schools are beautiful; they seemed to me to be admirably conducted. They are exclusively under the charge of one religious body—a religious body which differs from my views, but I am bound to say I think they are admirably conducted.

The children were taught trades, such as shoe-making, tailoring, and basket-making, carpentry, and a number of other trades. It did occur to me afterwards, although I don't like taking an ungenerous view of things, that perhaps too much was being done for them there. As a general rule, the parents of children who are in workhouses have been thriftless people; some of them criminals.

12190. Nearly all illegitimate?—A good many of them illegitimate; and I can imagine a poor, honest, working labourer who with his wife have been struggling all their lives on a limited income of 12s. or 15s. a week to rear their family and bring them up properly—I can imagine them feeling very sore that the children of those who have been thriftless are taught trades, and occupy those trades, and make it much more difficult for the honest labourer to get his children pushed forward beyond what I may term labouring.

12191. You would not be in favour of placing the worst class in the community—a dependent class—above the lowest independent class?—That is my difficulty; but at the same time I am not going to say anything against Gl'n schools, and if it was decided to adopt anything of the kind, I would not be so sorry to do it. But the difficulty, on more mature consideration, has forced itself on me which I have endeavoured to show you. And the boarding-out system I believe is a great many of the workhouses—certainly in the New-wards Union—seems to work remarkably well.

12192. And the children generally become agricultural labourers?—Exactly.

12193. And that is the class we are most in need of in agricultural Ireland at present?—Yes.

12194. Children being one to another class, that is the mothers of the children, the girls who come in and have illegitimate children in the workhouse. If some plan could be devised for closing the workhouse doors against that class, would you approve. A scheme like this, that has been suggested to the Commissioners, that different religious bodies should have penitentiaries or refuges for girls who fall for the first time. As soon as a girl in the neighbourhood falls she generally has to go to the workhouse some three or four months before her confinement; that instead of going to the workhouse she should go to one of these penitentiaries at the expense of the rates, and in some of these penitentiaries they actually have maternity wards attached, and in cases where they have not maternity wards attached, that the girl should go to the nearest maternity hospital, and as soon as she is discharged, after a fortnight, or whatever time, from that hospital, she should go back to the penitentiary with her child, and the religious influence of the management there, and her own religion—should be directed to reform her and give her a fresh start, care being taken of the child whatever would be thought to be the best way, by board-out as soon as the child reached say the age of a year or two, as soon as it could take whatever food was going in the house it was sent to, you would approve of such a scheme?—That question has not been before the County Council. For myself, it has some authority now on me. It seems to have a good deal that is taking in it, but wherever we get into these religious questions we get rather involved.

12195. Each girl goes to her own religion?—It would strike me, speaking without having time to reflect on it, that it is a good arrangement.

12196. The drawback that strikes people is that it makes it rather easy for those people to get rid of their children?—A great many of those girls are married with promises of marriage, and I would be very loath from having any opinion that they should be harshly dealt with.

12197. You would be willing to run that risk?—I would. When you first began to speak I thought you

Jan. 15, 1904.

Right Hon.
Thomas
Andrews.

were rather going to leave them to those religious bodies independent of the rates, and I would be opposed to that, because I think the rates should support them as well as any other afflicted class.

12202. Without having thought the thing over, your opinion would be favourable to such a plan?—It would.

12203. That would take away the class that, above all others, taints the workhouse. That class getting about the house and getting more brazen with each successive fall, appears to be the class that taints the workhouse work. If you could get that class out of the workhouse and the children, would you also be in favour of sending lunatics out of the workhouse to an asylum or auxiliary asylum?—Certainly; our County Council are unanimous on that. We are making extensions of the asylum here—our contracts amount to £250,000—with a view of having the least insane person out of the workhouse and put into the asylum.

12204. Of the ordinary inmates you would have only two classes remaining, the ordinary able-bodied men and women, which is a small class, very small indeed if you take away the mothers of illegitimate children. Would you see any objection to writing aside one workhouse for a large area, a central workhouse for putting these people in?—That would be classifying patients and putting each class into a separate workhouse.

12205. There are only about 4,000 able-bodied people in the Irish workhouses?—Then you would have to take them out of their country.

12206. You would have to take them out of their country?—That would be the able-bodied people alone.

12207. Merely the able-bodied?—Put them into one workhouse where they would have to work.

12208. Where they would have to work hard, and where they might be held in restraint if thought desirable by the governing body for each time as the law would permit?—That is another question that has not been brought before me before, but like everyone else I have seen how extremely undesirable it is that able-bodied paupers should throw themselves on the rates, and the method you have proposed is the only one I have yet heard propounded in order to deal with them effectually, and, at the first blush, I don't see any objection.

12209. Perhaps you are not aware that the number is so small, one-sixth only of the pauperism?—I was not. I am very pleased to hear it.

12210. The most difficult class is the aged and infirm. Have you any idea what you would do with them. We have had evidence during the present week in Down, and one of the proposals made was that one workhouse in each county should be set aside for aged and infirm inmates?—Again, without having given much consideration to it, I don't quite like that. I think there is a great difficulty in taking these poor people from their own locality. There is very considerable difficulty in inducing them to go into the workhouse at all. They prefer to stay at home and almost starve rather than go into the workhouse. They may be induced to go into one that is in their own locality, but I believe the majority would starve rather than go to one some distance away, and it strikes me that the effect of that would be to increase the outdoor relief. These people would stay at home, and the relieving officer would report that they were starving, and the Guardians, rather than let them starve, would give them out-door relief. I don't like the idea, but I do like this idea, if you allow me to say so. I think it would be only common humanity, that the old married couples should be allowed to live together.

12211. That would be possible if you had a central institution?—Would it not be possible in one ward in a workhouse?

12212. We have an open mind on all these questions, but we see the difficulty of effecting economy on any appreciable scale if you are to keep all the aged and infirm and sick at a union in their own union. The risk it seems absolutely necessary to keep?—It is. I feel no doubt you will have to break up some workhouses.

12213. And in those cases where the workhouses would be broken up, the aged and infirm would have to be taken to a distance?—They would, but probably not to a great distance, to the workhouse nearest to them.

12214. If you put a central workhouse the difference would be very small?—The further you take them the less they like it.

12215. Even in their own county. Do you think the difference between taking a man to Newswater and to Downpatrick would be prohibitive?—I think they would object to it, but if it cannot be avoided, it cannot. Perhaps for a moment I might call your atten-

tion to the idea the County Council had with regard to the idea of a reduction of workhouses, namely, that the first workhouses from which we would wish to be separated would be the border workhouses, Belfast, Lismore, Lurgan, and Newry.

12216. You think a county should be self-contained?—We think each county should, as far as possible, be self-contained. If some of the workhouses must go, as indeed I think they should go, the first to go should be the partnership workhouses with which we are in partnership with other counties.

12217. Then you are faced with the difficulty that some of the largest workhouses are the border workhouses like Newry?—The reason we did not speak more formally about that than we have done is because we did not know the circumstances of the Co. Armagh, the border county; but if Armagh is not worse situated for the closing of Newry than we are, then we think Newry should go.

12218. Remaining for hospital purposes?—Yes. I am sorry to be wholly opposed to the evidence given you in Belfast, namely, with regard to the closing of Newtownards Workhouse and putting it into Belfast. That, I believe, was done with a view to classification, when Newtownards should be provided over by the authorities in Belfast.

12219. As an auxiliary workhouse for the Belfast Union it was intended?—I think that the paupers in rural districts such as Newtownards would have the greatest possible objection to be forced into a city workhouse, where the associations of the paupers and their entire up-bringing have been different from the rural districts, and I don't think the country poor would gain in any way by being put alongside the city poor. The Belfast Union Workhouse is a very overgrown establishment. I live in a fairly large village; at least it looks so. Coover, where I live, is a village with four long streets, every house occupied. That village only contains 2,100 people. Just think of Belfast Workhouse containing, I think, 3,600. To go to increase that would, in my mind, be highly objectionable.

12220. But you saw by the discussion we had earlier in the day a good many of these classes would leave?—True, but you would be putting one of these classes back under a different authority into Newtownards, and still the management would remain with the central body in Belfast fortified with whatever representatives you might give to Newtownards.

12221. You think it would be a mistake to herd together the destitute of the city and country districts?—That is it precisely, and, as I said about the infirm, I think the paupers in rural districts would in many cases rather starve than be forced into huge establishments like Belfast. I think some of them would border on starvation, and possibly sink under it, and I think again that that would tend to the increase of outdoor relief.

12222. As regards the workhouses that would be closed, the view of the Council was that if additional accommodation for lunatics was necessary, one of the workhouses might be made into an auxiliary asylum?—We don't require that, for the reasons I have given; we are making ample provision here.

12223. Mr. MURPHY.—To what extent will that provision be?—We have calculated that it would be more than ample for the present.

12224. How many will the asylum then accommodate?—I believe it is 800.

12225. And in the institution at present, how many are there?—A little over 600.

12226. Then you are making accommodation for 150 more?—Say 200.

12227. Do you think that will suffice for all the needs of the Co. Down?—We know it will more than suffice for the present.

12228. And for the immediate future?—And for the immediate future; that is a point we have gone into and are quite sure of.

12229. Dr. BROWN.—This is the first county in Ireland that has adopted that principle?—I am very proud that it is.

12230. Just kindly give the Commission some of the points that led you to that decision. I suppose you considered the advisability of whether you should put them into an asylum or, perhaps, get an auxiliary asylum with a lesser grant?—We went fully into that; it is a matter I take considerable interest in myself. The figures are not just present to my mind at the moment, but when we took into consideration the expense of converting one of the present workhouses into an auxiliary asylum, and getting the limited capitulation grant, and the expense of keeping a separate staff for

Jan. 15, 1864.

Right Hon.
Thomas
Anderson.

the auxiliary asylum, we came to the conclusion that it would be as economical to extend the present asylum and put them in there, and it would be ever so much better for the inmates themselves.

12227. Mr. MURKIN.—But if the capitation grant applied to both conditions, then what would you think?—Even so I would much rather have them in what we may call the present institution.

12228. Do you see that it would be more advantageous to have these harmless lunatics put into an institution by themselves—a sort of farm home, where they could be occupied during the day, be to themselves, with healthful surroundings of a country life, and if the capitation grant was 4s. all round, don't you think that would be a better system?—I won't answer the question generally for the whole of Ireland, but if you will be good enough to go up and look round the asylum, I think you will find it a very perfect institution, and I think you will find it has all the health-restoring properties which are so necessary for the inmates, as well as for those who are bodily afflicted. There are a large number of wards there, and I cannot see any difficulty in putting those who are only mildly insane—I cannot see any difficulty in classifying them in a large institution like ours, and I think with the admirable physician we have there and the large staff which is liberally provided by the Committee of the County Council, I think they are better there than they possibly could be otherwise, and they can be provided there with the work of which you spoke better than they could be in any old workhouse converted into an asylum.

12229. Even with regard to the epileptics?—That is a medical question; I am not prepared to answer.

12230. In other places we have had put before us the desirability of not having too many of these classes in one institution, and the desirability of having harmless lunatics put into a farm home, where they could be occupied. That recommends itself to me personally, and I would like to get from you an expression of opinion. How much will the new buildings cost you?—We are building a male and female wing and farm-steadings. We have provided something like 100 acres of a farm there, which will give employment, I believe, to all the farm labourers who are accommodated in the asylum, and all able to work on it. That standing and the wings will cost £20,000. We have our contracts made.

12231. In a county not so well circumstanced as yours, not having land as you seem to have, would you not think that some of these diseased workhouses could, at a small cost, be turned into an institution for these harmless lunatics?—It may be you are quite right. I don't like speaking of any county but my own. The circumstances may be sufficient to warrant what you suggest, but that we have taken the right course here, I have no doubt.

12232. I have no doubt about your own particular county, but would it not seem to you a useful thing to separate the harmless lunatics from the violent?—There can be no two opinions about that, unless the large institution to which you refer was so large as to provide separate wards, and if so, I don't see much difference; but I would rather not answer abstract questions about operation of which I know nothing.

12233. CHAIRMAN.—The next suggestion of the County Council was that one of the workhouses might be turned into a sanatorium for consumptives?—We feel very strongly on that subject; we feel it is very much wanted.

12234. Had you killed or some workhouse like that in view?—Yes.

12235. The Council were quite unanimous about that?—They were quite unanimous. That was in the report I read to the Council, and they took no exception to it.

12236. Query 4. The Council made no suggestions about changes in chargeability. Were they all satisfied that for Poor Law purposes the union was the best area of charge?—That was not much gone into. I think that is the prevailing opinion. There is another question I have observed discussion about—whether there should be district or union rating.

12237. It has been suggested for the sick that a county rating might be better. It has been pointed out that county infirmaries are a county charge, and some portions of the county get no benefit, or very little, from the county infirmary, and it has been suggested that it would be fairer the sick all over the county should be a county charge?—I don't think I have any strong view on that. I would be rather inclined to let each union support itself.

12238. What about the county infirmaries. Now we are bringing up the workhouses to the level of the

county infirmaries, and many workhouses have got ahead a little of some county infirmaries. What would you think about leaving county infirmaries the area of the county-at-large?—I see a difficulty there, and it is a point I have not thought of before. We have in Downpatrick an excellent infirmary, and we have in other, which I have every reason to believe is well managed, in Newry. They, of course, are county charges, and I have not heard any complaints of them.

12239. We have received complaints in every county, not anything hostile to the institutions, but mostly on the question of rating?—I think it will largely depend on how perfect you make the hospitals you will have in connection with the present workhouses.

12240. They are becoming levelled up very much—they are becoming district hospitals—and if one operated from the workhouse they would be places where any poor person, or even a person above the rank of the poor, ought to be glad to go. Some medical witnesses suggested that each county should have its forces, making the county infirmary as far as possible the chief hospital for performing special operations for any people that could be brought there; that nurses should be trained there, and that those nurses should be county nurses to be drafted as required in emergencies. At present if any workhouse wants a nurse they have to send to Belfast, or wherever the nearest large hospital is, and get a special nurse at a high cost. If those nurses were trained in the county it is thought it would be more economical?—Nurses appear to me to be getting nowadays pretty much on an equality all over, and I greatly doubt if you train a good nurse in the county infirmary that she will in any way feel bound to go to the workhouse hospital where she would be paid less, when plenty of other positions are open to her.

12241. If she gets a better position she will go, but if her position is made a good one?—She will be more likely to remain.

12242. Dr. RYAN.—Is the objection to the county infirmary being made a county charge that some of the remote districts are receiving no benefit from it, and at the same time are maintaining their own hospital?—Yes; I think the benefits of Downpatrick and Newry infirmaries are too little known. I don't think it has been made sufficiently known that this infirmary in Downpatrick is as admirable a little hospital as it is. It seems to me to want nothing that any larger hospital almost could have, and it has an extremely clever medical man, and another, junior, associated with him. I think if that was more known over the county it would be taken more advantage of. I have been myself sending several patients to it from my own district.

12243. You can see the difficulty of a patient from Glend and Banbridge coming to Downpatrick?—Yes. If you multiply these infirmaries all over the county, then you won't require the hospitals in connection with the old workhouses.

12244. We are speaking of the workhouse hospital?—I know. And the grievance you think is because the infirmaries are a county charge, and yet it is only the districts immediately surrounding them that get the full benefit. I admit that, but I don't see any way out of it.

12245. CHAIRMAN.—It has been suggested that the district hospital, when all the other classes are taken out of the workhouse, that that hospital to be called the district hospital should be made a county charge. You will have a very small number going in during the night, so that there would not be any danger of increasing the numbers?—It may be quite right, and at the moment I think possibly it might be a proper charge, but not having considered it before, I have not a strong opinion, but I am inclined to think well of it at the moment.

12246. Mr. MURKIN.—Would not the widening of the area have a tendency to lead to superciliousness?—Undoubtedly.

12247. Dr. BIGGER.—It does not do that in the county infirmary?—It does not.

12248. Mr. MURKIN.—But the county infirmary at present is limited by law to a certain area, and the point does not arise, but if you make a change in the law the point would arise?—I think there is the danger you speak of.

12249. CHAIRMAN.—Then looking at the grants distributed out of the Imperial funds, a large union like Belfast will get many thousand pounds and small unions in the West of Ireland, like Belmullet, where 10s. in the £ over the whole union does not raise £50, will get a very small portion indeed, and they are really unable, owing to their poverty, to keep their workhouses as it ought to be kept on the lowest scale of

property. Would you be against a redistribution of the grants in a way that would take into consideration the exceptional poverty of some districts, and distribute the grants according to necessity, rather than according to the principle that those who have should get more?—I think it would be a difficult matter to settle. It is a very big question. The way you put it seems to have an element of justice about it, but at the same time I think it would be vigorously opposed in other neighbourhoods; at the same time it is not a point I would like to give a strong opinion on.

12253. Along most of the western borders—Doonagh, Moyra, Galway, and Kerry—there is so much poverty among the rangers, and the valuation of the lands and premises is so small that they are really unable to raise enough to keep their hospital as it ought to be kept.—Would you relieve them, to a certain extent, by diminishing the number of workhouses?

12254. It is rather difficult to do much in that way, for take Clontarf: it is forty miles from one end of the union to the other, and practically there is no one in that workhouse except the sick, and that is the way along the whole west coast; no one goes to the workhouse except the sick. The infirm get chimney-sweep accommodation, and stay there. The numbers are small but relatively the staff is large—that question you have not considered?—Not sufficiently to give you any evidence of value.

12255. You don't consider that any additional hospital accommodation is necessary?—Not if, as we recommend, that the hospitals should be retained in connection with the present eight workhouses. I think with the two infirmaries that should be sufficient.

12256. One query is, how far it would be possible to get contributions or payments in aid of expenditure from inmates who go in, or their friends. At present the law enables the Guardians to declare the patient to have been expended by way of loan and to recover up to the average cost, but in some institutions, such as the Latham Infirmary, a very large sum of money is recovered every year for the county. The governor, who signs the recommendation, mentions how much he thinks the patient could contribute, if anything, and people have got into the habit of paying. A very large sum is recovered each year by the county infirmary—I think that is highly proper.

12257. But they have not got any legal right to recover it. Would you be in favour of a change in the law that would enable Guardians and governors of county infirmaries to fix in their discretion how much might be paid for a patient and to recover it?—It is a new question to me, too. It would seem to me to be sufficient to be able to say that when a patient applies, or relatives apply for him, "On inquiry we find your means are so-and-so; we think you should pay so many shillings a week, and if you don't we won't admit you."

12258. That means negotiations at a time when perhaps admission is urgent, and there is no one person to carry on such a negotiation?—I think those who it can be shown can pay should be made to pay. We do that at the asylum.

12259. In Enniskillen the doctor started that system, and he recovers as little as a shilling a week. Every little makes up the total, and he then really recovers a substantial sum?—And it helps to take off the thumb of pauperism. I approve of it.

12260. Even if a labourer's child comes in he takes for granted that child would take 6d. or 1s. a week to keep, and he thinks that much should be paid by the father?—Quite so.

12261. Dr. BOGHER.—Your county infirmary patients do pay?—Yes.

12262. CHAIRMAN.—Have you any view about the tramp question?—I cannot suggest any cure now that would be of value. It is a frightful nuisance, and one that every ingenuity should be applied to stop. There is a perfect army of these people begging from door to door, and getting their hotels in workhouses.

12263. One suggestion that was made to us was that when the tramps were going about with children the Guardians should be empowered to take their children from them, if they thought it desirable, subject to an appeal to justices in Petty Sessions, if the parent committed there was any unfair interference with the control of the children?—It is an extremely difficult question to begin forcibly to take children from their parents and relieve the parents of them. I don't say if the parents are vagrants or criminals.

12264. They are really hereditary vagrants?—Yes; it would seem to be better for the children and cheaper

for the community. At the same time I see a great difficulty in doing that, and I would rather not express an opinion on it.

12265. The English system is that the Guardians should have power to detain the tramp for a certain time, increasing according to the number of times he comes in to take advantage of the workhouse, and to make him work?—Very proper.

12266. That would be a considerable way to reduce it?—Yes.

12267. If the number of workhouses was reduced they would have fewer resting places?—Yes.

12268. Some farmers feared they might rest in their barns or haggards?—I would not allow that to deter me. I don't think there would be much of that, and that is for the farmers and police to look after.

12269. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you think anything ought to be done to strengthen the hands of Guardians in recovering from the fathers of illegitimate children the amount of maintenance?—I think that would be highly proper; the fathers get off far too easily, and I think if there was such a power you would have fewer cases.

12270. They have such a law in England, and perhaps if something of that kind could be applied here you think it would be desirable?—I do.

12271. CHAIRMAN.—In England the girl herself can take proceedings; in Ireland she cannot?—I would be quite willing to go any length with you there.

12272. Mr. MURKIN.—Your Council recommended that there should be fewer workhouses on the county; you think that there would do?—The Council has not expressed an opinion on that subject.

12273. If they are to be fewer some of them must go?

—Yes, and if they are to go we think the first that should go would be those on the border line, of which there are four; Belfast to be separated from the county, and the portions of the Co. Down which now lie between Newtownards and Lisburn Unions, and Belfast we think should be thrown into Newtownards and into Lisburn if Lisburn be retained. My own feeling is that Lisburn should go. I don't think our Council would probably be unanimous with me on that; a large majority would be with me. But if you, gentlemen, said to me: "We have quite made up our minds that there shall be only three workhouses in the Co. Down, and if you asked me which were the three that should and if you asked me which were the three that should be retained, I would have no hesitation in saying Newtownards, Drogheda, and Banbridge. If you took the map before you and had to begin to draw to arrange the workhouses for the Co. Down, you could not do better than mark them out at equal distances and within easy reach of all parts of the county. And if we are to have three workhouses retained, I certainly think these should be the three, and the county would be very poorly supplied with less than three.

12274. The number of the infirm class to go into an institution, suppose we call it a home for the aged, or a county farm, would not in the Co. Down be over 400 or 500. It is generally agreed that children should in all cases be taken away from the workhouse, and the inmates also removed. Taking away all other classes would leave 400 infirm in the Co. Down; would not one workhouse, properly equipped, be sufficient for 400 people?—I really don't think that a workhouse should have less than 400.

12275. When we begin to do something in the way of reform, let it be something that is really worth while, and it does seem to me that to close one or two workhouses in one county or another won't be much good. Let us accomplish something satisfying, that will remain for fifty or a hundred years after we go. Don't you think that one workhouse in the Co. Down, properly equipped, with suitable land to it, would be sufficient to accommodate from 300 to 500 people?—I do.

12276. You say there is one objection to concentration, and that is, a sentiment that the people don't like to leave the locality in which they are residing and have acquaintances. Still at the present time they have to be removed twelve or fourteen, or sixteen miles, and twelve, or fourteen, or sixteen miles in country places in Ireland almost means emigration, so that really there is not so much in sentiment when you go to test the matter. Would you be in favour of giving Guardians power to arrange with neighbouring unions for the support of the poor of their own particular area, supposing it was too far to send them to the county workhouse, and if they found it more economical to board them in a neighbouring

Jan. 15, 1894.

Right Hon.
Thomas
Andrews.

Jan. 15, 1904.

Right Hon.
Thomas
Andrews.

workhouse?—Do you mean to board them in a workhouse of another county?

12274. If they so desired, and if the railway facilities were good, to give the Guardians the power if they found it more economical and better to send an odd case to the neighbouring county?—So long as it was permissive, I don't see any objection to it, but I do think the more our county can be administered and ruled within itself it is very much better.

12275. We had not a very strong feeling in that regard yesterday in Newry?—You would not expect them to have that feeling there, because that would simply extinguish their workhouse.

12276. But the idea is good if it could be carried out without hurting any particular interest?—Yes, and fearing there might be hurt to any interest was the reason we did not state it strongly in that report.

12277. Mr. H. C. Weir.—I represent some witnesses, and would like to ask a question with reference to the alteration of the boundaries of Downpatrick?—I think you could get that better answered by some of the Downpatrick Guardians.

12278. I would like to get your opinion as chairman of the County Council. There are three electoral divisions of Downpatrick, which lie on the other side of Strangford Lough, and are separated from the rest of Downpatrick Union by that arm of the sea. Is it your opinion, or would you think that in any scheme of amalgamation or abolition of workhouses, those three electoral divisions should be taken from it and added to Newtownards on account of the inconvenience to the poor, especially the sick poor, in crossing the ferry and coming into Downpatrick?—That is something that both Newtownards and Downpatrick would be retained as at present.

Col. Sherman
Crawford.

I was really only one of the witnesses, and Mr. Andrews has gone so fully into the matter, I only corroborate everything he has said, and, as an ex-chairman of the Newtownards Board of Guardians, I entirely disagree with the evidence given in Belfast. Every Co. Down inmate in Belfast ought to be removed to his own county.

12283. CHAIRMAN.—Was there any other point?—I don't know whether all the infirmaries in Ireland are situated the same as the Downpatrick Infirmary. It is on the lowest Government rate allowed by the Act, and the rest is supplied by private contributions. I would be afraid, if you made it a district rate, it would swamp the private contributions.

12284. That would have the effect of putting the whole expense on the county?—It would stop private contributions more or less.

12285. Dr. BIGGON.—Downpatrick and Newry are on the same basis; they raise double what the county gives them?—By the Act Downpatrick Infirmary is bound to get £300 a year, and the rest is made up by private contributions. I am greatly interested in the question of the children. I agree entirely with what Mr. Andrews said. My experience is that no matter how good the child was that was educated in the workhouse, there was always an inclination to drift back again.

12286. CHAIRMAN.—You prefer the boarding-out system. To my own knowledge it is most satisfactory. I employ a large number of labourers, and I find it is most helpful, because they are more suited for agricultural labourers.

12287. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—When a woman and her husband come to the workhouse with their children, what would you do. Would you, in the first instance, let them come two or three times, or have some standard or other by which to test whether those people ought to have charge of the children or not?—When children come to the workhouse with their father and mother it is to the advantage of the children, I think, that they should be separated from their father and mother.

12288. You think, as a rule, they are vagrants?—Yes.

12289. And you would leave it to the Guardians to say whether those children should be removed?—I would hardly leave it to the Guardians, but I would say when children reached a certain age they should be removed from the workhouse, and with regard to the tramps, I think they should not be allowed to leave until they had performed sufficient labour to recompense. And the reduction in the number of workhouses, which, no doubt will take place—

12290. Yes?—I have no doubt that if the union be diminished that there will have to be a very large re-arrangement of boundaries, and I think it likely in that case that Downpatrick would get a very large addition from the Kilfildist district, and I think, on the whole, that there would, especially to the sick, be a gain in their being connected with Newtownards. They would have a longer distance to travel from Pottery to Newtownards, but they would save crossing the ferry. But I cannot express any opinion of that kind from the County Council, and I would rather you would get the information from some of those who are better qualified to speak.

12291. Do you know that the passage of the ferry is sometimes so difficult that boatmen won't take it, and the ambulance cannot be ferried over?—I am rather ashamed to say I have not crossed that ferry in my life, but I see a postman here whom I have heard express very great fear from some of his passages across there, and I would not wonder but he would speak very fully on that subject.

Mr. H. MCGURK.—I certainly will. I may say at the very beginning that Mr. Weir has a particular object in asking these questions.

CHAIRMAN.—You might let that develop itself.

12292. Mr. MCGURK.—Am you aware what it has cost the Downpatrick Union for the last twelve months to bring the sick poor over the Strangford Ferry?—I am not.

12293. Are you aware that it is only twelve journeys, and the amount 12s. 6d. a journey?—I don't know anything about it, but it would not be a question of expense that would prevent us from giving every facility to the sick poor; but I don't want to express any strong opinion on the question at all.

Colonel SHARMAN CRAWFORD examined.

12290. CHAIRMAN.—Will diminish their facilities for travelling?—They only follow the line of the workhouse at present, and if these were broken up the tramps would be reduced.

CHAIRMAN.—The only thing is that in Ireland before there were workhouses there were far more tramps.

12291. Dr. BIGGON.—If the Banbridge Workhouse was done away with, what would happen if a tramp came there and looked for some assistance?—I don't know, I suspect the tramps only follow the line of workhouses.

12292. Something would have to be done for him when he would go to the relieving officer?—In that case perhaps it would be better to take him into the house.

12293. CHAIRMAN.—But if there were no workhouse for him; that is what we are assuming. The only institution in the neighbourhood would be a hospital for the sick; the last-up is the only other public institution?—Of course it is a very difficult question.

12294. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Some witnesses suggested he should go to the relieving officer and get a ticket for a night's lodging and breakfast, but if he came often turn him over to the police and prosecute him?—A very good idea.

Mr. James ANDREWS.—I appear, instructed by Mr. Weir, and with your kind permission, I wish to ask one question of Colonel Crawford with reference to the alterations that might be made in the boundaries of Downpatrick and Newtownards. The proposal that we wish to make is that the lower portion of the Ards, the Pottery part, should be thrown in under the new arrangement as part of the Newtownards Union.

Mr. Daniel MCGURK.—I represent the Downpatrick District Council, and may I be permitted to ask, through you, who this body is that is instructing Mr. Andrews?

Mr. ANDREWS.—I appear on behalf of several gentlemen, and I propose to call a few of them at a subsequent stage of these proceedings. Dr. McLaughlin, the dispensary doctor at Strangford.

Mr. MCGURK.—Who do you appear for as making a special case in reference to this small area?

Mr. ANDREWS.—These are some of the gentlemen I appear for, I don't propose to call them all, as I may consider these I call will be able to give you sufficient evidence of the necessity for the change. The names of those I propose to call are Dr. McLaughlin, Captain Somerset Ward, Mr. James Hutton, Mr. John Greer, &c., and Mr. Henry Dobbin. Their evidence will be very short, because it is confined to this one point.

CHAIRMAN.—This seems a natural matter for us to inquire into, and our rules about locus standi are very wide.

12295 Mr. Andrews.—Colonel Crawford, you are aware that the great probability is that the unions in Devon will be reduced, and in any alterations of the unions that may be made, do you consider that it will be beneficial that the lower portion of the Ards which at present belongs to the Downpatrick division should be thrown into the Newtownards Union or otherwise?—Personally, from the geographical situation, I am strongly of opinion as a private individual that it

would be an advantage for the poor, both the sick and the aged and infirm, that they should go to Newtownards instead of going to Downpatrick. It is called a ferry, but the tide runs six or seven knots, and it takes a robust person to get across there on a winter's day without ill effects. If I was a sick person I would sooner go to Newtownards than Downpatrick.

12296 Mr. McGee.—You have never experienced the sickness I have never been sea-sick in my life.

12297 Mr. McGee.—How often have you driven from Portadown to Newtownards?—Very often, and if I was in the ambulance I would be all right.

Jan. 15, 1904.

Col. Sherman
Crawford.

MR. WILLIAM HEALY EXAMINED.

I don't think I need occupy your time, because our Chairman has expressed my views.

12298 CHAIRMAN.—You have nothing additional?—No.

12299 Mr. McCarty.—Might I ask Mr. Healy about this new apple of discord. What do you think about it?—Really I could not offer an opinion. I think matters have gone along so quietly heretofore that I don't see any necessity for a change.

12300 Mr. McGee.—Was this matter brought before the special committee of the County Council at all?—This matter was not brought before us at all.

12301 CHAIRMAN.—You did not go into localities at all?—No.

Mr. Andrews.—I asked Colonel Sherman Crawford not as a County Councillor but as a private individual.

Mr. McGee.—It seems such an important matter that I thought the County Council should have given an expression of opinion on it.

CHAIRMAN.—You think it an important matter.

Mr. McGee.—Well, seeing that these gentlemen have brided Mr. Andrews on the subject, it seems important.

CHAIRMAN.—If necessary we can give you an opportunity of producing further evidence on it. As there is no further evidence on behalf of the County Council, we will hear the Downpatrick Board of Guardians.

Mr. William
Healy.

MR. CHARLES GIBSON, Chairman, Board of Guardians, examined.

12302 CHAIRMAN.—You have been present during the consideration of the previous witnesses. I don't know whether you wish me to take you through the entire matter?—I prefer simply offering my opinions, and I may say these are the opinions of the committee of the Downpatrick Board of Guardians, on two or three items. With reference to the first query—the amalgamation of unions—on that point we have considered the matter very fully indeed, and we are of opinion that it would be inexpedient in the interest of the destitute poor to dissolve any of the existing unions. We consider that this matter was very carefully indeed considered at the time the unions were formed. Having regard to the large extent of the Co. Down, and the nature of the country, it would be nearly impossible, considering the interests of the destitute poor, to dissolve any of the existing unions with advantage. In the first place, if you consider that from Downpatrick to Banbridge, taking a line as the crow flies, you would have twenty-three statute miles. By the road it would be much greater. Just on the borders of Downpatrick Union there is a large chain of mountains. Taking that chain of mountains into consideration, and the impossibility of conveying the sick poor from one side to the other, it would be altogether inexpedient to dissolve any of the existing unions.

12303 Owing to the distance and the chain of mountains existing?—Exactly; and also, when I am speaking of that question, it would be a proper thing to mention a question that has been raised here with reference to the cutting off of the Portadown district. I have been a Guardian in Downpatrick for the past twenty-one years.

12304 What part of the union do you reside in?—The electoral division of Banbridge, about four miles from Downpatrick. During these twenty-one years I have never heard the slightest objection to the convenience of the poor across the ferry, and I did not find any difficulty arising. Also I may mention that we would object to the cutting-off of this district and adding it to Newtownards, not only in the interests of the poor themselves, because they are much more convenient to Downpatrick than to Newtownards, but we would object still further in the interests of the ratepayers, because if you look at the charges for the whole county, you will find that the ratepayers of Ardara and Portadown are very much better off; their poor are better accommodated at Downpatrick than at Newtownards. The union charges for Banbridge are 134; for Charlestown, 108; the union charges for Downpatrick, 65; for Kilnab, 124; for Hillborough, 104; for Meira, 154; and for Newtownards, 116, so that the transfer of these three divisions, as proposed, from Downpatrick to Newtownards, would mean an addition to the rates in those three divisions. And also there is another point that Downpatrick Union itself is a large union—it

occupies nearly one-fifth of the county, it is large enough to be worked with economy, and it is not too large for administrative purposes; in point of fact Downpatrick is a centre, having a radius of ten miles right round, and it is quite possible to transport the sick poor easily, and cheaply, and economically, and having such a centre it would be inadvisable to destroy a really effective working centre, which is now only coming in to be effective, to destroy that by cutting off any portion of it, that is supposing the unions remain as they are, as I really hope they will. With reference to the children, I would wish to say that I do not think it is exactly the proper way of dealing with orphan and deserted children to board them out. To my mind the difficulty you have in sending the orphan and deserted children out to the country districts is that the people who really could and would look after them, and educate them properly in every way, will not have them; consequently the people who will board them out will be a class of people who really desire nothing more than to make money out of them. To meet the requirements of that, my view is that you should establish in the Co. Down three large institutions or schools, worked on the same system as industrial schools—one for the Episcopalian, the second for the Presbyterian portion, and the third for the Roman Catholics.

12305 Where would you leave the other varieties?—Let them take their chance. I only recognise the three.

12306 Mr. MURPHY.—Would not these children you talk about, for whom you are not able to find homes good enough, would they not find homes just as good as their parents could provide for them in the class they came from?—Oh, yes.

12307 Do you wish to lift them above the children of honest people and put them in a condition of life better than children outside the workhouse. You said that the difficulty in regard to boarding-out the children was that it was hard to get a suitable home for them, that the people that took them took them to make something out of them, and that they were not of a respectable condition of life suitable for the care of these children?—Quite so.

12308 Do you not think that the homes that the Guardians would find for these children, supposing they did board them out, would be homes just as good as the homes the parents of the children came from?—Oh, yes.

12309 Then do you think it would be a proper thing to raise the lowest class of the community at the expense of the rates to a condition better than that of the respectable independent class?—You did not catch my answer directly. My answer applies only to orphan and deserted children and I do hold that it would be desirable, when you do incur the expense for the education of an orphan child, to raise it as high as possible.

Mr. Charles
Gibson.

Jan. 15, 1904.

Mr. Charles
Goss.

12310. Higher than the child of the ordinary citizen?—I can scarcely say it would be higher than the child of the ordinary citizen.

12311. It is not permitted to the small reaper to send his child to an institution to learn a trade. Don't you think if the State provides for these waifs a suitable home, where they will have the same accommodation as the children of humble people outside, that the State is going far enough?—I rather think not. I think it is the duty of the State to provide, as far as possible, for orphan children; either give the power to the Board of Guardians to avail themselves of existing orphanages, or industrial schools, or else provide accommodation in the different counties.

12312. Have you many children in your own workhouse?—School children, 17—7 boys and 10 girls.

12313. Have you many boarded-out?—I think we have one. No, it is not boarded-out, it is adopted.

12314. Then you have not adopted the system of boarding-out?—We never did.

12315. Then you know nothing about its value?—We had one child boarded-out.

12316. Would you be surprised to hear that we had evidence yesterday at Newry to the effect that out of 200 children boarded-out of the Newry Union there was only the case of one child that did not make a success in life; but of the children raised in the workhouse nearly all fell away or came back to it again?—I am not at all surprised, because my experience of the workhouse is that if you take a child in the workhouse it will go into the world and come back again in a short time very bad. The workhouse undoubtedly is the worst possible place for a child, but my proposition is not a workhouse at all, but an industrial school established apart from a workhouse.

12317. But still it is an institutional life; the children don't have the opportunities of knowing the ordinary affairs of life, and don't know the advantages of home. They are strangers to the world when they go out of the institution; they have to begin to learn the very rudiments of existence if you keep them in an institution until fourteen or sixteen years of age. Do you not think it would be better to send these children out amongst the population and let them do the daily work of the household. Did you ever think over the question?—Yes, I never had any experience, but I have arrived at the conclusion that industrial schools should be established rather than boarding-out; of course it is only my view.

12318. Do you speak the view of the Guardians?—I speak the view of the majority of the Guardians of the Downpatrick Union.

12319. Dr. Brooker.—Have you any experience of any children brought up in an industrial school?—Yes, slightly.

12320. Can you remember some of them?—I can scarcely recall a particular case.

12321. How did you come to form your opinion?—From visiting industrial schools in Belfast and the neighbourhood.

12322. But it is not in the school we want to know about them, but their after existence?—Well, I have no experience of their after life.

12323. Have you any experience of children that have been boarded-out?—No; but I have a good deal of experience of children who have been reared in the home.

12324. Have you any knowledge of the relative cost of keeping children under the two systems?—Yes.

12325. What is the cost in the institution?—I believe they could be maintained in an orphanage or institution for 5s. a week.

Dr. Brooker.—I think you will find the average is over 60s a year.

Mr. McNamee.—5s. a week?—I believe they can be maintained at from 5s. to 6s.

12326. Dr. Brooker.—Do you know of any institution in which that actually is the cost of keeping the children?—Yes.

12327. Chairman.—What institution is that?—Foolage, Ballynatoagh.

12328. Dr. Brooker.—Is it assisted from some other grants?—It is assisted from nothing but charity.

12329. Therefore it costs more than 5s. a week?—They will actually take children at 5s.

12330. Chairman.—You mean it would not cost the *same* more?—No more.

12331. Mr. McNamee.—Your reason for disagreeing with any change in the present system is due to the

fact that when these workhouses were established things are now as they were then. Do you think the same number of people are in the country now as there were?—Certainly not.

12332. Do you think the railway travelling was as convenient as at present?—Certainly not, but you must remember that you cannot remove poor people either to hospital or otherwise by rail.

12333. But on the understanding that there is to be in every place where there is a workhouse at present a hospital better than the present one for the accommodation of the sick, and considering that in some of the unions of the Co. Down there are very few of the aged and destitute class—what is known as the infirm class—calculating them all they don't amount to over 200 or 400, do you not think that one institution in the Co. Down would be sufficient to provide accommodation for those 200 or 400 aged and infirm?—Of course it would.

12334. Suppose you take care of the children and lunatics, you have nothing left except the tramps and the aged and infirm, and why should these big huge institutions be kept scattered over the county if there is no need for them?—You have a class going in that we are troubled with very much in Downpatrick Union, that is army pensioners.

12335. You think the ratepayers should be compelled to keep up a house for the accommodation of the army pensioners?—Certainly not.

12336. Then you get rid of that class?—But I do not think that it would be possible to remove, as you speak of, all the aged poor to the central institution, because in the first place these poor people will not go.

12337. There was not much trouble coming down here to Downpatrick to-day if a man had a ticket in his pocket?—Quite so.

12338. What trouble would there be if the military officer provided a means of conveyance to the applicant?—I fail to see where the advantage comes in.

12339. The advantage comes in in getting rid of a staff of officials, and getting rid of the cost of the upkeep of a large institution, which, for long alone, in the average amounts to 4300s a year!—If you gave equal accommodation to the sick poor, but you cannot. You cannot get the aged poor to remove out of their district. You could not get an aged person from Newtownards or Donaghadee to come to Downpatrick Workhouse; or a person living at Carrickfergus, how would you transport him to Downpatrick?

12340. I have the advantage of living in a union where there was a workhouse amalgamated, and I know paupers who have to come twenty miles, and there is no inconvenience expressed, and the Guardians representing that special case say it was a very good thing to have the amalgamation; they see no hardship at all in the matter!—Perhaps they are easily pleased.

12341. Mr. Andrew.—If there was to be any redistribution made of the unions, do you consider it would be in the interests of the sick poor of Ardferry and Portaferry that that portion of the county should be thrown into the Union of Newtownards, and it should thus be necessary for them to undertake the long-petuous voyage across the Lough?—In the interests of the sick poor, undoubtedly it would be very advisable to send them to Downpatrick instead of a long journey of nineteen miles.

12342. You don't speak in any medical capacity?—Not at all.

12343. But just as a jolly gentleman who likes a good sea voyage. I hope it will be a long time before it is necessary for you, as a sick patient, to make a journey across the Lough?—I have an idea, a pretty accurate one, that the reason that prompts this question is not exactly the interests of the sick poor.

12344. You have never been across the *ferry* yourself?—I have not.

12345. Mr. McCortan.—You live as near as Mr. Hutton, or some of these gentlemen who are raising the question?—Yes.

12346. Does Dr. McLaughlin live in this area?—He is one of our dispensary doctors; he is on the Downpatrick side.

12347. Captain Somerset Ward does not live in this area?—He lives in Strangford, and was one of our official Guardians, and never objected to the sick poor crossing the Lough for twenty years.

12348. It is a political move to alter the complexion of Downpatrick Union?—Certainly. The real secret is that seven National Guardians come from Portlough.

Mr. HENRY McGRATH examined.

Jan. 25, 1894

Mr. Henry
McGrath.

12348. CHAIRMAN.—Would you wish to state your view on the question we have been considering?—In addition to being a member of the Downpatrick Board of Guardians, I am also County Councillor for the district.

12349. What district is that?—Downpatrick, the town, and the entire district of Lecale. I take exception to some remarks made by our Chairman, Mr. Andrews. He did not do so intentionally. I admit the County Council as a body did not recommend the disbursement of any union in the county.

Mr. F. Andrews.—I said so.

Witness.—What the County Council did, they fell in with the principle of Mr. Andrews' recommendation, that every union should be conformable with the county. If the principle could be carried out in its entirety with the other portions of your inquiry, and that is, that where geographical changes are to be made, that they should be made with a view to relieving the economical expenditure of the rate and advantage accruing to the sick poor in addition. I pointed that out to Mr. Andrews at the time, and the sub-committee did not deal with those two other portions of your inquiry. They did not deal with the question of how it would affect the ratepayers or what advantage would accrue to the destitute poor; we were not unanimous about that. Another objection I took to Mr. Andrews' proposition was this: about a sanatorium for consumptives. It was mentioned we considered one was absolutely necessary, but we did not recommend that any union in the county should be closed for that purpose. About amalgamation, I do not think it would be any advantage in the county of Down. Mr. McHughan thinks we are largely served by railway communication. We are on the portion you travelled over this morning, but in the central portion of the county we have very inadequate railway communication. I believe there is one being promoted from Ballymore to Newcastle, which will open up the back part, but in the mountain part there is no railway accommodation, nor in the Ards, so that to bring patients to these centres, as one witness suggested, it is not possible.

12351. There would be a local hospital according to the suggestion in each union?—Well, I would follow it as regards the infirm. To bring the infirm from Newry to Banbridge or Downpatrick by ambulance would be a very serious matter, and would entail death.

12352. Do you think the ordinary run of infirm people would not be capable of a railway journey of twenty or thirty miles?—But there is no railway from Newry until you come to Newcastle.

12353. Dr. BROWN.—From Banbridge?—Of course from Banbridge there is. The same argument would apply to other portions, to bring the sick poor. I think, about amalgamation, there are other questions that have been forgotten, and that is this, that no matter whether you amalgamate unions, you must retain dispensary districts, and dispensary doctors, and midwives, and relieving officers. It would be most inhumane to bring the relieving officers for the whole county every week to these centres, and the report book of the doctors and midwives.

12354. CHAIRMAN.—Would you be in favour of a dispensary committee for the examination of such books?—Yes, I think that was a mistake in the Act; the old dispensary committees should have that power or a committee of the Guardians, but you must retain the doctors and sick nurses. Then if you intend to retain the hospitals you must have a casual ward for transients going about.

12355. That does not quite follow, but you don't see how you could do without it?—No; and if you have a casual ward you must have the doctor to go there, and a porter to look after it. My feeling is you could not get the destitute poor conveyed at all to it, and I don't see that there would be much financial advantage, and I have failed to see any recommendation for the whole county where any particular individual or witness has insisted the general public that these geographical changes would be an advantage to the sick poor or the rate.

12356. Mr. McCURRY.—While you are on change of view, you might explain the question raised here?—I was rather surprised that Mr. Weir and Mr. Andrews got up and raised the question of cutting off these three divisions and adding them on to Newtownards. The eastern portion of the Ards, Portaferry, is seventeen or eighteen miles from Newtownards Union, and there is no railway communication. It is six miles only from Downpatrick. Of course there is the ferry, to con-

nect with, but then we have this advantage in the ferry: we have a Royal grant, granted in the reign of Queen Anne, 56 acres of land at either side for the support of two ferry boats, and these convey the ambulance across at the expense of 4s., and they are so constructed that they are not so much subject to the rise and fall of the tide like the ordinary ferry boat. They are a very broad boat, and no sea can disturb them very much.

12357. Is the ambulance horse taken over also?—The horse also. Captain Somerset Ward, who is one of the instructing witnesses, I saw his two horses coming across this morning quite early. There never has been an accident occurred in that boat during the lifetime of the oldest individual in the Co. Down.

12358. Dr. BROWN.—Is it always able to go across?—Always.

12359. Day and night?—Well, after night it is dark. I travel that ferry four times a week on an average, and I travel always by night.

12360. CHAIRMAN.—How long does it take?—It depends on the tide; five minutes or a quarter of an hour. The ambulance crossed twelve times last year, and ten times on an average for the last five years. We pay 15s. to the man who horses the ambulance and 4s. for the ferry.

12361. Dr. BROWN.—What is the population of that district?—4,548.

12362. Had you only twelve admissions to the workhouse from them. Is that about the same ratio of admissions as the rest of the population?—I think so.

12363. Do you not think the ferry is a detriment?—I am sure it is not. Ninety per cent. of the population of 4,500 are in favour of retaining the Downpatrick Union. Dr. MacLaughlin and Captain Ward live on the other side—he does not live in the Ards—and Mr. Hutton lives out of the district, and out of the 4,500 there are opposed to it Mr. Greer and Mr. Dunnean, and I am sure you won't see Mr. Dunnean here. The seven Guardians of the district are entirely in favour of being retained in Downpatrick. It is entirely a political matter altogether, with the object of wiping out the Nationalists, which I do not think they will succeed in doing. I wish to point out a matter that should strike the most violent and enthusiastic supporter of this scheme: the union rating in Downpatrick is 5d.; the union rating in Newtownards is 11d.; the valuation of Ardara is £8,311; the valuation of Portaferry is £2,774, and of Quinlan £26,074—a total of £30,759. If we had to pay our proportion of the union rating in Newtownards it would have cost these three divisions last year £638 more than we did pay, and then we will be joined on to a union which has a large number of loans to pay off, and in Downpatrick we have only a small loan in Portaferry, and portion of the asylum loan in Downpatrick.

12364. Mr. McCURRY.—Do you think that if any candidate stood on the policy of amalgamating either of these three divisions he would poll many votes?—I would wonder he would be at the bottom of the poll. I could get you 75 per cent. of the ratepayers of Portaferry in opposition to this scheme.

12365. Mr. McHUGHAN.—Do you think the Poor Law system of Down is in such a condition of efficiency that it could not be improved?—I do not.

12366. You say amalgamation would not improve it?—I don't think it will. In the first place, I would follow Mr. Andrews' idea about the improving of the district hospitals.

12367. That is going on at present, and that means more cost?—You cannot improve them without further cost. I would carry out the recommendations of the 60th section of the Act, and make the workhouse hospital into a district hospital. We are very badly supplied with hospitals in the county at present. We have only the Downpatrick Infirmary, and we hardly get a patient beyond the fifteen miles radius, and we have Newry, and they only serve a very small area, and the other is Lisburn. Up to the present we have not contributed anything to Lisburn; the others are the workhouse hospitals. I say we should carry out the 60th section and make each hospital attached to a workhouse a district hospital.

12368. Don't you know there is a feeling of dislike to the name of workhouse?—I do. I would call them almshouses.

12369. Don't you think it would be better to separate the sick from the aged and infirm. We found the aged and infirm in Newry sitting about in a big room. Don't

Jan. 15, 1894.

Mr Henry
M. Gresh.

You think these people should be away out in the fields?—Certainly I do. I would keep the sick in the hospitals.

12375. What would you do with the class I refer to, people who don't care to work yet could do a good deal?—That is the able-bodied?

12376. They are classed as infirm and aged, ranging from fifty to sixty-five or seventy years of age; these you have in every house. Don't you think these men would be better away on a farm than cooped up in that little yard or house?—Certainly; I see with you entirely.

12377. How are we going to get at that if you continue the present system. Don't you think it would be a better change to improve the infirmary in every place where there is a workhouse at present. Take away from that infirmary the children, the lunatics, and this class to which I refer, of which there are only 400 in Down, that class we see in every house doing nothing, sifting their time?—These most doing be employed on farms.

12378. Leave the sick in the infirmary, take the children and board them out, take the lunatics to the asylum or auxiliary asylum, then you have nobody but tramps and this class I have referred to?—You must keep a place for the tramps.

12379. I won't deal with them; they are a small and changing class?—They are not small with us; there are thirty or forty a week here.

12380. They don't cost much when you go into figures. I want first to deal with this particular class that I would put in a workhouse, and have one workhouse for them alone?—I would not do that at all with them. I would try and compel them to go and work on farms, where they are required at the present time. There is a perfect dearth of labour at present.

12381. You cannot make a man work any more than you can make a horse drink?—Don't you intend to make him work in your workhouse? I think he should be made work on the farm just as well as on your labour colony. If he is a sturdy individual and won't work in the workhouse, you could deal with him by law.

12382. In that way we will be getting rid of a considerable expense and effecting a very great economy, and, at the same time, raising the standard of efficiency?—I don't think you get rid of much expense. You must have the hospitals and nurses for the hospitals, and you would still have to have a casual ward and a porter and some sort of a master to look after it.

12383. I am trying to get at this difficult class that you don't care to take away from the workhouse?—I would take them away from the workhouse and force them on a farm, where they are wanted every day.

12384. A farmer won't want a man of sixty-five years of age?—He will, but he cannot get them.

12385. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. MURTAGHAN refers to men to far past their labour as not to be taken by a farmer for a day's work?—What good will that man be on your labour colony?

12386. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—They won't do much, but they will take away the name of workhouse from the locality?—You will have to support the men there.

12387. Yes, but one staff will be less expensive than seven?—Will that reduce the number of workhouses in the county to one. You would have the sick poor in the hospitals, you would have the labour colony, and you would have the children in institutions.

12388. Besides that preferably?—Well, then you have another class—your commissioners and responsible men, who have been unfortunate in business. What are you going to do with them?

12389. Have a system of classification at the colony and let them go there?—I would have a sort of almshouse built outside for the purpose of keeping those respectable married couples together. We have that in this union at present at Killybegh and they have not the surroundings of the workhouse attached. Lord Banger keeps up something of that nature on his estate, and they seem happy and comfortable.

12390. You would be inclined to retain the hospitals for the sick?—Yes. We should apply to the workhouse the test they have in Denmark—divide into the necessitous of every pauper who comes in and classify them accordingly. It seems very hard that the sempstress I have spoken about should be cooped up with a woman who has been breeding illegitimate children all her life. Now if they were classified according to their antecedents in life, they would be in different houses.

12391. CHAIRMAN.—At all events if they were in the same institution they should be kept separate?—About the imbeciles. Insane epileptics are being taken into the asylum, and they have a fine opportunity, if they

are able to work, of having the advantage of open air. There are about 100 of them working on the farm, they seem very healthy and happy and better than in the workhouse. For the same epileptics, I think there should be a labour colony for the province of Ulster.

12392. There are 400 for the whole of Ireland?—But I should say one institution for the whole of Ireland, unless, as in Scotland, we board them out. Then they are a source of revenue because in their healthy moments they can work.

12393. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—There was a proposition made by a philanthropic lady lately to build a hospital for Ireland, and the Guardians over the county did not approve of it?—If you could improve the status of the Guardians; besides being Guardians of the rate they should be Guardians of the poor; and that is what many of them forget they are.

12394. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—If there was a central institution where these people were sent, do you think it would be necessary to maintain a governing body for the dispensary and collateral matters of that sort in connection with the District Councils?—You would have to have the same dispensary districts and doctors, and the same supervision over them, and you would require to meet weekly or fortnightly to see that the directions had been carried out.

12395. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Supposing the area was continued as it is, could not the Guardians do as they do at present, meet as District Councils, and let after the affairs of the union?—They are not necessarily the same body.

12396. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Each of the Boards could send their governors to this institution?—Yes; but you must have your weekly meetings to look after the dispensaries. I think outdoor relief has not been given with a liberal enough hand.

12397. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Do you give much in this union?—Last year we paid £700. Under the old regime, if they were able to be removed at all, they did not get outdoor relief; now we have been giving it with a more liberal hand. The relieving officers are charged from giving coal. They can now give food, lodging, medicine, or medical attendance, and it is within the province of the auditor to exchange for coal. It seems very harsh on the destitute poor. Some auditors exchange for ordinary food—bacon and butter—things that are and sugar and oatmeal are the only necessities.

12398. CHAIRMAN.—You would like to have but added?—Yes, I think there should be more liberal outdoor relief given.

12399. Are you speaking for yourself personally?—I am speaking for the majority of the Guardians.

12400. That is a matter in your own hands?—We must obtain a certificate of the doctor, which has to be produced every week, and it is very difficult for the doctor to go round and see every recipient of relief weekly.

12401. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—You don't need to do that?—It has been the rule with the Downpatrick Board of Guardians that the relieving officer must produce a certificate from the doctor that the person cannot be removed.

12402. It is not necessary?—I would suggest we should apply the 39th section of the Local Government Act, whereby we can appoint committees for the admission of paupers. I think there should be some district committees for the purpose of looking after outdoor relief to aid the relieving officers. We can relieve a destitute widow with two or three legitimately born children if they are destitute, but there is many a widow who keeps her home intact with very small means, and if we had power to aid her with a supplemental grant.

12403. CHAIRMAN.—You mean poverty, not destitution, should be the test?—Yes.

12404. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Would not that be far more necessary if there is this central institution for the infirm, especially that the casual infirm should not all be driven into it?—I mean that outdoor relief should be given in a more liberal spirit; it is given much more liberally in England.

12405. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—It is given much more liberally in Banbridge?—Yes; and I am very much pleased with the way they give it in Northampton, in Wigan and Wakefield they give 2s. 10d. and 3s. 6d., and the rate is ten outdoor to one indoor; and in Cornwall it is 11s. 6d. against 3s., and it is cheaper there than here.

12406. The Guardians have a good deal of power?—The Downpatrick Board feel they have not sufficient power.

12402. Mr. McCORTAN.—Are you aware that in Bantock there is a 260 acreage pending, and does not your Board live in fear?—Our Board fear things they should not fear. About the question of tramps, I would suggest there should be a register either at the police barracks or at the workhouse, of where labour is secured, and they should be faced to go there and work. Colonel McCree suggested they should be photographed, and perhaps that would be a good idea, but they should be registered somewhere.

12403. And if they refused to go to work?—The other morning at the workhouse I saw ten or twelve able-bodied men coming out. When they are brought before the Board they say they cannot get work; they don't want work. If there was a register of work kept, and they refused to work, then deal drastically with them.

12404. CHAIRMAN.—Farmers would give in their names when they required labour, and then the relieving officer or the police would send the man to him?—Yes.

Dr. NICHOLSON examined.

12407. Mr. McCORTAN.—You have heard the matters that have been put to the witnesses by the Chairman and his colleagues on these issues that they have to inquire into. Have you any opinions to express?—I don't know that I have any, but I think the district hospital should be retained.

12408. CHAIRMAN.—You think it would be necessary that a hospital or infirmary should be retained for the treatment of the destitute or sick poor?—Certainly.

12409. Is that the only part that you professionally are interested in?—Yes.

12410. Dr. NICHOLSON.—With reference to consumption, do you find that there are a large number of cases?—Our numbers have always been very very few; in the last year there were six only.

12411. I mean to say in the district?—It is not very prevalent in my experience.

12412. What is your opinion with regard to the establishment of a sanatorium for a portion of the county or the whole county?—Of course it would be desirable.

12413. CHAIRMAN.—You could send a number of cases from this part of the county if such an institution were opened?—I think they would be very few.

Mr. MATTHEW KING examined.

I am Vice-Chairman of the Killeshel Board of Guardians.

12425. CHAIRMAN.—What did you wish to say for Killeshel?—I think it would be a great grievance on the sick and destitute poor if Killeshel was abolished, because it is in such an isolated position, and it is a very nice place for a workhouse. The majority of the people live on the mountains slope.

12426. If it were closed as a workhouse, would it be a suitable place as a sanatorium for convalescents?—Oh, yes; at the present time there is a very fine hospital connected with the workhouse, and a very good doctor; there are three trained nurses, a master and matron, and the patients are very well looked after.

Mr. McCORTAN.—In fact the army pensioners come down from all parts of Ireland. The last day I was there there was a pensioner from Cork.

12427. Dr. BROWN.—How many have you altogether?—Forty-one or six; they are permanent; they pay about 4s. a week.

12428. CHAIRMAN.—Why is your place a favourite resort for these workhouse?—It seems they are fairly well treated. The master is an old pensioner himself.

12429. Dr. BROWN.—What is the number of inmates in Killeshel?—I think about eighty. It is such an isolated place; it is twenty-one miles to Downpatrick, and twenty miles to Newry.

12430. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—While there might be a suitable place of a hospital there, do you see any great need for what is known as a workhouse?—They are nearly all infirm people in the workhouse; very few in hospital.

12431. According to the report in January last year, half the inmates were in the infirmary—thirty in the infirmary and thirty-eight in the body of the house. Supposing the infirmary was retained there and you retain all the privileges you have at present, do you

12405. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Do you think the farmers would care for that class about their doors?—When I get them in the potato season I am very glad to have them. I had a tramp last year, and I offered 2s. 6d. a day, and he would not come for that. He went to another man, who offered him his food and 1s. a day. "A shilling a day," he said, "that will only be six bottles of porter for me." We tried the cold bath and stone-breaking, but the master of the workhouse told the Board he would require a superintendent for each tramp to make him work.

12406. Mr. ANDREW.—Mr. McCORTAN has expounded his views so fully that I think it unnecessary to question him. We have seen his skill as a lawyer, and if report is to be believed, he is equally famous as a navigator. He considers discretion is the better part of valour, and when the ferry is a bit stormy he prefers to remain by his fireside?—I absolutely take exception to Mr. Andrew's remarks. I cross that stormy water five times a week.

Jan. 15, 1904.

Mr. Henry
McGrath.

12414. The few that are there, are they a danger to the public health of their families?—Not in my experience.

Dr. Nelson

12415. Are they cases of phthisis?—Yes.

12416. Are they living in small houses or in better-class houses?—I have not much experience of cases in small houses.

12417. Mr. McCORTAN.—Would your hospital require enlargement if the ages that Downpatrick was supposed to serve was enlarged?—Yes; we cannot do much more than accommodate our present numbers.

12418. Your accommodation is exceeded at the present time?—Not exceeded; we can meet all demands.

12419. In regard to this other question, have you ever known of any deterrent on the sick coming from Portaferry?—No.

12420. How long have you been medical officer of this union?—I am not quite sure; upwards of twenty years, at all events.

12421. And the sick from that district have availed themselves of Downpatrick in all cases?—As far as I am aware.

12422. You have never known of any bad effects happening from being conveyed in the van across the Lough?—I don't recollect any.

see any hardship in sending what are called the able-bodied by some, and aged and infirm by others to a central house?—I don't think there are any aged or infirm except army pensioners.

Mr. Matthew
King.

12430. There are fourteen or fifteen?—I really think they should be removed.

12431. Is not that a reason why Killeshel could be done without as a workhouse but still retained as an infirmary?—What advantage would that be?

12432. It would cut down the cost?—I question it very much.

12433. You have a workhouse staff and infirmary staff at present?—But if you divide our union among two or three other unions you will have to employ two or three relieving officers; what staff would you get rid of?

12434. The master and matron, and you would get rid of a great deal of the cost of the house which you have to pay now?—My experience of all these amalgamations is that it increases the cost.

12435. You are not speaking from experience?—I am, indeed.

12436. In what way?—All these amalgamations and retrenchments increase the expense in the work of the county. On the asylum they have spent £20,000 in the last three years.

12437. That is not amalgamation; that is enlargement and improvement?—Just bringing the inmates out of the workhouse into the asylum.

12438. That is not putting anything more on the ratepayers, because the inmates taken from the workhouse can be kept at a cheaper rate in the asylum than in the workhouse, considering that £10 a year is given as a capitation grant?—And how much would it come to erecting a central building in the county for those inmates?

Jan. 14, 1904.
Mr. Matthew King.

12439. You have four or five; any one of them would be suitable, or could be made suitable?—It is very strange; the old workhouses were not suitable to make an auxiliary asylum out of, and it was recommended that a new building should be built in Downpatrick, and now you suggest to fix another workhouse up for some other building.

12440. When workhouses can be made suitable for

infirmaries they certainly can be made suitable for pauper inmates?—Some years ago there were two rooms proposed to be fixed up for treated women, and we could not have all two decent rooms for the inmates of the whole lot building.

Dr. BROWN.—That was only to get the women accommodated close to the infirmary; the rest of the building was empty.

Dr. J. P. MacLAUGHLIN examined.

Dr. J. P. MacLaughlin.

Before I give any evidence I wish to disclaim anything political in coming here, and secondly, I do not come here as an official of the union, but as an individual who has had abundant opportunities of observing, for the long space of twenty-six years, the difficulties and dangers of crossing that ferry. I have heard it stated that for years the ambulance was taken backwards and forwards over that ferry. But since the Local Government Act things have been improved, and the present ambulance is a splendid machine, but I consider it dangerous to put it into a ferry boat crossing that arm of the sea. On account of its size the centre of gravity is very high, and in a strong wind it is like a sail. I should not think the freeboard of the horse boat is more than 14 or 15 inches. The tide runs in there at the rate of five or six miles an hour, and when there is a strong wind it kicks up a heavy sea.

12441. Mr. Andrews.—You live quite close to the ferry yourself?—Yes.

12442. And you are a pretty skilled yachtsman, too?—I would not take £50 and go into that ambulance or any machine to be locked up and cross the ferry. I have seen patients come over quite frightened. As far as the cutting-off of Portadown is concerned, it is nothing to me personally; I don't care. I will give the present Board of Guardians, who have now a Nationalist majority, the credit of having done two or three very good reforms in this union since they came into power. First, the midwives and the houses, two things I have been advocating for years and years.

12443. So that it is entirely for the interests of the sick poor you advocate this change?—Yes, I think the boats are not fit for the purpose. I was witness to a boat taking nearly four hours. She started from Portadown at 1 o'clock, was carried up the Lough, and got into the arm of the bay, and I assisted myself in drawing the rope.

12444. At all times of the day there is a strong tide?—Yes; sometimes you get the wind against the tide.

12445. CHAIRMAN.—The time you saw this boat in difficulties there was no ambulance on board?—The ambulance was on board, and the man in it. It started at 1 o'clock and got in at 5 o'clock. Two horses are not sufficient to drag that enormous boat across.

12446. About what is the length of it?—I should say the horse boat was 27 feet or 30 feet on the water line, and 8 feet beam.

12447. Has it a flat bottom?—A flat bottom.

12448. Was the horse in the shafts at the time?—No; the boat is brought up alongside the slip, and a wooden rail is laid, and the ambulance is run in and lowered with ropes. The horse is taken out and put alongside the ambulance.

12449. Mr. McCutcheon.—Of course the ambulance is taken across the way all other conveyances are taken across?—Of course.

12450. You will pardon me for assuming that it was political motives induced you to volunteer, but it is curious that you are associated with these gentlemen from other parts of the union?—Yes; but I can assure you that it is only as a man I am here.

12451. Shall I open your name out as instructing the solicitor?—I only come here as a witness. I am not instructing anybody that I am aware of. I am here as a ratepayer.

Mr. Andrews.—I don't appear on behalf of any political body.

12452. Mr. McCutcheon.—Am I to cross your name out as instructing the solicitor?—I have nothing to do with instructing the solicitor. I am simply a witness, living above the ship, and seeing what is taking place.

12453. None of your sick have to face this ferry?—No.

12454. Who is the dispensary doctor whose sick have to face it?—The doctor on the Portadown side.

12455. Have you ever had any conversation with him about it? You won't venture to assert that he will agree with you in this matter?—I presume he gives in order to the relieving officer to remove a patient, and knows no more about it. I live on the near side.

12456. You were out yachting on the day this episode occurred?—The day the horse boat was carried up the Lough I was out in my own district seeing patients.

12457. Now we must take it on your assertion that it is the interest of the sick poor of another district, and not your own, that brings you here?—I came here to speak about this horse boat. It is a matter of no concern to me. I am a land of passage.

12458. If you could get rid of Mr. McGrath you would have a happy life?—Since there has been a change in the complexion of the Board the medical officers have had a good deal of peace. Under Mr. Green's chairmanship I have no complaints to make. With regard to the consumptive cases, would you allow me to say that I really think something should be done with regard to them. I have seen a family of five swept away in five months, and it is awfully hard to know what to do for them.

12459. CHAIRMAN.—You refer to small houses where there is no possible separation?—Yes; patients expectorating, and the walls, and floors, and everything saturated with bacilli; if something could be done it would be a great benefit.

12460. You would be glad to see an institution for the county, or for a district, where you could send consumptive cases for treatment?—Yes; I have a couple at present, and cannot get them to keep the doors or windows open.

12461. Dr. BROWN.—Do you think it is on the increase?—I don't think so; the population has decreased considerably.

12462. Would they go ten, or fifteen, or twenty miles to a sanatorium?—I have no doubt they would in the early stages; it is generally in young people it breaks out.

12463. They cannot isolate them at home?—No, it is impossible, and the hacking cough at night disturbs the rest of the family.

12464. Mr. McCutcheon.—Has there ever happened any accident in connection with bringing the sick poor across?—No; that I heard of.

12465. And except for the day the horse boat wandered up the Lough a bit, this is the only particular instance you can illustrate your complaint with?—What I mentioned was the difference in size of the ambulance to what it was in the olden days. It was then a very much smaller machine than the present one.

12466. Your apprehensions would be quieted if you had these six Councilors sent away north?—I don't care where they are sent.

Mr. J. R. McCutcheon examined.

Mr. J. R. McCutcheon.

I am Chairman of the Town Commissioners. I come here to endorse what the Chairman of the County

Council has said, and to express my adherence to him of a sanatorium for the Co. Down.

Captain the Hon. SOMERSET WARD examined.

Capt. the Hon. Somerset Ward.

12467. Mr. Andrews.—As we know, you are the agent for Lord Bangor and Lord Dunleath, and you have had considerable experience of crossing here?—I

live at the ferry; it has come under my own observation that there are times when the horse boat cannot cross the ferry at all. Mr. McGrath stated just now

that he saw one of my horses crossing the ferry this morning. That is perfectly true, but he did not state—perhaps he was not aware—that I drove over from Ballyvaughan yesterday and came to the ferry about 1 o'clock, and the horse-boat man told me he could not cross until later. He made two attempts to cross the ferry with my horse and had to put back both times, and I had to leave my horse in Portaferry. If an urgent case had come to Portaferry, perhaps a case of infectious disease, it would be a serious matter if that person was kept in Portaferry all night. I thought I would come here and state the fact of what actually took place yesterday. On another occasion I drove over from Ballyvaughan and the horse-boat could not land at Strangford at all—had to go up the Lough and land at Castleward pier—so there are occasions when it would be absolutely impossible for that horse-boat to cross the ferry at all, and I don't suppose the horse-boat man would attempt to cross the ferry if there was any danger of capsizing with the ambulance. But what I feel is this, that there might be occasions on which it was very important indeed that a sick person should be taken across and the horse-boat could not take him across, and he would be detained in Portaferry without any place to go to, and if it was a case of infection it might be a serious matter for the town of Portaferry.

12458. And the case you gave us of yesterday's experience is an illustration of similar difficulties that have occurred to you?—Oh, yes; there are many occasions when the horse-boat cannot cross the ferry. I remember seeing a case in which the horse-boat must have been two hours crossing the ferry. With a strong westerly wind and a flood tide the horse-boat has to row down an immense distance towards the bar before it can cross; on this occasion it had to row down a very long distance and was swept up along past Strangford, and had to come back again, and I am sure they were more than two hours crossing. It struck me it was a very serious matter for the poor man in the ambulance.

12459. CHAIRMAN.—How long ago was this?—Some time last year. Jan. 15, 1904.

12470. How used they cross over in the old time before the new ambulance was got?—I don't know. I don't know they had not paid particular attention to the ambulance crossing. Capt. the Hon. Scarsden on Ward.

12471. You were a Guardian: how did they cross then?—The same way, only it was a smaller ambulance; but I feel perfectly confident that the man in charge of the horse-boat simply would not bring the ambulance across. There are days when the horse-boat itself could not get across.

12472. Mr. McGowan.—The whole of this difficulty can only be met by sending those six men about their business—I don't know anything about that. I don't pretend to give an opinion as to how it is to be met at all.

12473. Send them in portulans infidelius—I have nothing to say to that matter at all.

12474. If there was a provision that one hospital could send an emergency case to another hospital and be responsible for the charge temporarily, I suppose that would and the whole of this serious question?—Certainly; if there was any arrangement made so that the sick person should not be obliged to cross the ferry except in good weather.

12475. Taking ordinary normal times, people travel from Portaferry this way to Belfast?—There are many few days when an ordinary boat cannot cross, but the horse-boat is a different thing.

Mr. McGowan.—I have to thank you for your courtesy in intimating that you would not close the inquiry absolutely without giving us an opportunity of calling witnesses from that district.

CHAIRMAN.—Certainly. If there was a probability of its being decided contrary to the opinion of the majority of the Guardians, I think we will give you an opportunity.

Mr. JOHN GREEN examined.

12476. Mr. Andrews.—What do you wish to say with reference to the difficulties of crossing this ferry?—The evidence I wish to give is as to the difficulty of a boat going across the ferry carrying the poor and sick. I know from experience. For the last thirty-five years I have been managing the boat, and instead of its being a matter of five minutes, I have known the boat take from half-an-hour to five hours; inside the last three months a man went across in the ambulance who was five hours on the water. And the men have told me repeatedly that they declined to let the new ambulance or boat the boat at all; it is unwieldy and top-heavy. In my time we had to pay for one cart that went bodily out of the boat by the roll of the sea, and another time a cart-load of cement went, and a short time ago a bread-cart.

12477. CHAIRMAN.—Are the trustees responsible for that?—Well, no; the men are bound to navigate the boat, but they are not responsible for what occurs after.

12478. Mr. Andrews.—I presume there is a strong tide now?—There is a tide as the rate of eight or nine miles an hour, and when the wind is against it there is sea, and it is nearly impossible to keep a top-heavy cart in the boat. I brought this matter before Colonel Forde and General Montgomery when the Local Government Act came in, to see if a charge could not be made with regard to the sick coming across the ferry; and if he lived I think he would have brought this matter up. There is a strong tide, and they must row nearly a mile to get up. I say it is bordering on absolute cruelty to put a poor person in that boat at this present time.

12479. Mr. McGowan.—This would be the district hospital: you say a poor person should not be sent to this district hospital?—I don't know; I don't wish to offer any opinion.

12480. You say that the whole of that must go into Newtownards Union?—I would certainly say I recommended that to Colonel Forde. Mr. John Green.

12481. Is that the only remedy?—I don't care where the poor go so; they should not go across that ferry.

12482. That is the only remedy to divert administration and everything?—No. I am not interested in the political aspect, but the poor and sick should not go across that ferry.

12483. Should not a poor person have the option of going into another district hospital and let his district pay for him?—I don't give an opinion on that.

12484. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think it would be desirable to have a cottage hospital at some mid-point?—That was raised forty years ago to have a hospital in Portaferry, and the ambulance was adopted instead.

12485. Mr. McGowan.—Would the cottage hospital at Portaferry meet the case?—I think there would be no difficulty in going to Newtownards; they have a beautiful ambulance, and it is only two hours.

12486. Mr. Andrews.—Is not portion of this district nearer to Newtownards than to Downpatrick?—Yes, a good part of it; part of Ardara.

12487. Mr. McGowan.—Then it is part of one electoral division?—No, part of the three electoral divisions. You could go a great deal faster with the poor to Newtownards than to Downpatrick.

12488. What about the administration of the relieving officer. The relieving officer has districts on each side of the Lough?—I believe he has.

12489. You would say the Guardians of Portaferry should travel to Newtownards every Saturday?—The evidence I wish to give is with respect to the carriage of the poor across the water.

12490. And if that is remedied that is all you want?—Yes.

Mr. JAMES HYTON examined.

12491. Mr. Andrews.—You are an ex-Chairman of the union?—Yes.

12492. And you were a Guardian for twenty years?—For twenty-one or twenty-two years.

12493. Can you just tell the Commissioners what

proposal you would make?—I wish to explain my position, as I have been accused here of being a political leader, which I deny absolutely. And it has been said also here that this matter has not been discussed or complained of at our Boards of Guardians. That is Mr. James Hyton.

Jan. 13, 1904.

Mr. James
Hollan.

not exactly correct, for our late chairman, Colonel Forde, often and often in my hearing has said he thought it a most cruel thing to bring the poor across that ferry. This thing almost has originated with me. I have had a conversation with Colonel Forde on many occasions about this matter, and on reading the evidence given before you on this Commission it struck me there was an opportunity now of remedying this mistake, this geographical error. It is perfect murder to bring a sick person across that ferry. I have gone across it a few times, but not for many years, and the less the better.

12494. Do you wish to make any proposal with reference to any Districts that you think should be substituted?—There are other districts that lie into the Downpatrick Union that would be more convenient. There was one division made application some years ago to get connected with our union—Glendrummond.

12495. Does Saintfield adjoin that?—The railway runs through it into Downpatrick, and there is another division belonging to Kilkeel, Maghera.

12496. You think those might be well substituted for this other district?—I think so.

12497. Was there an observation you wished to make with reference to the question of rating?—Yes. I differ from the majority of the Board of Guardians in regard to the rating. My opinion is that it would tend to the ratepayers' interest certainly to have divisional rating, as it used to be.

12498. Can you give your reason for that?—There is a feeling of the ratepayers when it is a union rating that there should be more money spent on their districts than otherwise, and there is a laxity in the expenditure of the ratepayers' money under the present system.

12499. Mr. McCortan.—This geographical question would not arise if the sick poor had their option, on emergency, of going to the other district hospital. If you take them away and don't put them across the ferry, I don't care where you put them.

12500. Their geographical green might remain?—

Yes.

Mr. Andrews.—Mr. Donnell, our other witness, is not in attendance.

CHAIRMAN.—If this question of transferring the lower part of the Ards to Newtownards from Downpatrick comes before us so that we have to decide which union it should belong to, personally, I think, and my colleagues have not expressed any dissent, I think it would be desirable to have some more evidence, but it is very possible the whole thing may be decided without that being necessary.

Mr. Andrews.—Of course if there is further evidence being given by Mr. McGrath, we should get notice.

CHAIRMAN.—Certainly.

Mr. Green.—Would you take it from me that the Downpatrick Board are, generally, in favour of union rating.

The sitting terminated.

TWENTY-SIXTH PUBLIC SITTING.—MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27th, 1904. Feb. 5, 1904.

At the Courthouse, Dundalk.

Present:—Mr. MACKE (Chairman), Mr. MURTAGHAN, and Dr. COTT BIGGER.

CHAIRMAN.—Our next course is, first, to obtain evidence from the County Council, and we shall be glad to receive evidence now from any County Councillors who are here deputed by the Council.

Mr. M'KEE.—I am instructed to appear on behalf of the Guardians of the Ardee Union, and I would be obliged if you could have our witnesses examined to-day, and for this reason, that to-morrow is the Board-day of the Ardee Union, and they will be engaged there.

CHAIRMAN.—I expect we will be finished without any

difficulty to-day unless there is some evidence more than is usually presented. I should not think there would be any difficulty in finishing.

Mr. M'KEE.—I don't think the other unions which are interested are professionally represented or intend to be represented to-day, and I would ask you to hear me state our views.

CHAIRMAN.—We always like to hear first the views of the County Council, as the central and chief local authority in the county.

Mr. JOSEPH DELAN examined.

I am one of those deputed from the County Council, but the Chairman of the County Council is coming also.

12501. CHAIRMAN.—As you are here it may be more convenient to take your evidence. The first query that we put to the County Council was: "Whether, having regard to the extent, population, necessities of the sick and destitute poor, and economic condition of the county of Louth, and the facilities of locomotion and proper administration of the Poor Law therein, it would be expedient to dissolve any of the unions wholly or partly contained in the county, and if so, what arrangements, whether by amalgamation or otherwise, should be substituted therefor." What is the view of the County Council?—Our opinions differ. Mr. Hingham, the Chairman, is in favour of amalgamating some of the unions; my opinion is the very contrary to that.

12502. You have in your county three unions, Ardee, Drogheda, and Dundalk?—Yes.

12503. You say your opinion would be against breaking up any of the three unions?—Yes.

12504. But the County Council was divided on that question?—Yes, opinion was divided upon it.

12505. Was there a division on it?—No; it was merely an expression of opinion.

12506. And no poll taken?—No, there was not.

12507. I may take it that the County Council has not expressed any view?—No; their opinion being divided, they did not express anything very definite upon it.

12508. They left that altogether?—To the individual unions.

12509. And the evidence given before this Commission—what is your own view, you are against amalgamation?—Yes; so long as the system remains anything like what it is, I think the three unions are required for the necessities of the poor.

12510. Supposing there were some great change made in the system?—I don't see any changes proposed which would do away with the difficulty of a number of aged and infirm in each district who would want to be provided for, and I think it would be a great hardship on them to draft them to one central place. To remove them from the workhouse they are in at present, which they did not enter very willingly perhaps, but which was more or less a home to them, they would feel it a great grievance to be compelled to leave all the surroundings of their life. In Drogheda, Ardee, and Dundalk the aged and infirm population of each workhouse are practically more or less in their own homes.

12511. They are close to their own people than they would be if deported to a central workhouse?—Yes; I think it would be a great hardship on them to be sent to a central workhouse.

12512. What is the benefit of being in their own neighbourhood?—It is mostly a sentimental one, but one which must be considered.

12513. Are there any practical advantages?—They are more in touch with their own people, and are able to get a little kindness from them occasionally.

12514. Have you made inquiries about the number of visits that are paid, not to the sick in hospital, but to the aged and infirm?—I have not. I know they are

often neglected, but there are many people whose friends do look after them to a certain extent; but in general they have a feeling, whether it is reasonable or not, that they are not so cut off from their homes, and their ties with home are not so cut off as when they are in another place. And I don't see that anything would be gained in economy. There is no scheme suggested that would produce much economy in their care, or much more efficient care than they get in the three present workhouses.

12515. What you are considering is the closing of one workhouse, and the inmates going to another workhouse conducted on exactly the same lines as hitherto?—Yes.

12516. And you would be against that?—Yes.

12517. I think I would be against that myself, but supposing an entirely different system were adopted on it—With all the suggestions made no one has been able to suggest any really different system; if there were it would affect one's views, perhaps, but I have read of none yet.

12518. If you take the different classes of inmates in the workhouse, the class that is most important, the sick; of course you don't contemplate transferring them to any place. It would be a cruel hardship to oblige sick people to go to long distances, so assuming now that the sick were left where they are, then the other classes you would have would be the aged and infirm. Passing these over for a moment, you would have the lunatics. Do you think they ought to be removed from the workhouses?—No. I think if there could be a central institution for them, it would probably be an advantage; but I don't think there are enough in any one county to make material for a central institution.

12519. Here you send your lunatics to Dublin?—Yes. The County Council have been at different times talking about revising their lunatic system of maintenance, and considering would it ever be possible for them to have a county lunatic asylum.

12520. It is a very small country?—It is, but we have a good thing, I believe, in the Richmond population; but I think if that question ever is taken up, and it ever is found feasible or possible to have a county asylum, then it would, of course, be right and necessary to provide in that asylum not merely for the lunatics at present in Richmond, but also for all the harmless lunatics and insane epileptics of workhouses, and it would be very desirable to transfer them from the workhouses to that institution.

12521. Is it your opinion that at present the workhouse is not a suitable place for lunatics?—Yes.

12522. Therefore you would be in favour either of removing them to a central asylum, or, failing that, to an auxiliary asylum?—Yes.

12523. The next class you would have would be the children?—I think they should be boarded-out or dispatched in some way, rather than be maintained in the workhouse. It is not always found possible to get desirable and willing foster-parents for them.

12524. You are a Guardian, are you?—No. I am not, but I am connected with Ardee district. I know there

Mr. Joseph.
Delan.]

Feb. 3, 1904.

Mr. Joseph
Delane.

they have but a small proportion boarded-out, and I think they would be inclined to board more out if they could find suitable homes for them.

12525. Are you aware that there is a boarding-out arrangement in connection with the Armagh Orphanage?—I don't understand it.

12526. In this county, I think?—I am not acquainted with it.

12527. The Cardinal, I think, has one?—Yes, but I only know of it in a vague way. But I think—and every one thinks—that if the children could be provided for somewhere else it would be very desirable, and if foster-parents cannot be found for them they ought to be sent to an industrial school.

12528. It is very largely a question of price; if a little more is offered you will find the demand for these children greatly increased?—Perhaps so.

12529. What do you pay at Ardee?—I think 2s. a week. I think they have only six.

12530. That is a little low?—It is. I think every Board of Guardians is in favour of having these children out of the workhouse.

12531. Then the women who come in to give birth to illegitimate children?—That is a difficulty, and no one seems to know how to get over it.

12532. We have had a great deal of evidence in different places, and a scheme was outlined by some witnesses. There already are in existence, under the management of religious bodies of various denominations, homes or refuges for the reclamation of girls after their first fall. Would you be in favour of an arrangement by which the Guardians, instead of sending these girls into the workhouse to remain there three or four months before their confinement and some weeks afterwards, an arrangement by which these girls would be placed under religious influences of their own denomination?—Yes, I think it would be very desirable.

12533. And the Guardians should pay?—Yes.

12534. That would be likely to reclaim girls and diminish the illegitimate population?—Perhaps so.

12535. Are you aware that we find a great many mothers with two, three, four, five, or six illegitimate children. If steps were taken early it is only reasonable to suppose that would be diminished to some extent?—Yes, it is to be hoped so.

12536. Then you have in the workhouse a very small number—if you exclude those women who come in for child-birth—if you exclude those you will have a very small number of able-bodied men and women in the workhouse—for all Ireland it is about 4,000; would you be in favour of putting these people in some central institution for a province, where they would be obliged to work hard for their maintenance? You don't include in these the aged and infirm at all?—No, certainly not.

12537. No, certainly not?—Well, I think that class you refer to, the able-bodied, I don't know how you could depict them to advantage, except at great cost and without much material advantage to themselves, to a central place. As a rule they come in only for a week and go out again; that is my experience of Ardee.

12538. You have very few of that class in rural districts, but in towns you have large numbers?—But they should not be encouraged. If there was any system by which they could be made earn their way it would be very desirable. I have not taken that into account in expressing an opinion against amalgamation, because I don't know how you could manage to deal with the casual cases—with the ins-and-outs.

12539. That is really a chronic condition of destitution. They go out to look for work and come in?—It seems to me you require these local workhouses to provide for them; if you give them outdoor relief it will probably be mis-spent.

12540. What class of people have you in your mind?—Able-bodied men of indifferent character.

12541. Are they men of intemperate and thriftless habits?—They very often are.

12542. Would you object to these men being put under restraint in some central institution with a view of really putting them on a better basis?—No; I would not object to it.

12543. Are there many really honest hard-working people who are in that condition?—No, but there will always be a few.

12544. Owing to the falling away of employment?—Yes; all the people who are taken on casual employment there will be a certain number thrown idle every winter, and the people who are most inefficient must necessarily go to the workhouses.

12545. Have you many such cases going to the workhouse?—Not many; perhaps there would be a dozen families.

12546. Hardly so many in Ardee?—It seems to me if you abolish a workhouse you have no means of providing for these sort of people.

12547. On the 1st of January of the past year you had not a single one of that class in your workhouse?—No; they are a small class, I admit.

12548. Your twelve families would mean a population bigger than your whole able-bodied wards?—I don't know, but it seems to me you must have some provision for them in case they should come. There will always be a number left more or less destitute in winter.

12549. In Ardee a place where employment has fallen away lately to some extent?—To a considerable extent; there is less and less slitting.

12550. It is really a case of the people not being able to be supported by industry?—It is.

12551. Then if all these classes go from the workhouse—mothers, children, inmates, and shops—where no other persons left to consider except the tramps and the aged and infirm. Now, the tramps; do you think it would be any hardship on them?—I have very vague ideas about the tramps. I don't see what can be done with them. Though the present system is not at all satisfactory, in our union they give us very little trouble.

12552. And very little expense?—Very little expense.

12553. But they are an undesirable class of the community?—They are, but I am afraid it is not possible to eliminate them.

12554. They are useless, but there are a few honest-looking for work?—Yes, that is the difficulty. If they could get a note from their original home saying what they are, and if they could then obtain lodging from an outdoor relief authority, or any other local authority.

12555. And failing that, do you think they could be safely dealt with by the police as vagrants?—That would cost a great deal more than at present.

12556. But it may put a stop to it?—If it would put a stop to it I think it would be well, but if it does them under the surface instead it might do more harm than good; if it led them to avoid the place.

12557. If they were consigned for a tolerably long period to some central institution for able-bodied, where they would be obliged to work on a farm or in some other way?—If a system of that kind could be carried out it would be desirable.

12558. It would break them from their present habits, and a great many of these people have children, and they are raised as chronic tramps?—Yes, that seems to be one of the evils of the system. It is rather a permanent, but I think it would be worth making the experiment.

12559. Now then the aged and infirm are the only class left?—It is chiefly that class I am considering in saying I would oppose the dissolution of the workhouse. That is the most important class in our country workhouses except the sick.

12560. You have forty-five sick in your workhouse and forty-four aged and infirm. These aged and infirm are people who are able just to hobble about and do a few little things; the women are useful in mending and knitting; the men are not very much use?—Yes; they carry coals, and do some work of that sort, and work in the garden.

12561. But they are not invalid, except that they are broken down by age?—Yes, or rheumatism.

12562. Do you see that there would be much hardship in sending these people to a central institution?—It seems to me that there would.

12563. Suppose Ardee, or any other workhouse, were selected as a large workhouse for the aged and infirm of the district?—I imagine they would find it a good deal of a hardship.

12564. You are not aware of any case where this experiment has been tried?—No, I am not, but it seems to me—

12565. There is a wrench undoubtedly. I have superintended myself the removal of inmates from one workhouse to another in two cases, and there were most heartrending scenes, as if they were leaving their homes, but the next time I visited the new workhouse, I found these people pleased with the change—they were having a better time?—Apart from that consideration, could they be any better treated or cared for?

12566. The workhouses that go are generally small workhouses, where the taxation was high and the rent low, and the treatment would not be as good as in the large workhouse they went to?—In Co. Louth I don't

Feb. 8, 1904

Mr. Joseph
Dolan.

think that would apply, because in the small workhouse of Ardee the maintenance there is smaller than the others; the workhouse costs less than the others.

12565. That is what makes me think it might be possible for them to have better times elsewhere?—If that is due to the inferior treatment given, but I don't think it is.

12566. Mr. MURKIN.—High valuation?—I think it is economy in administration in general, but I don't think the economy applies to the food.

12567. CHAIRMAN.—It is the valuation, I expect?—Certainly. I think their treatment in Ardee Workhouse is fully as good as in any of the others.

12568. We have been there, but it did not strike us as anything special?—No, there may not be; but I imagine they get the same treatment as far as food and cleanliness goes.

12569. Any change, at all events as regards the part of the COUNTY you are acquainted with, ought to provide for the treatment of the sick in the immediate neighbourhood of their own homes?—Certainly. I think it would be a most disastrous thing to abolish a hospital anywhere it exists.

12570. Some of the people who come in to receive treatment in the hospital are people who could afford to pay a little?—Sometimes they are.

12571. And sometimes a considerable amount. Would you approve of an amendment of the law that would enable Boards of Guardians to, at their own discretion up to a certain amount, require the friends and relatives of patients to pay for them?—Yes.

12572. That would be discretionary with the Guardians; not a hard-and-fast rule that would operate severely, but if the Guardians thought a man could afford to pay from 5d. to 1s. a week up to the actual cost of treatment, do you think it would be a good thing to give that discretion?—I think it would.

12573. That is tried in some county infirmaries and has worked exceedingly well—Lisburn and Enniskillen. They get very large sums indeed in Lisburn. I think they more than pay the doctor's salary. Now as regards rating, what is your view about the area for rating?—I think the present system of union rating is the fairest. I heard some people advocating district rating; that is a question between a town and country district. I have no opinion on that. I am not interested in that.

12574. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you mean electoral district?—No, but the distinction between an urban district and a rural district. The transferring of the aged and infirm to a central institution would be a great detriment not only to the present occupants of a workhouse which will be dissolved, but to all people about, who would necessarily be seeking its shelter afterwards; it would be a great detriment to them against entering the workhouse.

12575. You think it would increase outdoor relief?—Yes. A great many who would be better for entering the workhouse would remain out at a hardship to themselves rather than go to the central workhouse, and they would suffer in that way. On the other hand, if outdoor relief could be given on a more liberal scale to deserving people, it would be a great benefit, and a great many of the old, who go to the workhouse unwillingly, would be happier outside on outdoor relief, though I don't think they would be better off. If they get a little more than the present rate of 1s. 5d. or 2s. it is not enough to feed them for the week.

12576. That is a matter for the Guardians; they don't need any change?—No, that is so. I heard a suggestion that if there were district nurses, which I think everybody recognizes as a very useful addition to the Poor Law system, if they were made part of the Poor Law system.

12577. CHAIRMAN.—One for each dispensary district?—Yes, I think that would be a proper area for one.

12578. It is a natural thing to have one under each doctor. You would be strongly in favour of that?—Certainly; and perhaps that nurse's duties might include an occasional visit to the old and infirm people.

12579. Of course, and in the training of nurses in the future, efforts might be made to get midwifery training for those district nurses?—Yes, so that we might dispense with the midwife.

12580. Still there would be always a danger; there are a great many cases they could not attend and look after?—Then it would be better to retain both.

12581. Would you be in favour of having the training of the nurses carried on at some central place in the county, say at the county infirmary, and then, if there was a sort of reciprocity or interchange between them, that all the nurses could be trained there, and

it would be unnecessary for the Guardians to send to Dublin, or Belfast, or elsewhere. They would get a nurse as they wanted her at much less cost?—I have no opinion on that question. I never entertained it.

12582. Mr. MURKIN.—You say you have never seen any suggestion put before the public as regards any reform of the system?—I mean anything more desirable than those general things.

12583. It has been suggested that certain classes mentioned by the Chairman might with profit be removed from the workhouse?—Certainly.

12584. If, for instance, those four classes mentioned by the Chairman were removed from the workhouse, you would have very few left?—Very few; but in a workhouse like Ardee you would have forty-five, one-third of the present population, and you would have, of course, the hospital.

12585. Do you think it is worth while keeping it there with a staff for forty-four or forty-five inmates. Don't you think there is a good deal of waste in that?—There is, but I don't see you would save anything by abolishing it. The waste on the building was incurred long ago.

12586. The building could be utilized for some other purpose, such as a lunatic asylum or some institution?—Certainly, if the building were utilized; but I don't see that there is any suggestion for utilizing all the buildings.

12587. Our business is to go through the country and get suggestions from men like yourself, who know the wants and needs of the county in which you live; and the suggestion has already been made that in some counties one workhouse would do for the class known as the aged and infirm; that is a very large class, perhaps the largest of the six. Do you not think that one house of that kind, modernized, brought up to a higher standard, would be sufficient to accommodate all the aged and infirm in the Co. Louth. The whole number would be only 333. Would not almost any house in Louth accommodate 333?—Yes, I think either of the three workhouses would.

12588. You would see no objection to that if it could be done without incurring additional cost to the ratepayers?—I think it would cause additional cost, and I don't think it would produce more efficiency. In a case like Ardee, it would equalize our rates with those of Dundalk and Drogheda, which are much higher.

12589. Suppose you had the management of your own particular union, and arranged with the central workhouse of the county for the maintenance of the people from your area at a certain rate per head, how would that affect you financially?—Unless the rate per head were higher than it is with us.

12590. Don't you know that when a thing is done wholesale it can be done much cheaper than when it is done piecemeal?—Yet Dundalk and Drogheda Workhouses have double the population of Ardee and the maintenance costs more.

12591. How about the valuation. It is not the population affects the rates. High valuation and small numbers relieved bring things down?—The cost per head of the inmates of Ardee Workhouse is less than the cost per head of the inmates of Drogheda and Dundalk, though in each of these there is practically twice the population of Ardee.

12592. If you look into the matter you will find that valuation has a great deal to do with the rating?—But not with the cost per head of maintenance of the inmates.

12593. If those inmates in your houses were put in a central institution they could be maintained at a price. I would think a great deal less than at present. Would you object to pay that?—Certainly not. If they would be as well done for, and it would cost no more, or even if they were better done for, I don't see why we should object to its costing more; but if they were only as well done for, and it should cost more, then I would object.

12594. Do you see anything feasible in such a proposal as establishing some central institution for a particular class?—There is a good deal to be said for it but for the hardship on the aged and infirm of transporting them from what have been their homes. If by giving them really better accommodation you could make them prefer their new homes to the old, the difficulty would be got over.

12595. Of the few workhouses that have already been done away with, I am very well acquainted with one, and there is no complaint whatever over it, and the Guardians who opposed the amalgamation originally are now quite in favour of it and say it has brought them a benefit in the reduction of the rates, and their

Feb. 8, 1904,

Mr. Joseph
Dolan.

is no complaint from the locality that the people have to go too far?—You could hardly effect a reduction of the rates in this case.

12592. What is the rate in your union?—The rate for union purposes is 11d. on buildings in Ardee; in Drogheda, 14d., and in Dunsink, 18d., and equivalently less on land, 5d., 3d., and 7d., and it has been in that proportion for the last three years.

12593. I think you will find on inquiry that the valuation has a great deal to do with that?—Yes, I know it has.

12594. Now you say you think it would be necessary to have some place for the accommodation of these inmates. Do you not think the fact that a workhouse is here and there over the county as a sort of attraction for these men?—It is.

12595. Do you not think they say: "Well, if I get broken down or am hard up I can get into the workhouse for a fortnight." Perhaps if that workhouse was not there so convenient they might not put their trust in it?—Yes; but you must provide for them by outdoor relief.

12596. Do you give much out-door relief in your union?—They do a great deal, but it is under very rare circumstances that they can give relief to a family if the father is able. If he is only incapacitated by destitution they cannot relieve him, and he must go to the workhouse to get relief. We have always such cases in Ardee; a number of people who have no qualification for relief except destitution, but that is not enough under the law.

12597. Would you be in favour of a change in the law to empower the Guardians, in a case such as you instance, to give temporary outdoor relief?—Yes.

12598. CHAIRMAN.—You would give relief for destitution?—Yes, as well as for drunkenness. That class suffers a hardship under the present system.

12599. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—If the Guardians were empowered to give outdoor relief in the case you have instanced, don't you think it would relieve the situation considerably?—It would, but it would not relieve the difficulty about the underswearing. That class of people if they got out-door relief would drink it.

12600. Would you be afraid of outdoor relief spreading if Guardians got that power?—I think they had better take the risk of the abuse and of its spreading than run the risk of starving people. I would be in favour of increasing the amount given in deserving cases to the old people.

12601. CHAIRMAN.—You would leave the area of charge as it is?—Yes.

12602. Dr. BROWN.—Was there a proposition before the County Council to convert Ardee Workhouse into a consumptive sanatorium?—No; it was mentioned vaguely by somebody, hardly seriously. It was not considered to any extent.

12603. I thought the proposition was made by the Dunsink and Drogheda Board of Guardians?—It has been made, but I heard nothing about their having a conference.

12604. You have done nothing in Ardee for that class of people?—I believe there was a special ward allotted to them for a time. I don't know whether it is in existence at present or not, but if there were any means of making better accommodation for them it ought to be done certainly.

12605. Have the Guardians taken any steps to provide that?—I don't know.

12606. If you are a member of the Board?—No, I am not; but if there was a county system or inter-county system of having a sanatorium for consumptives, it would be very desirable.

12607. In that case would Ardee be suitable?—It would require a medical man to say that. I am afraid none of the existing buildings would be held by sanitary authorities to be good.

12608. You mentioned the union having very low rates as compared with Dunsink and Drogheda; probably one of the reasons is the difference in valuation, but another reason that strikes me is the wretched condition in which the workhouse has been kept for so many years?—If that is your opinion—

CHAIRMAN.—I am afraid that is our opinion. Witness.—I must leave it to the members of the Board. I am not here to defend them.

12609. Dr. BROWN.—While respectable people might go into a hospital in the district if it were suitable, you could hardly expect them to go into Ardee Infirmary or fever hospital in the condition in which it is?—I think there was a big scheme of improvement contemplated by the Guardians, and they postponed it on hearing of this Commission.

12610. Did they bring it forward for the purpose of deferring it on account of the Commission?—I don't think so.

12611. What is the most remote part of the union from the workhouse of Ardee?—I am not very sure. I suppose there are many places from seven to ten miles. I don't know whether there are any less. There would be about a seven miles radius. I fancy there would not be much more; seven Irish miles.

12612. Then how many miles are you from Dunsink and Drogheda?—Ten from Dunsink and seven from Drogheda—Irish miles.

12613. For instance, a person six or seven miles from Ardee, would it make much difference if they were removed to Drogheda or Dunsink?—It might not to the outlying people. It is Ardee parish and a couple adjoining is I am considering, and it is mostly from that neighbourhood that the occupants of the workhouse do come.

12614. CHAIRMAN.—You have direct railway to Dunsink and Drogheda?—We have. It seems to me that would a constant stream of corpses, transporting them from place to place and sending an attendant with them if required.

12615. I don't think that expense would be necessary?—Perhaps not; it would depend on their disposition.

12616. You could easily give them a form of ticket that would not be paid for until it was used?—Yes.

12617. Dr. BROWN.—If there was a proposition to erect a sanatorium for the county do you think the County Council would join in it?—I fancy they would.

12618. Has the matter been discussed at all by them?—No; but I think they would be inclined to forward any scheme like that.

12619. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Of course you are of opinion that an infirmary is absolutely necessary there?—Oh, yes; and if there could be small infirmaries in other districts. I would be strongly in favour of having a district nurse in each dispensary district.

12620. Mr. M'TYER.—You reside in Ardee?—Yes.

12621. And I take it you have a pretty extensive and accurate knowledge of the prevailing conditions there in regard to union management?—In a general way, as an outsider.

12622. You were formerly a member of the Ardee Board of Guardians?—For a short time.

12623. With regard to these points the Chairman has asked you on, it has been suggested that the difference in Ardee in the rating between it and the neighbouring unions is due to the fact that the valuation is higher, and that therefore the rate would appear to be lower, whereas in fact it is not; is there any reason to suppose that the rating in the Ardee Union would be higher than the rural districts in Meath, for instance Navan, Kells, or Carrickmacross?—No; I think to the contrary; that is a question I did not consider before. As far as the valuation of the land goes I am sure that the land in Meath is valued at least with the land in Louth, probably higher; certainly I don't think there is any excess in the valuation of Louth land, and certainly not in the buildings of Ardee Union.

12624. Taking the five adjoining unions to Ardee, namely—Dunsink, Drogheda, Kells, Navan, and Carrickmacross, is it not a fact that the rates in every one of these unions are, at least, about 75 per cent. higher than in the Ardee Union?—I don't know what the proportion is, but I know it is higher in every one. I admit that the question of the different valuations of different unions would very much affect the rate, but I don't admit that that accounts for the low rate in Ardee.

12625. CHAIRMAN.—I understood your point; you say that owing to your contracts and other things the maintenance rate per head was lower?—Yes.

12626. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—But in proportion to your expenditure is your valuation not high?—I don't think so.

12627. For instance, in Dunsink they have about three times as many inmates as you have?—Yes.

12628. Is the valuation of Dunsink Union three times as great as that of Ardee?—No; it is not.

Mr. MURTAGHAN.—That is the point; it must be proportionate valuation to get at a proper knowledge of the circumstances.

12629. Mr. M'TYER.—Taking the other test as regards the cost per head of the inmates, is it not a fact that the inmates of the Ardee Union cost substantially less per head than the inmates of the neighbouring unions?—Yes; all the figures I have seen go to show that.

12536. Is that also, in your opinion, to any want of efficiency or to any want of proper dietary or management of the union?—No; I think the dietary and management and care of the poor are just as efficient and humane as in any of the others.

12537. To your knowledge has it not on repeated occasions won the praise of the Local Government Board Inspectors?—Yes; I have heard that different times.

CHAIRMAN.—Are you referring to Dr. Smyth's report?

Mr. McJannet.—Generally, Dr. Smyth took exception to some details.

Witness.—Mr. Bourke's reports were in my mind.

12538. Mr. McJannet.—In regard to making separate provision for consumptives, is the number very small in the union?—I don't know.

12539. As regards the County Month portion of the union, is it not a fact that there is no railway accommodation or no means of locomotion in that part?—No; there is none whatever; the population is sparse, and there is no railway in that part.

12540. Mr. McJannet.—Many poor in that part of the county?—I am not sure; there are not many. There is one town, Drumcondra, which, I dare say, supplies a fair number.

12541. Mr. McJannet.—Don't you think it would be a

hardship to the poor in that part of the union if Ardee Workhouse were abolished?—Yes.

12542. CHAIRMAN.—A good deal of the Month part is nearer Drogheda than Ardee?—I don't know that it is actually nearer; it may be as near.

12543. Mr. McJannet.—I am not sure that it is. All the northern part is much nearer, but there is part about Collier; I imagine it is as near Ardee.

12544. CHAIRMAN.—At all events it is what you might call a long haul?—Perhaps so.

12545. Mr. McJannet.—You think that it would be an injustice to the outpatients to amalgamate with any of the adjoining unions?—I imagine it would add a great deal to the rates.

12546. CHAIRMAN.—If it led to an increase of the rates you would be strongly against it; if it led, on the other hand, to a diminution of the rates would you be in favour?

Mr. McJannet.—And an improvement in the treatment?—If it led to a real improvement in the treatment I would be in favour of it, regardless of the rates, but if the rates were reduced I would be still more in favour of it. If it could be shown that there was no hardship to the poor in transporting them, and it would entail a reduction of rates, and they would be as well treated in the other, I would be in favour of it, but these points seem to me to be all questionable.

Captain W. de Salis FIDELITY EXHIBITED.

12547. Mr. McJannet.—You are Chairman of the Ardee Board of Guardians?—I am.

12548. And I believe you have been so for about fifteen years?—Fourteen years.

12549. On the question of amalgamation, what is the view of your Board?—Dead against it; unanimously against it.

12550. Does that represent the opinion of all the outpatients of the district as well?—Essentially; I have had a great deal of consultation with them.

12551. Mr. McJannet.—On what ground?—On economy and inconvenience.

12552. Mr. McJannet.—First, as regards the financial aspect of it. At present, as a matter of fact, are the rates in the Ardee Union very considerably lower than in any of the adjoining unions?—I should think 75 per cent. lower than any of the adjoining unions all round.

12553. Then, as regards the cost per inmate in the union, how many inmates are there in the house altogether?—An average of 150.

12554. I believe about fifty are in the hospital?—About that.

12555. And there are about fifty pauper?—That is about the average.

12556. And the remainder are made up of children and epileptics?—Yes.

12557. That is about the average of them?—There are hardly any able-bodied.

12558. Are the able-bodied so scarce that you have to pay hands to do the work of the union?—We have to get the garden tilled by outside labour.

12559. You think it would be a very serious inconvenience to the poor to be amalgamated with any of the adjoining unions?—Indeed it would be; Ardee is in the centre as near as possible of the union, and it would be very hard to send people away from that.

12560. And, generally, it is in a very central position for the county?—You could not get more so.

12561. Is it about six or seven miles on an average from the edge?—I don't suppose there is any part of the union more than seven miles, except Duncannon, and that is a very small part.

12562. As regards the inmates themselves, would you consider it a hardship and grievance to them to be transferred amongst a lot of strangers?—They would object very strongly to it.

12563. Of course there is no suggestion of abolishing the hospital?—I should hope not; it would be impossible to do it.

12564. It is absolutely necessary. That being so, would it be possible, do you think, to utilise the remainder of the house, keeping the present part of the building which is used for hospital purposes; would it be possible to utilise the rest of the premises for any other purpose?—It would be no use for anything else.

12565. Would it require a very large outlay of money to fit it for a lunatic asylum?—You could not make a lunatic asylum of it; there are no grounds; we have only about four acres.

12566. So it would be necessary to acquire additional land?—You could not get it; it is not there.

12567. As regards the County Month part of the union, I believe there is no railway accommodation?—No.

12568. And it would be a matter of great difficulty to transfer any of the poor of the district to a distance?—You could not do it; you would have to bring them to Ardee and then send them on by train.

12569. If the Ardee Workhouse was abolished, would the nearest union be about twenty miles from any of the points in the County Month part of the union?—Hardly that; I suppose the lower part would be fifteen miles away.

12570. Do you find the tramp nuisance a very great question of Ardee?—It is not as bad as it used to be; it has reduced considerably from what it was; but it is a nuisance, of course.

12571. How many not many applicants in the week of the tramp class?—No; it has been a great deal less than it was the last couple of years.

12572. Roughly speaking, what would be the annual expenditure in the year?—It is about £3,000 or £4,000.

CHAIRMAN.—We have all those figures before us; you need not go into statistics as regards distances, expenditure, or the number of inmates.

12573. Mr. McJannet.—Generally speaking, has Ardee Union been efficiently and economically administered?—I hope it has been; we have always had a very fine character there; we were said to be a model union, and I believe it has been worked very well.

12574. Has there every year, in your recollection, any serious complaints made against the management of the union by any of the Local Government Inspectors?—Never that I remember; the only thing is that a lunatic got away through neglect on the part of the Master; that is the only serious complaint we have had of the union.

12575. That is a great number of years ago?—I attended the Ardee Union nearly every Tuesday for the last thirty years.

12576. CHAIRMAN.—Have you done much in the last thirty years to improve the union?—We have; a great deal. We are trying to keep it up to date as far as we can.

12577. Mr. McJannet.—Have you improved the sanitary accommodation?—We have, and we were going to do more when we heard of this inquiry, and we postponed matters to see what would happen.

12578. It is not true, as suggested, that you merely proposed it for the purpose of deferring it?—Certainly not; everything was arranged to be done, and would have been done last summer.

12579. CHAIRMAN.—What was going to be done?—The drainage system was to be renewed altogether.

12580. Mr. McJannet.—Was there some suggestion of having new conscriptive wards?—There was a suggestion for a new ward.

Feb. 8 1904.

Mr. Joseph Dolan.

Feb. 8, 1864

Capt. W. de
Mills, M.P.

12681. Special accommodation for a slight runn—
There was, and consumptive wards.

12682. Was there some improvement of the hot
water system too?—I believe there was.

12683. And bath?—I think there was; there were
several things.

12684. CHAIRMAN.—Do you know where the fever
hospital water supply is got from?—I don't know.

12685. Are you aware that it is from a well under
the fever hospital?—I am.

12686. Dr. BROWN.—And the soil pipe within a few
feet of it; are not these matters that could have been
attended to several years ago?—The fever hospital is
generally empty as a rule; this last month there have
been some cases there.

12687. Does that mean that there is no fever ever
in the district or that persons won't go into it?—There
have been very few cases there; the greater part of this
year it is empty.

12688. It should be avoided if there is fever in the
district—Of course it should be; it is very easy to make
it all right.

12689. Mr. MURKIN.—You said your rates were
75 per cent. lower than the adjoining unions?—I believe so.

12690. The previous witness said your rate was some-
thing like 11d., but in the neighbouring unions it was
14d. and 16d.—I think that is a mistake.

12691. Those were figures read out by that gentle-
man, who seemed very well informed and a very excel-
lent witness?—I think I know as much about it as he
does.

12692. CHAIRMAN.—What do you think the rates are?
—Ardee is about 1s. 3d.

12693. The last witness said 11d.—He is wrong
there.

12694. He was more in your favour; what are the
general ones?—1s. 8d. and 1s. 9d.

12695. Mr. MURKIN.—The witness said it was 11d. on build-
ings.

12696. Mr. MURKIN.—Would the fact that your
rates are low not be due largely to the sparseness of
the population—the fewness of poor in your union?—I
don't think so.

12697. You have no large towns in your union?—Not
larger than Ardee.

12698. Nearly all the poor come from towns; we
find very few people living in the country coming to the
workhouse; my experience is that the great mass of the
population of the workhouse come from towns?—Of
course they do.

12699. That may be a reason why your rates are so
low; that once would still exist if Ardee joined its
parishes with some other unions?—The Ardee rate-
payers would have to pay for that.

12700. You have a large number of children in the
workhouse considering the extent of the union and the
number in the house; the last report says you have
thirty?—I suppose we have about that.

12701. That is a very large number for so small a
workhouse; do you not think those children would be
better boarded out?—They are too young, most of them.

12702. They can be boarded out from three or four
years of age?—They are very young children.

12703. Do you not think it is an unhealthy place for
children to be reared in?—No doubt about it; it is a
mistake.

12704. Would you not favour the boarding out of
these children?—Certainly, if you can get a place for
them.

12705. If you had the children out of the house and
the lunatics away in a proper place—I suppose you
would favour these harmless lunatics being sent to some

place where they could be better treated?—There are
very few of them.

12706. You had only six; but even so, would it
not be better that they should be in some place where
they could be better looked after?—It would.

12707. If you had them out and the children out you
would only have about 100; the half of that would be
sufficient?—You could not talk of getting some of the small
children out.

12708. CHAIRMAN.—They can be boarded out as soon
as they can eat what is going—these years old?—The
difficulty is getting good foster parents.

12709. If you offered a sufficient amount; you board
them out at present at a less cost than you keep them
in the workhouse. If you brought up the rate for the
outside a little more do you not think you would
then get them?—I don't think you would.

12710. Other unions don't experience your difficulty.

12711. Mr. MURKIN.—In some unions there is
great competition for these children?—There is very
little with us.

12712. Still you believe in the principle of boarding
them out?—Certainly; I think the workhouse is the
worst place children can be.

12713. Except put from the point of view of local
trade, don't you think it would be a benefit to have
only one central place for the aged and infirm?—I don't
think it would.

12714. Why, don't you know the name of workhouse
reder stinks in the nostrils of the ordinary man?—
No doubt it does.

12715. You cannot get rid of the name as long as you
keep the institution; don't you think it would be
better if you are going to have a reform to have one
that would be a service. Suppose Ardee was chosen
as the place for the county workhouse?—I would not
favour Ardee being chosen as the county workhouse at
all.

12716. CHAIRMAN.—What you are concerned about in
Ardee is you don't want to pay for the destitute of
Drogheda and Dundalk?—We do not; we don't want to
pay for those large towns.

12717. You have no county patriotism?—I don't
know that.

12718. Mr. MURKIN.—That would not neces-
sarily come about, because you could make arrange-
ments to pay the cost per head of the inmates that you
would send to the county almshouse for instance?—
Yes; but there is no county almshouse.

12719. Suppose there were, we are trying to get the
knowledge from local men to guide us as to how the
system could be improved or reformed, and these sug-
gestions have been thrown out in other places.
What we would like to know from you is would it
appear to your sense of propriety to have, in this
county, which is a very small county, one place
for the aged and infirm—what large class that frequents
the workhouse—and to distribute other classes in other
ways—the boarding out of the children, the sending
of lunatics to an asylum, and the providing of some
home for the mothers of illegitimate children?—I don't
think you would improve matters at all.

12720. You think the workhouse is such a perfect
system?—No; I don't say that at all. I would be
very sorry to say that.

12721. What suggestion would you make for its im-
provement then?—I would make none; I will not start
a new system of my own.

12722. CHAIRMAN.—Then your view is to leave things
as they are?—My view is that Ardee could not do
better than it is at present, and it is the view of the
whole district.

Very Rev. Canon

ROBERTS examined.

Very Rev.
Canon Rogers

12723. Mr. MURKIN.—You are the Catholic Parish
Priest of Ardee parish?—Yes.

12724. And also the Chaplain to the Union Work-
house?—Yes.

12725. And you have been so for a considerable
number of years?—Upwards of twenty years.

12726. What is your view about amalgamating Ardee
Union with any of the adjoining unions?—Well, I
would like to know how the amalgamation would
go; I would like to know what is meant exactly by
amalgamation; I look upon it as fatal to take away the
hospital.

12727. CHAIRMAN.—Yes; it is generally conceded
that it would be undesirable to oblige the sick to go

long distances?—I would like to know, then, what the
proposal is.

12728. That is what we are here for—to try and get
proposals?—If it means classification and separation,
and that means the benefit of the poor and the saving
of the rates, I think it would be a good thing.

12729. The centralization of certain classes of inmates
in different workhouses?—

Mr. MURKIN.—And the distribution of other
classes?—My experience is bounded entirely by the
Ardee Workhouse, which is a small institution, and
with regard to the different classifications spoken of
to-day—for the infirm poor and the lunatics and the
children—taking them separately, for instance with

regard to the children, I would be for sweeping them all out of that at once. Then the barracks, the workhouse is no proper place for them. Then we have only the infirm poor and the hospital patients. Well, seeing that the hospital is remaining, the question resolves itself into what shall we do with the infirm patients. I speak from experience; I know it is very difficult to get the infirm poor to go into the workhouse as things are, and possibly it might be very difficult to get them to go a distance from home, but at the same time I recognize that is entirely sentimental, and the idea of its being a workhouse is an obstacle to their going in.

12736. CHAIRMAN.—That would be against any amalgamation?—But if you have a central place administered, and equipped, and up-to-date, and free from the taint of workhouse associations, I would not hesitate to say that the people would refuse to go, and I presume the cases would be better treated than they are at the present time.

12737. Mr. MURKIN.—All present they are cooped up in a little room, without any occupation, and it does seem a very odd thing indeed to see so many handed that way without any object in life, simply waiting for their meals, and passing one day after another in idle gossip?—It is.

12738. CHAIRMAN.—But the sick ought not to be obliged to go?—Certainly not; I think it would be advisable to interfere with them; on the contrary, the hospital ought to be retained and up-to-date in every way.

12739. As far as a local hospital can be?—Yes. You mentioned something about an orphanage.

12740. Yes; I heard something of it in Armagh.—The orphanage system is this, that there is an orphanage committee to work it.

12741. It meets once a month in Armagh?—Yes; and, of course, the accounts are audited. The clergyman of the district—i.e., or any of my assistants in my own parish—if we find we have a case of a lone father orphan we bring the case before the committee; we must prove that they are really lone father orphans; we must then be in a position to name some persons who will take charge of the orphan or orphans, and the person who will take charge of them must be of a good character and have a small holding of land in order to keep a cow and supply the orphans with milk. There must be a guarantee that the children will attend school, and there is an inspector appointed whose business it is to go round once a year—a lady. She sends in a yearly report, and visits the orphans in their homes and the schools. She reports then to the committee her opinion, and says whether the orphans were well clad and comfortably looked after, and what the attendance at school was, and everything generally about them, and makes any complaint or comment she thinks necessary. She gives the number of attendances at the school, and if the committee consider the attendance is not what it ought to be the orphans are withdrawn and must be provided for in more suitable homes.

12742. You have had experience of that system; what is your opinion?—It is in existence nine years, and is working well.

12743. It originates in a fund left?—In a fund left for charitable purposes, the same to be designated by the Catholic Priests of Armagh; and in order to avoid the expense of sinking money in buildings this system was devised on the lines, I think, of the Protestant Orphan Society, but it is entirely a boarding-out system; the children are sent from three years old up to fourteen, and the person taking charge of an orphan is paid 2s. 6d. a week.

12744. And your inspection is frequent?—The report is only sent in once a year.

12745. The lady inspectors is a resident of the diocese?—Yes.

12746. Mr. MURKIN.—You occasionally see the children yourself?—I do.

12747. How do you think they are treated?—I think they are treated very well. There were cases that we considered were not sufficiently well treated, and we removed them to other homes.

12748. Do you find you can board out all your orphans?—Yes, although I have no children in my parish under the doocoon scheme.

12749. But you are aware all the same?—Yes; I am a member of the committee myself.

12750. When you are attending the meetings have you heard of complaints about the difficulty of getting suitable homes?—No; the condition is that before the orphan is put on the list the home must be secured.

12751. Are you able to get enough orphans to absorb the funds?—Yes; as a rule we have none to spare. With our present resources we have between thirty and forty orphans.

12752. What is the annual fund at your disposal?—The interest of about £10,000. It costs £5 a year for each orphan.

12753. Mr. M'IVER.—You hold no brief for the Ardsle Guardians, but speaking as an impartial outsider, is the Ardsle Workhouse efficiently and well administered?—I know it is a most popular union with the poor; and my experience is that they prefer to go to Ardsle rather than any other union in the county.

12754. You visit them and see that yourself?—Yes; and I am there for thirty years.

12755. Don't you think it would be a hardship if the destitute poor round Ardsle district, and more particularly in the County Meath part of the union, were obliged to travel a long distance to get to the union workhouse?—You see, the guardians propose that the institution they sketch out will not be a workhouse—it will be a kind of sanatorium or home—and I suspect if that were brought home to the poor they would go even a distance more freely to it than to the workhouse, because there is a taint in the workhouse. That is one of the difficulties we have to contend with, no matter how well the workhouse or hospital is administered.

12756. Of course, there is no question of abolishing the hospital accommodation?—No.

12757. And having the hospital accommodation there is it not then necessary to have a medical man and a trained nurse?—Yes.

12758. And a clerk and porter and some helpers?—

CHAIRMAN.—You would certainly want a doctor and chaplain and nurses, but what else—would you want a solicitor?

Mr. M'IVER.—By all means a solicitor. Would it not mean practically the whole existing staff of the union?

Mr. MURKIN.—You have that staff at present in the infirmary without touching on the body of the house. You have an additional staff for the body.

12759. Mr. M'IVER.—Is any extra expense involved in the rest of the house?—Merely the maintenance of the patients.

Mr. MURKIN.—What about the upkeep of the buildings and the fuel?

CHAIRMAN.—The master's salary and the matron's salary.

Mr. M'IVER.—You would want a master to supervise the hospital.

CHAIRMAN.—Not at all; they are very much in the way.

Rev. Canon A. L. FORD examined.

12760. Mr. M'IVER.—You are the Rector of Ardsle parish?—I am.

12761. And you are the Protestant chaplain to the workhouse?—Yes.

12762. What are your views as to amalgamating with the adjoining unions?—My views are rather peculiar—I should like to wipe out all the workhouses in the country.

12763. CHAIRMAN.—Perhaps you are not so peculiar as you think?—But, facts de sacro, I would rather see Ardsle Workhouse maintained, if not on the present lines, at least in something of the present form, for several reasons. I should like to emphasize the opinion which has already been given, that it would be a very considerable hardship on the poor of Ardsle to have to go to Dundalk or Drogheda. It may not seem at first sight so difficult, and the suggestion that a ticket should be given to the applicant to enable him to get his train fare would do away with part of it; but it is not probable that on all occasions the ticket would be given. For instance, in the Ardsle Union—I don't suppose the Press will give me away, and I don't suppose the Guardians would like to be given away either—but there is a superstition that the Ardsle Union won't take in male tramps, and no male tramps come in consequence.

Feb. 8, 1904.

Very Res.
CANNON FORD.

Rev. Canon
A. L. Ford.

Feb. 4, 1894.

Rev. Canon
A. L. Ford.

12757. Mr. MURKIN.—Is it only a superstition?—They would be hoaxed, I fancy, to take them in. Then belief arose only a few years ago, and the tramps all at once from a very considerable number down to a very small number, until at present there are only about sixteen, whereas formerly there were sixty, even up to 100.

12758. Is that a salutary superstition?—Well, it is and it is not, for this reason, that occasionally you have exceptional cases, and I think exceptional cases should be provided for. I would not provide for the habitual tramp—a sort of a tramp tourist, who goes from one place to another, and has all the workhouses tapped out and the distances, but I think provision ought to be made for persons who are honestly seeking for work.

12759. An extension of out-door relief, would not that be good?—I would extend the out-door relief certainly, but the difficulty is to know how to apply it with proper safeguards. I believe the extension of out-door relief with proper safeguards would be a very admirable substitute for a group deal that goes on at present.

12760. Mr. McIVER.—Can you give the Commission your experience of how the Ardee Union is managed?—I have been a chaplain of three workhouses in the course of my ministry, which extends over a quarter of a century, and I think that, taking them on the whole, the Ardee Workhouse, with all its difficulties, and I don't say that it is absolute perfection, is considerably in front of the others. I was chaplain of Dundalk Workhouse for a time, and my recollections of Dundalk Workhouse are certainly not of the most rosy or favorable character. I was chaplain of Newry Workhouse for fifteen years, and there things are managed on a larger scale, but I really think that the poor are more comfortable here.

12761. CHAIRMAN.—Have you seen it within the last year or two, since they rebuilt the hospital?—No, not since they were burned down.

12762. Then I would not compare them—I am afraid you would have to give way to Newry at all events!—If you burned Ardee Workhouse and let us rebuild it we would have a very good hospital, too; but at the same time I think the sick are very comfortable in the hospital, and speaking for those that have been there, members of my persuasion, they have testified to the great care and kindness which have been shown them while in the house, and they certainly seemed to be clean and comfortable. I don't see how you are to do away with the hospital, because at the present minute you have fifty-one patients in the hospital.

12763. We have not received any suggestions that the hospitals should be closed?—Then, as regards the infirm, there are sixty-five infirm—thirty-two male and thirty-three female—in the Ardee Union, and, as one of the Commissioners has said, their position is certainly very sad. I don't think that life in a workhouse for the aged and infirm is anything to be desired. The question is whether you would make it better by having a central place occupied by the infirm—I don't think it would be less expensive.

12764. Mr. MURKIN.—A sort of farm house, where these people would have a little occupation?—If it could be done without serious expense that would be ideal.

12765. CHAIRMAN.—Where an old couple would not be separated if they chose to be together?—That would be admirable, but it would mean a very considerable expense on buildings. Any workhouse building, as far as I know, does not seem to be at all suitable for such a purpose.

12766. If you had nothing in the house but the aged and infirm don't you think the present buildings would be suitable for classification?—You would have to divide your buildings into flats.

12767. Are they not divided into flats at present?—For the most part they are in large dormitories; there would be nothing of the separate system—providing a sitting room or kitchen for a couple of old people.

12768. Some light partitions might be put up?—Yes.

12769. Mr. McIVER.—As regards the boarding out system, is it adopted to some extent under the Ardee Board of Guardians?—I know very little about that—no children I have any interest in have been boarded out.

12770. Don't you think it would be difficult to get the same sanitary or moral surroundings, where they are properly housed and cased, as in the institution?—I don't believe in bringing up children in the workhouse; and I took very active steps when I was chaplain at Newry to get all the children put out, and all my children were put out. There was one difficulty which Canon Rogers did not mention. The Ardee Society with which he is connected is a copy of the Orphan Society, as he said, which has been working in the County Armagh and County Louth—the Protestant Orphan Society. But there is one thing that we don't teach, I don't know whether the society does, I should fear it does not, we don't teach illegitimate children at all, and you would have that difficulty.

12771. CHAIRMAN.—We have had suggestions from various quarters that they should be dealt with by the people who have charge of the penitentiaries or reformatories—of course, boarded out at an early age. In some cases I should make a difference—a difference between what I should call the result of a sudden temptation and the result of a constant habit. I have known both cases—cases where they have simply used the workhouse as a resort.

CHAIRMAN.—They all drift into that, unfortunately, if some steps are not taken.

12772. Mr. McIVER.—Is it the prevailing view of your parishioners that it would be a hardship to be amalgamated with the magistrates of Dundalk or Drogheda?—If amalgamation meant the sweeping away of Ardee and an increase of the rates, the cost of the transit of paupers by rail, and probably an increased cost per head, I think the ratepayers would feel it very considerably. The Ardee Workhouse has been fairly suitable for the paupers of the district; it has been worked on economical and fair lines; the buildings are some of them old, and they might be very considerably improved; some improvements have been made, as I know, during my chaplaincy, and some more ought to be made, but I think that any amalgamation which would mean additional hardship to the poor and increased rates, would not meet with favour, at any rate in this district.

12773. CHAIRMAN.—The district generally is in favour of letting things remain as they are?—No, we should like to see things improved.

12774. But I mean the workhouse to remain?—Yes, the workhouse to remain, but improve it.

12775. Mr. MURKIN.—But if it did not mean all these undesirable things you suggest—if it meant no increase in the rates, if it meant an improvement in the condition of the poor, would it not be well to attempt a reform on those lines?—Anything that would improve the condition of the poor, that would lighten the moral atmosphere, that would enable children to be brought up apart from the contaminating influence of idleness, would meet with my hearty approval.

12776. Dr. BRIDGE.—Do you think it would be an advantage to separate the hospital from the workhouse?—I think so.

12777. Do you think more patients would avail themselves of hospital treatment?—I think so; and if it were made distinctly a hospital and not regarded as a workhouse, it would be very much more useful, but if it were made a hospital I would like to see it properly equipped as a hospital—modernized, and brought up to date.

12778-79. You would hardly agree with the Chairman that it does not require any improvement?—As a hospital, I should like to see it made more a hospital. At present it is more like a sick infirmary, and the system on which it is worked is practically the system of the rest of the house.

Mr. McIVER.—I intended to examine a witness as to statistics, but I find that is not necessary; but I will examine the clerk as to reports of Local Government Inspectors about the union.

CHAIRMAN.—We can get those. If you wish us to go into them, we will certainly get the original documents and read them.

Mr. McIVER.—It was merely to correct an impression which I thought prevailed, that the Ardee Union was not properly managed.

CHAIRMAN.—We are speaking of our own opinion, and no matter what we read we could not alter the opinion we formed.

Dr. MICHAEL COLLIER EXAMINED.

Feb. 4, 1904.

Dr. Michael
Collier.

12780. Mr. M'FEE.—You are a medical practitioner in Ardee?—Yes.

12781. And you are the doctor to the workhouse infirmary?—Yes.

12782. And have been so for many years?—Yes.

12783. About how many patients on an average have you in the infirmary during the year?—About fifty.

12784. It is scarcely necessary to ask you if you would consider it a retrograde step to abolish the hospital accommodation in the district?—Yes; I don't believe that could be done.

12785. You require two buildings, I take it, for the hospital—you want a separate building for infectious diseases and another building for ordinary cases?—Yes.

12786. Assuming the hospital would be kept on, in your opinion would it be possible to adapt the remainder of the building to any public purpose, such as an asylum or sanatorium?—I don't believe it would be suitable for an asylum—there would not be sufficient ground for recreation for the inmates, unless there was more ground acquired.

12787. Are the buildings as at present suitable for an asylum?—No, they would have to be fitted up.

12788. Would they require a large expenditure of money?—They would.

12789. And do you think as the union is at present what that it is a well-managed institution; broadly speaking, we don't claim that it is perfect, but on the whole it is well and efficiently managed?—I consider it is.

12790. And do you think it would be a hardship on the poor of the district to have to travel a distance of a mile of this sort?—That is the prevailing opinion.

12791. And is the opinion of the ratepayers and of the Guardians unanimous against any amalgamation with the adjoining unions?—Yes.

12792. For financial reasons, and reasons of convenience as well?—Yes.

12793. And, generally speaking, it is a good healthy district about Ardee?—Yes.

12794. And the workhouse is in a favourable position from that point of view?—Yes.

12795. Would you consider it more healthy than putting people together in large towns, such as Drogheda and Dundalk?—I would say so.

12796. There never has been any serious epidemic outbreak of disease there?—We have had very little fever for the last ten or fifteen years. When I was appointed first there was a great deal of fever in the district—typhus, typhoid, smallpox, and even diphtheria; but for the last ten or fifteen years we have had very little fever in the entire union.

12797. CHAIRMAN.—You had a number of scarletina cases?—Yes we had a great number this year; that is general.

12798. Mr. M'FEE.—I believe I am correct in saying there has not been a single case of typhus for the last fifteen years?—Yes.

12799. Was there a good main drainage scheme carried into execution some years ago?—There was in the town of Ardee.

12800. And that has endorsed very materially to the health of the district?—I should say so.

12801. There has not been any outbreak of disease in the workhouse that could possibly be due to any defective drainage system?—I had an outbreak of summer diarrhoea last summer, and I believe that was due to defective sewers in the building.

12802. Is the water supply good?—The water supply is good. It has been analysed by Sir Charles Cameron on two different occasions, and found to be perfectly fine.

Mr. M'FEE.—These are all the witnesses I intend to call. The case that I have been instructed to make here on behalf of the Ardee Board of Guardians is that public opinion is unanimous against amalgamation with any of the surrounding unions. The board have carefully considered the matter with a very full attendance of all the members, and they have unanimously resolved to take steps to prevent any amalgamation with the adjoining unions. This opposition is not due to any vague sentimental or selfish reason, but we claim it is based on solid, substantial, and good ground. Fifthly, as regards the financial aspect of the case. An examination of the figures will show that the rating in the Ardee Union is very considerably

less than in any of the surrounding unions—less not only this year, but for many years past. I find the rating in the £ in the Ardee Union is 1s. 6d., in the Drogheda Union it is 1s. 8d., and in Dundalk it is 1s. 9d.

CHAIRMAN.—These are, of course, for all charges?

Mr. M'FEE.—These are for Poor Law expenditure.

CHAIRMAN.—Are these union charges or do they include district charges?

Mr. Dringdale, Clerk.—Purely Poor Law expenditure.

CHAIRMAN.—And medical charges?

Mr. Dringdale.—Yes.

Mr. M'FEE.—The Navan Union is 1s. 9d., Kells 1s. 8d.; these figures cannot be controverted, they are unimpeachable facts, and they show that we, living in Ardee, have a distinct advantage over the inhabitants in the adjoining unions, and we claim that unless some very good, substantial, and sufficient reason is shown for depriving us of that advantage that it would be an injustice to us to take it from us. These figures clearly show that the rating is 75 per cent. more in any of the neighbouring unions than it is in ours; and we say that we should not be deprived of the advantage without very good grounds; we should not be involved in any costly or doubtful experiments in the management of Poor Law administration. It may be said that these figures are fallacious.

CHAIRMAN.—These are figures from the County Council.

Mr. M'FEE.—Yes, from the last returns. It may be said, perhaps, that these are fallacious, that they represent an advantage that does not exist in reality, and that it due more to a difference in valuation in the unions. I don't think that can exist, but even assuming it does, we come to another test, and that is, the test of the cost per annum. As regards that, too, I think we have a very distinct advantage. In the Ardee Union the average cost per head per week of the inmates, including all salaries and house expenses—

CHAIRMAN.—What does it include?

Mr. Dringdale.—Workhouse expenditure, diet and clothing, salaries of officers, and all establishment charges. It does not take in the medical charities or registration.

Mr. M'FEE.—That is 3s. per head in the Ardee Union, in the Drogheda 4s. 3d., and in Dundalk 5s. 1d., in Kells 11s. 6d., and in Navan 9s. 3d. These are again figures that cannot be controverted, and which bear the highest testimony to the efficiency of the administration and the care with which everything is attended to, and the economical and proper working of the establishment. Then we have the diet scale here, and it shows clearly that this economical working is not due to any defect in the diet—any inferior sort of diet.

CHAIRMAN.—Was the suggested dietary scale of the Local Government Board adopted?

Mr. Dringdale.—It was.

CHAIRMAN.—Then you need not go into that.

Mr. M'FEE.—Then, coming to the question of local convenience, nobody suggests—and the suggestion would be an absurd one—to abolish hospital accommodation for the district. Reading the signs of the times, the tendency is towards a greater multiplication of smaller hospitals than to centralise ones. Therefore, I take it that there can be no suggestion from any quarter of abolishing the Ardee Hospital.

CHAIRMAN.—We have not received any.

Mr. M'FEE.—That being so, it is, of course, necessary to carry on the establishment. You must have two buildings for a hospital. You must have a separate building for infectious and contagious diseases, and you must have another one for the ordinary cases which crop up in every community. The witnesses who have been examined here, and the testimony is worthy of your careful consideration, say that it would require a very large expenditure of money to adapt the remaining part of the house to altered circumstances—to fit it up as an asylum, sanatorium, or any other establishment you like. At present it is reasonably useful, and it is reasonably adapted for the requirements of the district; it fulfils its purpose well, and it has from time to time won the commendation and the praise of Local Government Board Inspectors, with one exception, perhaps; but that is the exception that proves the rule, and that was more in

Feb. 2, 1864.

Dr. Michael
Collins.

matters of detail than anything else, it was not due to any default in principle or any serious complaint as to the management. Then there is another reason that suggests itself—that it would be a hardship to the present pauper inmates of the union to have them transferred. I am not inclined to place too much reliance upon this circumstance. You have mentioned that in a case under your own notice that although the patients were very much anxious to be disturbed in the first instance, afterwards they settled down, so that I don't think there is very much in it; but for all it is worth, I put it to you, would it be fair to transfer those fifty poor old men and women from the surroundings they are familiar with, and place them in a position where they get out of touch with their old friends? They feel it as a hardship in their old years it is an argument, at all events.

CHAIRMAN.—Unless there are some counterbalancing advantages.

Mr. McFarr.—But there is another reason. That is, to leave such a large district without a refuge for the poor or destitute. The Ardee Union is conveniently shaped; it is compact; the area is 26,000 acres, and with the exception of one part, which is next the sea-side it is a radius of six miles in all directions from the workhouse, so that it is easy to cover and easily got at from all parts. If you abolish the workhouse what happens. The poor of the district then have no

place to go to except to tramp all the way to Dundalk or Drogheda, Navan or Kells. In the County Meath part of the union there is no railway accommodation; the population is very sparse, and it would be an utter impossibility for them to be able to get to a union. I don't see how it is to be done. I think there are great practical difficulties in the way, and if you abolish the Ardee Poor Law Workhouse for proper accommodation is a repeal of the Poor Law Acts for the district and a great hardship and injustice on the poor and destitute. We would welcome by all means any proposed change in the Poor Law administration, we are not so retrograde as not to welcome any change for the better in the administration, either in the differentiation of cases or any other means you like; but we say it would be a hardship to the ratepayers and the poor to amalgamate us with any of the adjoining unions. We have managed our affairs well in the past, and have justified our claims to manage them well in the future, and to be left undisturbed. We are not to be taken as going against any change for the better, but we say we have an advantage in rates which should not be taken from us, and we claim home rule in the respect. We have every respect for the enterprising citizens of Dundalk, but we say we are managing our affairs well, and have no desire to be thrown in with them. These are the arguments that suggest themselves to me, and I thank you for the courtesy and patience with which you have heard me.

Mr. JAMES HALIFORDY EXAMINED.

Mr. James
Halifordy.

I was asked to come here as one of the Town Commissioners of Ardee.

18803. CHAIRMAN.—You have heard what has been said here to-day. Do you agree with the general evidence that the Ardee people are against amalgamation?—Yes.

18804. They think it would raise their taxation, and

that matters are well managed as they are!—Yes, and it would not make the expenses any the less. The only thing I would say is that if buildings are necessary to those people—the consumption and epileptic—and union should provide those buildings for itself.

18805. You would not like to go shares with Dundalk and Drogheda?—No, sir, they would run as I agree with all the other evidence.

Dr. HERSCULES H. MACDONOCHIE EXAMINED.

Dr. Hercules
H. MacDono-
chie.

18806. CHAIRMAN.—You are Surgeon of the County Infirmary?—Of the Louth Infirmary.

18807. I think you are also a member of some of the public bodies?—I am a Poor Law Guardian for the district of Dundalk. I am also surgeon to the prison and to the Great Northern Railway.

18808. You have seen the queries that have been circulated by the Commission?—I have.

18809. And you have heard the evidence which was given to-day?—I have heard a great deal of it.

18810. Now, without going into details, is there anything that struck you on which you would like to give your opinion?—There is one little point as regards the expenses of Ardee and Dundalk. I think if you take the standard year 1867 you will find that the cost of the paupers in Ardee Union was slightly higher than the cost in Dundalk. I think it was £1,412 against £1,341 in Ardee; so that that does away any misconception which may arise.

18811. If they give one year telling in their favour you wish to give another year telling in your favour?—I merely mention that as the standard year. I may mention that the Board of Guardians appointed a committee to deal with these queries, and we sent in our report, and that, I think, has been forwarded to the Commission, and if you would allow me to go through that report briefly, I think perhaps it would be the best way.

18812. Dr. Brown.—With regard to the improvements at Dundalk, were they paid out of the rates, or was there a loan for the building of the addition to the fever hospital?—That was a loan.

18813. And the disinfection and the ambulance.

Mr. Feigin, Clerk.—The disinfecting chamber and ambulance were paid for out of the rates.

Witness.—I declare you are aware there have been very extensive improvements in the last ten years in the Dundalk Workhouse. There is a great deal more to be done, but very large capital sums have been expended, and also sums from the rates.

18814. CHAIRMAN.—Before you go into the Guardians' matter, were there any questions you would like to mention as regards your infirmary. Our reference takes in questions with regard to all public institutions,

not merely the workhouses?—Well, of course, we are a little cramped for funds, but that rests with the County Council.

18815. They cannot give more than a certain amount?—But we are not getting our full amount; but still the County Council have behaved very generously to us. They have increased our annual grant in the last five years.

18816. Would your view be that the rates should pay for all necessary expenditures in treating the sick, as far as there is a deficiency after their own contributions?—Do you mean as regards the union?

18817. The county infirmary?—I think the county infirmary ought to have funds to meet their legitimate expenses from the rates.

18818. That is their strictly necessary expenditure?—Certainly.

18819. And anything above that would be got by subscriptions and contributions?—Influents are working on rather the reverse. We have a union small funded sum, and we have annual subscriptions, and then we get a grant from the County Council every year to supplement that up to about what our income would be necessary.

18820. In this county you do get considerable subscriptions?—Yes, but they have fallen off. I cannot say they have fallen off in the last two or three years, but they have fallen off considerably since the Local Government Act.

18821. Is that owing to the fact that subscribers are no longer members of the governing body?—Quite so. I am afraid they take up an opinion, which I have tried to combat privately as much as possible, and that was that it was being supported altogether out of the local rates.

18822. Do you think that that would be a desirable system?—I think it would, perhaps, and to do away with what I might call idiosyncrasy and, which we get from the private subscribers.

18823. Would you not continue to get that for special objects, greater comforts?—Not to any large extent. We have got considerable benefactions, and there is a most excellent guild of the ladies of Dundalk and the neighbourhood who meet, and they have a small subscription, and they send in a certain amount of work,

Feb. 3, 1904.

Dr. Horatio
M. MacDon-
nell.

and this is divided between the patients in the hospital and the district nurses in the town. It is entirely a local private charity, and they have given considerable sums to the hospital. Only six months ago they gave as a sum large enough to buy a very fine operating table; and then we have done up some of our wards in the infirmary entirely by private subscriptions without coming of the rates at all.

12824. Mr. MURTAGH.—You would not like to dole these off?—Certainly not.

12825. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think it would dole them off if you had the necessary expenditure safe and sure?—I have never yet been refused any legitimate request by the governors of the infirmary. There is nothing but the best of feeling, and anxiety to do what I recommended for the good of the hospital.

12826. As regards the nursing, would you be in favour of your infirmary being a training school for nurses for the county or any other area?—I am afraid our establishment would not be large enough for housing the nurses or giving them constant employment. We always used to have one probationer who did not pay, but we trained her, and we have had two or three, but never more than one, at a time. They got a most excellent training, for they had to act as a nurse and had twenty-five or thirty beds to look after, but we should not have sufficient material to make a training school.

12827. I mean for the ordinary nurses as distinguished from the higher class?—I don't like any distinction between higher and lower class nurses.

12828. But still you have them in fact, I suppose?—Well, we have not at the infirmary; we got the very best nurses we can get for money.

12829. But of the higher class nurses in Ireland there is a comparatively small number, and there are thousands of nurses necessary for the country; they cannot all be trained for three or four years?—Well, I am afraid the Louth County Infirmary would not be a suitable field.

12830. You have as few hospitals to consider; you have only one at Ardee, Drogheda, and Dundalk. Now if you take up the Guardians' part?—That is in doubt, in the interests of the epileptics, idiots, chronic lunatics, and consumptives of the Co. Louth, that the existing unions of Drogheda and Dundalk be allowed of their charge, and proper accommodation provided elsewhere. That was the first, and I take it, the most important recommendation we made.

12831. That means either at Richmond, Portrane, or an auxiliary asylum?—Some place.

12832. Had you any feeling as regards auxiliary asylums?—I am afraid I cannot speak from actual experience of them, but I know that they are extremely expensive.

12833. The auxiliary?—Of course we only deal with Portrane and Richmond.

12834. I was thinking more of the experiment tried in the Co. Cork at Youghal?—No, I cannot speak of that.

12835. Mr. MURTAGH.—The number in Dundalk at present is considerable?—I think we have forty-nine, of which twenty-two are imbeciles, seventeen lunatics, and of these nine are epileptics. The accommodation is only three wards and five cells and passages.

12836. You think they ought not to be there?—I don't think you could put them in a worse place than a Poor Law hospital with the infirm and aged.

12837. You have a similar number in Drogheda, I think?—I cannot speak of that. I fancy they are pretty much the same. Up until a very short time ago our few hospital accommodation was extremely limited, but now we have got a really beautiful hospital, and that has been done by the Poor Law Guardians without any pressure from anyone. They felt it right to do it, and they did it very well and very economically. To reply to Query 3.—That is a desirable to adopt a classification of inmates which will differentiate between the deserving and the undeserving poor. It is perfectly well known that there is a very large class of inmates come into unions which are in the neighbourhood of towns. A great number of these are closest of the criminal class. We are troubled here with three or four families. When the fathers are not in the union they are in jail generally, and nothing can be worse than the up-bringing of the children. They are what you would call the undeserving poor.

12838. What would you suggest in regard to those children?—I have always tried as a magistrate to have those children taken away from such parents and sent to orphanages.

12839. Do you think it would be well to give the Guardians power to take the children away from such parents?—I think it would be an excellent plan, and I think the powers of the Guardians ought to be enlarged, so that those cases of truancy could be dealt with by the chairman, who is an ex-officio magistrate, that he would be able to deal with them judiciously up in the workhouse without having them summoned and brought to Petty Sessions.

12840. The Chairman of the Board of Guardians is not necessarily a magistrate?—Here he is.

12841. CHAIRMAN.—In any case he would not have the clerk of Petty Sessions or any of the officials. It would be rather an extraordinary proceeding to deal with a man and deprive him of his liberty in a board-room?—I don't think so, it can be done elsewhere; you can deal with a man in prison without bringing him to Petty Sessions, but I must see some extension of powers is wanted to enable Boards of Guardians to deal with this truancy question, in a place like Dundalk it is a great nuisance. It is on the high road between Dublin and Belfast. We are worse of than Ardee which is not on the road to anywhere except Kells or Navan.

12842. So you would approve of a change in the law enabling the Guardians to take these children from their parents?—I certainly would. The reply to Query 3 was "the detention of criminals and tramps until 12 o'clock noon"—I think at present we can detain them until 11 o'clock.

12843. The general suggestion is that the Irish law should be assimilated to the English law, which gives these power to detain them a very much longer period, according as a man comes back oftener?—Certainly, that would be most valuable; some extension in that direction. I don't know whether your Commission have the power of recommending, but we find it rather hard sometimes the deportation of paupers from England and Scotland here.

12844. We saw cases in Belfast Workhouse where a number of Scotch people were there in receipt of relief and could not be sent back to Scotland?—As between unions in Ireland, it would be impossible to devise a scheme fair to every one, but if we got English, or Scotch, or Welsh paupers we ought to have the power of deporting them altogether. I think I ought to mention that since this report was drawn up there was a discussion at the Board about the question of district as against union relief.

12845. Mr. MURTAGH.—Divisional?—The general idea was that the towns ought to pay for their own.

12846. CHAIRMAN.—You mean the rural district as against the urban district?—That is it, practically.

12847. Mr. MURTAGH.—And in the rural district electoral division against electoral division?—No, I don't think so; it was the town against the country.

12848. It has often been put before us that an electoral division charge was a better method, especially as regards outdoor relief?—That I might safely say, although I am opposed to it as being a town Guardian, still I think it is only fair to state that the opinion of the Board would be in favour of that. There is a good deal to be said on both sides, and we had not the matter threshed out, but there is no doubt the opinion of the majority of the Board was in favour of that.

12849. You have no opinion of your own on the point?—I should not like to express an opinion without going deeper into the question.

12850. Some persons have suggested an intermediate system—to adopt the dispensary area as a suitable one?—Yes, but a large portion of the two dispensary districts in Dundalk are in the rural district—one goes out to Blackrock, the other goes out a good way in the other direction, although they are both in the town, and a large portion is rural.

12851. Do you approve of the system of amalgamation of workhouses in Ireland?—Oh, I think, certainly, for many reasons.

12852. Would you wish to express your view as to how many would meet the needs of the Co. Louth?—I should think two ought to be ample, that is if they were to remain as at present. Very large capital expenditure will be required to put either Dundalk or Drogheda in its proper position for maintaining lunatics, imbeciles, epileptics, and consumptives; there would have to be a very large initial expenditure. I thought myself that that could best be met by removing all that class to other places, and my idea was to keep them under local control by making Ardee the centre for receiving imbeciles, such lunatics as could not be sent to Portrane, idiots, and consumptives. Of course that would also entail the expenditure of making these

Feb 3, 1864.

Dr. Brookes
H. MacDon-
nell.

premises suitable, but it would have the benefit of retaining them under local control, and the rates, which would go in their support, would be spent locally.

12853. CHAIRMAN.—You would suggest leaving the Ardee Workhouse, as far as it is not wanted for the sick, made an auxiliary lunatic asylum?—And a place for convalescents, too.

12854. There would not be room for both?—Then I think it ought to be increased.

12855. Do you think it would be desirable to have three classes—clean, lunatic, and convalescent—close beside each other?—Well, of course, it would not be ideally perfect, but I think if proper accommodation were made for the convalescents you could take them out of the main body of the house. You would have to build for them. I don't think any workhouse in Ireland, as at present constituted, is suitable for the reception of convalescents. We have not very many here, because there is no accommodation for them really. If there was accommodation for them we should have a considerable quantity from the surrounding districts.

12856. There is a good deal of convalescent?—There is in some of the districts, but I think it would be only fair, if the rates are to support those people, that the rates should be expended locally; that is why I should like to see a relieving station, if we may call it so, in the county kept and accommodation provided for these various classes. Of course nobody has ever suggested that there should not be a district hospital under the County Council for Ardee. That, I take it, is absolutely essential.

12857. Dr. BROOKES.—Under the County Council?—I think the County Council have power under the Local Government Act.

12858. Why not make all the hospitals under the County Council and supported out of a county rate?—The county infirmary is practically under the County Council, from which they get the larger share of their grants, and the largest number of the members of the Board are from the County Council, but I think there is a distinction between a district hospital and a union hospital. I think there are powers under the Local Government Act of placing it under a separate committee.

12859. CHAIRMAN.—And you think that committee ought to be a committee of the County Council?—Well, nominated by the County Council and gentlemen and ladies residing in the neighbourhood. We have found the greatest benefit from having ladies amongst our Guardians.

12860. Dr. BROOKES.—That would be similar to your county infirmary?—Well, it is open to that objection, perhaps.

12861. I don't mean that it is an objection; I think it would be an advantage. Then there would be two hospitals under the County Council and two hospitals under the Board of Guardians?—I think it is very important to disassociate hospitals, which are solely for the treatment of the sick, from the Guardians and the workhouse.

12862. Would you suggest that they should be under the County Council?—I would suppose that the district hospital in Ardee should be under the County Council.

12863. CHAIRMAN.—And a district hospital in Drogheda?—I don't think that is required, because you have that demand provided for in the county infirmary. Of course you could not have a divided authority in Ardee, the Guardians having control of one portion of the building and the County Council of another; but still I think it would be quite feasible to disassociate a scheme by which a district hospital could be called a district hospital and worked on the lines of a district hospital.

12864. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—And why not managed by the district?—Certainly.

12865. What have the County Council to do with it?—They have to supply the funds.

12866. No, the Guardians supply the funds?—There is no difference of opinion, I think, between us, it is a mere matter of detail, but it is always better to disassociate the actual legitimate medicine and surgery from the Guardians.

12867. CHAIRMAN.—If these various undesirable classes were removed out of the workhouse it would be practically turned into a district hospital?—Oh, certainly; but I am afraid we will always have the poor with us, and we must always provide for them.

12868. But they might not be in buildings adjoining the hospital. If the able-bodied were in a provincial building and the infirm in the county building, then you would have the sick in the local hospital, that would make the hospital more popular and perhaps

more efficient?—I think it would, but I think it is a considerable objection to establishing what might be termed a lunatic asylum.

12869. Do you think it would increase the rates?—I think it would increase the rates, but I don't think any one would object to that if the poor people got better comforts and had better accommodation. I don't think a small increase in the rates would be objected to except by a few people, who would grumble at anything extra; but I think it ought always to be guaranteed that whatever funds were raised for them should be expended locally.

12870. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—There are only about 20 of that class in the whole Co. Louth. Would not a workhouse in the county accommodate those 20?—Would not any house be large enough to accommodate those 20?—I don't think Ardee would.

12871. The smallest house in the county is supposed to accommodate double that number?—The house at Drogheda would accommodate about 350. It was built to accommodate 500, but the cubic space is entirely sufficient at present.

12872. Then we are told that the farthest distance is only fifteen miles from the extreme point of the union to the workhouse?—I should think the extreme limit in Ardee would be from Drogheda to Ardee—that would be fourteen miles—and from Omagh to Drogheda, though not as the crow flies actually fifteen miles, involves a much longer journey by rail, so on the question of amalgamating Ardee with Drogheda we have larger distances already in our union than would exist if portions of Ardee was thrown into Drogheda.

12873. You have already longer distances?—Certainly.

12874. That would get rid of the distance question?—I don't think there is anything in the distance question at all. Of course various savings could be effected and the Guardians would reason. The only difference would be that they would have to come into Drogheda and Drogheda instead of meeting in Ardee.

12875. Not necessarily; they could stay in their own place and meet at District Commissioners?—Yes; but I mean as Poor Law Guardians.

12876. It would be different if they all had to come longer distances, such as would be necessary from Ardee to Drogheda?—From Ardee to Drogheda is already single—you have a railway—much simpler than coming from Omagh to Drogheda.

12877. The cost of transit is something; the Guardians would not care to undertake the expense of going often, but if the management continued as it is in the locality?—That would get rid of one objection, but I think it would be better that we should all meet together as far as the Guardians' work is concerned.

12878. Dr. BROOKES.—With reference to the district hospitals, do you think that these district hospitals should be so equipped so that major operations could take place in them?—Certainly.

12879. CHAIRMAN.—They are all now so equipped?—I am afraid not.

12880. Dr. BROOKES.—Would you think that if they were equipped operations would be performed?—It will equipped there is no reason why they should not.

12881. It takes a considerable amount of practice to keep a man efficient in major surgery?—It depends upon what we call major surgery; merely taking of a leg or an arm does not want so much skill.

12882. Appendicitis or obstruction of the bowels?—These would probably be sent into the county infirmary.

12883. Do you think there ought to be better arrangements for sending cases into the county infirmary from the smaller hospitals?

CHAIRMAN.—Some sort of connection between the district hospitals and the county infirmary—making them more systematic?

12884. Dr. BROOKES.—There is no connection between them at present?—No, but we get patients from all over the county.

12885. Sent from other hospitals; you were quite recently sent a case of cancer?—Oh, we have got some cases.

12886. Do you think it would be very well if there was a better system?—It would be very well if it could be worked, but there are considerable difficulties in the way, but they are not insuperable. You mean mentioning them?

12887. If all the hospitals were on the one basis and looked to the one institution—a large equipped hospital in the county as a hospital to which the larger operations should be sent?—That is practically what exists at present.

12898. Have you any statistics in the county infirmary of the distances from which patients come?—Yes, every year we have a report of how many come over five miles and how many inside five miles. We can have those for you. The proportion is much greater within the five miles—all the serious accidents—and, of course, we get a great number up from Gosnold and along the line. I can get the numbers for you.

12899. The larger portion of the district is outside the five miles?—Of course it is.

12900. And you could not say from memory how many patients you get from there?—I could not tell you from memory, but I can get you the figures for the last few years.

12901. Mr. M'Four.—I understand you are in favour of the scheme of amalgamating Ardee Union with Dundalk?—No; I was in favour of a scheme by which Dundalk and Drogheda could get rid of certain classes of patients, giving them to Ardee.

12902. You would send us all the under-shedding?—I don't know what you would call under-shedding. I am afraid we would have to keep our under-shedding, which are the semi-criminal population, ourselves; but the consumptives, imbeciles, and epileptics are the most to be rid of all classes.

12903. And you would send those to Ardee for comfort?—Yes, under proper conditions.

12904. You have said very fairly that any scheme you suggest would entail a very large capital expenditure?—If we had to supply our own beds, imbeciles, epileptics, and consumptives with proper accommodation, it would.

12905. Don't you think it would be necessary to acquire additional land around Ardee Workhouse; at present there are only two acres?—I thought there were four acres. Of course the consumptives would be able to walk about the place; it would be desirable to have more ground, but I should not think of equipping it as a regular sanatorium, where you want considerable ground under control, where they would be surrounded by walls to prevent their escaping.

12906. Would you think there would be any objection from the medical point of view to aggregating those different classes together?—I think the consumptives would have to be housed separately.

12907. Don't you think the consumptives might be in danger of infecting the other patients with consumption?—Unfortunately, they are all crowded together in the workhouse now.

12908. There are very few consumptive patients?—You have very few. I am glad to hear it.

12909. How many consumptives are there in Dundalk?—We have not any room for them, but we have half a dozen or so; we could have twenty or thirty if we had proper accommodation.

12910. What would you think of a central large workhouse for the whole county at Ardee?—Well, it would be a very desirable thing, but I am afraid it would be open to a great number of objections.

12911. I don't quite understand your suggestion as to a district hospital at Ardee?—I suppose you know the Local Government Act; in that you will see the County Council have perfect power to establish district hospitals, and the Guardians can also establish district hospitals.

12912. You would not advocate establishing two hospitals?—Not in Ardee.

12913. You have two in Dundalk?—We have the union hospital and the county infirmary.

12914. Would you think it would be a desirable change to put the two hospitals into one in Dundalk?—No; we would have to build a very big hospital.

12915. Everything you suggest entails building?—I did not suggest building two hospitals; it was you suggested it.

12916. You have two hospitals in Dundalk, and you don't think it would be desirable to put them into one?—They are for a different class of cases altogether; one is more for chronic cases—the union hospital; and we only treat acute cases, non-infectious cases, and operative cases in the infirmary.

12917. Would you recommend the present hospital in Ardee to be abolished altogether?—No; I don't think Ardee would do without a hospital; it ought to have its district hospital.

12918. In your suggestion to build and equip a hospital under the control of the County Council?—That would be one way of building a district hospital; the present hospital could be renamed a district hospital and worked by the Guardians.

12919. That would only be a change of name; a rose by any other name would smell as sweet?—I hope it would smell sweeter.

12920. Is that your only suggestion?—Rename it and equip it as a good working hospital.

12921. Would you advocate giving control to the County Council?—Or the Guardians.

12922. There is only one hospital in Drogheda?—That is all. I think there is a small cottage hospital outside.

Mr. MATTHEW DUFFY, Chairman Dundalk Board of Guardians, examined.

12923. CHAIRMAN.—Have you been present during the meeting?—Yes; I have been here all day.

12924. Is there anything you would like to add to the general evidence that has been given or to qualify it?—I thoroughly agree with what Dr. MacDonnell has said with regard to the epileptics. I don't wish to say anything with regard to the abolishing of Ardee Union, because it is rather a dangerous question to go into than what I see. I did not give it sufficient consideration. Then, as regards the classification of the inmates, I agree with Dr. MacDonnell's opinion too. As to query 7 I think we have a scheme with regard to paralytics; I think it would be desirable that we should charge a lesser sum to poor people instead of the set scale laid down.

12925. It is a discretionary scale; they may charge as much as they think the people can pay without hardship?—Yes; but as low as 5d. or 1s. a week. Is that discretionary too?

12926. Yes?—Then, with regard to query 8, we detain the tramps until eleven o'clock. I would like to keep them for two or three days and compel them to break stones. We find them back in Dundalk every five weeks nearly.

12927. Does the master not prosecute them?—There was an order made to that effect, but it was never carried into force; in some cases you cannot do it.

12928. But the people who come back after three weeks or a month?—They generally come from the town; they should be looked on as vagrants, and I think the Guardians should have power to prosecute them.

12929. Those are not vagrants; they are what are called idle and out-of-control?—Yes; but if the Guardians had power to prosecute them and keep them in for two or

three days and make them break a certain quantity of stones, it would prevent them coming in. With regard to the rating, it is a question that the country Guardians have taken very much into consideration—instead of union rating that it should be district rating.

12930. What started this?—The outdoor relief list.

12931. It is a little bit heavy in the towns?—Yes.

12932. Are you a town Guardian or from the country?—Country.

12933. And your friends in the country think you are paying too much for the town outdoor relief?—We think the town Guardians might use a little more discretion in giving the outdoor relief.

12934. Are the countrymen able to vote on that?—Yes; I had a vote on it last Monday.

12935. As each case comes up whether relief should be given or not, are not the countrymen there to vote?—Yes. But except when a very great hardship comes up it is not always made public by the board, and then it is afterwards it is found out on the revision of the outdoor relief annually. It was reduced by £220 in the year, and I found £180 of that was in one district—Dundalk. That was what raised the question.

12936. Mr. MURKIN.—What is the annual amount of outdoor relief in the union?—Over £2,000. As a matter of fact the district Guardians, with one exception, are in favour of a change in the rating.

12937. But the town Guardians are in favour of leaving things as they are?—No. I have a resolution here, proposed by Dr. MacDonnell and seconded by Mr. Peter Hughes, both Dundalk Guardians—"That this Board are of opinion that the question of union and district rating requires to be reconsidered."

Feb. 2, 1904.

Dr. Hercules H. MacDonnell.

Mr. Matthew Duffy.

Feb. 8, 1894.
 St. Matthew
 Duffy.

12622. CHAIRMAN.—But it never went back as far as electoral divisions?—No; I think the feeling was in favour of two ratings—union and district rating.

12623. Did many of those people who were getting outdoor relief in the town belong to the country originally?—Some of them.

12624. I suppose the towns think that is rather a reason why the country should pay part?—Yes; that question has been raised too; but I know one case where a man was carrying 38s. a week—a Dandalk man—and was getting 5s. 6d. a week outdoor relief. I could give several other instances.

12625. These would be distinct abuses—not defects in the law of rating, but defects in the administration by the Guardians?—Quite so; that is the reason you want to clear away from the Dandalk Guardians if possible. They would be more careful if they were paid out of their own rates.

12626. You don't think it is necessary to carry that beyond town and country?—I don't think it would be. 12627. Mr. MURPHY.—But there are some unions in which there are farmed towns that are not urban districts; how would that come in?—You would have to deal otherwise in those districts; Ardee is a rural district.

Mr. MICHAEL O'NEARA examined.

Mr. Michael
 O'Neara.

I am a member of the County Council. If you would allow me to just state what I have to say I will shorten the matter. In the first place, I go in very strongly for better classification of the inmates of the workhouse. I think there is a separation of the different classes urgently needed. The inmates, imbeciles, and epileptics should be put into a separate asylum, and the children. I think the Guardians should have enlarged powers with regard to outdoor relief; it would tend greatly to keep down rates.

12628. CHAIRMAN.—What would you make the test for eligibility for relief?—Poverty, of course.

12629. Poverty; not destitution?—Destitution first.

12630. Destitution is the last extreme of poverty; would you make it a milder form?—I would make it milder, and I would make eligible those who at present cannot receive it—those who have half an acre of land.

12631. People who have labourers' cottages?—I don't know; I suppose there might be a distinction made in that case.

12632. You would be letting in that class?—There is a discretionary power in the Guardians to prevent any abuse; they are supposed to do their duty honestly, and I think as a rule they do. The law as it exists excludes a great many deserving people, and three people if they get a little relief from the rates would be excluded from the workhouse; they cost 3s. in the workhouse; if they got 2s. they could support themselves outside.

12633. If they were refused relief outside do you think they would come in?—To come in is the last thing they would like to do.

12634. It is not so much on the ground of economy you recommend the change, but humanity?—Both humanity and economy.

12635. If they would come in it would be a saving to give them a smaller amount outside, but if they would stay out and only come in in the last resort then there would not be any economy?—Well, but there would be cruelty in it; but both on the ground of humanity and economy I think the present powers of Guardians ought to be increased, and, of course, that would be done by an alteration in the law; it would be a great saving to give a person 2s. a week instead of 3s.

12636. If that were the result?—I think it would tend greatly to that result.

12637. If by refusing 2s. you have to spend 3s. it would be great economy to give the 2s., but if you refuse the 2s. and he does not come into the house?—The cruelty and hunger, and hardship follow.

12638. Can you tell us any cases without mentioning names, in which hardship resulted from refusing to give outdoor relief?—Many cases.

12639. One, please?—In one case they had to suffer hunger and hardship by not getting relief.

12640. Did they live in the town or the country?—In the country.

12641. Had this family land?—They had a small portion of land, and, of course, were excluded from getting relief.

12642. Had they any stock?—No; I may say not; perhaps a few hens.

12643. How much land had this family?—In some cases one acre.

12644. But in this particular case?—In the particular case I have known they could have several acres of land and yet be in want from the fact of not being able to manage the land.

12645. Have you one particular case in your mind?—Yes; this particular case had several acres of land, and yet from her inability to manage the land, and it

being poor land, she was in a state of starvation, and her children.

12646. There do you think that if a person cannot manage a farm or several acres that the Guardians ought to come and maintain her?—You might have some reason to refuse a person with several acres.

12647. That is the case you mention?—I have other cases. In this particular case the land was poor mountain land, incapable of producing any profit, and therefore no matter whether she managed it properly or not.

12648. What would she sell her interest in that?—There was a person offered her £30 for it.

12649. Did she take it?—She did not. Owing to her impoverished condition her brother took her in and supported herself and her family and he could not support his own family.

12650. Would you think it was a case for giving relief out of the rates when a person had land for which she refused £30?—I consider there could be a good many worse cases. Then about the amalgamation of unions, I consider amalgamation quite necessary. Of course the Ardee Guardians are not to be blamed for expending the cause of their own district and trying to maintain the Ardee Union as it exists. But at the same time it must be remembered that when these unions were built the population of Ireland was double what it is at present, and surely if it took three workhouses then two ought to do now, or perhaps one. Well, I don't think one, under existing conditions, would do, and the number of cubic feet for each inmate is owing to our advance in—

12651. Hygiene?—Hygiene; thank you for the word! If Ardee Union were converted into an asylum for the epileptics, and imbeciles, and imbeciles of the county I think it would be a great improvement; these people would still consume a great deal of food and the Ardee people would have the benefit of it in their neighbourhood. I have visited the two schools and found only seven or eight pupils in each school. I suppose it takes £120 a year to pay the two teachers, and I think it is an extravagant use of money paying £120 a year to teach fifteen or twenty children; if there was a central place established that all the children could be sent to. 12652. Or would you board them out and teach them to become farm labourers?—That is a very good system.

12653. Have you plenty of labourers in your part of the country?—Abundance.

12654. What part of the country is that?—Omagh, in fact all the small farmers are labourers.

12655. You are aware that in a great deal of the country there is a scarcity of labourers?—I am aware of that.

12656. Do you think it would be a good thing to rear up those boys to a healthy life as farm labourers?—It would be a good idea, but it would be better to keep them together and equip them for the battle of life.

12657. Would you be in favour of educating those walls whom we would like to treat kindly, but would you be in favour of educating those so as to make them rise above the lowest independent class of ratepayers in the community?—It would be treating them very generously.

12658. Do you think it would be fair?—It would not be fair if the cost was very much or increased the rates. It would not be fair to the poor ratepayers.

12659. Who would have their sons left behind?—I don't think it would be fair if it cost a great deal.

12660. No matter what is cost, if it could be done for nothing, do you think it would be fair to give them a better prospect in life than the children of independent ratepayers outside?—I think it would be a very

invaluable thing to give them the best possible education if it did not press the poor ratepayers outside.

12967. I was thinking of the competition; you would be putting forward these poor little children in life as a better position than the children of ratepayers outside could have?—That could not be expected. Those that are not boarded out I certainly would like to educate them, but those that could be comfortably boarded out I would prefer that. Those are the principal points I wanted to draw your attention to. I have a great many complaints in the workhouse—as I am a member of the Board of Guardians—that the Master was overworked and had too much to do, and there were a great many complaints about the messing of clothing, and some Guardians said it was owing to the great amount of duty the Master had to do; and some suggested if an assistant should be appointed to take special charge of the stock of the house.

12968. We are rather on another line—to see how we can get rid of the Master?—I fell in with your idea; and if out-door relief was increased I think we might abolish the workhouse.

12969. Mr. McFiee.—You say when the Poor Law Acts were passed the population was twice as great as it is now?—Almost.

12970. So that going on a strictly mathematical basis if we had then three unions in South, we should now only have one-and-a-half?—Yes; but I qualified that by saying that they lack now more to the healthy states, and give them a larger amount of cubic feet and air.

12971. I suppose you would put one at Dundalk and half a one at Ormskirk?—No; we would put one at Dundalk and one at Drogheda, and make Ardee a general institution for imbeciles and lunatics.

12972. You say you consider it a great waste of public money to be paying for the education of the children?—Certainly not; that is a misconstruction.

12973. £250 a year?—I said £120 a year is an extravagant amount of money to spend for the education of about twenty children.

MR. PETER HUGHES EXAMINED.

12980. CHAIRMAN.—In what capacity are you giving evidence?—As a Poor Law Guardian of Dundalk. The only evidence I wish to give is as regards rating between the urban and rural districts. My view is that the rating as it at present stands is fair. For this reason, that the towns are made the dumping ground for people who are done with their labour in the country. They generally come into the towns.

12981. On the chance of employment?—Yes.

12982. And if they don't get it?—They fall on the rates.

12983. And you think the union ought to bear it?—Certainly; and as regards the giving of outdoor relief,

12974. Don't you know that that is an Imperial contribution?—Not altogether.

12975. How much of it?—Half of the teacher's salary is paid by the Treasury and the other half by the rates.

Clerk.—The whole of it.

12976. Mr. McFiee.—You are coming here to give information to the Commissioners and you don't know your own business?—I plead ignorance on that point.

12977. From the ratepayers' point of view you are anxious to keep down rates?—Doubtedly.

12978. But you would like to increase the salary of the officials?—I did not say a word about that.

12979. I thought you said you wanted another Master?—No, an assistant; that is, if things are not changed; but I hope there will be a radical change made soon, and that all the Masters can be dispensed with. I wish all lawyers could be dispensed with, too.

12980. Don't you think it would be an injustice to the ratepayers of the Ardee Union to have their rates increased?—I am not quite prepared to say that the result of the change would be increased rates for the Ardee people.

12981. But assuming it would be, don't you think that unless some considerable advantage would be gained it would be an injustice to the ratepayers?—Even if it were an injustice to the ratepayers of Ardee it would confer a great boon on the ratepayers throughout the county, and all the inmates of the workhouses in the county, which would more than counterbalance such a thing.

12982. If you could pay your rates out of our pockets you would like it?—I would like nothing but what is just. I would leave injustice to the lawyers.

12983. Would not somebody have to pay it?—Yes.

12984. Would it not be a case of robbing Peter to pay Paul?—Not necessarily. What we should look to is the greatest benefit for the greatest number.

12985. Those are your views about Poor Law administration?—A small part of my views. I don't like to occupy too much time.

I don't know of any abuses in Dundalk Union at least, for the simple reason that there always a greater number of rural Guardians present than there are of urban ones. They are watching; they won't let anything be done that is irregular; the chairman himself self makes all the orders when he hears the evidence. I have not heard of any case where there was 18s. a week earned by a man getting outdoor relief.

12990. That case was quite new to you?—Yes; I never heard of it.

12991. It was never raised in the boardroom?—Not until I heard it to-day.

MR. BEVERED HAMILL EXAMINED.

I am Chairman of the Urban District and I am also a Guardian. I agree with Mr. Hughes. What he says is quite true. A number of the country people come in here, and they are thrown on the rates, and it is only fair it should be a union charge.

12992. CHAIRMAN.—A great many of them are weary people?—Most of them are. I know cases myself where they have come into Dundalk, could not get employment, and, of course, were destitute, and they had to get relief.

12993. You think it would be unfair to put them on the town?—I do.

12994. Would there be people who were working in the town for a number of years?—A good many of them are new arrivals.

12995. When a man has been working for twenty years, he and his family living in the town, would you think it fair that their support should be charged on the town?—Where there is a man working twenty years in Dundalk he generally has a permanent employment.

12996. That class of people don't often come?—Very seldom, except through their own fault. Most of the cases of outdoor relief in Dundalk are people who have just come into the town lately; some, through sickness, are thrown on the rates.

12997. Was there any other point you wish to refer to?—With regard to the classification and wards in

the workhouse, I think it a great hardship for poor people, who, perhaps, from no cause of their own, are compelled to go in there, to have to mix up with the outcasts. I think there should be a separate ward for these people to end their days together.

12998. You know the workhouses don't at present afford room for that?—I think that should be increased accommodation for that.

12999. If different classes of inmates were sent to different workhouses, the aged and infirm to one workhouse, you would be able to put what you might call the deserving in one part of the building and the undeserving in another?—I think that is one of the things that should be changed.

13000. Would you approve of having the infirm sent to one institution?—It might be too expensive.

13001. I mean subject to economy resulting from it?—Yes, I would.

13002. Because in anything that we recommend we will have to view economy?—I don't think the imbeciles or those suffering in that way are properly treated in a workhouse.

13003. You would rather have them in an auxiliary asylum?—I would. I believe they would be better treated. They are a lot hampered for space at present in Dundalk.

13004. There is room for some of the slayers, but you cannot make fresh classes in the building?—No.

Feb. 6, 1904.

Mr. Thomas
Berghan.

I entirely disagree with the last two witnesses.

13005. CHAIRMAN.—You are a rural Guardian?—Yes.

13006. What district do you come from?—Naggards-town.

13007. What is your view of the area of charge for outdoor relief?—I disagree with the proposition they put forward as regards outdoor relief, that is, that it is men that go in from the country that are put on outdoor relief. These and again cases come up where Guardians apply and get outdoor relief for men with their children earning 10s. to 14s. and 16s. a week and their parents living with them, and we were supposed to give outdoor relief. That is a thing I cannot understand that we should do. These men here come up and say it is men coming in from the country—young men that are rubbing up the labour. They are coming in to Dundalk to work, and these two men say these are the men that are on the rates; no such thing at all. You know it yourself that it is not the young men who are coming into Dundalk that are going on the rates. It is men that have spent their good years in Dundalk, and gave their labour to the Dundalk people, and then they are thrown over on the rural districts. I think we have every right to complain that we should be connected with Dundalk at all on that account. I think there should be a rural and urban rating.

13008. Mr. MURKHAM.—Your position is that you provide these men, bring them up until they are fit to earn a living for themselves, then they go and give their labour for the best part of their days to the town of Dundalk, and Dundalk, having got their labour, should support them when they become incapacitated?—Certainly so.

13009. CHAIRMAN.—Do you know any cases from your own district, without mentioning the names of young men, or comparatively young men, coming here to work, and who afterwards become destitute?—Not that I know. I don't know any, but I know plenty of young men who get married in our district and come into Dundalk to work; and I very often asked them to stop in the country, when there was plenty of work, because we were starving for labourers in the country, but they like to come into Dundalk, and it appears they would rather come in and work for 2s. or 3s. a week more than we would give them in the country, but they have their perquisites in the country, and they get nothing like them in the town at all. They have potato ground and milk and fire sometimes, that they have not in Dundalk.

13010. And good healthy air?—Certainly so, and plenty of employment.

Mr. THOMAS SCRAGHAN examined.

13011. Mr. MURKHAM.—You don't want to encourage their coming into town?—I do not.

13012. CHAIRMAN.—Have they got good comfortable houses?—They have. There are a good number of cottages, and there were contracts for new cottages given last Monday, and it is to be hoped there will be more. I did not care how many, for it is a great accommodation to have the people living in the country. There about boarding out children. It is a thing I would not tolerate if I could help it, to have any child reared in a workhouse, no matter what a cost. I would like them to go out; if it does not pay us to-day it will pay those who come after us. There is one case. The Master was asked what did a certain family that frequented the Dundalk Workhouse cost the rates, and he said it was over £3,000. I believe it is true. The father and grandfather and the children from one to the other were all reared there, and they are going there still. I would wish to put before the Guardians also that all the children belonging to these people, the ins and outs, should be left under the Guardians, to take them without their will, and send them to some school or reformatory to have them made better people.

13013. Or boarded out?—Or boarded out, that they would not be reared up in the workhouse to be a burden on the rates. Then the tramp question. I did not hear many going into the tramp question. It is becoming such a terrible plague that I am afraid we will be flooded out of the country altogether by them in a few years more.

13014. It is not as bad as that?—It is very bad.

13015. The numbers are not as heavy as that?—I have a right to know it passing along the road. There is one case of a tramp, and it appears he was in the workhouse above the night before. It occurred the week before last. He went on by Louth, and went into where there was a woman washing, and said, "I want money." The woman said, "I have no money, will you do you?" "No, I will not have bread; give me a pair of boots." She went and got her husband's second pair of boots for fear of being smashed by the ruffian and gave them to him. I have that from the husband and woman on Saturday night. Then there was that case—I suppose you saw it in the paper—the Monaghan case, where this tramp had his arm tied behind his back, pretending he was maimed in arm, and was begging all day and got drunk at night, and the police took him. He got good for nothing on the people. These are the class of people I think an eye should be kept on, and not allow them on the rates.

13016. You would lock them up?—Certainly so.

Mr. P. B. FIDGIAN examined.

Mr. P. B.
Fidgian.

I am the Clerk of the Union of Dundalk. I wish to inform you that the exceptional expenditure during the last ten years on our workhouse would at least reach £20,000, none of which was paid out of loss but all out of the rates, which would in some way account for our being in excess of Ardee.

13017. CHAIRMAN.—That would be the reason to a considerable extent?—To a considerable extent, although, as Dr. MacDonnell pointed out, in the standard year we were 2½d. per head under Ardee. I have been asked also to mention to you that the Guardians would like that sec. 7 of the Act of 1883, whereby people

must now enter the workhouse before being sent for external treatment, might be amended, so as to enable these people to be sent on a doctor's certificate; they also suggest the extension of the Casual Law Act of 1862 to this country.

13018. That would meet the last witness's view?—To a large extent. The only difficulty as far as I could ascertain that we had here in putting in force the existing Act would be in proving that people left one union for another for the purpose of obtaining relief.

Mr. JAMES MCCARTHY examined.

Mr. James
McCarthy.

I am here from Drogheda, and I simply desire to say that we have no burning desire to amalgamate either with Ardee or Dundalk.

13019. CHAIRMAN.—You are not in favour of amalgamation?—In the abstract.

13020. But when it comes to your own union, do your Guardians think that anything might be done?—They think that it would be extremely difficult, and neither make for efficiency nor economy. We think it is quite possible and desirable, so to speak, that there should be a large extension of outdoor relief, if it could be protected from abuse; an extension in this sense, although it might be regrettable—that sons or daughters or nephews or nieces should be subsidised

to maintain their aged relatives at home instead of in the workhouse.

13021. That would be virtually boarding out the aged and infirm people?—Of the decent and deserving poor, and then a concentration of the useless would be possible.

13022. You would be rather afraid that might be liable to abuse?—Yes, that is the danger.

13023. A great many poor families who would not dream of seeking the workhouse might like to apply for a grant in aid of their parents or old relatives?—Yes, and in some cases where it would be nearly impossible for sons or daughters or nephews or nieces

of parents to maintain them at home they would struggle to maintain them if there was a grant.

13024. You would be in favour of that amendment of the law?—Yes.

13025. And would the Guardians of Drogheda be in favour of that?—was it discussed?—It was privately discussed, but they saw so many difficulties in the way that they did not desire to place their opinions before you.

13026. Retrograde Union comes near you?—Yes, but it is dearer to the North Dublin Union, in Dublin. We are altogether in favour of educating the children or nursing them outside the workhouse; as a matter of fact we do it. We are one of the four or five Meath unions who have a joint school in Trim, but it is rather a costly experiment, and I quite agree with some observations that fell from you to-day, that it is, perhaps, more desirable to rear the children of waste and strays as agricultural labourers than to give them a higher education, which would probably bring them into competition with the children of respectable ratepayers. It costs something like 6s. per head per week in the Trim school to rear those children, and we can board them out, to my mind, with equal efficacy at 3s. 6d. or 3s. a week amongst the decent labouring classes or perhaps the small farming classes of the country.

13027. I suppose those people are glad to get that

little sum of money?—In many cases, yes. As a matter of fact, there was a competition for children in Drogheda Union, before we joined the Meath Unions in the Trim school. I think with much greater economy and with perhaps equal advantage to the children, they might be boarded out. Those are my own opinions. In case you decided to amalgamate the unions and provide for the respectable poor amongst their own families and connections, you might abolish the present system of relieving officers and replace it by district nurses, who would be the pay-mistresses of these people district nursing.

13028. Who would be the paymasters of these people?—The district nurses.

13029. That would be too heavy a job for a district nurse?—It is not a heavy job at all, and many of us think they would give a better idea of a healthy locality than the present relieving officers.

13030. You could hardly expect her to take money about and be a paymaster?—We don't think it would be heavy.

13031. Have your relieving officers large districts?—They have.

13032. How many have you got?—Four; but now, in the age of bicycles, we think it quite possible for a woman to supervise the district. Some of us do. I have not heard the suggestion from any other union, and I would like to place it before you.

Dr. LIVERY examined.

13033. CHAIRMAN.—You come to tell us something about your hospital?—Yes, sir; I think it would be advisable that union hospitals should be segregated from workhouses proper, and they should also change the name, and go under the name of district hospitals.

13034. And take them away from the supervision of officials who look after the ordinary able-bodied?—Yes; have them as far as possible distinct and separate.

13035. Numbers of people have very strong objections to go to them as they are; at present the name is not exciting. About the location?—I don't consider workhouses are suitable places for them.

13036. They cannot be cured?—They cannot be; and they are very much overcrowded on the female side. Of course, we have no consumption accommodation.

13037. I suppose the best plan for that would be some central institution serving a considerable area. You would not think of one for a small county like Louth?—You could either have a county institution or an inter-county—a number of counties joined.

13038. As far as you are aware, is there much phthisis about this district?—A very great deal. It is a very alarming, the amount of it.

13039. Dr. BURNES.—Is it on the increase?—I think it is. Of course, I have not very long experience, but in my experience I think it is on the increase.

13040. Do you find it possible to have cases isolated at home?—Some could; but they don't do it. You may instruct a person to carry on an open-air treatment, but the next time you go there you will find they are afraid of the draught.

13041. Do you think if they were in a sanatorium for a few months they could carry out the treatment at home?—The education would be very beneficial to them.

13042. If they once saw they were improved by the treatment?—They would be tempted to continue it.

13043. Mr. MURKHAM.—Is it not characteristic of that disease that those afflicted with it don't think they have it?—A medical man would very soon tell them they had it. But, to begin with, I would make consumptive a notifiable disease, not to the local authority, but to the central authority; and if a

patient could not carry out the treatment in their own home I would give them the option of carrying out the open-air treatment or go to a sanatorium; I would compel them to go to the sanatorium.

13044. That might be a large order?—It is a very alarming disease. One case in the district tends to spread it about.

13045. Dr. BURNES.—Do you refuse patients admission to the union hospital suffering from consumption?—We don't encourage them to come in; we don't refuse them; we have not the accommodation for them.

13046. If you were asked about a case going in, would you say you would not take it?—I would recommend them not to come.

13047. Have you told the Guardians that?—I don't think I have.

13048. Would it not be well to inform them how you stand at present with regard to consumption?—They are quite aware of it.

13049. Do you know that some months ago they proposed to build wards for consumptives?—It was before my time.

13050. Some person proposed that they should wait and see could they get some disused building in the county?—I don't think consumptive wards in connection with the workhouse would be suitable. It would be better to have them separate and distinct, and treat it as a highly infectious disease. I also think that consumption is not only a local but a national evil, and the State should contribute to the upkeep of any such establishment.

13051. Have you an operation room?—We have not.

13052. Do you think one should be in connection with the infirmary?—I would not say in connection with the infirmary here, considering we have a county infirmary; but if there was not a county hospital there certainly should be.

13053. You think the operation cases should be transferred to the county infirmary, where they could be performed easily?—Yes, in this particular union.

13054. CHAIRMAN.—There would be very few cases you could not transfer?—Very few; we might say none.

Feb. 8, 1906.

Mr. James
McCarthy.

Dr. Livery.

The sitting terminated.

Feb. 21, 1904.

TWENTY-SEVENTH PUBLIC SITTING.—WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY

10th, 1904.

At the Courthouse, Naven.

Present:—MR. MICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. COEY BIGGER.

Colonel NUGENT T. EVERARD, D.L., EXAMINED.

Col. Nugent T. Everard.

13055. CHAIRMAN.—Would you prefer to answer questions asked by us or to make a statement?—Perhaps if you would allow me to answer questions in the sense in which the Committee of the County Council appointed for the purpose decided they should be answered, so far as they were able to arrive at an agreement. I presume you have the queries here?

13056. I have.—In answer to the first question, we state we are of opinion it is expedient to dissolve one or more unions in the county, which would be effected by amalgamation.

13057. Do you indicate the unions, or prefer not to?—We found it impossible to arrive at a unanimous conclusion as to the unions that should be dissolved, and we thought it would be for the Commission, after having heard the evidence, to decide that particular point. Then as to the second query, we answer that as under Section 75 of the Local Government (Ireland) Act of 1893 it is expedient to have an auxiliary asylum in the county without the co-operation of the counties of Westmeath and Longford, which counties, with Meath, form the asylum district of Mullingar Lunatic Asylum, we consider, even if the law were changed, we are not prepared to say it would be desirable to have an auxiliary asylum without the co-operation of the adjoining counties.

13058. I don't see exactly why you think it would be impossible to have an auxiliary asylum?—That is our reading of Section 75.

13059. But we are not tied to the existing law. We can recommend changes in the law?—We speak of the law as it stands, and we have found that the counties in the same district decline to entertain the opinion. Perhaps it would be better not to go into readings of the Act. We have an opinion here.

13060. We can suggest reforms of the Act?—The reason why we think, even if the law were changed, it would not be desirable to have an auxiliary asylum for the Co. Meath alone is, in the first place, the number of lunatics and idiots in our present workhouses consists of too small a number.

13061. Is the Mullingar Asylum overcrowded?—It is, but we would not suggest—

13062. You would not be restricted to Meath lunatics: you could have them from elsewhere?—I am taking it for the county only, because the other counties in the same district decline to be associated in an auxiliary asylum. The number of lunatics and idiots in the five unions of the Co. Meath, that is those that are really in the Co. Meath, number only 105, and therefore the expense of an adequate staff, with a qualified medical officer, would be altogether out of proportion to the number of lunatics to be confined in that auxiliary asylum.

13063. That auxiliary asylum would be in the hands of the central district asylum, and would not be limited to the 105 lunatics in the Co. Meath?—If there was a district asylum for the counties in the lunatic asylum for the district of Mullingar, that would be quite satisfactory, because that would provide a sufficient number of inmates to support the asylum without bearing too heavily on the rates. Another reason why we object to the auxiliary asylum for the county, or for even a combination of counties, is that the capitation grant would only amount to 2s.

13064. But if the capitation grant were raised to 4s. 1—If it were raised to 4s., there could be no further objection on that score. There is another point, as you ask for amendments in the law as to the admission of lunatics and idiots. As you are aware, that question has been before the House of Commons, and if you will just allow us to read a portion of Mr. Gerald Balfour's answer, which was given on the 30th of February, 1896, to the question: it is as follows:—"It is

true that in some workhouses lunatic epileptics are sent to the lunatic wards, and the Local Government Board often pointed out to the Guardians this is not a desirable arrangement. It has been frequently explained, in answer to questions in this House, that destitute persons of unsound minds are sent to Irish workhouses without either legal warrant or constraint, and if unable to take care of themselves they are detained and not allowed to take their discharge." That is a point which, it is admitted, requires amendment, because there is nothing to prevent an unsound person from being brought into the lunatic ward of a workhouse and left there as a person unable to take care of himself. That is not supported necessarily by any sworn evidence, and I need hardly say when once a lunatic or supposed lunatic is brought into the lunatic wards of our workhouses, there is no doubt there is very little chance of his ever getting out, because the mere sense of injury from being placed among a lot of lunatics and idiots of the various kinds kept there would be very likely, if he had any tendency that way, to derange his intellect. In any event I think there is no case, or hardly any case, of recovery and discharge from any of the lunatic wards of the workhouses, so far as I am aware.

13065. Don't you think the best way would be that no patients should be admitted into the workhouses at all?—Certainly. That is one reason why I am in favour of an addition to the Mullingar District Asylum.

13066. Or the provision of an auxiliary asylum, if it can be managed at a more economical rate?—If possible. Then, in answer to the third question, we state that, with or without any dissolution of a union, it would be possible, by an arrangement for the maintenance of any class or classes of paupers in the workhouse of another union, to make better provision for classification and treatment of the lunatics chargeable to said union. I think we may extend the classes of lunatics and idiots from the consideration of this question, because I have already dealt with them. You have first of all the sick, then you have the infirm, and then you have the question of vagrants—

13067. The children?—The children are provided for in this county by a district industrial school, so that is why we don't take them into account. The boarding-out of pauper children is practised in all the unions, is the best of my belief. With regard to the sick, I don't think any of the workhouses are provided with a proper operating-room.

13068. Before you go into the details, do you think it would be necessary to raise your information on local hospitals, as at present existing, or do you think some could be closed?—No; I am of opinion that by the unions combining on the same principle as they combine to send the children to Trillick Industrial School, and having representation on the Board of the particular workhouses that accommodate these inmates, that it would be sufficient.

13069. Do you think, for instance, that the sick will come from Oldcastle to Naven?—I do, for the simple reason that there is no part of Meath, as far as I can measure it on the map, more than six miles away from a railway station, and every railway station is connected with Naven.

13070. You cannot take the sick by railway; there are a great many ordinary medical and surgical cases you cannot move by railway?—I think they can be as easily moved by railway as at present, but—

13071. If put on the railway at the door of their own houses and taken to hospital it might be possible, but you could not move them in practice by rail between widely-separated places. That is never permitted by surgeons if it can be avoided?—To be put on rail?

Feb. 20, 1904.

Col. August T. Newell.

13072 Removal by rail is not a recognised way of conveying the sick to hospital?—I am afraid I have not noted that way myself.

13073 Very likely, where there is no choice?—There happened to be no choice. But what I would suggest, in addition to the provision of one large district hospital for the Co. Meath, is that we should have district nurses appointed who could render their first aid.

13074. In the people's own homes?—Yes; under first aid in cases of accidents, so that patients could be safely carried with a broken leg, put temporarily in slings, and could be safely removed, whether by road or by rail, to the central hospital. As a matter of fact—I speak under correction, of course—nearly all serious cases of accident are treated in the county infirmary or sent to Dublin to the hospitals there, because there are no facilities for serious operations in the workhouse hospitals.

13075. A great many big operations are carried out in workhouse hospitals, although the facilities are not as good as they ought to be?—I dare say they are, but it is quite impossible that they can be carried out with a fair chance of success, owing to the insanitary surroundings. Then in regard to the infirm, I cannot see any difficulty in those people who have become infirm through age being brought to a central workhouse by rail.

13076. Certainly there is no difficulty?—By rail or otherwise; and I think perhaps this would be an occasion on which I should mention the enormous accommodation which there is in the workhouses of the county. I have taken the five which are actually in the county—Dunmurry, Kells, Navan, Oldcastle, and Trim, and these five have accommodation for 4,607 inmates.

13077. That is enormous?—That is what they were built to accommodate.

13078. That, of course, is not their present accommodation?—The actual number in those workhouses at the commencement of the year 1901, which is the last return furnished by the Local Government Board, amounted to 351, and of these 106 were lunatics and idiots, which, at any rate, it is to be presumed we shall eventually remove. Therefore it would leave about 245 to be dealt with, which could be accommodated in almost any workhouse within the county. I think I have answered number 3. Number 4, that inasmuch as an amalgamation of unions will tend to increase the already overmanned Boards of Guardians, we are of opinion that there is necessity for such a change in the law as would reduce the present numerical strength of our Boards of Guardians. You are aware we have two Guardians appointed for each district electoral division. Of course that number would be entirely unnecessary if the unions were amalgamated, and we would suggest that one should be appointed in each district.

13079. What you suggest is really that there should be a county workhouse for the aged and infirm, and another county workhouse for the sick?—That would be my opinion individually. As I have already mentioned, we could not particularise.

13080. You would keep up two workhouses, one for the sick and the other for the feeble and healthy?—Yes, with the addition of district nurses, and of course the fever hospital would have to be maintained; but I am of opinion that as it is so very seldom need it should be sufficient to have a caretaker and his wife, and telegraph to Dublin when necessary for any nurses. That would not be a very heavy charge on the individual unions.

13081. Could you give us any evidence as to what places the central institutions will, according to your scheme, be placed in?—Of course Navan, that is the most central, and Kells also, or Trim. Kells is served more by two railways than Trim, but either of those would make a very good second. I am leaving out of account Droghda, because that is more Louth. As to question Number 5, whether any extra accommodation is wanted, we think not.

13082. For hospital?—For any purpose.

13083. That was meant for hospital?—Then as to question Number 6, whether any administrative and financial changes are desirable, we thought that was rather a hypothetical question.

13084. That would include any idea that might be floating in the minds of people?—There are two ways by which the system—

13085. You could then discuss anything about the area of change, if you think any amendment would be desirable under that head?—There are two systems absolutely distinct. You can amalgamate two unions by dissolving one of the Boards, or dissolve both Boards

and then having a union of the two, but there is another way, and that is by combining several unions for distinct purposes, in which case you would retain the Boards as they stand for local purposes, such as giving out-door relief. Then, as far as the payment by patients is concerned, we think that they should be made to pay according to their means.

13086. That is that the Board should have authority to fix how much they could pay without hardship, and recover it according to law?—Yes, that is the meaning of our answer. Then as to the treatment of our vagrant poor, generally known as tramps or casuals, our answer is that the labour test should be rigorously enforced; and we did not go into the question of labour colonies. They have had some experience of those colonies in Scotland, and they have answered admirably well and are almost self-supporting, but that hardly comes under your present at present.

13087. Oh, it would?—I think that would be extremely important, if we could obtain direct evidence supported by figures as to the financial working of the scheme in Scotland.

13088. I am glad you have mentioned it; we will look it up?—But I think that the easy distances our workhouses are placed from one another is a great inducement to vagrant life.

13089. Short stages?—Yes, short stages, and practically no labour put; and the both test is not always applied. In fact in some workhouses I dare say it would be impossible to give every one a bath without running great risk of the vagrant's life, because they have no means of heating the water sufficiently.

13090. I knew it would be impossible in most workhouses?—So I think some very great change in the practice, at any rate, would be required.

13091. Would you approve of an assimilation of the law to the English law, which enables Boards of Guardians to detain vagrants in the workhouse for a certain time in accordance with the frequency of their visits?—I think there is a great deal to be said both for and against that question—making them do work.

13092. They could have the discretion; they need not enforce it?—We find a great many who would like to live in the workhouses altogether.

13093. Of the tramps?—Yes.

13094. That is quite true?—A great many of them who only come out at times; they think they can do more business outside.

13095. But still most of them are people with a taste for a vagrant life?—That is quite so; and, unfortunately, it is hereditary.

13096. Would you be in favour of an amendment of the law that would give the Guardians the power to detain these people if necessary, and even go so far as to take their children from them and bring them up separately?—Certainly, I think the children of vagrants ought to be taken from them, and they ought to be brought up, at any rate, with the opportunity of learning a trade or calling of some sort. I am not altogether in favour of the system at present practised of the district school, because I have seen other systems that are more successful; that is where the district school is only used as a place where they learn trades, but they live in what are practically cottage houses in small companies under a respectable woman, who looks after them.

13097. And in these out-door employment?—No; that is for learning the same trades that they learn at present at the school, that is baking, tailoring, shoe-making. But they have some conception of what a home life is. They live in small numbers under somebody who is capable of giving them the care and attention of a mother.

13098. Do you think that that cottage home system is an expensive one?—It is found not to be more expensive. I object altogether to the barrack life, which, I think, quite unfit a man in after life to care about a home of his own.

13099. Do you apply that system to your own school at Trim?—I am afraid that some of them have come back to the workhouses, but a great many of them have been respectable, and are making respectable members of society; but it has not had a sufficiently long trial to say what would be the average result.

13100. Had you anything to say about a county infirmary?—No, nothing, except that it supplies a great need in the county, because the more respectable classes object, I dare say for sentimental reasons, to go into the workhouse hospital, and a great many for the reason that they think they are better treated in the county infirmary, that is to say, there are more facilities

Feb. 10, 1895.
 Col. Napier &
 Everett

ties for classifying them, and certainly there is a better opportunity of operating successfully in the county infirmary.

13109. Dr. BACON.—Has it quite sufficient means: are its funds large enough?—No, I think they ought to be increased.

13110. What is the county grant?—I think it is £1,200.

13111. Are there many subscribers outside that?—No, very few now; since the Board consists of elected members by the County Council the donations have fallen off. They seem to think it ought to be supported entirely by the county rates.

13112. Do you receive money from some patients?—Not very much. You will have more evidence from the medical officers. I am not prepared to say how much, but I notice very often the pay wards are nearly empty.

13113. Do you not take payment from the ordinary patients not in pay wards?—No; the same qualifications for the workhouse apply to the county infirmary, that is to say no ticket can be given to any man who is able to pay.

13114. You have no special wards set apart for consumptive patients?—No, that is a very great need. There is one reason why I think we ought to have, at any rate, a grant for buildings, to be able to add one.

13115. Do you think it would be in connection with the county infirmary, or would it be in connection with the district hospital?—I should prefer it being in connection with the district hospital, because the accommodation is not very large at the infirmary, and I don't think it would be easy to add very largely to it, the space being limited.

13116. What I mean to say, would it not be better to have one sanatorium for the whole county, separate and not in connection with the county infirmary, separate and distinct, on a good site?—Yes, for the reason you don't propose to have two, and there are a large number of consumptive patients who could not afford to pay anything.

13117. Would it be desirable to get them into hospital, so that you might prevent the spread of disease?—Certainly.

13118. Consumption is a very infectious disease?—Very.

13119. You mentioned something about district nursing. Do you think you would have the district nurses in connection with any hospital?—I don't think it is necessary. The district nurses can be appointed now if a certain sum is guaranteed or collected in any district.

13120. That is the jubilee nursing you are referring to?—Yes.

13121. Do you think it would be a benefit to have them in connection with the district hospital, where you could perhaps get the patients to come into it more easily if they thought their cases could be treated there?—I think it would be. I think it would be very desirable.

13122. Where they could be relieved, and so on; where the nurses could change with the district nurses, some system like that?—I think it would.

13123. Mr. MURKIN.—You say you think one district hospital and the infirmary would do for the county of Meath?—As far as the accommodation at present stands it would be absolutely ample.

13124. No doubt as far as numbers, but would it not be a disadvantage for the localities not to have some hospital in their midst. For instance now, if you take places like Drumshaghlin, Kells, or Odoonville, would not some hospital be needed for the sick in these districts?—I have suggested that cases of serious illness ought in any case be brought to a hospital, but that cases less serious could be treated in their own homes if you had district nurses; and any serious cases, I won't say all serious cases, but a large proportion of the serious cases, are brought at present to the county infirmary at Navan.

13125. But would the homes of these people be suitable for the purpose of nursing?—That is hardly a question I could answer directly, but I think there are certain cases that could be treated in their own homes. It is not every home where you could treat serious cases, but I think, under the direction of a district nurse, sanitary provision could be made in almost any home.

13126. Do you not think it would be necessary to retain hospitals in the places where they are now, hospitals of an inexpensive character?—I don't know exactly where you could draw the line; if you have a

central hospital, which is within at any rate fifteen or sixteen miles at farthest from any portion of the county, and buses of rail coming from all parts to that centre, it seems hardly necessary to have more than that one.

13127. But there is a difficulty in moving the sick, especially if their illness is very acute?—Of course there are some cases that could not be moved a mile.

13128. Would it be fair to those localities to take away from them the accommodation for the sick that they have at present?—That would be against all change or centralization.

13129. CHAIRMAN.—As regards sick people?—As regards sick people.

13130. Mr. MURKIN.—Can you really centralise the sick?—I think you could.

13131. If some inexpensive system were retained in the place where the hospitals are now, do you not think it would be better than to compel the sick to go to some central point in the county?—I think it would be too expensive, if you were to have every modern improvement, as in a district hospital.

13132. CHAIRMAN.—Not so much as that. Every modern improvement would be very expensive, but with the dispensary doctor to look after the small hospital, that would be for urgent cases?—That is what I call a cottage hospital.

13133. A district hospital—say under forty beds; say about thirty beds?—That would be an economy on the present system.

13134. The cost of locomotion is considerable, the danger is serious, and every locality should have, as far as possible, equal advantages?—I think a small cottage hospital would be useful for the first treatment, and then, as soon as they were sufficiently recovered, to be moved, they could be moved to the district hospital. I agree it is so far as the cottage hospital might be an auxiliary to the central hospital.

13135. Almost every witness we have heard has insisted that there should be accommodation for the sick in the place where the accommodation is at present, and I may say you are the first one to advocate a central infirmary for the county, and I was just wishing to know why it was that you hit upon that idea?—Because the means of communication are ample.

13136. And the county is not large?—The county is not very large.

13137. Districts like the Hill of Down would have to go to Dublin before they could come here?—There would be a difficulty there. It would be a long railway journey. If you take Carlow: that is something about half the size of Meath, and one workhouse is sufficient for that county.

13138. Dr. BIGGER.—It has three hospitals?—I was not aware there were three.

CHAIRMAN.—And other unions have part of the county.

13139. Mr. MURKIN.—How you had such experience of the colony system?—No, I have only heard a general report about them. I have never seen one of them, but I have heard a very favourable report.

Yes. We have had some testimony in other places in regard to it.

13140. CHAIRMAN.—Would your idea be that the Co. Meath should be one Poor Law Union, that all the unions, even such as Drogheda, that have portions of the Co. Meath, should come into what you might call the county union?—No; my idea is outside Drogheda altogether.

13141. You would only take in those workhouses that are really in the county?—Precisely.

13142. That would exclude Odoonville?—No.

13143. A great deal of Caran is in Odoonville?—Of course if it would be more convenient for the inmates of the Odoonville Workhouse to go to Caran, that would answer the same purpose.

13144. You don't take the county as a unit?—Not altogether.

13145. You concede it would be a considerable convenience if it were taken?—I think it would. My idea was we should maintain the present Poor Law Board for certain purposes, such as the administration of outdoor relief, and they should combine, as they have done in the case of the Trim district school, for the purpose of centralising their sick, and their infirm, and also their idiots and imbeciles.

13146. Does anything else occur to you?—Nothing else.

Dr. L. FISKEHAM examined.

13133. CHAIRMAN.—You are Medical Officer of the Workhouse, and also one of the surgeons of the County Infirmary.

13140. You heard the evidence of Colonel Everett just now as to having one hospital for the unions that are wholly contained in the Co. Meath. Do you think that would be a good idea?—In the main I would agree with most of the evidence of Colonel Everett.

13143. So far as regards the removal of the sick each long distance?—I think that the removal of the sick can be very well accomplished.

13145. You think it could?—I do; and talking about taking in the Oldscote Union or part, the people who are not very ill can quite well come half-way from here to Oldscote, and vice versa.

13148. Would you put them into an ambulance to do that distance. You think if you had a really good ambulance they could go the rest of the way without much injury?—Certainly, I think so, if you have a proper ambulance. As a matter of fact they may have to do that now, or very near it, in out-of-the-way districts.

13144. Dr. BROWNE.—How far?—I would say about six or twelve miles.

13145. Have you any ambulance doing that at present?—Not quite that distance, but they have to come from Slane at present, eight miles from Navan.

13146. With an ambulance?—With an ambulance. Not a perfect, but a fairly good, one; and they come.

13147. In connection with the workhouse?—Yes.

13148. CHAIRMAN.—You think they could come from Dunshaughlin to Navan; how far would that be?—That would be a long journey—seventeen miles—but they are much nearer Dublin there.

13149. But they would not have any right of admission in Dublin. They are in Dunshaughlin Union there?—Of course very bad cases, I don't think, could be removed for long distances. What I would be in favour of is, in each district where you have a fever hospital at present, maintain that hospital as a small hospital.

13150. As a general hospital?—Not as a general hospital, I won't say, except you may maintain it for acute cases.

13151. If a fever case comes in there after an hour's notice?—Some acute cases are contagious diseases. You may look on pneumonia and most of these things as contagious acute cases. We have sometimes cases of consumption, chronic consumption, and unspurred pneumonia; that is a contagious case that should be put in a fever hospital.

13152. Say a case of lueria: that could be operated on locally, and that it would be necessary to operate on locally to save life?—It is only in cases like that that the difficulty arises, acute appendicitis or acute lueria, and these cases, that is where the difficulty arises.

13153. You would be hardly willing to go as far as Colonel Everett and say that one hospital for the county, so far as these unions are concerned, would be sufficient?—Quite sufficient with the ambulances and fever hospitals maintained in the districts in which they are at present.

13154. But you would take in some general cases into those when there were no fever cases?—Yes, certainly.

13155. How would you get them out of it when fever cases come in?—You can always have your wards out of it.

13156. You would have a male on one side and a female on the other. You would have both wards occupied?—You may have four wards, for instance, a male and female on the contagious side, and a male and female on the non-contagious.

13157. You would at once get into a big hospital?—Not at all, a very small hospital; if you had four cases on each side, that is eight between male and female; that is sixteen cases. If you had provision for sixteen cases.

13158. Dr. BROWNE.—How many wards would you have?—Two on each side. Two for infectious.

13159. CHAIRMAN.—You would have typhoid and scarlet in the same ward?—So you may.

13160. You would not object to it?—I don't object to it very much.

13161. Dr. BROWNE.—Do you mean to say you do that now?—You may have to.

13162. CHAIRMAN.—You would not approve of it?—I would not approve of it as a rule.

13163. Dr. BROWNE.—Did you ever hear of any well-regulated hospital doing that?—No.

13164. You are advocating it, are not you?—I am not advocating it as a rule.

13165. CHAIRMAN.—You would put up with it?—I would put up with it.

13166. Dr. BROWNE.—Do you think it a desirable working system?—I won't say I would recommend it.

13167. Would you allow a patient suffering from typhoid fever to go into a scarletina ward?—Certainly I would if I had no provision otherwise; not as a chance.

13168. CHAIRMAN.—But if you recommend us to start a ward which would be the only accommodation for all sorts of infectious diseases?—No; I recommend you to have two for infectious and two for non-infectious.

13169. Dr. BROWNE.—That would be four wards on each side. You cannot put male and female together?—

13170. CHAIRMAN.—You could not have any classification of infectious diseases if you had only one ward for male and one for female?—That is another way to look at it. You would want more certainly.

13171. Great difficulties would arise in practice in having general cases treated in an infectious hospital, don't you think?—Of course they would, except you could make provision for separating.

13172. It does happen in workhouses sometimes that the fever hospital is utilised where there is very little fever, but cases can be removed across the yard in a very short time?—Of course that is at present in most workhouses, I suppose. You see the thing is you must try and get, I suppose, a workable thing fairly economical, and if you go in for a very big scheme you won't carry it.

13173. Dr. BROWNE.—But as a medical man, could you recommend such a scheme?—You may make provision in the small hospital; certainly, if you could have four wards or three wards on each side, it might be ample. Remember we have now the fever hospital often vacant for weeks and weeks.

13174. CHAIRMAN.—It is very often vacant, and then a number of cases come in?—Of course that is the case, but very seldom are we obliged to utilise the upper wards in the fever hospital here. Sometimes, of course, we are.

13175. We are rather thinking of country hospitals, say in Dunshaughlin or places like that, where they would have no such accommodation as you have in your very good fever hospital here?—That is just the thing. Our union is a large central place; still we have not very much fever.

13176. Is there anything you wish to say about the infirmary?—Nothing.

13177. You find the funds sufficiently ample?—Of course the funds are very small, and there are a great many things we would like to get, and we would be better able to do if we had more funds.

13178. Would you approve of having the entire necessary expense of the county infirmary placed on the rates, leaving subscriptions, and such like sources of revenue, to provide for what you might call desirable, but not necessary, improvements. What is your net expenditure per annum here at present. You get £1,800 a year from the county. What do you spend about altogether, one year with another?—I suppose we spend about £1,800 a year.

13179. I suppose you really have to cut it tight?—As far as possible. Then, of course, when we want anything extra we have to make a sort of collection—they won't give us anything from the County Council—by bazars and that sort of thing.

13180. Mr. MURPHY.—If the support of the infirmary were put entirely on the rates, then, of course, the management would have to be different?—Of course that is a matter I don't know what difference there would be in the management.

13181. The people that pay the money would like to have the distribution of it?—Yes; a very proper arrangement, I would say. But as a matter of fact the management is mostly in the hands of the County Council at present.

13182. About two-thirds, and it provides four-fifths of the money?—I think only three or four of the old governors are on the Board. All the rest are appointed by the County Council.

Mr. JAMES TUTT examined.

Feb. 10, 1904.
Mr. James
Tutt.

13183. CHAIRMAN.—You are one of the Guardians of the Oldcastle Union?—Yes.

13184. What is the view of your Board of Guardians?—Without going into it, unless you wish me to go into the question.

13185. As regards the amalgamation of unions?—I wish to tell you, if you permit me, that on the 22nd of April last year there was a committee appointed to inquire into the very high expense that was then apparent, and we went into it very carefully, and found that the cost of each inmate would be 5s. 11d., or thereabouts, making a total of £15 6s. 7d. per inmate per year.

13186. For food and clothing only?—Yes. And then we took account of the officials in the house, which would add on £10 1s. 6d. per head more, making a total cost of £25 8s. 1d. per head in Oldcastle.

13187. For the sick or for average inmates?—Average inmates. On that occasion we then recommended that it was so high we thought the best thing to do would be to have amalgamation, and that report is adopted. But since, I may tell you, they have changed their opinion very much, for and against. They think it very expensive to have people to come here from Ros, that is a district six miles from Oldcastle. To have them come here would be a great hardship and tear them away from their friendly surroundings.

13188. You mean the sick?—The sick poor; and generally speaking, we are in favour of boarding these people out if it could be so arranged.

13189. Boarding-out the sick and infirm?—Yes, to their friends, and these, of course, who have no friends they would be supposed to go to a central place; and I may remark that each union thinks themselves central, and they think that is the place all ought to go to.

13190. Oldcastle considers it is a good centre for Meath?—To be sure, and so would all the rest, I suppose.

13191. Is your Board of Guardians in favour of dissolving Oldcastle, if you are left the power of boarding-out your aged and infirm?—If it would be a saving they would.

13192. Would they be in favour of any change practically which would mean a saving to the rates without hardship to the sick and poor?—They are of opinion lately that there would be no saving at all by amalgamation. They have changed their ideas.

13193. Did they consider the question of such an amalgamation as was suggested by Colonel Everest, virtually having one workhouse for the sick and one workhouse for the non-sick for the entire Co. Meath?—They would look on that as practically impossible.

13194. Why do they think that?—For the reason that you could not bring them such long distances. The expense would overcome the benefit.

13195. Do you think sick people would be likely not to leave their own houses at all if they had to go such long distances?—It would be tearing them away from

their friends, and where there would be sick poor, it would make them feel so much worse; they would think when taken away they were not going to see their friends any more, and it would be a hardship in that way.

13196. You think it would really deter people from having the advantage of a hospital?—Yes, they would not come. They would sooner stop at home in their own beds and the there.

13197. Mr. MURKIN.—That applies particularly to the sick?—Yes.

13198. That is when they want to see their friends and parents; they won't see them?—Yes.

13199. It would not apply to the aged and infirm?—No.

13200. CHAIRMAN.—I want to find out exactly what you would do. You would leave a place for treating the sick in Oldcastle?—Certainly.

13201. Except that, you would be willing, if economy would result, to have a central institution for those persons who are not sick?—Yes, I believe that is the general opinion.

13202. As long as the sick people could be looked after?—Yes. Of course the remark that was made there about having district nurses would come in with these people if we adopted the boarding-out system—that they would go round and see after the old people. I think it would be very advisable if they did.

13203. You think if there were a central institution for the aged and infirm, that it would be only fair to give unions at a distance, like yourselves in Oldcastle, the alternative of boarding-out the aged and infirm with their funds, if they had any?—Yes.

13204. Mr. MURKIN.—By that method you would get rid of a good many persons, the staff of the workhouse proper?—Yes. For instance, the average expense of the keeping of the workhouse; you do say with £10 1s. 1d., that the official cost.

13205. And the firing and repairs, and a great deal of the expenses in connection with a large institution, such as a workhouse is?—Yes; the expenses referred to we find are £1,790 13s. 3d. for expenses connected with the workhouse for provisions and necessaries and clothing.

13206. Dr. BROWNE.—How do you make up your £15 per head?—The average cost per head per week would be exactly five and twopenny three farthings, which would bring it up to £15 6s. 7d. for food and clothing, and then the officials.

13207. The establishment charges?—Yes.

13208. What do you include in establishment charges?—The master and clerk—all the salaries.

13209. The whole of the clerk's salary?—Yes.

13210. And the upkeep of the house?—Yes, and everything, would bring it up to £10 1s. 6d.

13211. Mr. MURKIN.—That is 4s. a week for the latter charge and 6s. for the other?—Yes.

13212. Ten shillings a week?—Yes.

13213. That is higher than the upkeep of some of the asylums?—Indeed it is much above it.

Mr. E. B. PARNON examined.

Mr. E. B.
Parnon.

13214. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the Rural District Council, and Guardian of the Edenderry Union?—Yes.

13215. What is the view of the Edenderry Guardians as regards the Co. Meath part of their union?—The view the Edenderry Guardians take is this, that we object to that portion of the union situate in Meath amalgamating with any unions in Meath unless there was a general amalgamation all over the country. Of course we should lose our share of the rate in that part of the union in Meath for establishment charges, and they had the option of amalgamation when the general Act was passed and they did not.

13216. Unless there were a general amalgamation?—Yes.

13217. You would take Kildare and King's County to be a whole unit if Meath was to be one?—Yes. The union is divided in valuation—about \$40,000 in King's County, somewhere about the same in Kildare, and about £15,000 in Meath. Of course if the Kildare portion went into Kildare, and the King's County portion went up to Tallamore somewhere, and Meath was here, it would be a different thing, but if Meath amalgamated here—

13218. And only left you the balance?—Yes.

13219. Your rates would become higher?—Yes, but I may say that in any question of amalgamation we

should strongly object to amalgamation unless the standard rates were taken into consideration. For instance, our standard rate is 1s. 0d.; Tallamore is 1s. 10d. If we were to pay a large portion of the Tallamore rate when amalgamated in the King's County, where the standard rate is very much larger, we would lose all the advantages of an economical rate that we would gain in amalgamation.

13220. You think if there were a big amalgamation the standard rates should be revised?—Yes, we think our standard rate should be retained, which is a very important matter.

13221. But if your firm is broken up and you enter into a new firm you could not carry your old percentages with you?—No, but if we went into a new firm we would not take the bad debts of that firm, but should insist on some arrangement being made before we went in. That I think is a very important thing. By economy and strict management in the Edenderry Union we have kept down the standard rate very low. We would lose all the advantages. That is of great importance.

13222. Your rates are lower than in the adjoining union?—Very much; considerably.

13223. That would make you opposed to amalgamation unless the result of amalgamation was that you would have to pay a still lower rate?—Yes, quite so.

Feb. 10, 1906.
Mr. F. R.
Payton.

13234. That might happen if a large number of establishments were broken up?—Yes; but we think in the question of amalgamation the standard rate should be taken into consideration.

13235. How would you take it into consideration. How could it be done. Suppose the paupers from your part of the Co. Meath come to Navan in future, how would you apply the standard rate?—It would be rather difficult. I should charge Meath in accordance with the more establishment charge of the union—the valuation; then I should simply charge them for the number of paupers. It could not be called a capitation grant, but per head, the number of paupers coming from Meath, and what I would suggest is they retain the question of out-door relief.

13236. You would keep up your Board of Guardians at Edenderry. You would get them to pay to Navan a capitation grant at the present rate for the maintenance of your paupers, even though they might cost more at Navan?—Yes, if the net result was advantageous.

13237. That would not be advantageous to Navan?—Yes it would, because it would increase the area for establishment charges. If you increase the area you lessen the amount of establishment charges which Navan and the other unions have to pay. The establishment charges remain very much the same. That is our argument. They would be able to make provision for a greater number of paupers in some of their unions. The more establishment charges would not rise then. I should suggest that Meath pays simply their portion according to the numbers they send of in-door paupers.

13238. That they should board them there at a fixed rate?—Yes.

13239. How would you come to the fixed rate?—I should take an average all over the county for the fixed rate of maintenance.

13240. You might have to pay more, of course, per head?—No, I would not object to that, provided the standard rate was maintained.

13241. I don't quite see what you mean by standard rate here?—In the calculation of the equivalent grant we get half the standard rate in the poor rate of our own union.

13242. Your standard rate is 1s. 0d., say 1s. 1d. The other people get a grant at a higher rate, and you would object to get more from the Government?—No, I should not. What we do object to is that we should pay—we might get more from the Government—we would still have to pay out larger half. We could not get more from the Government now because it is settled.

13243. Unless it was put into the pot again?—Yes, that is different, but still there is the general principle. It would be hard on them now to have to pay half of 1s. 10d. instead of half 1s. 0d. You see my point?

13244. I do?—I am somewhat of a student of Poor Law. If you will allow me, it seems sometimes people suffer more the real importance of the Poor Law in not quite studying what effect any change which might take place would have on the morality of the population. For instance, you might say boarding-out is a very good thing. I dare say you are perfectly aware—that that I mean to teach you—there are three objections to the Poor Law. One is that by providing for the old and infirm you prevent thrift in the population, because none takes any trouble to get by for old age.

13245. You cannot get much thrift out of a few shillings a week?—No, but there is some money saved. There are a certain number of people who would save money. The second is young relations very often support parents out of their wages. Therefore it has been suggested that the Poor Law is a bad thing in blighting the natural affections that would come into play. In Ireland there are many cases where the young do support the old. The effect is it makes use of money which could be made use of in a more profitable way. Speaking from the human point of view, I should be in favour of boarding-out, but when you come to consider whether it would have a bad effect on the people, increasing pauperism, it is doubtful.

13246. What are the classes of children you would send out?—I am not at children. I am assuming the boarding-out of old people. The standard of living is low in Ireland. If you offer special facilities for every time they get old, don't you think it would be a great temptation to people. Would not it be likely to lead to very much increased pauperism?

13247. You think that unless it can be safeguarded it would be very dangerous?—What I would be inclined to suggest is that paupers should go to one central

workhouse, and that the out-door relief, and many duties hitherto done by the Boards of Guardians, should be given to the District Council. Why could not the District Council deal with out-door relief, and in-door paupers go to some central workhouse in the county?

13248. That has been suggested before to us?—The question of children I have taken a great deal of interest in. Of course the real question is—I don't know whether you can advise me as to whether the English Act of 1880 can be put into force in Ireland—I don't think it can—that allows Boards of Guardians to take the guardianship of children.

13249. They can in certain circumstances pass a resolution placing themselves in loco parentis in Ireland?—All the arguments are in favour of boarding-out. I only deal with a certain proportion of the children. Any one who has read anything of the system of Poor Law in New York, France, and different places—they have had it often in France—knows that a very large proportion of pauperism can be traced to children. In New York I believe they have had three generations of paupers—children, grand-children, and great-grand-children paupers.

13250. We have seen four generations of the same family in one workhouse?—It is very difficult for me. For one thing I am a Protestant in religion. I don't know how it would be looked at from the Roman Catholic point of view. In France, which is a Roman Catholic country, or at least has been, the State takes possession of the children. I take it it would be open to you to advise that the law would be altered in that way. I am strongly in favour of the law being altered so that children could be taken possession of. When the children are habitually on the rates, I think the Board of Guardians should take them away from their parents and bring them up properly. With regard to Trist Industrial School, I tried to get Edenderry Union to join, but they would not. As regards the barracks system, that Colonel Bernard spoke of, in Dr. Barnardo's Home—I don't know the statistics, and so on—but it is found of the children trained in these Homes, only 5 per cent. who went to the colonies went to the bad, so that is rather as much in favour of homes as it is of boarding-out. As regards classification, I always felt very strongly, of course, on that, that there should be separation between good and bad.

13251. As regards children, do I understand you to be in favour of a boarding-out system or of institution management?—Well, provided the institution was carried out on the Barnardo's Home plan, I would almost be disposed to do that.

13252. But those homes are almost exclusively used for collocating purposes?—Yes; for bringing up the children.

13253. And sending them to the colonies?—But they are brought from the worst slums in the towns.

13254. We have no such population in this country?—Of course the boarding-out merges them with the population, but it is rather difficult to get good homes. I know some persons are rather against the boarding-out system, because it is difficult to get good homes.

13255. We had very interesting evidence some days ago as to the action of the Cardinal Archbishop of Armagh, who started in his diocese the boarding-out system in connection with an orphanage. Instead of sending the children to an orphanage he started the boarding-out system, and it worked extremely well?—Our boarding-out system so far has done very well. We have not had the children out long enough to know whether they will come back to the workhouse, but it is satisfactory so far. I could not give any definite information, but I suppose the boarding-out is more practicable than the homes.

13256. You have not visited Trist School?—I have, and gone into the system.

13257. How does it impress you?—Very favourably; and they kept statistics—

13258. You think such an institution as that would be worth maintaining?—I do. One thing is, I think, the pauper children should have some special advantage in entering the world. Of course if you succeed in merging them in the population by boarding-out, well and good; but supposing, as I should say, they are always looked on with some amount of slur as pauper children, certainly those children should have the advantage of some trade. Of course I am aware that the many offer special facilities.

13259. We have received a great deal of evidence as to this boarding-out, and it appears that for a long number of years the children have become labourers, and have often supported the couple with whom they

Feb. 10, 1904

Mr. K. B.
Pepton.

were boarded out in their older life, and that they eventually became as their own children?—I cannot really give my own ideas. I have not had lengthened experience. I should not put my opinion against lengthened experience, and I could give way on that point. One point I always felt strongly, if it could be done without any real danger of increasing pauperism, as it should be compulsory on Boards of Guardians—a great many of these things should be compulsory—I don't think a respectable man or woman—I think we are all agreed about that—who have maintained themselves in respectability all their lives, it should not be optional to any body of men, Boards of Guardians or anybody else, that they should be put in the workhouse and put on the same footing as a person who has led a bad criminal life; it should be compulsory they should have some special treatment at a certain age.

13250. In a central institution, such as Colonel Evershed mentioned, you could have some classification between respectable people and people who had not led responsible lives?—Yes, with due regard to old age,

because it might increase pauperism if it was not fairly advanced.

13251. Not to make them too comfortable?—Not to make them as the pauperism in New Zealand, which is fifty-five years old. That is rather too young. I should say sixty or sixty-five years of age. With regard to hospitals, district nurses would no doubt be a good thing, but there are so many houses that have not got good sanitary arrangements that it might be rather dangerous.

13252. You would not like that they should move the night in their own homes in the neighborhood?—No; I have heard doctors say that many patients that their lives because people could not come to see the sick people. It would be well to have people nursed in their own homes, but the sanitary arrangements are so bad; but I would not depend entirely on a hospital situation so far away as Navan, nearly twenty miles away from some places. I think there should be some institution rather nearer. The lunatics should be treated specially.

13253. In lunatic or auxiliary asylums?—Yes.

Mr. LAURENCE WARD, A.P., examined.

Mr. Laurence
Ward.

13254. CHAIRMAN.—You are one of the Dunshaughlin Guardians?—I am.

13255. What is the view of the Guardians as to the continuation of the union and the workhouse?—I think I can tell you this best by reading a resolution passed by the Board with a view to having it read here to-day. This resolution was proposed by Mr. G. P. Murphy, and seconded by Mr. Lynch, who is chairman of the Guardians:—“Resolved—that the Dunshaughlin Board, having fully considered the terms of reference contained in the warrant of appointment of the Poor Law Reform Commissioners, our Board are unanimously of opinion that the circumstances of this union, and the interests of the destitute poor, as well as those of the ratepayers, and finally the convenience of those constituting the Board, are such as to make any of the proposed changes most undesirable on the score of economy and general convenience. The Guardians, therefore, enter an emphatic protest as their reply to the proposals submitted, as far as this union is concerned.” That resolution expresses all our thoughts.

13256. On the grounds of economy, they think there would be no economy?—That is their opinion.

13257. If they found there would be a very considerable economy, would that modify their opinion?—I am sure it would.

13258. Do you think they would then change their mind and go in for amalgamation?—I am sure they would if they thought there would be a considerable economy; and if they did so the only thing would be to try to lessen the hardship of the poor and convenience the men who would represent them.

13259. If the hospital were maintained at Dunshaughlin for the sick, so that no hardship would be inflicted on the sick, who could not go to a distant institution, except by traversing long distances, would that meet the objection as to the convenience of the poor?—I think it would, except on the score of out-door relief. I think there would be a great difficulty in distributing the out-door relief. We will suppose our workhouse to be merged in Navan, or Trim, or any of those places; the distance representatives would have to go would be very very long. Some of them might have to go perhaps twenty-two or twenty-three miles—drive eight or nine miles to a station and then come by rail. I think you would find very few men would go that distance to attend. Then how would you carry out your system of out-door relief. You would be obliged to place it almost entirely in the hands of the relieving officer. That would not be very desirable.

13260. It would be too economical you think?—I am afraid I could not agree with you on that point. They would have to make bad fellows of themselves in some cases, and it would not be very convenient to relieving officers to do so.

13261. Still where it has been in the hands of relieving officers the expenses have been very much lower?—Yes, but the Guardians of the district know the persons who are entitled to out-door relief.

13262. They know the persons who wish to get it?—Yes, and they know the persons who ought to get it and who ought not to get it, and it would be putting the relieving officer in a very awkward position.

13263. He could stand that awkward position very well if his salary depended on his doing the right thing?—I dare say he could. That was one of the great difficulties with us. We thought it would be very difficult to get the representatives to attend Board meetings owing to their having to travel so far.

13264. Did you consider the question whether the District Council, if maintained, as distinguished from the Guardians, could discharge any of these duties?—Our Board did not go into that question, but a majority think it would be a very difficult matter to get representatives to go far distances. We find that. If a man had simply to come to the workhouse for the sake of saying such a one ought to get out-door relief, I think you would have a very small attendance.

13265. Suppose the District Council were maintained at Dunshaughlin?—Yes.

13266. Mr. MURPHY.—Suppose no change were made in the method of administration at all. Suppose the Guardians looked after the business in future as they do now. Suppose they had the control of the out-door relief and the power to pay to a central institution the cost of maintenance of the paupers for the particular union, do you think the Guardians would see any objection to that?—That is leaving the paupers removed to a central institution?

13267. Let the able-bodied and the classes known as aged and infirm be sent to a central institution, retain still the hospital at Dunshaughlin for the sick, board out the children?—Yes. As a matter of fact there are very few children there. They go to Trim School.

13268. Provided they were there, and the lunatics removed, you would have no other class but aged and infirm. Could not that class be sent to some central institution having attached a considerable quantity of land, where these people, instead of being housed up for the greater part of the year in smoky, ill-ventilated rooms, could have pure air and be occupied with something suitable to their strength. Would not that be preferable to the present system?—I think it would.

13269. The Guardians still maintaining their own management, paying their own expenses, still saying what out-door relief could be given and what refused?—And would they then have representation at this particular Board where those paupers would be removed to?

13270. No, but they would have representation in a particular union, and paying as much per head for their own people in a central union?—If the expenses would be very much less, I don't see any objection.

13271. You would get rid of considerable expense. You would get rid of the staff of the workhouse proper, as distinguished from the infirmary, the cost of food and various other expenses in connection with the repair and upkeep of the larger part of the house; that would be an immediate saving?—It is my idea if, say, Dunshaughlin Union were merged in Navan, Kells, or any of these places, I think you would find the representatives of these places, where there are large towns, would be very lavish in their expenditure. They would go in for having improvements adopted, and the

ates for it would be heavy. Instead of lessening, our expenses would probably increase. They would go in for everything modern.

13272. CHAIRMAN.—You would rather keep up in the old-fashioned way?—No. I would have the modern to some extent.

13273. Not as far as Navan?—No, I don't think so, because I think they would be very lavish in their expenditure. In Dunsborough the number is generally about fifty in the infirmary. The house was built to accommodate 400, and we seldom have more than 100 in it, and of course our difficulty is removing the people; and we think that the expense would perhaps not be lessened at all.

13274. If you had the infirmary there you would not have to remove any class but the aged and infirm, and there would not be any great difficulty in that?—Yes, but I would not be in favour of removing them to a central hospital. I think that would be inconvenient owing to the question of distance.

13275. You think that it would be likely to keep the sick people at home?—Yes. I agree with Mr. Tuite that dragging them away from their homes would probably kill some of them, they would get so lonely.

13276. Mr. MURKIN.—Suppose the infirmary were retained and the change could be made without any additional cost to Dunsborough Union, would you be in favour of such a change?—Yes, if there was a guarantee there would be no additional cost, I think it would be an improvement.

13277. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose you mean if there was evidence. You could hardly have a guarantee?—Yes, as nearly as one could go to it. We have a great deal of accommodation there. We have a very large fever hospital, in which there are seldom many patients. We have built a new isolation hospital this year at a cost of something like £220, and it has never been used, so in the matter of hospital accommodation we are very well equipped; we have got plenty of buildings.

13278. Mr. MURKIN.—All you want is the people?—Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM LYNCH examined.

13285. CHAIRMAN.—You are Chairman of the Dunsborough Board of Guardians?—Yes.

13286. Do you agree with the evidence that Mr. Ward has just given now?—Yes.

13287. Is there anything in addition to what he has said you would like to put before us?—I think one word we would want to retain in case of amalgamation is the maternity ward.

13288. That is a sick ward?—And we want to retain a fever hospital, an infirmary, and a maternity ward. The maternity ward is very largely availed of by poor people around the district. It is very well equipped. We have a trained nurse and a certified midwife.

13289. That is in the main body of your house, in the north wing?—Yes. It is over our chapel. So on the basis of economy I don't see what we would gain by amalgamation.

13290. If a very large scheme could be adopted, and if, as a result of that, economy would come, do you think your people would object to amalgamation if they were left local accommodation for the sick?—I don't think they would; but I don't see what advantage it would be, or what buildings would be left, that any one could make any use of. In the first place you must have a fever hospital.

13291. But keeping the fever hospital and the infirmary?—Then you want a maternity ward.

13292. That is part of the infirmary?—Then you must keep the same staff officers.

13293. Oh, not?—You want the nurses.

13294. You don't want a master, matron, and the other officers?—I don't understand how they could be done away with. You would always want some authority there.

13295. You would have very good authority. You would have the doctor and head nurse. That is two

13270. Dr. BROWN.—How many wards have you in the hospital?—I could not tell you exactly. Mrs. Leonard is here. I am sure she will tell you. Of course, speaking about tramps, like everybody else, we don't know what to do with the tramps. Some of these men are very decent. You might inflict great hardship by imprisoning them, or anything of that sort. I know some of them are very respectable men going about in search of work. It is hard to know what to do. As a body they are a very dangerous lot.

13280. CHAIRMAN.—If you had full discretionary powers, like the Boards of Guardians in England, do you see any objection to that?—You could detain them in the workhouse by way of punishment if you thought fit. You would then be in a position to take stronger steps under the Vagrancy Acts if you thought they were bad cases, and you would have a discretion to let the honest seeker for work go about?—Our workhouse is a sort of half-way house for them between Dublin and Navan. Under the present system they cost us very little; probably not more than twopenny each at the outside for a night's lodging.

13281. A 2s note would go a long way towards covering the annual expenditure?—If we kept them for a few days it might increase our expenditure very much.

13282. Mr. MURKIN.—They would do more than twopenny worth of work?—I believe, if by any possibility the militia and short-service system could be abolished there would be fewer tramps. I presume that is a suggestion that could not be acted upon.

13283. Mr. McKENRY (solicitor).—You heard Colonel Broward speak about the reduction in the number of Guardians in each electoral division from two to one: how would it operate?—I am afraid it would not operate very well. A lady Guardian has informed me if a lady and gentleman were contesting a seat, the gentleman would go out altogether, and that would not be desirable.

13284. CHAIRMAN.—You would have to provide for ladies specially?—Yes.

They have in the county infirmary here?—It is quite different to these. It would be much larger.

13296. This would be much smaller?—The average in our infirmary is fifty.

13297. They are not all acute sick. A great many of these are merely infirm sick when the doctor puts on diet and keeps on as sick people, though they are not really sick?—They could not be moved anywhere else. They are not fit for a general ward.

13298. But they would be fit inmates of a general almshouse for aged and infirm?—No matter what you do with them you would want some central place to treat them in.

13299. Yes, that is what we meant?—Dunsborough Workhouse is centrally situated in the midst of the union.

13300. How far are you from Navan?—About thirteen or fourteen statute miles to the furthest part of our union from the workhouse. There is portion at Ashbourne, and further on Donaghmore, where Mr. Dams comes from to represent the division.

13301. Is Clonsie in your union?—Yes.

13302. That is about the furthest point away?—No, Donaghmore is the furthest point away.

13303. Half-way between you and Swords?—On that line, in the neighbourhood of Garristown, nearly over there, and the representative has nine Irish miles to come to the union—that would be about twelve or thirteen English—that would be about twenty-six statute miles to leave him there and back.

13304. It is just the same distance as Clonsie if you measure the road on the map, precisely the same distance?—Clonsie is a very direct road.

13305. The other is straight enough too, going by Rathoath. Then your opinion is very strongly against amalgamation or breaking up the workhouse?—As far as the needs of the sick and the destitute poor go, I would be very strongly opposed to it.

Mr. THOMAS HALLINAN examined.

13306. CHAIRMAN.—Are you one of the Guardians of Dunsborough?—Yes, Vice-Chairman.

13307. What part of the union do you live in?—Sion.

13308. It is not farther to Navan than it is to Dunsborough from your place?—Something about the same distance; about a mile, or probably two miles, further to Navan.

Feb. 10, 1904.
Mr. Laurence Ward.

Mr. William Lynch.

Mr. Thomas Hallinan.

Feb 10, 1904.
Mr. Thomas
Moffigan.

13309. Would the people about you mind much which union they went to?—They would, as far as I know.

13310. Would they prefer Dunscaughlin?—Yes.

13311. Why?—They look on it more as their own union at present, and will for the future.

13312. It is absolutely right there, but if it be dissolved?—Surely.

13313. No, Dunscaughlin Union. I was wondering why the people would prefer to go there than to Navan, which is only a very small distance more from them?—They would prefer to go there. They know so much more about it. They don't like to hear of coming into a town at all.

13314. Would the Guardians prefer going to Dunscaughlin, where there is no business for them to transact than to Navan, where they transact their business?—Yes, it would be a matter of indifference to them in that case.

13315. Which would they prefer for their own case?—So far as I am concerned, and any I know, would prefer Dunscaughlin.

13316. What would be the reasons influencing them to prefer Dunscaughlin?—It is more convenient in a sense. In Navan they would have to go through the town. They might have no other business and a little more expense probably; in my case it would be.

13317. There is no temptation to expenditure in Dunscaughlin?—Not so much.

13318. Mr. M'Keever.—Have you anything to say as supplementing Mr. Lynch's remarks?—With regard to the accommodation of the workhouse, when we had it under consideration, if there is any part of the house done away with it would be the body of the house, and then there is a question asked about what purpose could it be put to, and we have come to the conclusion if it was done away with it could be put to no other purpose, and that portion of the building would become quite useless. Of course, as Mr. Lynch and Mr. Ward, our chairman, have described, the infirmary, the fever hospital, and the maternity ward would need to be retained. Then you would practically be doing away with nothing only a small portion of the body of the house.

13319. CHAIRMAN.—A large portion of the building would be useless for any other purpose?—Yes; it could not be turned into anything like a hospital auxiliary.

13320. This happened in a union called Gortin, in the Co. Tyrone, which was swallowed up by Omagh Union—Mr. Murnaghan's union. There they had the same difficulty. The buildings were worth nothing it was thought, but they were pulled down, and made building materials for houses and things of that sort?—That could be done, too, with it.

13321. They could be got rid of in that way?—Yes. Then to take it from the ratepayers' point of view. The people, at least in my district, don't like to hear of amalgamation at all, owing to the very high expenditure that has been hitherto in the poor school in Trim. That is on account of the large area and the high valuation.

13322. You still send children there?—Of course. There are no children at all in Dunscaughlin workhouse except infants—one or two.

13323. They go to Trim when three or four years old?—Yes; and are kept there until they are fit to go into the world, and they cost a great deal for it to the ratepayers.

13324. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—What do they cost?—The union I have got is about between £30 and £35 per year for the last fifteen years.

13325. Dr. BROWN.—Pre head?—Yes, and that is an enormous sum—like the premium that would be paid in a college. The ratepayers look to that. The ratepayers look on amalgamation as being the same thing.

13326. CHAIRMAN.—I may take it the Dunscaughlin Board are totally against amalgamation?—Yes, as far as I am aware. And then, of course, the tramp business. We entirely agree with the chairman—Mr. Ward—in that, that if it was possible to have an alteration in the militia it would strike at the root of it as far as Dunscaughlin is concerned. Then I have so far under your notice that from Dunscaughlin Union there are very few cases come into the county infirmary here. They pay their portion all the same.

13327. That is a county-at-large charge; you pay your share?—Yes; and except lately it has been changed, there was only one or two cases in fifteen or sixteen years sent in from Dunscaughlin Union.

13328. If there were an amalgamation, and if you were left your hospital, having regard to the fact that you get so little value out of the county infirmary, do you think it would be only fair to make these local hospitals into Dunscaughlin county-at-large charges on the same basis as the county infirmary?—Yes, it would appear fair on the surface. Of course I could not go into it and say how it would work out.

13329. It would work out you would have to pay much less for your hospital?—Yes, but it might work out similarly to the Trim joint school.

13330. Then you would have to blame yourselves for it?—Yes.

13331. Dr. BROWN.—What was the reason then were so few patients going into the county infirmary from Dunscaughlin?—It did not seem to be popular, and there did not seem to be any mode of having them recommended and taken in. It was hardly known until lately how to make application to go in and the authority was.

13332. What was the mode of conveyance?—Their own vehicles or neighbors. They had to hire a horse. Generally it was to hospital.

13333. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—Under the old system the people did not know they could take advantage of the infirmary?—No, they were not aware until it was recently debated in the County Council.

13334. And it was considered a sort of endowment place for the well-to-do?—Certainly, from the Dunscaughlin point of view.

13335. The poor thought they could not get in at all?—Yes.

13336. Mr. M'Keever.—Would you make any recommendation with regard to any alteration in the present Poor Law in the way of out-door relief?—Yes; in that direction I find in our district some great trouble with regard to the quarter statute acre clause.

13337. CHAIRMAN.—You would like to enlarge the limits for out-door relief?—Yes, to do away with that clause altogether. It clashes altogether with the Labourers Acts.

13338. Would you put any other limit?—Then should be some safeguard, of course.

13339. Would you go in for an absolute repeal of the clause or a large quantity of land?—Not an absolute repeal of the clause altogether.

13340. So that a man with ten acres of land you could, if you thought fit to, give it to him?—It is desirable or impossible, with some other safeguard.

13341. What other safeguards occur to you?—I could hardly propose one. It is my own proposal.

13342. Does any other safeguard occur to you?—Not at present.

13343. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—Would you still keep it in the hands of the Guardians?—Yes.

13344. CHAIRMAN.—Is it partly in order to be able to give out-door relief to labourers in labourer cottages?—Yes, to meet that. The local representatives and the relieving officers are very often in danger of surcharge in these cases; when the auditor turns up he may at any time surcharge a local representative.

13345. It would be illegal to give it at present?—Quite so.

13346. Of course you would not give it?—It is very hard to get over the matter where there is a very heavy case or a case of great hardship, and then think of the auditor coming on.

13347. Would those people on out-door relief be continued as your tenants of the houses?—Yes, they should.

13348. How would they pay any rent if they had to get out-door relief?—In some of those cases the children provide the money to pay the rent—in many cases that I know of—although the tenants may not be able to maintain themselves at a particular time.

13349. They would not be destitute if they had children earning, and they would not be eligible for out-door relief?—The children are not legally responsible to support them. They might pay the rent.

13350. You would not consider that a questionable thing to do—to pay children so much for supporting their parents?—Not to pay them so much, but if children undertook to keep a house over their parents' heads I would not object to that.

13351. You would pay them out-door relief?—I would pay the parents in cases of hardship, or where they would be ill.

13352. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—Is there much out-door relief in your union?—Not very much.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER OWENS examined.

Feb. 22, 1894.

By
Mr. Christopher
Owens.

13353. CHAIRMAN.—You desire to give special evidence as regards the boarding-out system and the management of children?—The extension of out-door relief in connection with district houses—

13354. What about the boarding-out system of children?—I believe that the system adopted at present in Town School is altogether at variance with human nature. These children are placed in this school at an early age. They only go outside the walls once in ten days for exercise, and naturally children ought to go out into the country; and they are associated with themselves—no other children with them. They lose their self-respect and self-respect by being kept within the institution. I am altogether in favour of the boarding-out system, because I believe that these children would be brought up with other children of the same age, and that they would not lose their individuality as paupers; that they would go to school with the other children, and they would be brought up with the other children they lived with, and they would become inured to the hardships of the world, and eventually they would attain that self-respect which they ought to have to become useful members of society, and the foster parents would have a motherly or fatherly feeling for them, and if they went into the world to do for themselves, that they would have that home to come back to if sickness or anything else overtook them.

13355. They would become members of the family?—Yes, and the expense of sending to a school is enormous. In fact you could send these children to the Continent and send them to school there at the same price. The price is enormous.

13356. Are you a member of the committee?—I am a member of the School Board and the Naven Board of Guardians.

13357. What do you attribute the great expense of the institution to?—I cannot attribute it to mismanagement.

13358. Running it on too high a scale, is that what you put it down to?—I do not. I believe they are bound to a trade and all get a trade, and I believe these are children there not capable of taking a trade, and therefore the work they do is not sufficient.

13359. They cannot become tradesmen in after life?—They cannot.

13360. You think only a percentage of the children brought up there become real tradesmen?—A very small percentage become. It is not at all surprising. They have not the same intelligence as the other children. What I would suggest, if the boarding-out system were adopted, that these children, when they would be going to the National schools throughout the country, the masters would be very good judges of their character, and if they found one capable of doing a trade—we have a new system of education going to be brought in throughout the country—if they found one with an aptitude for a trade, then the Board of Guardians of whatever union that child belonged to would give a fee towards it.

13361. You would not be in favour of giving a high-class trade to what you may call the waste of our life around us. You would not be in favour of giving to them advantages in excess of those given to the children of the tradesmen and the poorer classes?—No, certainly not; but if I saw a child develop sufficient intelligence and talent, I would give him all the advantages that his talent and intelligence entitle him to. I certainly would. I believe that a child, no matter what parentage he has come from, that God has endowed him with a soul and mind, and that he will make his way if he has the stuff in him, and I would give him the chance to make his way if I saw he had the stuff in him. But I would say that as to the children who are boarded-out, the Guardians ought to have the power to give them a fee to bind them to a trade, because I think that children who are brought up to a trade, if they get a trade, when they go out to make their way in the world, the least is thrown at them by their fellow tradesmen that they received their trade as pupils in a school, and it will break down their self-respect. I believe the system is radically wrong from the bottom.

13362. The institution system?—The institution system; and in connection with that I would say, as to the tramp system here and the character of the tramps, I believe they have been born and reared in workhouses, going from one workhouse to another, but if you have a boarding-out system it would be helping to keep the people away from workhouses as much as possible.

13363. You would cut off the supply for future ages?—Yes. I believe I would be at the root of the evil.

There is another point. We see tinkers or tramps who sleep at the backs of districts. I pity the children who are with them. I know them. I see them.

13364. You would allow the Guardians to take these children from them?—They should take these children compulsorily from them, and I certainly could not see my way to board out these children, but there are various industrial schools in the country.

13365. Why could not you see your way to board out these children?—What would you do with the father and the mother?

13366. If you put them into an institution, what would you do with the father and the mother?—The father and mother are tramps, working at their trade—tinkers—grapes we call them. If you could find a means of dealing with the father and mother it would be quite easy dealing with the children. These children have never gone to school.

13367. If you take away the children from them at all it does not make much matter whether you board them out or put them in an institution?—But naturally the instinct of the father and mother will cling to the children, and they will come and try to enforce their way.

13368. If you think they are not fit to have them you would take them away from them?—Yes.

13369. Mr. MURKIN.—You think the parents would go to the house where the foster parents are and trouble the foster parents?—I think so.

13370. If they found them out?—Yes.

13371. That is the difficulty you apprehend?—Yes; but it is a pity there is no law to take the children from these wayward tramps. They are the propagators of tramps, and the children will be tramps, and their children's children will be tramps.

13372. CHAIRMAN.—Was there any other point?—One of the witnesses mentioned that the half-acre of garden belongs a respectable man who has worked from getting out-door relief. He has a sentimental prejudice against going to the poorhouse hospital, and won't go in. I know several cases, and they will not go in, because there would be the hint of pauperism about them.

13373. Would you agree with that recommendation that was made?—I would strongly recommend that when a man becomes sick, we will say from influenza or some other case, temporary or permanent, and if he becomes feeble, I would not ask the man who tried to battle with the world—he may have lived an improvident life, certainly, but when illness overtakes him, and he has this objection to go in, I think the law ought to allow us to give out-door relief.

13374. You would limit it to cases of temporary incapacity due to illness?—Yes.

13375. You would take the doctor's word for that?—Yes.

13376. It would limit the field for abuse?—Yes.

13377. Mr. MURKIN.—You would not say want of employment?—I would say want of employment especially, because the Guardians would know whether this man is actually in want of employment.

13378. Then you would go in for extending out-door relief generally, not merely for the sick?—I believe when a person is old and has a rooted sentimental objection to go into the poorhouse—

13379. CHAIRMAN.—A natural objection?—A natural objection. I believe that a person would be cheaper on the rates to be left out, and it would be much better for the person himself, because if a person reaches seventy or eighty years of age, if you take him from his natural way of living in the country and lock him in the prison, what I call a workhouse—

13380. Would you be afraid a considerably increased expenditure would result from this?—No, but a lessening of expenditure. I say in this union of ours that two and a half persons could be relieved on the old rates—

13381. But then how many more will apply for out-door relief if they think they can get it?—Those who are responsible will limit the number within the strictest possible bounds.

13382. What would you make the area of charge for relief, the union or the district?—I would make the district.

13383. The union or the district?—The union if you would extend it so.

13384. Then in Naven Union would you make the town one area of charge and the country another, or would you have the union the district?—You make me as being a rural Guardian. Certainly, from my own point of view, I would make the urban district support its poor.

Feb. 10, 1904.
 Mr. —
 Christopher
 Owens.

13385. Mr. MURKIN.—What you would suggest is this, that in case there was an amputation in this county, and there was a central home for the infirm, you would leave it optional for the Guardians to say whether they would send a destitute person to the central home or give him a certain amount of out-door relief temporarily. Is that the point?—That is the point; but I would not send a person to this central infirmary against his will.

13386. Not an infirmary, but an almshouse—some place or other where there would be accommodation for

the aged and infirm?—Yes, that is my point. With regard to destitute nursing, I believe all these unions, if they are broken up, I would certainly be in favour of one union being sufficient for the Co. Mayo, but I would say where there had been a union, the hospital should be retained, and that the unions, if destitute nursing is established, should find their homes in these hospitals. They would be in the centre of the union when the doctor requisitions them where a person wants nursing in his own home, and it would be more economical to nurse him there. These three unions could be requisitioned from this hospital.

Dr. F. W. SULLIVAN examined.

Dr. F. W.
 Sullivan.

13387. CHAIRMAN.—You are one of the surgeons of the County Infirmary?—I am an honorary surgeon of the County Infirmary.

13388. Have you any other public appointment?—No, but I have had nine years' experience as medical officer of the Navan dispensary district.

13389. What points do you wish to call our attention to?—In my opinion the standard of accommodation for hospital patients for the population of the county should be for all diseases about one bed for every 150 of the population. I think that a county hospital should be centrally situate, such as Navan, where there are four lines of railway converging on it, commanding almost the entire county. I think that the county hospital should be thoroughly equipped with every modern improvement, and that the staff of the hospital should consist of a resident medical officer, who would also act as apothecary, and that should be made an annual or bi-annual appointment.

13390. Would such a man be a good man to take for compensating?—Yes; he must have a certain amount of experience. I should certainly give the preference to a man who had been resident pupil or clinical clerk in a city hospital. This hospital I think should be supported by the county-at-large.

13391. As at present?—As at present; and should be administered by a committee of the County Council and governed by subscriptions as at present, but it should be under the inspection and control of the Local Government Board. The surgeons, I think, should be paid, having due regard to the responsibility and to the proportion of the work. Surgery and medicine have made vast strides since the passing of the Infirmary Acts several years ago, when people were treated by depletion, and cupping, and firing more than by scientific means. The time has arrived now when professional services should be duly recompensed. The hospital should be controlled by a patron with administrative abilities.

13392. You would say she should be a trained nurse?—Yes, and as well as being a trained nurse, she should be able to satisfy the committee that she would have administrative abilities. She might be a tremendously good nurse and have no administrative faculty. The county hospital should be used as a training school for supplying nurses to the county-at-large except maternity nurses. The staff nurses might be placed at the disposal of the public for private cases on payment, if they were equal to it, and I would give a preference to every nurse who was trained in the county hospital for all county appointments requiring nurses.

13393. Or would you put it in a different way, and say that all the county nurses should be nurses for the county and sent wherever their services would be required?—Yes, that is the same thing in different words.

13394. Giving them an absolute appointment?—I don't know you could bind yourself to that.

13395. You might want three nurses in one hospital in some weeks, and one might discharge the duties for a very long time afterwards. You could move them backwards and forwards as required?—Yes. I would advise an improvement in the general scale of distaff. Although the crude material is of most excellent character, perhaps the coarseness and service are open to improvement. Good wholesome food is often rendered inferior by indifferent service. Invalids require better cookery than the ordinary labouring man or woman, as the case may be, and with the variation of cookery they would do better. As to the payment of patients, I would make two scales, a minimum for those who could afford, in general wards, and a maximum for those who used private wards in a hospital.

13396. You would only have two rates of payment?—Yes, a minimum and a maximum.

13397. Would you object to the system in operation

in Enniskillen Infirmary, where every patient is required to pay in proportion to his means, some only a shilling a week and others full cost?—That you would have to deal with by the person making the ticket of admission.

13398. In consultation with the surgeon?—Yes, although he would not be in a position to know their means probably.

13399. They find no difficulty there?—Yes. With regard to fever hospitals, I would have the treatment in all fever hospitals free, for the purpose of encouraging the people to make use of the hospital, and as a benefit and protection to the public.

13400. If a comparatively wealthy person from the town went in you would not give him the benefit of the free hospital?—I would, if I thought it would prevent the spread of infection.

13401. If they wished to go into hospital they would be proper persons to pay?—It is a debatable point whether it would not be cheaper in the end to prevent the spread of infection or epidemics.

13402. Dr. BROWN.—You are speaking from the public health point of view?—Yes. Except you might guard it in such a way that people in a certain social position could not have free admission. But at present the position we find is that any one who is a domestic servant or a cook taken from anyone's house, comes under the denomination of domestic servant, and they have to pay for him. The result is they are concealed in fever cases rather than pay for them so that the fever may spread.

13403. Very few people are so foolish as to take a servant with fever into their own house?—Some of them will do it sooner than pay for him. That is my experience. It may be rather unique, but it is a fact all the same. With regard to the ambulance service, it is practically useless for the county; useless as it at present exists, because each union has only the ambulance at the disposal for its own union. There ought really to be an ambulance available for the county-at-large.

13404. They have one at Lifford Infirmary?—Any properly administered hospital should have an ambulance available to go anywhere. Our ambulance is not available to go to Lifford, only a few miles away, because it is in another union. With regard to tuberculosis cases, I suggest they should be all treated in a sanatorium such as authorities like Arthur Latham highly approve, because their treatment in unions will bring the treatment, which is a most valuable one, into dispute. With regard to the old people, I am all for keeping them out at a moderate amount of pension, having them under the supervision of inspectors of the Local Government Board, not pauper children. I would educate in a central establishment, and have them taught a trade and not boarded out. Boarded-out children have no future before them.

13405. CHAIRMAN.—Have you any personal experience in these matters?—I have some in the Dispensary here. Boarded-out children are taught nothing. They are made practically slaves to the people who board them out, and they are taught no trade.

13406. Why should they not be employed as farm hands? why do you want to give them a trade? why should not they work as farm hands?—Isn't you think it is very good for them?—If they were in a central establishment they could be taught farm labouring in a scientific and a better manner.

13407. Is there any better way of teaching them than putting them in a farmer's house and letting them learn?—I was struck with this; they seem more slaves than anything else.

13408. Any one who does work is a slave in a certain sense; even doctors are slaves sometimes?—Very often they do not seem to have any limit, and are willing

until after fifteen without any remuneration except their keep, and that would be hardly the way. They should be free agents by then.

13409. Would you make them come of age by fifteen?—I think I would. I would be all for the continuance of the dispensary system as at present, but I would have attached to the county hospital an out-door department.

13410. The dispensary system does not come within our warrant?—There should, in my opinion, be auxiliary hospitals for a limited number.

13411. Dr. Broom.—Where would you place them?—In suitable districts.

13412. Where in this county?—In all the thickly-populated towns.

13413. Do you mean to say as well as the union hospitals?—Not as well as the union hospitals. Only in the event of closing the union hospitals.

13414. In closing the union hospital you would leave the district hospital in the same place?—Yes.

13415. CHAIRMAN.—Otherwise the county is sufficiently provided with hospitals?—It is over provided.

13416. Dr. Broom.—Why did you say one in every 800. Is that for acute diseases?—Yes, that is about the standard for acute cases. That would not cover the infirm, or imbecile, or chronic cases, but acute cases; and that would not cover it in large towns, but putting the urban and rural districts one against the other the average would be about one in 800.

13417. That would not do for large cities like Dublin?—No, but taking the county-at-large and the population.

13418. About training the nurses in the county infirmary, what about giving the nurses lectures, and that sort of thing?—That would devolve on the surgeons and the matron.

13419. Would not they have to receive lectures?—Yes.

13420. Before you would think of recognising the institution for training purposes?—Yes; nurses have almost better facilities in a large county hospital than in a clinical hospital, because the work done there by medical students would often devolve on the nurses.

13421. There are no lectures given in the Co. Meath Infirmary?—I have done so, but I discontinued it.

13422. Mr. MURKIN.—You say the county is over-hospitalled at present. Do you mean by that, you could do without some of them?—There are so many unions, and each having a hospital.

13423. You think some of them could be done without?—Yes, I think, but I would not wish to express an opinion on the point. I would suggest that there should be a maternity department in connection with the county hospital, because the use of the union hospital for such purposes is distasteful to the respectable poor, and the result is that the poor people are deprived of the comforts of hospital treatment.

13424. CHAIRMAN.—That would only benefit Navan?—I don't know. The hospital would be available to the county.

13425. It would not benefit a much larger area?—They could all get tickets of admission except in emergencies.

13426. That is what you must think of?—Every case would not be an emergency case. The union hospital will not be used as a maternity hospital by the respectable poor.

13427. Unless you restrict it virtually to that class?—Yes.

Mr. JAMES GANNON examined.

13428. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the Ardee Board of Guardians?—Yes.

13429. Portion of your union is in the Co. Meath?—Yes.

13430. We had the views of the Ardee Guardians at Dundalk, and there we learned that they were opposed to amalgamation?—So they are.

13431. In the Co. Meath you are of the same opinion as the Co. Louth portion?—Yes.

13432. You prefer to continue to go to Ardee?—Yes.

13433. We had very full information at Dundalk about the Ardee Union. Is there anything you would wish to say in addition, that you would wish to mention yourself?—I don't know any more than that the people are very keen on this since it was rumoured that there was a possibility of it, and they are all afraid there would be an amalgamation. We don't like to leave Ardee on account of the low rates, something about 70 per cent. lower than the surrounding unions. I live on the border between Navan and here, and the people outside the border would rather get into Ardee if they could.

13434. Would you be willing to take them?—I think we have enough.

13435. Mr. McKee.—With reference to the poor, do you think it would be advisable to have the hospital moved from Ardee?—No, I think not. There is plenty of accommodation, and it is our district, within

an easy distance of it, and the poor are well done for and no complaint from them at all.

13436. Your rate you say is 75 per cent. below that of the adjoining unions?—About that.

13437. Do you think with any system of amalgamation that the ratepayers of that union could be compensated?—I don't think it would be possible.

13438. CHAIRMAN.—You think we could not save money for you if we had an amalgamation of unions?—No.

13439. If we did show a saving, what would you say then?—If we got a guarantee.

13440. If we said there would be a saving?—We don't believe there could be a saving.

13441. If there could be you would not object to it?—Of course.

13442. Mr. McKee.—If the ratepayers could be assured they would pay less rates than at present, there might be no objection?—They might not object, but it is very doubtful.

13443. Mr. MURKIN.—It is simply a question of cost?—No.

13444. What is it?—Convenience for the poor. Ardee is very central and they have not very far to go. If it was amalgamated with another union they would have a considerable distance to go.

13445. Mr. McKee.—What is the very farthest distance from the remotest portion of the Meath district to Ardee?—About six miles.

Feb. 18, 1904.

Dr. F. W. Sullivan

Mr. James Gannon

Mr. T. B. DRUMGOLE examined.

13446. Mr. McKee.—You are Clerk of the Ardee Union?—Yes.

13447. Have you made a calculation as to the average amount of poor rate for the last three years in Ardee and the adjoining unions?—I have.

13448. What is the result of that?—The result is broadly in other unions surrounding Ardee it is 75 per cent. greater than in Ardee, and I have even extended the comparison to thirteen years back, and the result is the same proportion is preserved all through.

13449. To what do you attribute that?—Because there are certain circumstances in the case of Dundalk. It is largely influenced by the population of the workhouse. In the case of the Meath Unions—Navan, Kells—it is not influenced so much; very little in the case of Navan.

13450. CHAIRMAN.—Is it pure economy as regards Navan?—There is not such a disparity in the popula-

tion of Navan and Ardee, but it must be economy; it must work out as a test of economy for Ardee.

13451. Mr. McKee.—Taking it on an average, per head per week per family, how does that work out?—

13452. CHAIRMAN.—What is the average cost of food and clothing?

13453. Mr. McKee.—Food, clothing, and upkeep, taking everything?—I have taken last year from the returns. The average for Ardee is 7s.; Droghda, 8s. 3d.; Dundalk, 8s.; Kells, 12s. 6d.; Navan, 8s. 3d.

13454. So roughly it is 75 per cent. less there than?—In the case of Kells it is over 60 per cent. less.

13455. Take it that the workhouse hospital was retained, and all the other branches of the union dissolved and distributed among the adjoining unions, how would that work out as regards the finances of the union?—It would not lower the financial liability at all. The greater portion of our staff is absorbed by

Mr. T. B. Drumgole.

Feb. 10, 1904.

Mr. T. B.
Dromgoole.

the hospital at present. In money our total staff at present costs £265. Of that there is solely absorbed by the hospital at present £235, and then there are general officers belonging to the workhouse in general who must be retained if the hospital is retained.

13455. CHAIRMAN.—These are all figures we have got in the books and papers, and there is not much use in giving them to us in this way.

Mr. M'Keever.—My idea was to prove, so far as I could, to you—

CHAIRMAN.—What Mr. Dromgoole's view is, but he does not take the same basis as we do at all.

Mr. M'Keever.—But what I wanted to show was that it would be of no advantage to the ratepayers that any system of amalgamation should be introduced.

CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Dromgoole's opinion is all according to his estimate. He is merely taking estimates on a very limited area that we would not take. He may be quite right in everything he said, but it would not affect a very wide scheme at all.

Mr. M'Keever.—What I wanted to show was that our ratepayers would not gain any advantage by amalgamation with any adjoining union. The only way in which I can do that is by showing what the ratepayers are at present paying in the £, and what the adjoining unions are at present paying in the £.

CHAIRMAN.—We have that.

Mr. M'Keever.—Assuming an amalgamation, I have asked him—

CHAIRMAN.—You are assuming an amalgamation that we would never dream of adopting or recommending, so you are really killing a dead horse.

Mr. M'Keever.—I have at least done this, shown that our union is worked 75 per cent. more economi-

cally than adjoining unions, and, of course, I would insist, in the terms of your reference, that our ratepayers should receive an advantage rather than be put to any disadvantage by any scheme of amalgamation.

CHAIRMAN.—They made that clear at Dundalk. The gentleman who appeared there took exactly the same line there.

Mr. M'Keever.—If I can make myself clear a far as that is concerned, I am quite satisfied.

CHAIRMAN.—That is quite clear. We get all these figures from the clerk. We will issue returns for him to give us statistics, and we will work on these statistics.

Mr. M'Keever.—Of course the ratepayers of the Ardee Union would be perfectly satisfied that any scheme which would modernise the system would be carried out, but they would be very chary to consent to a scheme which would increase their liability.

CHAIRMAN.—So we understand. They took up a very strong position in that respect at Dundalk. They said it would be an injustice to them to do anything to increase their rates, and claimed it should not be done. We have that clearly before us, their contention is the matter; but the only thing is if we want to go into these statistics we would have to sit here for very many hours asking him questions on the basis of these calculations. As they are given they are useless. We would have to test everything he says. It would take hours and hours. We will do that in our own office when we get the papers from Mr. Dromgoole's (Witness).—We have not the outlines of any scheme.

We have not yet either. They are only stating.

Mr. M'Keever.—Of course sometimes we find a pretty fair idea of what a scheme is to be before it is formulated. That is the only witness I have at present.

Mr. JOHN CHAMBERLAIN examined.

Mr. John
Chambers.

13457. CHAIRMAN.—What are the views of the Dublin Union?—I am entirely opposed to amalgamation. I think it would be a hardship on the poor, in the first place—the difficulty of removal—and I think it would not serve the ratepayers either.

13458. If a scheme could be put before you that would make it appear there would be a saving to the ratepayers?—We would take that, but we would look to the poor first. We are very generous to the poor in Kells.

13459. In what way do you show your generosity there?—I think we have one of the best-kept hospitals in the county. At all events it is the most expensive. But we have no power over that. It is the doctor's business.

13460. The doctors asked for a great many things you did not give them?—I think we supplied them with everything except baths.

13461. Dr. Brogan.—Did you do all the doctor asked?—If we did we might be beggared.

13462. CHAIRMAN.—Is it not a rich district?—In the northern end it is not.

13463. Dr. Brogan.—Would you not be ashamed if you saw some of the western districts where the people are very poor and the poor are better treated?—I was never able to travel.

13464. CHAIRMAN.—If you took a look in at Hillinger it would be an advantage, if you want Dublin to be preserved?—I don't go on that at all. I have as much for any union to be preserved.

13465. It would cause them to go to a better-managed institution?—I cannot see any mismanagement except that the doctor is a little bit extravagant.

13466. Is there anything else except the question of amalgamation you wish to speak about?—Nothing else, except the Trinit school, which I heard condemned here, and I think it a splendid institution. I approve of the way in which the children are brought up. Even for the time they are going to Trinit—some of our children go to Trinit—and there are cases of tradesmen in our place who were in the school, and I think they have done well. I approve of that institution. It was stated they cost £35 a year. It is only a little over £20 in our union.

13467. Dr. Brogan.—Are you Chairman of the Kells Union?—

13468. CHAIRMAN.—I was speaking of Dublin all the time?—I was wondering why you were running us down so much.

13469. We saw a great deal we liked in Kells. I invited Dublin witnesses up?—Don't mistake me for Dublin again.

Mr. A. GOGARTY examined.

Mr. A.
Gogarty.

13470. CHAIRMAN.—Are you from Kells, too?—Yes.

13471. You got a shock when you heard these remarks?—I was going to preface my remarks by saying we were shocked at our end of the table when we heard it. I did not think we were altogether so bad as that in Kells, but the only evidence I have to give is I am opposed to amalgamation. There are two grounds we go on. The removal of the poor such long distances, be wherever they may be sent, and I know from the railway company they will carry no infectious diseases. Therefore, I consider that fourteen or fifteen Irish miles is too far to take a fever patient.

13472. But they would have fever hospitals for their own places still?—That would be something in favour of it.

13473. That would take away that part of the objection?—Yes; but I was going to show, which I think unnecessary now, our union is able to accommodate a far larger number than we have got in it, and, as vice-chairman, I find fault with the way in which the doctor classifies his patients in it. We have two buildings running parallel with one another—

13474. I think we had better not go into that now. We have no jurisdiction on these detailed questions. It is merely general evidence we want?—Then I am in favour of locating the lunatics in a central position, for I think that where there is only twenty or twenty-five, as we have presently, they cannot be looked after as well as if there was a central place for them, where they could get what I might term a certain amount of exercise. They are not, as a rule, invalids. Therefore I think it would be more healthy for them to get walking about, and indeed I think there are a number of patients in our union who should get outdoor exercise, and not be cramped up as if they were in a hospital. We have seven or eight acres of ground and fields enclosing them, and we think if the doctor would not be exactly confining them to a certain compass—

13475. Are you now referring to aged and infirm?—I am referring to what the doctor classifies in his hospital that is solely under his charge; and another thing—of course I don't think you are going into it exactly—this, that the master, in my opinion, should have control over the house, generally speaking.

13476. You would not approve of doing away with

him altogether?—I would not, because the doctor will be only there for about a very short time in the day. He cannot supervise the undertakings in the place and see that they do their duty.

13477. The doctor only looks after the hospital?—That is all; but after some again the matter should have power to get the workhouse.—

13478. To pull up the nurses?—Yes.

13479. We would be very sorry to agree with you in that?—I heard it described here that we are a very expensive machine. So we say, for we have three trained nurses, and as a gentleman to my right describes it, we are a staff they might get in with us and might suffer by it. The doctor is the cause of that. We have no control over the doctor, and if we feed them well we are willing to pay for it. With regard to the boarding-up of children, I am totally opposed to it, opposed to the people that the children in the houses of these people are looked on as pauper children by the people they are with, and the other members of the family, and all the members of the family in the same neighbourhood; and also, as they may get into some slight little room with the other children, they will not be properly treated. On that account I believe a place like the Trins Schools is far better for the poor children than boarding them out would be, and I am totally opposed to what I may call house pensions.

13480. Old-age pensions?—Yes, that is to support the poor at home in their own houses. While it may be better for them to have open air and open space about them, still they will not be as well treated. I don't care how well they are never looked after by a relative or other people as they should be. They will still spend some of what they get in a useless manner, but if confined in a workhouse they will be properly looked after. That is my opinion.

13481. About tramps?—The tramp system I had a particular opposition to it until I found lately, on looking into it, it is not so expensive on the union after all. It is a very small cost in the tramp at the end of a year. Ours would only come to about 27. Another thing I look on. I believe that if these three parties that get a year each in Trins the other day, I believe even if they had got into the workhouse they would not have got a year each. We must still try to protect these parties from one another. By going into the workhouse for the night they will find a lodging, and they will go there instead of sleeping in an out-house, where they are very dangerous to other people; so I changed my mind as to them. I was thoroughly opposed to them, but we find now it is safer for the community at large and for themselves to be so, and it is a small expense.

Jan. 10, 1901.
—
Mr. A.
Gagerty.

MR. T. CARPENTER CHAIRMAN.

13482. CHAIRMAN.—Are you also from Kells Union?—Yes.

13483. Do you agree with your colleagues?—No.

13484. What is your opinion?—I have been a member of the Kells Board of Guardians for five years. I am also a member of the Visiting Committee. I am in favour of amalgamation. I believe it would effect a great saving of public money and be little or no hardship on the poor. I think it should and would be to have so many workhouses as we have at present that are not needed. I don't say all of them are not needed, but certainly some of them are not needed. When the workhouse were built we had a population of 253,000 in our Co. Meath, and at the present time we have but a population of 67,000, or about one-third of what it was then. In my own union—Kells—the workhouse was built to accommodate 711 inmates, and at one time I have heard them were 1,000 inmates in it. Last week when I was there there were but 146 inmates, and I have learned that the same state of things prevails over the rest of the county.

13485. And the country too you would say?—I dare say. I am firmly convinced that two workhouses would be quite sufficient for this county, one in the northern portion of it and the other in the southern portion of it. After the amalgamation I think that one of the divided workhouses should be set apart as an auxiliary asylum. On account of its central position, I think Navan would be the most suitable for this purpose. To this asylum should be sent all the lunatics of the county that are at present confined in the workhouse. They should be placed under the care of a special lunacy doctor, and receive special lunacy treatment suited to their condition, which would be a great improvement on the present system. Of course the Government or the Treasury would give the usual grant to this auxiliary asylum. I think, and I may say I am certain, that Kells Workhouse would be the most central for North Meath.

13486. Have you any opinion about the southern half?—My knowledge of South Meath is rather limited.

13487. You would prefer not expressing any opinion on the matter?—Quite so, but I believe Kells would have sufficient accommodation for North Meath. As I stated previously, it was built for the accommodation of 711 inmates; our water supply is excellent; we have a new ambulance, built according to the specification of the Local Government Board, which relieves to a minimum the fatigue, danger, and hardship of carrying the sick poor to hospital; we have also another ambulance in good working order. Then we have erected improvements lately, such as new beds, and other things; and also as regards railway accommodation, Kells has a good train service, so that a certain portion at least of the inmates could be brought to and fro on the railway. As regards the infirmary portion of it, we have 130 beds, and last week we had 126 inmates, and going through the workhouse, I quite agree with what my friend Mr. Gogarty says that there are

parties in the infirmary who could very well be in the body of the house. Of course I am not a medical man, but I express it as my opinion.

13488. On commonsense observation?—Yes, that they should be in the body of the house. Our nursing staff is very efficient. We have two trained nurses in the infirmary, and nine assistants. As regards our fever hospital; our fever hospital was built to accommodate thirty-six inmates.—

13489. Those assistants are partly paid workhouse?—All paid. Those nine assistants and two trained nurses are paid.

13490. Dr. Brogan.—Nine workhouse?—Some of them are of the male gender.

13491. Workhouse or workmen, are they all in the infirmary ward?—Yes; nine assistants in the infirmary and two trained nurses. Our patients number 105. The fever hospital was built to accommodate thirty-six patients, and all who were in it last week were there, and the nursing staff consists of one trained nurse and three assistants, and the average cost per head is pretty high, being 6s. 3d. Of course if we had amalgamation, and if the North portion of Ardee Union were taken in, and Oldcastle and portion of Navan, the cost per head would be considerably lessened, as I believe that there are too many paid assistants in the workhouse at the present time. I think that the workhouse left open would require very little, if any, increase of paid attendants after the amalgamation.

13492. CHAIRMAN.—If any?—If any. As regards the Trins District school, I quite agree with the two witnesses who have gone before me. We are paying parties—we are paying 326s. We have got eighteen inmates, but when we consider these parties are getting a trade, and are made respectable members of society, and do not gravitate back again to the workhouse, as such persons formerly did. As regards out-door relief, I think that the road limit is open to objection. I think it should be discretionary with the Guardians to give out-door relief to parties who have more than a roof of ground. As an instance, I will just tell you we had a case in our union—a very old creple, man and woman—who lived on an acre of cut-away bog, and we could not give them relief as they had this much land and they were in a starving condition. We understood that, and eventually this old man conveyed his title of the property over to another, on consideration that he would bury him decently. That was the only consideration, so we gave the couple the out-door relief.

13493. MR. MURTAGHAN.—You got round it?—We got round it.

13494. You did not think it a bit of harm?—Not a bit. I think it may be incurred in the breach than the clearance, the road business, but there might be other cases that we should not get round so easily.

13495. CHAIRMAN.—You would rather have an open shed?—We would if it would be discretionary with the Guardians, and not bind us to the road.

13496. You would like the area of charge the present

Feb. 16, 1904.

Mr. T.
Carpenter.

union?—Yes, I think it good enough for certain purposes. It is pretty hard to support so much of the urban population at the same cost as we have ourselves, but we must take into consideration that a great many of these paupers came out of the country into the towns, so I think it as well to have them a union charge.

13547. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you wish to express any view with regard to county boundaries? Would you like to see the county self-contained?—Yes.

13548. You would like to see Meath all to itself?—Yes. That is why I said I think we should take in Oldcastle and Ayles. I believe a county should support itself, and I believe Meath would be able to support itself, notwithstanding the objections that are made that we are extravagant. I believe we are not extravagant at all.

13549. You have a rather large staff at Kells?—Yes, it is not our fault. It was forced by the Local Government Board.

13550. You did not kick a little bit?—We did, but our kicking was of no use, and we kicked a good little bit. Unfortunately some of the officials whom we had resigned, and then we had to appoint these trained attendants in their place. We did appoint parties who were not trained, and the Local Government Board would not sanction their appointment.

13551. CHAIRMAN.—Was Dr. Smyth, the Inspector, in the workhouse?—Yes.

13552. Did not he say there were too many attendants?—No, but he wanted us to get more.

13553. Did not he say there were too many attendants but not enough of success?—He wanted us to appoint more trained nurses.

13554. Did he say there were too many attendants?—He said it would be better to have more qualified assistants and fewer unqualified ones, but we considered that the more paid attendants we had the more we really have attendants waiting on attendants.

13555. He thought you had too many?—He would us to appoint more trained nurses.

13556. You appointed all were wanted?—He would us to appoint another.

13557. For night?—Yes.

13558. What nurses have you now?—We have two nurses. They do alternately day and night.

13559. You have only one nurse then looking after 100 patients?—Yes.

13560. If you think that is enough I won't ask you any more?—Considering we have nine assistants in addition.

13561. Nine assistants tending over such a case, knowing nothing about nursing duties?—I think if we had a couple more nurses we would want as many assistants to attend on them.

You have given us very interesting evidence.

Mr. Murphy.—That is all from Kells; but I wish to convey the opinion of the Guardians with regard to your last question, that is the last witness considered one nurse in the day time sufficient for 125 patients. The opinion is that there is not more than from ten to twenty in bed that require nursing. The rest are walking about.

13562. CHAIRMAN (to Mr. Murphy).—There are few acute cases, but they are mostly chronic invalids. Yes.

That does put a different face on it, certainly.

Mr. THOMAS MALONE examined.

Mr. Thomas
Malone.

13563. CHAIRMAN.—You come from the Drogheda Union district?—Yes.

13564. A large part of the union is in the Co. Meath?—Yes.

13565. What is the position your Board of Guardians occupy mid-way between the two counties?—They came to a resolution, which I am sorry I have not, that they would not go in for this amalgamation, on the grounds that they could not see that it would be economical, but of course they have accommodation actual. It was built for 600, and 300 is the present number.

13566. Would you be against the view that each county should have within itself all the means connected with the county?—Oh, I don't think that should be. I think the system at present, where two or more counties come close together, is good enough.

13567. You think that is more convenient for the people who are attending the market towns, as Guardians, and for the sick coming in?—Quite so. There has been a great deal of discussion about the boarding-out of children. We heard out whatever children come there, and it is very much approved of. Of course I always thought there was a drawback in this boarding-out system.

13568. What do you fancy is the drawback?—Simply the idea they may be competent to take trades. They won't have the opportunity, and they are then confined to becoming farm labourers.

13569. Is not that a class that is very badly wanted in the country?—No doubt.

13570. Don't you think it is a great service if the Guardians can provide some of that class?—I admit

that, but at the same time I think that an opportunity should be given, if possible, to children in that position of life to better themselves from the ordinary labour, only they never can under that system.

13571. You would rather approve of giving them opportunities for raising themselves that are not given to children of the poorest independent class?—There is something in that, but those are depending on what the Guardians can do, and what the public can do for them. The others are not.

13572. Do you think that would be part of your duty as a public man to give them a better start in life than children of small farmers?—Putting it in that way, I don't think it would be part of my duty; but if these children come under the care of the Guardians, I think they ought to do the best they can for them.

13573. You would not make doctors of them or barristers?—I would, most undoubtedly, if they had the stuff in them, and if you could give them the education.

13574. There are no half measures with you?—That is putting it in the extreme, but I would not deny them.

13575. But there is a difference between debarring them and what you might call over-educating them?—I am afraid we have gone too far. Some of the children are sent to a day school being boarded-out. Certain children we are sending to Trin School, and I who are eligible for it. We have both systems, and I am not sure would it be competent to board out children to a certain age, and take them to Trin School. Of course I could give you the numbers and the cost.

13576. We have those in our statistics, thank you. Have you any other witnesses from your union?—No, there is no other.

Mr. WILLIAM CURRY, J.P., examined.

Mr. William
Curry.

13577. CHAIRMAN.—What is the Navan view, Mr. Curry?—I would ask permission to make a brief statement. The workhouses of this country were built to accommodate a much greater number of inmates than that which they now contain. The absence of railways and other modern facilities for travelling, together with the extreme distribution of the poor at that period, may perhaps have rendered it necessary to build these large houses. Navan Workhouse was built to accommodate 1,134 persons, and the fever hospital to accommodate 250 patients, thus providing accommodation in Navan Union for 1,384 persons. From inquiries I have made, I find that, excluding the Drogheda Workhouse, which is in Meath but closed in 1894, there were in the five workhouses closed in Meath on the night of Saturday, 29th of December,

629 persons. Navan Workhouse can, therefore, accommodate 505 persons, together with the inmates of all the other workhouses in Meath on that night according to the original standard of accommodation. Having regard to the decreased population and the improved travelling facilities, there are more workhouses in Meath than are necessary to meet its present requirements. The average percentage rate for poor relief expenses—about 15.60—would be reduced owing to savings in officers' salaries, &c., by amalgamating some of the surrounding unions and closing workhouses. Dissolved workhouses could be utilised, one for harmless lunatics, epilepsy, &c., of whom there were 105 in the workhouses of the county according to the last yearly report of the Local Government Board. Another could be utilised as an auxiliary

Feb 10, 1904.
Mr. William
Curry.

lunatic asylum. The average number of inmates from Meath in Mullingar Asylum for the past three years was 261. The average demand of that institution on our county for a similar period was £12,559 18s. 10d., or average of over £41 per head. The withdrawal of, say, 100 inmates from Mullingar and accommodating them in Meath would relieve a great deal of the congestion that exists in the former place, and whilst getting any further additions to it, it would be of great benefit to the latter to have some of the funds expended in the county in which they are collected. Quite recently—this is in regard to Number 3—our Board had a communication from the Local Government Board, which stated that a Select Committee of the House of Commons had written them to take a typical urban and rural union in each of the four provinces of Ireland, and make exhaustive inquiries to be made as to the number of persons in the workhouses of such union over sixty-five years of age who were mentally and physically fit to live outside an institution, and who had friends or relatives with whom they could reside in the event of their getting a pension of from 5s. to 7s. per week. Navan Union was selected by the Local Government Board as the typical union for the province of Limerick. Our Board appointed a committee to make the necessary inquiries, and got the information required, with this result: they found forty-two persons over sixty-five years of age who were mentally and physically fit to live outside. The clerk was then directed to write to the friends or relatives of those persons. Out of all written to five replied that were willing to take them out. Four replied they were willing to take them out, but had not sufficient accommodation, four refused to take them out, and the remainder did not reply. From this it seems to me that the boarding-out system is rather desirable now feasible. Similar experiments have been made in England, with, I believe the same result. The children of the union, excepting twelve, who were boarded-out, are provided for in Trillick Industrial School. The inmates of dissolved workhouses should be transferred to the retained workhouse, which would be sufficiently large for the improved classification of inmates by the removal of imbeciles, &c., as before indicated, to one of the closed workhouses. Poor

relief expense should be raised off the county-at-large. Such a change would be the most equitable mode of raising funds, because the poor, when they did not starve or emigrate, flocked into the workhouse in search of employment. The abolition of electoral division rating, and the adoption of union rating under the Local Government Act, in other words, the trend of modern legislation, is in the direction of equalising rates. With regard to hospital accommodation, there is none required, because in addition to our workhouse hospital, which contains fifty-six beds, in charge of a very able doctor and staff of fully-trained nurses, and equipped on the most up-to-date lines, with a perfect water supply, and hot and cold bathing, &c., we have a fever hospital capable of containing over forty beds, on both of which we have recently expended over £1,200. We have also a county infirmary capable of containing fifty beds, in charge of an able surgeon, and visiting surgeon, and matron, and a full staff of trained nurses. The hospitals of dissolved workhouses should be retained for treatment of ordinary cases of sickness, serious cases to be sent for treatment to the county infirmary. With the hospitals associated from the workhouse surroundings and converted into district hospitals, several changes could be made, such as allowing patients to wear their own clothes, with the doctor's approval, and a few others; classification to be improved by the removal of the imbeciles and epileptics from the retained workhouse, and the re-arrangement of the remaining class according to age, good character, &c. As to pay wards, in all hospitals it would be desirable admission should be granted, and all sick should be charged in proportion to their means. Tramps, in my opinion, should furnish the relieving officer with a ticket from the police of the district before being granted an admission ticket to the retained workhouse, thus giving the police authorities necessarily a close scrutiny and supervision of this undesirable class. They should be made perform suitable labour, and they should be detained until the second morning after admission. The existing laws, in my opinion, contain ample means of dealing with any of this tramp class who refuse or neglect to perform their allotted tasks within the required time.

Mr. FRANCIS BERRIDAN examined.

Mr. Francis
Berridan.

12523. CHAIRMAN.—Would you kindly let us have your views on the matters that we are inquiring into?—In answer to the first query, I am of opinion that amalgamation is absolutely necessary, both as the interests of the ratepayers and in the interests of the poor; and what I would suggest is that these workhouses should be retained in the county and those dissolved. I need not mention the workhouses that I mean. This should be left to the Commissioners, but the workhouses to be retained shall be selected on the ground of facility, accommodation of the population, and being so situated as to be easy of access. I presume that these retained workhouses would give accommodation to the infirm and able-bodied of the dissolved unions. Of course provision in anticipation will be made for the children, which is already made in the Trillick School, and provision will be made for the lunatics, and therefore the only class of patients to be accommodated in the retained workhouses would be these two classes that I have mentioned—the infirm poor and able-bodied. From the evidence that has been given by Mr. Curry, and by other gentlemen, it is quite clear that even one workhouse would be more than sufficient to accommodate all the able-bodied and infirm poor in the county. I now come to the dissolved unions, whatever they may be. I suggest that the hospital be retained, and that the expense of the master, and matron, and the nurses would be a relief on the rates. Take Drogheda, for instance, as an example. I suggest that the Meath portion of the inmates in the Drogheda Union could be sent to some of the retained workhouses, that is the infirm poor, but that the hospital should be retained for the accommodation of the sick poor in the Meath portion of the Drogheda Union. Just take it as a sample. It may refer to the other unions just the very same as Drogheda. With regard to the lunatics, I think I have made that perfectly clear. I may further observe that, on the grounds of economy for the ratepayers, that while would effect a considerable saving to the ratepayers without doing any injustice to the poor, for these reasons, that these hospitals be retained in the dissolved unions should only consist of a head nurse, who would act as matron and head nurse in

put and attend the patients, and a night attendant. The clerk could be dismissed, and the master and matron, and these are all very highly-paid officials, and the services of these could be dispensed with, and the benefit to the ratepayers would, in my opinion, be very considerable. I also fall into line with the opinion of Colonel Eveyard, that district nurses should be appointed, at least in all these dissolved unions. Now, having a lot of experience in rural districts, where the head of a family gets sick—he may have a cold—a doctor is sent for—he visits him and orders him into the workhouse, probably for the reason that he may not have to give a second call or a third call, if necessary, and he orders him in on the spot; whereas if this poor patient were visited by a district nurse, probably a little medicine, and a little cleanliness, and all the little surroundings made all right, probably this poor man would be made all right in a few days.

12529 The doctor would not have to give a second visit at all?—But in any case the doctor would certify that the illness was of such a nature as would necessitate his coming into hospital. These dissolved unions should be made available for such exceptional cases as these. In answer to the second query—this is for the auxiliary asylums—I am of opinion that a union centrally situated, in a district comprised in a district lunatic asylum district, such as Mullingar, which comprises the counties Meath, Longford, and Westmeath, I am of opinion that workhouses in a central position, so as to afford the necessary accommodation for the inmates, that this would be made available, or what would be much better, on second consideration it occurred to me that this auxiliary asylum for the harmless lunatics should be in Mullingar, by building an annex to the present lunatic asylum. I give two reasons for this. In the first place, there are three resident medical officers in Mullingar Asylum and a consulting medical officer. There are four doctors, and these could be made available for looking after the harmless lunatics; and there is another reason, that these harmless lunatics are very useful on land, and could be made to work, and very actively self-supporting, and could be classified so as to have no communi-

Feb. 10, 1904.

Mr. Francis
Sheridan.

action at all with the dangerous lunatics. I think the classification of lunatics is a very serious matter, and by having the removal of these harmless lunatics away from the dangerous lunatics, I think it would go very far to effect a cure in a great many instances. These are the reasons why I would go for having the asylum for the three counties at Mullingar. Another reason, that the Local Government Board insist, where we have an auxiliary asylum for the treatment of harmless lunatics, that we must have two medical officers to attend them, and probably a whole staff of nurses, and if we were to utilise a disused workhouse in either one or three of the counties, that the large amount of structural alterations to be made for their accommodation would be more, and would be far more than would be required to build an annex to the asylum in Mullingar. Therefore, on these grounds, I am of opinion that the asylum for harmless lunatics should be in Mullingar. The other question is with regard to the boarding-out of workhouse inmates. I am in thorough accord with the suggestion made by Mr. Curry, that, from the inquiries he has made and got from parties who would be very likely to take them over, the boarding-out of workhouse inmates would fall through. I think it would not be a success; and besides, these poor workhouse inmates over sixty-five, they have their diags to go to, and plenty to do; they have fire, and so on, and if they went out, say four or five miles away, they might be neglected and die alone. As a rule, some friends or relatives are very ungrateful, and I do think these people would be better off in a workhouse than they would be outside. With regard to boarding-out, I would like to make a few observations. I am entirely opposed to boarding-out under certain circumstances. Of course it is a very contentious matter, the boarding-out system, and a great many of my friends differ from me considerably in opinion as to whether the boarding-out system or the Trim School is the better one. In some instances the boarding-out system, as, for instance, in Navan, where we have some of the children cared for, with this system with us they are all right. Some of them are with their grandfathers or grandmothers, orphan children, well protected; but I object altogether to the boarding-out system of sending these poor little waifs and strays to strangers. They may be neglected. They may not be sent to school, and even if well cared, where are their chances? They can be nothing more than farm servants. In fact they will never arrive at anything.

13530. Is there anything else you wish especially to mention?—With regard to boarding-out, I was reading

a pamphlet the other day by a lady in England. She says:—"It is cruelty to take it for granted that because children are boarded out they soon become members of the family, and leave helpless orphans to the mercy of persons who may ill-treat or neglect them." I only want to allude to this matter to give my expression of opinion with regard to Trim School. I don't think it is an expensive one, but this enormous expense, which was stated at so much per head, was due to the large amount of money that the Board of the Trim School had to borrow to make the necessary structural alterations and accommodation for the children. That was one of the reasons, and then the basis of admission per head is based upon the valuation of the money, and this may become very unduly in some instances, but I think, on the whole, the Trim School gives a chance to a young lad or a young girl to become somebody in the finish up of the day; by a course of discipline and training they will eventually be something. I want to show the public none of the children sent to Trim School ever come back, with one exception. That one exception was a boy from the Navan Union, who was hired out to a farmer, and his hand got lame—he had a bad hand—and he was quite unfit to work, and with the exception of that young lad there was not a single boy or girl ever returned back from the Trim School again, or ever became a burden on the rates.

13531. What, briefly, is your opinion about the tramp?—I would give them plenty of work.

13532. In the workhouse?—No, I would have a farm of land attached at a place near the workhouse. There are too many facilities given, and in fact the Boards of Guardians are actually making new tramps out of the old ones by the accommodation that is afforded them.

13533. Would you give the law power to enable people to arrest tramps, and detain them as compulsory farm servants?—That might necessitate a change in the law.

13534. It would, of course?—No; I would rather take my own view of the matter.

13535. I don't see how you would get them to work on the farm if you did not give them power to keep them there?—If a tramp was admitted to the Navan Workhouse—there are two classes of tramp, the legitimate tramp and the professional tramp. The professional tramp, there might be some means of dealing with him. The only plan, in my opinion, is give him work at the ordinary rate of wages. If he refuses to work let him starve or go about his business.

Mr. JAMES MAGUIRE examined.

Mr. James
Maguire.

13536. CHAIRMAN.—You wish to deal with the Trim School?—I am a member of the Committee at present. No doubt it is a very expensive institution. At the present time we board out some of our children, but my opinion is this, if the members stick together and create the reforms we are about doing in it, it will be a very good school. We are aiming at it at present. There is no use in suggesting the boarding-out system now that all the expense is gone to. With a little reform it will be a good institution. With regard to the tramp question, it is one I take a deep interest in, and as the outset I would say there are three classes of tramps to be dealt with, that the most expensive one is the militia tramp, because the moment he comes out of the militia, he has what he calls a reserve pay every two months. He spends whatever money he has the moment he comes out, and then returns in the workhouse until two or three days before his time is up; he writes an application to where he will be found for his money, then he goes out, spends it, and comes back again. That is one class of tramp we have no law to deal with. Some of them have cost the ratepayers up to £800 between themselves and their families. The other class of tramp is the vagrant, who never provides a home or a home for his family. I hold he should be arrested and imprisoned, and have his children taken from him.

13537. Or put to a labour colony?—Yes. The other class is the itinerant musician, who spends his day singing, gets money for it, and goes to the workhouse at night. The most serious evil is the company tramp; he may be a townsman if you will. He gets a doctor's ticket and is put into hospital, and his wife and children are put on the rates, perhaps to the tune of 8s. a week. That goes on for six or seven weeks until he is discharged. Application is then made by the relieving officer for another week until he is perfectly well outside. Then he works for another day or four weeks, when the same thing goes on again. This is the man who puts the expense on the rates, because he is costing you up to 12s. or 15s. Then the establishment charges of a place are very expensive, and my own opinion is, if the master, clerk, and doctor of any union are in collusion, they can run it any way they like. They can walk on any Board of Guardians.

13538. Mr. MURDOGH.—Do they combine?—That is a question I won't answer; but it is very hard for any Board of Guardians to know it except they attend regularly. If you once lose a week or two from a Board of Guardians you are at sea for about three months until you get on it again.

The Sitting terminated.

TWENTY-EIGHTH PUBLIC SITTING.—THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11th, 1904. *Pgs. 11, 1904.*

At the Courthouse, Trim.

Present:—Mr. MICKS (Chairman), and Dr. COST BIGGER.

Mr. FRANCIS GARDNER examined.

13533. CHAIRMAN.—You are Chairman of the Trim Board of Guardians?—Yes, sir.

13541. What is their view on the question of amalgamation of unions in your county?—Well, as far as amalgamation, I don't see very much what is in it, as far as my opinion is concerned.

13541. The board passed some resolutions—you recommended that one workhouse should be closed?—Yes.

13542. You don't say what workhouse that should be?—Well, we did not mention that.

13543. You had no personal opinion yourself, I suppose on that?—Well, I thought Dunsheughlin might be the one to be closed.

13544. And then what would you do with the Dunsheughlin buildings?—Either to use it for lunatics or for a consumptive hospital.

13545. And you would recommend that the full Government grant of 4s. a week should be given for all the patients sent there instead of 2s. given in the ordinary auxiliaries?—Yes.

13546. Then, as regards the five unions, Dunsheughlin you would make into a district lunatic asylum, you would use two as infirm workhouses for all the infirm and able-bodied inmates of the five unions?—Yes.

13547. One in the north and one in the south, and those should take in tramps, and nowhere else should tramps be taken in?—Yes; that was what was suggested.

13548. And you would use one of the other workhouses as a consumptive hospital?—Yes.

13549. What would you do as regards the sick?—Well, I think with the exception of Dunsheughlin, the sick should be still kept in each of the other workhouses.

13550. You would keep on an infirmary or hospital in each of the others, both for fever and the ordinary cases of sickness?—Yes.

13551. But would it be Trim, in the south, for the infirm people?—Yes, and Kells, in the north.

13552. In order to provide for the sick and the maternity cases, wards and a staff should be maintained in all the five hospitals. You don't think that any of the adult workhouse inmates should be housed out?—I don't consider that would be a feasible plan at all.

13553. You think that would be too likely to lead to extravagance?—I am sure it would be a most extravagant way of treating them.

13554. Are you in favour of giving out-door relief?—Yes, as far as cases that require to get it. We see very often in Trim in giving anything unless in what we know are cases that should get it.

13555. About how much a year do you spend in out-door relief?

Mr. F. J. Sheridan.—In the last year, £1,955; about £2,000.

13556. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think the sum of charge for out-door relief should remain as it is, as a uniform charge?—Yes.

13557. Do you represent a rural or town district?—Rural.

13558. You don't object to pay your share of the town out-door relief?—Certainly not.

13559. And, then, as regards the infirm and old people who are sent to those unions, you would charge such union with the amount per day that they cost?—Yes.

13560. And tramps you would make a county charge. Does it occur to you that any more stringent legislation ought to be passed as regards tramps?—I think the Vagrant Act should be put in force, and I think it would be quite enough to deal with these fellows.

13561. To give you the powers which the Vagrant Act gives to the English Boards of Guardians?—Yes.

13562. Now, you are in favour of disconnecting the hospitals from the workhouses as far as possible, and making them more district hospitals?—Yes.

13563. And you think in that way the hospitals would become more popular and more likely to be used by the sick poor?—Yes; and better in every way for the sick poor.

13564. And you would like to have pay wards for patients who could afford to pay?—Certainly.

13565. Do you think the amount that people should pay might be determined by the discretion of the Board of Guardians?—Yes.

13566. And that they should be compelled by law to pay such an amount as was assessed on them by the Board of Guardians?—Yes, I would say they should be compelled.

13567. Now is there any general evidence beyond what you have said that you would like to give?—I think you have touched on all the subjects.

13568. It just occurred to me that there might be something else that you would like to mention?—Unless what I heard about the evidence given in Kavanagh yesterday about dispensing with the industrial school, and really I think that would be about the very worst thing that could be done, for it is a most useful thing; and although there are a good many people in the union—the Navan people especially—that wish to do away with that, I think it is a most necessary institution.

13569. You have been connected with it a long time?—Yes, since the commencement.

13570. If you would just give me a little sketch of the commencement, and its history since, it would be very interesting?—There were some gentlemen in the neighbourhood of Trim. Mr. Goodman was the prime mover—and he, seeing this disused prison, that was useless there. I was one of the deputation that went to the Castle to wait on the Prison Board to get it as an institution for this purpose, and they complied with our request. We renovated it, and did everything.

13571. How much did it cost you to put it right?—We must have spent £5,000 or £6,000 in the first instance.

Mr. L. Sheridan.—Something over £3,000 the first contract.

Witness.—Then we borrowed £1,000 afterwards.

Mr. L. Sheridan.—That was for additional buildings.

13572. CHAIRMAN.—Was the £4,000 to put it as it is?—About that, or £5,000.

13573. What arrangement was made as regards children going there?—The five unions became contributory—Droghda, Navan, Kells, Dunsheughlin, and Trim.

13574. Not Oldcastle?—Oldcastle would not join with us.

13575. Nor Edenderry?—Nor Edenderry. So the children were collected in from all these unions; they got a proper training—a better training than they could get in the workhouse—and all of these that are capable of taking trades get them; and some of them have been most creditable in the institution. I know myself, from the reports at the present time, that we have some of the best tailors and tradesmen that could be got.

13576. What trades do you teach the boys?—Shoemaking, carpentry, bakery, tailoring, and making wire mattresses.

13577. And you have competent teachers?—Oh, certainly; first-rate men to teach these trades.

Mr. Francis Gardner.

PA. 11, 1904.

Mr. Francis
Gasson.

13578. I suppose Mr. Sheehan will be able to tell us how many boys and girls have passed through the school?—Yes.

13579. About the girls?—They are trained laundresses and stitchers, and all that sort of thing; and I know there are a great many of them in my own neighbourhood as servants, and there are no better servants.

13580. They teach them domestic service?—Yes.

13581. Including laundry work?—Yes, and cooking.

13582. Do they teach them how to cook a little?—Certainly.

13583. They come out plain cocked?—Plain cocks, and the best of general servants for farmers—no better.

13584. And I suppose you are not able to give them any experience for dairy work?—No, they have not that; they have no cows to carry on that.

13585. And they make their own clothes?—Oh, yes; they are taught sewing and knitting.

13586. Have you been on the committee from the start?—Yes, sir.

13587. Are you quite satisfied with the management of the institution?—Yes, I would be very sorry to see it interfered with now, at all events, after all we went through. I think it is a good institution, and has done great good to these poor people.

13588. My colleagues and I went through the institution very carefully, and we thought the girls looked very well and strong, but we were sorry we could not say that for the boys?—I am surprised to hear that—the boys are very well kept.

13589. They were shockingly dirty and untidy, and neglected looking—shoes bad, clothes ill-fitting, not at all creditably turned out. There may have been some

special reason for it on the occasion of our visit, though?—Did they know you were visiting?

13590. No, certainly not; they were not on dress parade. Is there anything else you would like to say about the school?—Nothing; only I would not like to see it done away with after all we have gone through with regard to getting it up, and from what we know that it is going on well. There may be a few tramps that may want to break it up, and say the children would be better on outdoor relief, but I say not.

13591. Your opinion is strongly that way, after all the expense and trouble you have gone to?—Yes.

13592. Dr. Beaumont—Do you know the cost per head of the children in this school?—Well, I saw a report that they were costing up to £28. At a meeting where I was some members of the board told me they cost up to £28 a head. On that day I was in the chair myself, and I found £8 10½d. was the amount that came before us for their weekly keep, and then I looked afterwards to see how could £28 a head be made up, and I could not make it up. They exaggerate a good deal—the members of this school.

13593. CHAIRMAN—Way do you think there is any feeling against it?—I could not tell you.

13594. Part the natural contrariety of human nature—what one man supports another man attacks?—We never had any ill-feeling towards this school until the last two years—since we got new men coming in.

13595. Mr. Beaumont—Is there a feeling against the school in the district for the last two years?—Not in the district. It is only one district, and I would say that district is Navan, for I think every other district is most favourable to it.

Mrs. M. J. CULLENAN examined.

13596. CHAIRMAN—Are you one of the Guardians?—Yes, I have been for some time.

13597. Are you connected at all with the Trim Industrial School?—Yes, I have been on the School Board also for five years.

13598. You have had the advantage of hearing the evidence at Navan yesterday?—Yes, I had; I went over to hear it purposely, because I knew they would say things about the Industrial School.

13599. What was your view of the evidence?—I think it was Mr. Owens spoke about the school?—I don't mind him, he has an aversion to the school, simply because we would not do what he wanted—he wanted to spend a lot of money in starting a large library for the boys.

13600. He was not willing to go as far as Mr. Carragee?—No, that was it. We supplied them with books, but because we did not do what he wanted he has rather taken a dislike to the school. But, as far as the schools are concerned—and I have heard, Mr. Dunne, my father talking about all his life—I think there are only four boys one of the whole number that left the school that ever went back to the workhouse. One came back three weeks ago, and is at present in the workhouse; he was taken out by his grandmother, and joined the militia, and came back from the militia. I know another boy who was not very strong, and he went back to the workhouse—and two more very wild boys—those were the only four that came back.

13601. They came back to Trim?—One went back to Navan, another to Donaghuaigh, one to another union, and one to Trim; but these were the only four boys. Last year, when the row arose about the school, Mr. Kelly, the master, wrote to so many places as he had sent boys to, and tried to find out how they had done. He has that height of letters, saying what wonderfully good workmen and tradesmen they have been wherever they went. My idea about boarding out children, especially in this county, is that they really get no home education, because in other counties there are small holdings, where the children are taught to work with their parents. Here they have not that advantage. They may have a school to go to, and get an education of that kind; but I think for this county, at least for this district, the Industrial School is a much better place for them. They are taught a trade, they are taught a little discipline, and taught to be regular and up to time in everything; and, after all, I think that is rather a useful thing later on in life; and, you see, they leave it at sixteen. I heard a person say yesterday that the expenses were

very high, and they could not give a reason for it. One of the reasons, I suppose, is that as soon as the boys really become of use as in their trade they go out. We have more applications than we can supply for boys, and as soon really as a boy knows his trade he goes away, and it is little boys that are always working in the school.

13602. Dr. Rogers—Do you think any boy could know his trade at fifteen or sixteen?—I know three carpenters that left the joint school, and if you go up and look at our new church, the wood-work of it was done by a boy straight out of the Industrial School.

13603. CHAIRMAN—You mean the carving of the pews?—Not the pews, but the carving of the rails in front of the organ loft. He had not a man over him. He was left there by the contractor. I think that is very fair evidence. He did not do the pews, but all the wood-work round the church was done by that boy.

13604. Dr. Rogers—Were there no other boys that could have helped him in the work?—There may have been, but the contractor put such confidence in this boy that he left it all to him to have it finished.

13605. CHAIRMAN—Was he in the school at the time?—No, he had left it—he had just left it.

13606. Do you happen to know what wages he was getting?—I think it was 18s. a week.

13607. Dr. Rogers—That is not a tradesman's wage?—No, they don't get very high wages when they leave the school; that is one of the things I am always fighting against. They often go out at 10s wages, but we think it is better to send them to a respectable place to begin with, and let them get low wages, than to send them, perhaps, to a place where they would get better wages but not be as well looked after. It is in the same idea with the girls. I think the girls are not taught quite as much as they might be in ways; they go out, too, when they are very small, and know very little.

13608. CHAIRMAN—At eighteen the girls go out?—They cannot be taught much cooking, because the kind of cooking that is done in a large school like that is not the kind you have in a private house, and the laundry work is just the same. Those girls have to do all the washing for the school. There is not very much fine washing; they are taught the rough work.

13609. More of what you would do in a farmhouse?—Yes; but we have not had any complaints of girls sent out.

Mrs. M. J.
Cullenan.

13610. Can these girls make shirts?—They have got to make it for the school; I suppose they can; the food seems very well cooked; I have often seen it.

13611. Can they make tea?—I think they would do that very readily, but I think it is not fair for people who don't go into the school and see things to say things like they said in Navan yesterday.

13612. Do you visit the school often?—I do often, and go at times when not expected.

13613. How do you account for the boys' condition?—Some time ago they were not as clean as they are now.

13614. I should hope they were not as dirty?—I don't know what happened; one time it was very hard to keep them; they are supposed to be very well minded; I don't go in to look at their clothes.

13615. If you go in at this time of the day, for instance?—It is not so easy to keep boys' clothes right.

13616. It is not, but still when there is a good good and a tailor on the premises and a shoemaker you would expect these boys would be always dry shod and decently clothed, and their skin would not be chafing in unwashed places?—I know they do look very shabby, but yet they are well fed and well minded; I suppose they get up with the clothes.

13617. Dr. BROWN.—Do they go outside for walks together?—They do not go as often to walk as they ought to go; they are supposed to go once a week, but I don't think they do.

13618. Have they a special suit of clothes for that?—They go out in their Sunday clothes.

13619. So the Trim people see them at their best?—Yes; and the girls the same.

13620. CHAIRMAN.—The girls were clean, and rosy, and comfortable-looking?—They have the same to mind the girls; they are easier minded than the boys; it is not easy keeping clothes on boys.

13621. It might not be so difficult in a place where there is such a high bill for clothing and a tradesman on the premises; your clothing costs quite as much as in the Ulm Joint School; quite a great deal more, in fact?—I don't know how it is.

13622. Now, is there anything else on the school matter before we leave it?—I don't think there is anything else.

13623. Dr. BROWN.—You mentioned that there were only four boys you knew of that had not done well; there may be others; you could not tell?—About this time last year the master wrote to all parts where he had sent boys, and he had replies from nearly everywhere.

13624. But you have no register keeping in touch with the boys?—No; and I think that is a pity.

13625. How many boys have left the school since it was established?—I was trying to think this morning, but I could not remember.

13626. How many years is it established?—Thirteen.

13627. Of course for the first number of years there would not be many boys to leave the school?—No; the school has greatly improved in the last couple of years since all the boys that came in first have left; the first boys that came in were much older and difficult to manage.

13628. CHAIRMAN.—Not so manageable?—No; so long as any of the boys that came in first remained, the boys were much harder to manage than they are now.

13629. Dr. BROWN.—Now you get the boys coming from the school directly?—Yes; the same take the small boys and start their education, and they are really much more manageable than when the older boys were in it.

13630. But the number of boys that have left the school cannot be so very large nor can you have much experience of them how they do in after life, seeing you have only started thirteen years?—Yes; but those that have left have done very well.

13631. At the first blush of freedom they may work very well, but afterwards, when things come against them, they may not do so well, and they might want the institution life again?—We have got a good record so far.

13632. CHAIRMAN.—Can you tell us anything about the girls, how they get on in after life?—They have all gone as servants.

13633. What class of service did they go to?—They go to small farmers.

13634. And shopkeepers in towns, perhaps?—Yes; very few go to anything else; people do not like taking a workhouse child, as they call them.

13635. Is your industrial school looked upon as a workhouse?—It is; and you cannot get people to think otherwise.

13636. Do you find it difficult to get the girls off?—Yes, to what I would call really good places; they will get £5 or £6 a year, or £4 a year.

13637. You would not send them to a public-house, for instance?—We have sent one or two, I think; but we don't send them now.

13638. Dr. BROWN.—Is the reason of people taking them simply because they can get them at such very low wages?—That is the reason, and they think they have no place to retreat to; they will do the work sooner than go back to the school.

13639. CHAIRMAN.—They never go back to the school when once they get out?—No.

13640. Dr. BROWN.—Have you followed them up?—Yes; we have followed up a great number of those girls; there are quite a lot of them in good situations in Dublin getting £18 or £20 a year.

13641. CHAIRMAN.—How many of these girls, to your knowledge, have gone back to the workhouse?—I know three.

13642. Was that to the Trim Workhouse?—One came back to Trim, but the poor girl was not exactly fit for the world.

13643. And two others you know of at other workhouses?—Yes; I heard of two or three in Dublin. The girls, once they get away do not wish us to find them, and it is much harder to discover the girls than the boys; when we tried to find out last year where all the girls had gone to we could not; all those who had done well replied, but then some girls did not reply at all.

13644. But the girls look to the ordinary eye more hopeful subjects than the boys there; what is your opinion of them; do you think they have done as well, or better, or worse, than the boys?—I think the boys have done a great deal better—much better.

13645. In what way?—The boys have made a name for themselves; you have no idea of all the letters that come begging for boys, and men will keep situations open to get the boys.

13646. Dr. BROWN.—To what do you attribute that?—They say they are very orderly and practical, and have many good qualities that they cannot find in boys they take from their homes.

13647. Have the wages anything to do with it do you think?—The boys, generally, get much better wages than the girls. I know some of the good tailors in Dublin like to get boys, and their best men are boys from the industrial school, and they give them as good wages as the other men.

13648. CHAIRMAN.—They would not go straight to Dublin from the school?—No. The three I know of in Dublin did not go straight from the school, they passed through a local hand first, and then went on to Dublin. There are numbers down in the West and all over Ireland; everywhere they go the priests and the people in the neighbourhood have nothing but good to say of them.

13649. You only know a very small percentage that have turned out badly, but you are not as sure in your mind about the girls?—No; I don't think the girls are such a success, and I don't know what is the reason. They cannot be taught their trades for after life as well as the boys because they have to do all the rough work; they do all the washing, which is a large item in that school; they have the cooking, and when that is done and their school hours over, there is not much time left for teaching dressmaking and other things.

13650. I think not dressmaking?—They have a dressmaker.

13651. I was asking the sister in charge, and she said not dressmaking, but they sew; they are not outers out; they don't make dresses for other people?—If a girl is going out she is supposed to make her own outfit.

13652. They don't cut out themselves?—The dressmaker is supposed to teach them.

13653. I suppose they could make a dress for themselves?—Some of them know how to cut out and make dresses, for I have seen them.

13654. I suppose there is not the same demand for dressmakers as there used to be before, so many ready-made clothes shops were established?—No; if we could give a girl a good training for one special branch—as a cook or laundress—before they left school it would be much better.

13655. Is the milk for the children brought from outside from farmers?—Yes; a contractor supplies it.

Feb. 11, 1894. 13656. Did you ever think of keeping cows?—No; but I wanted to start fowl last year, but the Board all said—"Yes; put more expense on; it will do no good." There is a place they could keep fowl in very well.

13657. I suppose you could get land adjoining near enough to keep cows?—Yes.

13658. And have the cows driven in; that was never considered?—No; those things were always said to be putting on expense.

13659. In a great many workhouses the Guardians keep their own cows, and find it an economy—and it would train the girls; they are taught nothing like that now.

13660. They would not be useful girls for a country home; they would know nothing about fowl or cow management or feeding pigs?—No. They go out well educated.

13661. Literary?—Yes; and they are taught to be very clean and tidy, and, generally, obedient girls all round; but as for their knowledge it is more of a general kind.

13662. It is not practical for farmhouses?—No; not for everyday life afterwards. That cannot be helped, I suppose, in a big institution.

13663. Would your feeling be in favour of boarding out girls?—If suitable homes could be had for them, but in this county I don't know such a thing. We could not get homes that I think would be suitable in which to rear girls; they are better off in the school than in most of the homes about here.

13664. Having regard to your evidence about the girls and their after life, and the difficulty of placing them, I thought perhaps you might consider boarding out for the girls would be the best?—It would be if proper homes could be got for them.

13665. Whereabouts were you thinking that homes could not be got; inside the Trim Union?—All this part of the county. You would require a comfortable home before a girl could be sent out. The people who would take them would simply live on the money paid to rear these girls, and they would make them absolute slaves.

13666. Would that be of the farming class?—There are not many small farmers about here.

13667. About Oldcastle there are a great many small farmers?—Yes.

13668. That would not be too far to board out children from Trim?—I don't think the Guardians of any union would like to send children away out of the union district.

13669. Oh, then do; the South Dublin Union send their children off to the County Wicklow?—We have some children boarded out, but, personally, I don't think there are sufficient homes in this county to rear girls properly.

13670. What would your ideal of a home for these girls or children be?—Where they would be well treated and kept clean.

13671. Would you say a farmer's house?—A farmer's house, where they would have fowl and milk, and a little house-work to do; where they would be well treated and get good food and ordinary home teaching.

13672. Ordinary food; you would not look for food better or a situation better than the labourers' children have themselves?—I think they would be made slaves of in that class; they would do all the hard work. I don't think there are places in this county that would suit them; they would be brought up dirty and untidy, and be taught nothing.

13673. I was trying to get at the kind of place you would wish to put them in?—Where they would have home comfort, bread and milk and stout, and ordinary country children's food; be kept clean.

13674. Attend school and have a decent place to sleep in, and all that?—Yes; all that. That, I know, they would not get in this part of the county. They would be kept dirty.

13675. There is a very large grazing district down about Limerick, and there the Guardians have a very large number—some hundreds—of children boarded out. Of course they don't look for an extra comfortable place; their idea is to rear these children without any undue hardship, but to let them take what is going?—Limerick is a very different county to this.

13676. I was thinking of it as somewhat similar to some extent—a good deal of grazing?—Oh, no; the Limerick people are very different to the South people; they are very much more thrifty; and the people in Limerick work a good deal harder than the South people.

13677. There is not much hard work about Kilmuck and Harrow?—They are great people for working calves—even the smallest and poorest. They don't do that with us; they won't rear fowl. Even in Galway I know of children boarded out, and they will do very well; I go and see them there, and they are well reared, and you can take those children afterwards and make servants of them.

13678. Where the circumstances of the country are suitable you think boarding out is good?—I do; especially for girls.

13679. But here in this great grass country you say there are not the people who would be suitable for boarding out with?—No.

13680. And you would not like to send them to a distance, such as Oldcastle, or Galway, or Limerick?—Oh, no.

13681. Why not, if you come to look at it critically?—I don't see why it should not be done, but I don't think it would be agreed to. Personally, I don't see why.

13682. Some of the Welsh Guardians are sending their children to Cumberland and Westmorland; that is a long distance?—I should think it might be very good. For instance, down in Wicklow; that is a place where the people are very industrious, and the best servants come from Wicklow and Wexford, because the girls are well-reared.

13683. Do you see any objection to sending your children there?—No; personally I should send them where they would be best minded and trained.

13684. What would be the objection among the majority here?—I don't think they would like to send children to another union district.

13685. Rather keep the money in the county?—I think that would be the idea.

13686. Is there anything you would like to say about the Poor Law generally?—I certainly think that something ought to be done for the hospitals. I know it was all gone over yesterday several times. I think there ought to be amalgamation to begin with; all the infirm people should be put into one house, and let them be well minded and well cared for.

13687. You would classify the poor according to the houses?—Yes; I would put the aged and infirm into one and make them comfortable, and then I certainly think that you would require to keep the present union hospitals; it would make a difference, because at present in the hospitals there are nothing but old people; they are not patients; they are simply infirm.

13688. Well, there is a small percentage in every hospital; there are a number in Trim who are actually sick?—Very few; may be three or four in a hospital at a time.

13689. I think you would find that rather too low an estimate?—I think all the year round it is very low from hospital patients.

13690. Of course a person who has to be in bed practically all the year round?—I don't count that. I would put that down as very infirm indeed.

13691. Would you put it down as sick or infirm; would you not say that a person in that condition wanted most careful nursing, and should not be handed over to the tender mercies of an untrained matron?—I would not hand them over to the untrained matron; if the aged and infirm were put in one house I think they require good nursing—just as in the hospital; but I would separate them from the sick people. You won't get sick people to go into a union hospital, because they object to being put in a ward with infirm people.

13692. Dr. Browne.—Have you found that from your own experience?—Yes; over and over again.

13693. You think if the old people were removed the hospitals would be more availed of?—Much more availed of as a hospital, and the sick people could be better minded, and it would be half the expense. At present we have three nurses in the hospital; they have

to spend most of their time with the aged and infirm—we might nurse and three day nurses—and they spend their time with the infirm people.

13704. CHAIRMAN.—How many workhouses should be kept in the county; would you have one or two for the infirm?—I would have two.

13705. One for the males and another for the female?—I don't see how you can get the old men and women from the far end of our county, near Edenderry, to Navan. In the first place they would have to go by train; they might leave their homes at seven o'clock in the morning and they might not reach Navan until seven in the evening. I would have two—one at this end of the county.

13706. Each for male and female infirm?—Yes.

13707. And if any old couple wished to be together you would have them arranged so that they could be?—I would, certainly. I think you would get many people to come in by doing that. I think if there was only one general workhouse for the aged and infirm a great many people would sooner stay out and starve.

13708. You think it would cause hardship?—I think it would cause a great deal of hardship. Perhaps they would say it was cheaper to leave them outside and support them by giving them 2s. a week or 2s. 6d. than to have them brought into the workhouse—well minded and well cared.

13709. They prefer the permanent outside?—As a rule, and even this year we have had applicants to pay a nurse to mind them outside.

13710. One for each family?—Two old ladies refused to come in; they said they wanted a woman paid to mind them at home.

13711. Dr. BROWN.—Of course you did not?—I think in one case.

13712. CHAIRMAN.—You would have Kells for the infirm of North Meath and Trim for the infirm of South Meath?—I think it would be most central.

13713. What would be done with Navan?—Send the lunatics to Navan; they have the County Meath Infirmary in Navan.

13714. They have a very fine hospital building?—And I don't see why any portion of the County Meath is to be paying its proportion of £1,200 a year and never having a patient in it. I think that hospital ought to be handed over to the Navan people and the northern end of the county altogether.

Mrs. McCann examined.

13715. CHAIRMAN.—You are also a Guardian?—Yes. 13716. You have heard what Mrs. Callaghan has said; is there anything you would like to add?—I agree with all Mrs. Callaghan has said; I have not much experience; I have not been long on the board.

13717. Mrs. Callaghan has put forward your views?—Yes, decidedly. She has a great deal of experience, and her views are quite mine.

13718. Are you on the Joint School committee?—No; I know a good deal of the girls who have been sent out, and they are all very satisfactory about our place. The more often send out girls to my part of the country; they are all very good girls.

13719. What part of the union do you live in?—Athboy.

13720. What class of situations do the girls get there?—With small farmers.

13721. Any shopkeepers?—No; I have never known a girl sent to a business house.

13722. How do these girls get on afterwards?—One feature of their character is that they say in the houses they go to, and become one of the family in a small house, and I have known a couple with heads who raised all their family, and eventually some of them got married out of those places to servant boys, and gave great satisfaction; they are very domesticated girls. I know one woman who has a girl like her own daughter.

13723. At what age do they go out?—Fifteen or sixteen; the supply is not equal to the demand for girls; they have not enough girls to send in so, for women are waiting for them.

13724. Is there anything as regards Poor Law administration you would like to mention?—The only thing I would ask you to do is if you could extend the out-door relief to small farmers holding a half-acre and upwards where sickness comes in.

13705. You don't use it here?—There may be two or three petitions the whole time.

13706. Dr. BROWN.—For how many years are you speaking off?—I know there have been two petitions in the last two years.

13707. CHAIRMAN.—It is beginning to be used?—Yes; since they divided it and have three doctors.

13708. I suppose you have a member of the committee in the town?—I am one of the governors.

13709. Have you given orders yourself for admission?—They won't go.

13710. Did you ever give an order for admission?—I did, one; I got one man to go after great persuasion; they will not go into Navan. I know it is a very well regulated hospital, but it is no use to this part of the county.

13711. Is it because it is a short distance—only seven or eight miles?—Six miles; they won't go.

13712. What is the reason, I wonder?—I don't know.

13713. Is there a really hostile feeling to Navan?—They always say they would rather go to their own doctor. I know four patients went from Athboy.

13714. They would rather go to the workhouse here than to the infirmary in Navan?—Neither; they would rather go to Dublin.

13715. You would have Navan for lunatics; what would you do with Dunsinghilla?—I would close it up, but leave the hospital. Hospitals would want to be left at each place where there is a hospital at present.

13716. Then there is Oldcastle?—I don't know about Oldcastle. There is one thing we want in the county, and want badly, and that is a place for consumptives. I have been trying to get up a consumptive hospital for the last five years, but I cannot work it. If something is not done for the consumptive people in Meath we will all die of consumption; they are dying by hundreds, and nobody takes the smallest notice. I have had statistics from doctors round the country, and it is appalling. Whole families have been wiped out about here. I hope the result of this Commission may be to make a change.

13717. You would not want a hospital for Meath alone?—We would very nearly supply one from Meath. We said we would put the consumptive people in Oldcastle, because it is nice and dry.

13718. It is a very good site; is there anything else?—I think that is all. I think I have said quite enough.

13719. Would you put any limit; quarter-acre is the limit at present?—There are some people with half-acre and one acre and up to two acres, bog land, very much poorer than the people who are getting it.

13720. Would you say the limit should be changed from quarter-acre to two acres?—According to the discretion of the Guardians. I know people with two acres of bog land who cannot make it out of it because it is covered with water, and we are often asked is it possible to get relief for these people, and it is against the rule to give them more than one week's provisional relief, and consequently they are in utter starvation.

13721. Do you think they ever could support themselves on these farms?—They are never dependent on that; the man is generally a labouring man with some farmer, and when his wife knocked up there is a large family of children.

13722. As long as the health lasts them is no necessity?—No.

13723. But when illness comes you then find you would wish to have the power to give them some relief?—Very often in our district where you see desecrating cases.

13724. Would you limit it still further, saying two acres for sickness only?—Yes; decidedly where the man of the family gets sick or the woman gets very sick and the man has to stay at home to mind the children. At present I think the administration of out-door relief is ridiculous, but I cannot get the Guardians to consent with my views.

13725. Is what you say it ridiculous?—There are several people getting relief who have some working; I believe that is allowed, and the case I have just described now is not allowed by the Local Government. I heard where a woman has a son working, and is up to sixty-five, and has 2s. a week.

Feb 11, 1904.

Mrs McCann.

13736. Did you ever mention these cases to a gentleman called the auditor?—No; I never met the auditor at all.

13737. Because you might be surprised at the result if you did. You must not take it that cases such as you mention would be getting relief with the approval of the Local Government Board?—I know that they are on a long time, and it is a kind of pension as our part. The Guardians say they are infirm and that their

sons will not support them, but I know there are several deserving cases that don't get relief.

Mr. F. Sheridan.—In nearly all these cases you have to get a certificate for the auditor from the medical officer that they are infirm.

13738. CHAIRMAN.—Are not these cases you are referring to cases where the sons and daughters are able to support them and don't?—Yes.

Mr. THOMAS HEWITT examined.

Mr. Thomas Hewitt.

13739. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the Trim Board?—Yes.

13740. Are you from a rural district or the town?—Rural.

13741. You have heard the evidence that has been given by the lady Guardians; are their views practically those entertained by yourself and other members of the board?—Well, yes; to a certain extent.

13742. What would your own view be?—I don't believe in having two workhouses in the County Meath; I certainly think we should only have one workhouse and hospital.

13743. Would it not be a very long way to take the sick from Oldcastle or Clonsilla to the central hospital?—Yes, of course; it is very long, no doubt.

13744. But you consider it could be done without hardship?—I think so.

13745. Where would you put the hospital and the central workhouse?—As far as I can see Trim is almost the centre of the County Meath.

13746. You would not say Navan is nearer it?—No; the centre of the County Meath lies between Trim and Navan, but it is still nearer to Trim.

13747. Anywhere as the Tellinora direction?—No; two and a half miles from Trim and four and a half or five miles from Navan would be about the centre of Meath; Trim is the county town.

13748. What would you do with the Trim Workhouse; would you see that for the sick and infirm?—I would have the sick there; we have a very good doctor in Trim—one of the best in Ireland, I believe—and we should take advantage of that.

13749. And give the county the advantage?—Yes.

13750. And would you then leave the Navan infirmery?—I expect so, as it is nearer to the centre. I would try to come to the centre of Meath as well as I possibly could. I did not come here prejudiced against any place.

13751. What about the Drogheda Workhouse?—I don't consider that in Meath; that is more of a Leath workhouse.

13752. What about the part of Drogheda Union that is in Meath; you would let that still go to the Leath Workhouse at Drogheda?—Yes. I expect the Leath people would make some arrangements there themselves. It is a very large town, Drogheda.

13753. Did you ever hear talk of the idea of having each county an area for Poor Law administration as well as for county government?—Yes; I have heard of the idea, but as a general rule I always work on my own ideas.

13754. What do you think of the idea?—I would prefer to give it the go-by in many instances.

13755. You have heard what was said about out-door relief?—I don't quite agree with that either. I would not believe in extending out-door relief to people that would have two acres of land.

13756. You think the present limit is a fair one?—I certainly think the present limit is a fair one.

13757. Mrs. McCann.—In case of sickness?—Yes, of course.

13758. CHAIRMAN.—You are not in favour very much of out-door relief?—To all cases that require out-door relief, of course.

13759. Is your tendency rather to restrict out-door relief?—Yes; because it is a very expensive item.

13760. Do you like the present area of charge for out-door relief?—No; I would have divisional ratings.

13761. Has the out-door relief increased, so far as you are aware, of recent times?—Yes; it has in this way. Since it became a union charge it has become very heavy on certain electoral divisions. Take Athboy, for instance, where they are very liberal in out-door relief.

13762. You would rather that the people who are giving a good deal of out-door relief should pay for it

themselves?—Yes; that is my idea; and then I think the system would not be abused so much.

13763. A place like Athboy is a little little country town, and a great many of the country people go in there looking for work?—Yes; and get knocked up. I don't expect a great many country people go in to look for work there; there is no work for them.

13764. Don't you think a great deal of the town population is made up of people who come in from the country and settle down there?—No; I cannot say that in the case of Athboy, for they are nearly all business people in Athboy; you have not in the town of Athboy those sham houses.

13765. You think the people in Athboy have been old residents there, and not country people who want to do work there and get knocked up afterwards?—I mean the dispensary district of Athboy. I don't say there is very much relief in the town; it is in the dispensary district I complain of, because it comprises several towns.

Mrs. McCann.—Kildallery is the district really where the poverty exists; in Athboy they are very thriving.

13766. CHAIRMAN.—You go as far as Kildallery; that is just at the edge of the Dublin Union. As regards the people coming into hospital, would you like the Guardians to have power to charge people who come in as much as the Guardians thought they could afford to pay?—Yes; I think it would be a great advantage, and would improve the union hospitals very much.

13767. It would give the people who come in a feeling that they were not paupers?—Exactly.

13768. And it would provide a certain amount of money in aid of the rates?—Exactly. And there are a great many people that would come in. Of course I should make a distinction in the hospitals for paying patients and non-paying patients.

13769. Take the ordinary case of a man earning 15s. or 21s. a week; you would not call a child of his coming in a paying patient?—Well, no; I would not.

13770. And yet that child if it stayed at home would cost perhaps 1s. a week to keep it?—Yes; or something more.

13771. You think that man might be safely asked to pay 1s. a week?—Yes; but I would not go in for such small charges as that.

13772. These are the kind of charges I am thinking of; to get the independent spent up as much as you can; and if a child would cost 1s. a week at home, to pay, at all events, that much for it?—We have very few labouring men in this county getting 15s. a week.

13773. Do you mean to say they are not getting so much?—10s. and 12s. is the general rate in this county for labouring men; when you get to 15s. you commence a tradesman or a clerk.

13774. In the case of a man earning from 12s. to 15s. there would be no hardship in charging him 6d. for a child in the hospital for a week?—Yes; I see how it would do away with the present system of pauperism, no doubt. I would be in favour of doing away with the present system of pauperism so far as I could.

13775. So that you might charge a man what would not hurt him and what he would save by the child being away?—Yes; there are a great many difficulties to be surmounted in the present system.

13776. There is too much money spent now?—Yes.

13777. And you think amalgamation is really necessary, or highly desirable, in the interests of the people who have to pay?—Yes; in the interests of everyone at the present time.

13778. But you would not wish real hardship to be caused to the sick in removing them too far?—No.

13779. You would suggest that only the one hospital should be in the county if possible?—But if doctors and people who have made the matter their study think that would involve too much hardship.

13780. You would not press anything that would cause hardship for the cause of economy?—Certainly

not; I would fall in line; we could have two hospitals then. I take for instance a fever hospital; we have a fever hospital attached to every workhouse; I cannot see the idea of that at all. Take Tyne; in our fever hospital we have a nurse, and once I remember it was a year and a couple of days without a patient. I consider there should be only one fever hospital. It might be a little bit risky to close a fever hospital, because if fever came and you had not the hospital built you would have fever spreading over the country very quickly. But we need not close the fever hospital.

13781. You would leave a caretaker in it?—Yes.
13782. And then get a nurse on a case comes?—Yes. I only consider the nurse at the present time caretakers of the fever hospitals.

13783. You would not see some respectable person in to keep an odd fire going and keep the place brushed down and washed, and have a nurse as soon as wanted; that is your idea?—Yes.

13784. But you would not close the hospital altogether?—No; for this reason—the minute a fever patient comes into the hospital we get a trained nurse down to attend for the night; we would do away with a good deal of expense in that way.

13785. Now, is there anything else you would like to refer to?—Well, no; I am powerless.

13786. Are you not on the committee of the school?—No; I think the whole system of the school should be changed.

13787. How would you change it?—That is the way the difficulty comes in.

13788. Would you go in for boarding out or would you still keep the school?—I go in greatly for boarding out, for this reason—that the boarded out children always turn out more respectable than children reared in the school.

13789. Is your view then that the school is unnecessary and boarding out would be a substitute for it?—Some of the children are fairly careful children, and get trades.

13790. If they get trades they must have tradesmen there to teach them, and tradesmen cost a lot of money. I suppose that is where the expense very largely is?—There is great expense, no doubt; wherever it is I do not know; but it is a great deal more expensive than in Glou; I have a good knowledge of Glou, for I have some friends on the board.

13791. You have not gone into that here; tried to find out where the extra cost is?—Not now, but I expect I will.

13792. You have it "on your list"?—Yes, it is on my list, no doubt.

13793. As regards tramps or casuals, you think the

law would require to be changed?—I do; if possible to do away with tramps altogether.

13794. How would you do that?—I expect we would want the aid of the Government to do away with the tramps.

13795. What would you suggest the Government should do?—Take them into some docks.

13796. In Germany the Government arrest them and put them as prisoners in a colony; do you think that would be a good plan here?—That is what I was coming at; something of that sort. The tramps are a great nuisance in the country.

13797. They are a useless class?—Yes; I think every-one admits that.

13798. A harmful class very often?—We would not want so many workhouses if the tramps were done away with.

13799. There are some decent men out of work occasionally, going from one place to another?—You would have to classify them.

13800. What would you do with those?—We would have to adopt the system they have in England.

13801. They are not able to stop it in England. I don't think they are getting any further ahead than ourselves?—I don't think they are.

13802. Their law is more stringent, certainly, but Germany is the place where they make it impossible pretty nearly?—Yes; they put them into these government docks; they transport them; but they certainly should be classified; a real tramp should not be at large; he is going to do nothing, only idling, through the country.

13803. Then the poor fellow who is looking for work, when he has lost it in one place and is looking for it—perhaps a tradesman or seaman—what would you do with him?—You could do nothing with him. I should not consider him a tramp. It would be pure necessity that would be causing him to tramp.

13804. The other fellow is always trying to put himself forward as a respectable tradesman or workman out of employment?—Yes.

13805. The difficulty is to distinguish between the two; I suppose you would have to leave that to the police and the relieving officer to make the best judgment they could in the matter?—Yes. In many places masters and porters of workhouses are able to distinguish between those fellows; it is very easy to know a professional tramp.

13806. You would lock up the regular tramp and enable the police or the relieving officer to provide for the benefit of the man who was honestly looking for work?—Yes.

MR. LAURENCE SHERRIN examined.

13807. CHAIRMAN.—You have been Clerk of the Tyne Joint School since the start?—Yes.

13808. About what year was it started?—April, 1893. It was opened a couple of years afterwards.

13809. It started in 1890. I have got here from the Local Government Board reports for the year ending March, 1901, the receipts and expenditure for the Glou and Tyne Schools; I find that the Tyne School received from the rates last month—£5,795.

13810. And from the Parliamentary grant?—£210.

13811. Making a total receipt of?—£5,995.

13812. You may say £4,000, and you spent on provisions and necessaries in that year?—£4,492.

13813. And for clothing?—£445.

13814. And for salaries and rations?—£280.

13815. Making a total of?—£4,737.

13816. Then there was other expenditure?—£1,294.

13817. Making a total expenditure of?—£4,731.

13818. Now we have followed up all the heads of expenditure except the item for "other expenditure"; what was that other expenditure made up of?—Principally establishment charges.

13819. What establishment charges would it be, exclusive of salaries and rations, which are charged separately?—The staff that we get in for the different shops—dishes and staff.

13820. I would like you to give me for any one month the details of the expenditure under the head of "other expenditure"?—For the year ended 30th September, 1902, there was £2,780, money supplied by the board.

13821. Just take the one heading, "other expenditure"; you have provisions, clothing, salaries; do

your accounts go according to those headings?—No; they don't run the same way.

13822. What are your headings for 1903?—For maintenance and clothing, £1,597.

13823. Have you salaries and rations there separately?—No; it is all together.

13824. What is your next head of account?—Other expenditure, £1,745.

13825. Give me details of the £1,597?—Provisions and necessaries and coal.

13826. Candles and gas?—Yes.

13827. Soap?—Yes.

13828. Black lead?—No; I don't think that would go under the head of necessities; it principally consists of soap and coal and light.

13829. Now the "other expenditure"?—£267, doctor; teachers' salaries, £258.

13830. What teachers are under that?—Master and two assistants, a nun and two assistants.

13831. And tradesman?—The tradesman does not come in there; that relates come to £222.

13832. Who pays the rations?—All the male officers—the tradesmen are extern, they do not—the master and two assistants and the porter.

13833. Do their rations come to £232?—A portion of that is fuel and light.

13834. You told me you charged that under the head of maintenance and clothing?—The sums get their proportion of fuel and light.

13835. The sums don't take rations?—No; they get £20 a year and £25 in lieu of rations.

13836. That is not charged in the £232?—No.

Feb. 12, 1904.

Mr. Thomas Sherrin.

Mr. Laurence Sherrin.

Feb. 11, 1894.
Mr. LAWRENCE
Sheridan.

13637. Where else is it charged, if not charged there?—No, that is merely the ration, and fuel and light.

13638. Then where is it charged?—Portion goes for the schoolmaster and schoolmistress, and portion in that £205 for salaries of other officers.

13639. You have got returns 2332, and you cannot give us what we want about that yet. What is the next head?—Medicine, £2 5s. 6d.

13640. What is next?—Other expenses come to £666.

13641. What are they; that is too much for a lump sum. Can you not give details of it?—I cannot give details from the abstract. I can give it from the expenditure book.

13642. In a general way, what do you think that £660 includes?—It includes, as far as I can recollect, a good lot of steam coal, used for the steam boiler for cooking.

13643. That would not be among the ordinary fuel and light?—No.

13644. What else would there be. Have you got the trifles charged separately?—Yes.

13645. What are the other headings?—Industrial department, £76.

13646. What expenditure is that?—In connection with the industrial department—shoemakers.

13647. What would that include?—I can tell you when I get the books.

13648. Would it be leather, materials, or things like that?—No, sir.

13649. What is your next head of account?—Interest on repayment of loans, £13 1s.

13650. What is the next?—For law expenses, £19 11s. 6d.

13651. What is the next heading?—That is all the headings.

13652. Where are the wages. You have given me the doctors and teachers. You must have the teachers in the other expenses of 2661?—I think that is where it runs into.

13653. You have five contributory unions. Are all the expenses apportioned according to the valuation, or partly according to the valuation and partly per head of the children?—The clothing and maintenance according to the collective number of days.

13654. That is the bare support of the child is charged to each union for each child sent?—Yes.

13655. Then the rest of the expenditure?—According to the valuation.

13656. So that the unions would pay for each child that proportion of the sum of £1,567?—Yes, sir, according to the number of days that each child spent there.

13657. And the other expenditure would be apportioned according to the valuation over the various unions?—Yes.

13658. Can you show me the apportionment there, the charge against each union?—Yes; for the half-year ending March, 1903, the £1,567 is apportioned over the unions—Droghda, £403 14s. 5d.; Dunshaughlin, £215 6s. 8d.; Kells, £230 7s. 6d.; Navan, £475 3s. 10d.; and Trim, £554 10s.

13659. That is how much they pay out of £1,567?—Yes.

13660. How much did each union pay out of the other expenditure?—Droghda, £418 7s. 11d.; Dunshaughlin, £238 13s. 10d.; Kells, £209 5s. 6d.; Navan, £435 17s. 6d.; Trim, £547 7s. 5d.

13661. Have you got the totals for each union. You do the first column according to the collective number of days?—Yes, and the second according to the valuation.

13662. Do you divide the collective number of days, showing how many children they would represent. Did you divide the collective number of days by 365?—No, sir, but just the exact number of days.

13663. You could not tell me how many children would be charged to each union for that year. Have you it only according to the collective number of days?—The number of children in the school were 178 for one half-year, and 177 for another. We have only about 150 at present.

13664. Can you give me the relative number of children for each workhouse?—It is according to the collective number of days I have it, but these are just exactly the children that come in and out; they don't represent the exact number as an average. The collective number of days were—for Droghda for the year, 13,789; for Dunshaughlin, 8,147; for Kells, 6,543; for Navan, 13,459; and for Trim, 15,810.

13665. That divided by 365 will give us about the number of children?—Yes, sir.

13666. For that half-year, how much would it cost per child in the school?—The last two rates that were adopted by the Board of Management amounted in the year to £5,013; that divided by 152, the present number of children in the school, would give a cost of about £33, without taking into account all the official salaries.

13667. Every bit of expenditure?—Not the workhouse; you only take in the average cost.

13668. We take in a great deal more; we don't go as such a very green house as that. You cannot tell me how much it costs Droghda and every other place for each child sent you?—No, sir, I did not make that calculation.

13669. Some of the local bodies have made that calculation. One man told us it cost £25 per child; that would be a great surprise to you?—Taking the rate struck for the last two years into account, 183 children, and the rate £3,013, that would be just about £20 a head.

13670. But then it is not apportioned that way; it is apportioned partly according to the valuation and partly according to the expenditure. Did the original order forming the district school district fix what charges were to be on valuation, and what per head?—No, sir.

13671. How did this arrangement come of apportioning the expenditure in this double way?—The same way as in the workhouse. The clothing of the children in the workhouse is apportioned according to the collective number of days.

13672. You are speaking of the old times, when there was electoral rating?—There is no charge made.

13673. You are treating the joint school arrangement as if the joint district were a union and each union an electoral division?—Yes.

13674. Are you sure there was not any provision for that in the original order forming the district?—An most certain.

13675. You think it was merely a course of action you took up and the officers passed?—Yes; there was no distinct provision, only to follow out the course under the old system.

13676. The old system did not provide for it; it would be only by analogy you could take it?—The preparation of all the books was left to myself, and the only basis I could work on was what I had as clerk of the union. The Local Government Board never gave me any assistance as regards the books of the establishment. When the Glen School was established, they sent to me for the books I had here, so they are on the same basis.

13677. Dr. BIGGER.—How many children have you in the whole school?—150.

13678. And your total expenditure for last year was?—

13679. CHAIRMAN.—£3,597, and then for a year less that I have the Local Government Board report on, it was £4,431. I think you may take £4,000 as the normal expenditure.

Dr. BIGGER.—For 150 children?

CHAIRMAN.—You may say 150; it is over 150.

Witness.—The numbers have reduced of recent years. Droghda had upwards of sixty children in the school, but they must be boarding-out because the number has been reduced below forty.

13680. Dr. BIGGER.—That runs up to £25 or £26 a year, counting 150, which is the maximum number?—Then there are the salaries of the different officials and tradesmen, which come to a good sum. Baker, 30s.; tailor, 35s.; carpenter, 32s. 6d.; shoemaker, 30s.; dressmaker, 30s. a week; there are six nurses, porter, and master.

13681. CHAIRMAN.—But you don't pay for six nurses?—Yes.

13682. Dr. BIGGER.—Do you keep an account to show the profit on these different departments?—There is, sir. There was a loss on some of the shops last half-year, and a profit on some of them.

13683. If there is a profit on some, should it not work out below £26 a year?

13684. CHAIRMAN.—Where is the profit; in any one it is not much, I suppose?—The net loss on all the departments was £40 for the half-year.

Dr. BIGGER.—Is that including the salary of the tradesmen?

13685. CHAIRMAN.—It is a material account, or what?—There is one general account for all the departments.

13686. Dr. BIGGER.—You have not a shoemaker's account?

Mrs. Callaghan.—There is.

WITNESS.—There is a profit there.

13997. Dr. BIGGER.—Are the salaries of the tradesmen charged against the departments, and then the quantity of the material, all put down on the one side, and whatever sales there are on the other?—Yes.

13998. Then if you only lose £30 or £40 on the total of the tradesmen, you cannot account for much of the expenditure there?

13999. Mr. NEWITT.—Are the salaries of the tradesmen charged to the accounts?

Dr. BIGGER.—So he says.

14000. Mr. NEWITT.—Am I to understand that as being correct?

CHAIRMAN.—We would like to know how the profit and loss account—take the shoemaker's shop—is made up, whether wages go in with materials; and then we would like to see how the boots, manufactured articles, and repairs are charged.

Mrs. CULLINANE.—There is just the cost price put on, because they are nearly all for the unions; there is very little profit put on.

CHAIRMAN.—The boys have them for their own use. Mrs. CULLINANE.—Yes, and they make them for the unions.

14001. Dr. BIGGER.—Do you charge for Trim School the same as you would charge for an outside union?

Mrs. CULLINANE.—No, he only puts down what the material costs; we have charged that this year.

CHAIRMAN.—You are entitled to a fair profit on your own use.

14002. Dr. BIGGER.—You could charge the Trim School the same profit as you charge the other unions. Do you do the same for bread, and so on?

Mrs. CULLINANE.—No; the price of bread is made for each union.

14003. Dr. BIGGER.—Do you charge Trim the same price for bread as the other unions?

Mrs. CULLINANE.—I don't know that.

CHAIRMAN.—I am afraid we are rather in a fog about these accounts.

(Witness produces Abstract Book.)

14004. CHAIRMAN.—These are the details of your expenditure, but have you no summary or classification of them?—No.

14005. £470 is too big an item to throw at us under the head of "other expenses." I want the details of it?—There is £21 17s. 6d. for coal.

CHAIRMAN.—The best thing will be to adjust for heat, and afterwards you can give it to us.

On resuming after lunch,

14006. CHAIRMAN.—Now we want the sub-items of that sum, £470?—Painting, £21 6s.; result fees, £117 1s. 4d.

14007. That is levied on all the unions according to valuation?—Not according to the valuation; according to the report of the school inspector.

14008. But it is paid for by the several unions according to the valuation?—Not according to the valuation; according to the number of children.

Mr. P. SHERIDAN.—For establishment charges it should be valuation, and for provisions and necessaries the number of children.

14009. CHAIRMAN.—There is painting £21, there are number of small items, and then the next large item, £117 1s. 4d., that is for result fees. How much of that is the girls' school teachers get?—About £25.

14010. And the male teachers, £65, that is divided half-half to the master, and the remainder is divided between the other two assistant teachers.

14011. Then the master's salary, as a whole is—master £40 a year, as schoolmaster £50, and for result fees he has £20; that is, his salary is £120 a year?—Yes.

14012. Does he get rations besides?—Yes, £25 or £26 a year.

14013. Has he any other allowance?—No.

14014. What is this item?—Architect's fees, £24, and repairs of buildings, £27 12s. 10d.

14015. What is the £125 6s. 11d.?—For books, advertising, and school requisites.

14016. Coal?—£131 18s. 9d.; that is for the steam boiler; that is for the year.

14017. That is about 25s. or 30s. a ton?—It varies; less than that.

Mr. KELLY, Master.—I think 15s. or 17s. a ton. They get the very best. It has to supply the waterworks.

14018. Dr. BIGGER.—That is about 150 tons a year.

Mr. KELLY.—Something about that. We have our

own waterworks, and for the last year we had to dry almost all the clothes by steam, and all laundry work and cooking is done by steam, and the water is all heated by steam.

Dr. BIGGER.—Then it is £1 a year for every child in the school.

14019. CHAIRMAN.—What is this item?—Hardware, brushes, &c., £134.

Mr. KELLY.—Buckets, and things like that, and spades and shovels; it is all of that nature.

Mr. NEWITT.—Where those figures supplied to you?

Mr. KELLY.—All those bills pass through my hands.

14020. CHAIRMAN.—Are they from the one contractor?

Mr. KELLY.—No, sir; two contractors, or you might say three.

14021. What does one contractor supply?

Mr. KELLY.—I could not exactly tell you, but there is one contractor at the present time supplying, from a very large lot, brushes of all sorts, enamelled plates, enamelled dishes, bricks, and cement.

14022. You don't see much cement?

Mr. KELLY.—I don't know about that particular half-year, but for the last half-year we never used 2 cwt. There is half-cutting machines, cutting the boys, never more than one or two of those used in the half-year. There is a miscellaneous catalogue; there are sixty or sixty-five items on the list.

14023. CHAIRMAN.—Then plumbing expenses?

Mr. SHERIDAN.—Repairs to boiler, £36 3s. 4d.

14024. Was there much done in the year, as far as you recollect?

Mr. SHERIDAN.—There was. I know the Guardians at our meetings are very particular going through our accounts.

Mrs. CULLINANE.—When we get them.

14025. CHAIRMAN.—Now we want the details of the salaries, and the number of officers. The chaplain gets how much a year?—£25.

14026. The boys and girls are all Catholics?—Yes.

14027. Is there daily Mass in the institution?

Mr. KELLY.—On Sundays, and sometimes one day in the week, and sometimes two, and on holidays also, and Benediction often two or three times a week, and the chaplain holds his examinations very often.

14028. CHAIRMAN.—Then Mr. SHERIDAN gets £63, the matron £55, and there are six sisters, and five get £25, and one £45.

14029. What for rations?—The salary is £30, and £25 for rations.

14030. Then the doctor?—£57 at present.

14031. Does he visit daily?—Yes.

14032. And then the porter £25 a year and rations?—Yes.

14033. Dressmaker 15s. a week, carpenter 32s. 6d., shoemaker 30s., the tailor 35s., and baker 30s. Then the total amount of salaries and rations comes to £860 a year. Have you been able to find out what is the average cost of each boy, and how much each union pays for each boy that it sends?—No, except what I have told you before.

14034. That was a very general thing. I want if in pounds, shillings, and pence, according to your average. You may take a note of that, and let us know how much, taking the last three years, the average per child has been. Would it be the same for boys and girls?—It would be the same.

14035. And how much each union has paid per child, including both its share according to the valuation and its per capita payment?

14036. Dr. BIGGER.—There were four intern officers. The average cost of provisions for the master, porter, and two teachers, their rations come to £232, you said. Can you explain that?

Mr. KELLY.—There are four officers. The average cost of provisions is, per week, £1 15s. 4d.

14037. Dr. BIGGER.—I am speaking of the total expenditure.

Mr. J. SHERIDAN.—Does that include necessaries?

Mr. KELLY.—No; necessaries are 22s. 6d.

Mr. J. SHERIDAN.—There are necessaries supplied to the unions in the shape of fire.

Mr. KELLY.—There are six men; the necessaries for four are 22s. 6d.—coal, candles, soap, starch, and bins.

14038. Dr. BIGGER.—How is the coal supplied?

Mr. KELLY.—In buckets averaging 2 stone a bucket.

It is taken out of the general supply of the establishment.

14039. CHAIRMAN.—What amount are you entitled to use?

Mr. KELLY.—5 stone a day in winter and 3 stone in summer. The officials only take what necessaries they

Feb. 11, 1904.

Mr. LAWRENCE SHERIDAN.

Feb. 11, 1904.
Mr. Laurence
Sheridan.

require in starch, blue, and soda. All their clothes are washed in the establishment, and all soap, starch, blue, and soda is sent to the laundry; it is all handed to the matron. None of the officials use their full amount of coal.

13930. It is not a real entry of what takes place at all?

Mr. Kelly.—The necessities, such as starch and blue, were never delivered to the officials.

13931. Dr. Brogan.—Is it charged in this account against them?

Mr. Kelly.—I cannot say.

13932. CHAIRMAN.—Is it included in the £232 a year?

Mr. Kelly.—I could not say. I make up what the actual provisions and necessities would be if consumed on the establishment, and it goes into the laundry, and the matron is able to do a lot of the children's clothes with the same amount that is charged to the officials. I brought the matter before the Board on one occasion, and tried to get it changed, and to get the officials more fed instead of necessities.

13933. CHAIRMAN.—The only benefit is you get your clothes and washing for nothing.

Mr. Kelly.—Yes. With the exception of 12s. 9d. for coal, the remainder goes to the laundry out of the necessities.

13934. Dr. Brogan.—Is 6d. a week is a good deal to go to the laundry in a week.

Mr. Kelly.—It goes to wash the officer's clothes and a good deal of the children's clothes as well.

Mr. Herd.—The average in the workhouse for provisions and necessities is 4s. 6d. for each official.

13935. Dr. Brogan.—Could you tell us the total consumption of soap and these necessities in the school altogether?

13936. CHAIRMAN.—It is a very remarkable thing that at Glin there were 289 children and here you have 241. They have 91,000 collective number of days in Glin and 62,000 here, that is one-third higher than here, and yet their cost is a great deal less than here. That is very remarkable.

Mrs. O'Connell.—Where does the largest difference come in?

13937. CHAIRMAN.—That is just what we are trying to find out.

Mrs. O'Connell.—Is it the officers' salaries?

Mr. SAMUEL KELLY, Master and Principal Teacher, examined.

Mr. Samuel
Kelly.

13938. CHAIRMAN.—First you enter on one side the materials and wages?—Yes.

13939. Is there anything else on that side of the account?—No.

13940. What have you on the other?—Cash actually received for work done for the public outside, and the value of the school work.

13941. What value do you put on the school work?—The value I always put on the school work up to the last date. Supposing we used £20 worth of material in the shop during the half-year for school work, and the wages cost £10, the value of the school work for that particular month would be £30; that is the way I calculate it. Take, for instance, the tailoring shop. If he made ten suits of clothes, I calculate the average amount of material consumed for each suit.

13942. That is no profit and loss account?—No; any profit made or loss sustained is an apparent one.

13943. You can run it into a very real transaction. What is your new method, might I ask you?—The auditor has ordered we should put down so much value on each suit of clothes. My idea never was to show what work could be done for outside, but rather to show what it cost to make it inside.

13944. Have you a time-book?—No; but there is a time-book in the school, and the boys are working for a certain time.

13945. You don't keep a time-book such as a tradesman would keep, showing how many hours a boy worked, and at how much an hour?—I never considered any wages for them at all.

13946. You put it only down for the teacher?—Yes; the skilled labour.

13947. Although the boys might have made some of the clothes?—The boys do the most of the work. I always insist on that except in the tailoring shop.

13948. Dr. Brogan.—Do you keep any time-book for the tradesmen?—The porter's book; he is working the whole time or teaching.

CHAIRMAN.—They are liberal here.

Mrs. O'Connell.—I think they are, decidedly so. When were the accounts audited last?

Mr. Sheridan.—Mr. Kine was here a few weeks ago.

13949. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Connolly was here on the 2nd of November, 1903.

Mrs. O'Connell.—We were left rather a considerable time without anybody; nobody knew what was happening.

Mr. P. J. Sheridan.—In the half-year ending 30th September, 1903, officers' rations were £63 1s. 1d. added to that for fuel and light, £46 1s. 4d.—£109 15s. 4d.

13950. CHAIRMAN.—We are only looking into it because questions were asked at Navan yesterday which charged this place with great expense, and in looking into it we saw that the Glin expenses were very much lower.

Mrs. O'Connell.—They don't feed the children as well as we do.

Mr. Kelly.—The necessities for the half-year ending September, 1903, £36 0s. 4d., paid at the beginning of the half-year. We received £132 15s. 16d. of necessities, making £168 15s. 2d., and at the end of the half-year there were £115 2s. 14d. worth of necessities on hand. That leaves necessities £53 15s. 4d. for the half-year.

13951. Dr. Brogan.—That is £2 a week?

Mr. Kelly.—That includes coal and gas, soap, starch, blue, soda, and candles.

13952. How do you estimate the gas?

Mr. Kelly.—We don't estimate it; when the gas-bill comes in, by the clerk's direction, I put it in the provision account for that particular week.

13953. CHAIRMAN.—How do you apportion that in the officers'?

Mr. Kelly.—I think the clerk does that.

13954. If you were giving your ponies, would you like to have it calculated on all this soda, and blue, and starch?

Mr. Kelly.—I have never thought of that yet.

13955. Dr. Brogan.—Why do you keep such a large stock of necessities on hand?

Mr. Kelly.—We get in the year's supply of coal in August and September.

13956. CHAIRMAN.—Have you any profit and loss account for the shops?

Mr. Kelly.—The auditor last year charged them altogether. My usual custom was to show what actually was the value of the month's work.

13957. Do you examine carefully the porter's book?—Decidedly.

13958. CHAIRMAN.—The day we went over the shop we did not find all the men in occupation?—The porter was there and the tailor.

13959. No, he attended as afterwards?—Well, if we lunch time; he may have gone out for a second.

13960. Dr. Brogan.—Do they ever have breaks time?—Except with the permission of the Board. They get six days' leave in the year, and can take two days at a time by permission of the Board.

13961. They never stay out half a day?—They generally regulate these—unless it is very important but none—to suit the requirements of the establishment.

13962. Would it not be better to keep a proper time-book?—Really the tradesmen are working from the time they come in until they go home.

13963. CHAIRMAN.—You don't find tradesmen having such kind confidence in their employees; they should keep a time-table?—The time-table is kept in the establishment.

13964. These men are paid by the week?—Yes.

13965. Would it not have been cheaper to pay them a yearly salary when the same men are employed all round?—That would be a matter for the Board.

13966. You don't deduct their wages if sick?—No, the Board give leave. I stand at the gate myself, and we the men coming in every morning, as a rule, unless I am laid up.

13967. Dr. Brogan.—What hours have they?—From a quarter to eight until 6 o'clock in the evening, with the exception of the dinner hour; they have three-quarters of an hour for dinner.

13968. You are aware your expenditure is a great deal higher than in Glin?—I never saw a return from Glin except once, and I noticed the average cost of provisions and necessities was a great deal lower than ours, but we give our children a very generous dietary.

Working boys have meat every day in the work except

Feb. 11, 1904.

Mr. Samuel
Kelly.

fraser—a quarter of a pound; they have turnips and vegetables two days in the week, and Irish stew on one day. The boys work from 6 in the morning until 6 at night. They have to go to school from half-past 6 to half-past 7, and they have to work from half-past 7 to half-past 8, cleaning dormitories, and yards, and shops.

12988. CHAIRMAN.—You don't often give them a day in the country?—Since scarlatina broke out the doctor did not allow them out; they generally go out on Sundays, and Thursdays or Tuesdays.

12989. Is it all right now, the scarlatina?—The doctor has not taken the restriction off yet. On Friday evening we give out the clothes for the whole establishment, and Saturday is the play evening for the boys.

The two assistants, the master, and myself, look after the washing of them every morning.

12991. The clothing and beds ought to be in better repair?—We are pressed at the present time with the work from the unions.

12992. Those are only explanations why things are not right. It would be much better to have them right. About how many children have left the institution?

Mr. J. Sheridan.—101 on the boys' side and 79 from the girls.

12993. You don't pay the costs of parents coming to see the children?—No.

Mr. F. J. Sheridan.—They have to pay themselves.

Mr. Kelly.—It is very seldom we have any people coming to see them from Drogheda.

The sitting terminated.

Feb. 16, 1904. **TWENTY-NINTH PUBLIC SITTING.—TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 16TH, 1904.**

At the Courthouse, Mullingar.

Present:—**MR. MICKS (Chairman), and Dr. CONY BROGH.**

Mr. N. J. Deane, Solicitor, appeared for the Guardians and District Council of Mullingar.

Mr. Andrew Moore.

Mr. ANDREW MOORE examined.

13974. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the County Council?—Yes, sir.

13975. Did they consider the queries that were issued by this Commission to them?—Yes.

13976. And what was their view as regarded the Co. Westmeath, and what should be done with regard to the amalgamation of unions?—They recommended the Union of Delvin would be closed.

13977. And Athlone and Mullingar should remain?—Should remain.

13978. Devoted to their present purpose, or would they suggest any change?—No; just as they are.

13979. Did they consider whether some classes might with advantage be removed from workhouses and treated elsewhere?—No, that was not raised.

13980. How far is Delvin from Mullingar?—I don't know exactly the distance; about twelve miles, I should say.

Mr. Shaw.—Yes, Irish.

13981. CHAIRMAN.—Is it proposed then that all the Delvin inmates should be moved to Mullingar?—No Mullingar or the surrounding unions, where it would be convenient.

13982. Would there still be left any village or local hospital for treating the sick of that locality?—I am not acquainted personally with the locality of Delvin, and I am not able to answer that.

13983. The County Council did not consider that question as far as you are aware?—They did; but I think the chairman of the Delvin Union will be here to-day.

13984. There was one query—how far, in the case of persons who are not destitute, it would be desirable to introduce a system of payments or contributions in aid of the cost of treatment: was that question considered?—It was not.

13985. Did they express any views about what might be done to mitigate the tramp nuisance?—Yes, they were very warm on that point. The tramp system is a great evil to the ratepayers of this county, and they are chiefly reserve and militiamen who are going about travelling here during the winter.

13986. You find you have a great number of militiamen here as tramps?—Yes. In Athlone, where I come from, that is the gate to the West, and now I might say, on behalf of the Athlone Union, that if this system of training were changed from summer to winter, it would give those tramps an opportunity of getting employment during the summer. It is in the winter time we have these chiefly tramping about.

13987. From a military point of view, that might be an awkward time for manoeuvres?—It might. But if the adjoining counties would close some of their workhouses, that would curtail the tramp system very much.

13988. If you had no half-way house between here and Kells, if you closed Delvin?—Yes; and if Ballymahon was closed they would have to walk to Longford.

13989. That would diminish their comfort, at all events, if it would not lessen the evil?—It would.

13990. Did they consider the question of a convalescent hospital?—No, sir; that was not entertained at all at the meeting.

13991. Did they pass any written resolutions on the matter?—It was a committee appointed to consider the matter, and their report was adopted.

13992. Have you got their report?—Mr. Levinge will get it.

13993. Are you a member of the County Infirmary Committee?—Not now.

13994. You were originally?—I was.

13995. Is there anything that occurs to you personally, or was there any question about the county infirmary at the meeting of the County Council Committee?—No, sir.

13996. It is working smoothly?—It is working very smoothly.

13997. And satisfactorily; there is nothing you wish to suggest about it?—No. I was a member also of the Asylum Board for three years.

13998. That is not within the limits of our inquiry?—No, sir; but my experience there was that these are people in it who might be accommodated in some of these unions if they were closed as unions, such as epileptic and harmless lunatics.

13999. Would you be disposed to make an outlying lunatic asylum of the Delvin Workhouse?—It is very suitable for that purpose.

14000. You have not seen it?—No, sir; but it is a small place not very large.

14001. The state of repair, if you saw it, you might not have a very favourable view of its fitness for any such object?—My reason principally for assuming that point is that the cost of maintaining the Mullingar Asylum is so very great that people could be kept much cheaper.

14002. I believe it is the most expensive asylum in Ireland?—It is one of them.

14003. Now I have here a copy of the resolution passed by the County Council. You propose that Delvin Union should be amalgamated with Mullingar, and three other rural districts, namely, Ballymahon, Coole, and Killebeggan should be changed either to Athlone or Mullingar Unions as most convenient?—Yes, they would meet the want of Delvin Union.

14004. In what union is Ballymahon?—Ballymahon.

14005. You would break up Ballymahon and take the Ballymahon Rural District into Mullingar?—Yes.

14006. Then Coole is part of Granard?—Yes.

14007. And you contemplate the breaking up of the Granard Union and the addition of the Coole district to Mullingar?—Yes.

14008. And Killebeggan, what union is that in?—The town of Tullamore.

14009. Do you contemplate breaking up the Tullamore Union?—I think not.

14010. You propose taking away the Killebeggan district from that?—Yes.

14011. What are your grounds for proposing to take that away?—Well, there is not much of the county in the Tullamore Union, I believe.

14012. Are you influenced by a desire that the county should include all the Poor Law administration within its own bounds?—It would be better to have it that way.

14013. That is the object the County Council had in view?—Yes, they wished to have control over their own affairs.

14014. They wished that there should be no Poor Law body connected with any other county interfering with their county?—No.

14015. You only propose to take as much of the Co. Westmeath as is in the Tullamore Union—the Killebeggan district—and you don't propose to take more of the Granard Union. You only just want to get your own county?—Yes.

14016. Would you take all Delvin that is in the Co. Westmeath?—Yes.

14017. Fines, of course, is in the Coole district?

Mr. Deane.—It is on the very borders of the Coole district.

14018. CHAIRMAN.—From Fines to Castlepollard, is that the Coole district?

Mr. Deane.—Yes.

14019. Is Castlepollard in Mullingar Union?

Mr. Deane.—Delvin; the Coole district just goes to the town of Castlepollard.

14020. How far would it be from Fines to Mullingar, that would be the extreme distance?

Mr. Deane.—It would be fourteen Irish miles.

Feb. 16, 1904.

Mr. Andrew Moore.

14021. And from Clonsilla?

Mr. Deane.—About sixteen.

14022. That would be the extreme length of the new proposed Mullingar Union. There are populous districts, relatively speaking; you have the big villages of Clonsilla and Fines.

Mr. Deane.—Yes; otherwise it is not.

14023. It is a grass country, I know. As an alternative, the County Council suggest—"That the sick and infirm poor in each county belonging to the Unions of Ballymahon, Gennard, and Tullamore be sent there." I don't understand the meaning of that?—The meaning of that is that in case there were people who were very sick and could not be brought on to Mullingar, they could be accommodated there.

14024. That they should be brought to Ballymahon, Gennard, or Tullamore?—Yes, pay for them there.

14025. Did they propose to break up the Ballymahon and Gennard Unions?—I don't think they meant that. They merely propose to take away the part that is in Westmeath. The feeling of the County Council was that the counties that these unions are in might decide to break them up.

14026. They want to make it a comprehensive unit for all local authorities within the county?—Yes.

14027. Then there is no direct expression of opinion from the county that any union should be broken up?—Except Delrin, in our own county; we have only three unions in the county.

14028. As regards an auxiliary asylum, you say you are not in a position to make any suggestion?—Unless one of these three or four workhouses were closed, that one of them could be made use of for epileptics and harmless lunatics.

14029. So as to leave none of that class in the workhouses?—Or in the asylums.

14030. You think they could be kept at a cheaper rate than lunatics are at present kept in the Mullingar Asylum?—I think they could.

14031. In answer to Query 3, you say: "We are of opinion that no children should be kept in workhouse up to fourteen years of age, but should be boarded-out?"—It is a great success in Athlone Union.

14032. I heard of that when visiting Athlone lately. Do you find any difficulty in getting suitable homes for them?—No, sir; the children come in every month for inspection.

14033. Do you think that is a wise thing. I would suggest your considering that, whether it is a wise thing to bring boarded-out children into the workhouse, where they will have an opportunity of feeling their connection with it. I should think one of the great advantages of the boarding-out system is to make children unconnected, and make them forget, if they ever do remember, that they ever had any connection with pauperism or workhouse?—It gives the Board an opportunity.

14034. Yes, but is it not at the risk of making the child always remember that it is a pauper?—They are so very young they would not be able to distinguish.

14035. I am afraid coming into the workhouse for inspection?—I see your point.

14036. I think it is worth considering, really. In some cases children who are boarded-out may come back to the workhouse. We have only heard of a couple of suggestions of such cases, but where that would happen it would be very likely, because they know of the workhouse by going there to be inspected?—They seem very pained coming into the workhouse.

14037. Yes, but afterwards it comes back to them why they came in there. In by far the majority of unions they have given up that plan of inspecting boarded-out children at the workhouse, and instead they have committees to inspect them at their own homes?—We cannot get that. There were ladies invited to form a committee to go around, and they never turned up.

14038. I think if you get not one committee, but if you get a number of small committees—two or three ladies in each locality—get a number of ladies out near Ballymahon, say; let two or three ladies there visit and report from time to time; not have a big union committee, but little separate committees in different unions, and let them report how the children are getting on, and then the inspection is of a sort that can do no harm?—If they fail in turning up there would be no inspection.

14039. I should hope you would get them to meet. The inspection by one Guardian would be as good an inspection as any other. So far back as 1869, I remember the Limerick Board of Guardians used to delegate the duty to one member of the Board to report on the children in the neighborhood, and used to receive his

report and deal with it. He went when it was convenient to him; he was not tied to a day or week; just made the inspection of children and reported on them, and there it worked exceedingly well—I am very glad you give me this much information. I will make use of it.

14040. I think you will find really that it is calculated to get out of the children's mind any idea that they are paupers, or any idea that the workhouse is the place they could go back to, which is, I think, the great advantage of the boarding-out system, and I am glad to see your Council has such a strong opinion in favour of it. With regard to the alms-houses, you say: "We suggest that the dietary for this class be of such a nature as will not be any attraction to those people to frequent the unions." That would operate in keeping away these tramps and ins-and-outs. I suppose in towns like Mullingar and Athlone you have people who drop in for a day or two and out again?—Yes.

14041. Would you have many of these in Athlone?—Not very many.

14042. There is a good deal of employment in Athlone?—Very great employment.

14043. You don't suffer from poverty except, I suppose, where a family is drunken, or from want of health?—There is scarcely any poverty. I am a member of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, and there are scarcely any applications.

14044. With regard to Query No. 4, you recommend that the law with regard to out-door relief should remain as it is at present. You don't suggest any change about the area of charge for out-door relief?—No; we approve of the area of charge as it stands at present.

14045. At all events you, as a town Guardian, would approve of that?—Well, I am concerned both ways.

14046. To No. 5 you say: "We consider that there will be sufficient accommodation in Athlone and Mullingar for all the sick." Then, in answer to No. 6, you say: "That after the amalgamation of unions, one closed workhouse should be selected for harmless lunatics; the particular workhouse might be determined by the Local Government Board." No. 7: "Persons not destitute, and able to pay, should be called upon to pay the actual cost of maintenance and treatment." That you have power at present for. The queries we issued were rather with another object. It did not refer to any particular point, because in the case of any person able to pay you have the power to enforce payment by way of loan. The Commission meant, in issuing the query, that the Guardians would, in their discretion, have power to oblige a patient, or his responsible relative, to pay, not the actual cost, but such sum as he might be considered able to pay without hardship. For instance, if a labouring man, earning 12s. or 14s. a week, sent a member of his family in, that member would at all events cost 5s. to 1s. a week to support, and if any extension of the law, such as is indicated, were made, then the Guardians would be able to require that man to pay 6d. or 1s. a week, as they might think fit, and from that small sum, which would be the lowest possible fee I suppose you could agree from that, you might bring it up to the actual cost of maintenance, which might include perhaps payment of an additional nurse, which would make it a very heavy bill, would you, as an old Guardian, approve of giving such a discretion to Boards of Guardians to enable them to recover, if they thought fit, the cost of treatment from everybody using the sick wards of the infirmary, such a sum as might be considered they could pay without hardship?—I would.

14047. Are you aware that such a system has been tried in some parts of Ireland already?—No.

14048. In the north of Ireland, at Benishillen, and again at Lisburn, the county infirmaries there have adopted such a system, and we got evidence that it was wonderful success. They charged very small sums up to the actual cost, and quite a large revenue was brought in, and the system was popular with the people, because instead of coming in as paupers or free patients, they came in paying as much as they could fairly pay?—It is a very good idea.

14049. And it was a very large assistance to the rates?—Something similar to that is practised here in the county infirmary, according to the person's valuation.

14050. If a person who had not land came in, how would they manage then. Suppose a railway official came in—a guard or a porter—how would you fix that?—I think the railway company pay for them, if I don't mistake.

14051. Well, some men who would not be paid for by a company?—They would be all free.

Feb. 16, 1894.

Mr. Andrew
Nicols.

14052. Although they might be able to pay, and perhaps have been willing to pay?—Quite so.

14053. I think we have heard all you had to say about tramps?—There should be some means of making them fellows work.

14054. Would you approve of having for all able-bodied people one workshop in some central position, with land attached to it or workshops attached to it, where they would be put under proper supervision at really hard work, so that in the ordinary institutions in the country you would not find any able-bodied at all; that they would be all drafted to the central institution, very much on the present lines, where they would be detained and obliged to work. I am not now speaking of cases of deserving poverty, but cases of thriftless and idle, vagabonds and tramps. Would you be in favour of such an institution as that if it did not add to the rates?—I would, but I don't see how it could be worked, because those fellows, if they saw they were going to be drafted off to a workshop, would take their discharge.

14055. But if the law were amended, giving the Guardians, or whatever the working body would be, giving them power to detain them. You are aware from your long acquaintance with the Poor Law that these people are very often attended by their families?—I know they are.

14056. In one union we happened to meet four generations of the same family in receipt of relief?—They claim the house as being their own.

14057. Would you be in favour of an amendment of the law enabling you to take the children from these people, and either board them out or deal with them putting the Guardians in loco parentis?—I would indeed.

14058. It might be a little expense at first?—But it will save the children.

MR. NICHOLAS McNABES EXAMINED.

Mr. Nicholas
McNabes.

I am from the County Council, and I am also Chairman of the Board of Guardians, so I am in a rather awkward position. The County Council are in favour of amalgamation and the Board of Guardians are opposed.

14070. The Mullingar Board of Guardians are opposed to amalgamation as far as their own union is concerned?—Yes.

14071. Would they be opposed to take in Delvin and parts of others?—They think Delvin can be worked much cheaper at Delvin.

14072. So they are opposed in fact to amalgamation?—Yes.

14073. And you were one of the minority at the County Council?—Yes.

14074. Then we would be very glad to hear your views as representative of the minority?—We have not proper means of conveying papers from Delvin Union to Mullingar—it would mean a lot of extra cost—and I think they can be managed much cheaper at Delvin, and doing away with Delvin, you would have no union within twelve miles; the nearest would be Kells.

14075. If Kells were broken up?—Then you would have Leamford and Oldcastle.

14076. Did you make any financial estimate or calculation in support of your view that amalgamation would not be an economy?—Yes.

14077. Have you got your figures with you?—I remember them.

14078. What was your calculation?—That is for the maintenance of paupers in the different unions.

14079. You come to the opinion that it would not be an economy to the rates to break up Delvin?—Yes.

14080. On what financial ground did you come to that conclusion?—The Poor Law rate in Delvin is only about half what it is in Mullingar. They are able to maintain them much cheaper in Delvin than in Mullingar. I mean Poor Law. I am not referring, of course, to the District Council.

14081. Oh, quite so, Poor Law altogether?—It does not follow in the case of amalgamation of unions that the District Council would also be amalgamated.

14082. Certainly not; we have nothing to do with that?—Then it would be altogether against the interest of Mullingar that we would amalgamate with Delvin—the District Council—but the unions could be worked much cheaper in Delvin; in fact at half the cost.

14083. Taking that a little further—this is now an argument about Westmeath—would not your argument apply to every county in Ireland, and is not your opinion, if you follow it up, is it not virtually an ex-

14059. And stop a continuation of the system?—It would.

14060. Dr. Baugher.—You mentioned about the county infirmary—about the qualification for admission there. What did you mean by a land qualification?—To make it cheapen according to their position, which was determined by their valuation.

14061. How was that determined?—So much per week, according to the valuation.

14062. Does that work at all satisfactorily?—I am not in a position to say. I am out of office for the last twelve months. I was in it for three years.

14063. You were on the County Infirmary Board before that?—No; only since this Local Government Board Act came into operation.

14064. You would be aware if it did not work satisfactorily?

Mr. Baugher.—There is a member here. Witness.—I was three years in the asylum, so I am a harden lunatic now.

14065. Dr. Baugher.—The County Council, you have answered, did not consider the question of a county infirmary?—That was not entertained by them at all, but in connection with the Athlone Board of Guardians, I say now that it would be a very useful thing to have in the county.

14066. Your own idea would be that it would be a very good and proper thing to do?—Yes.

14067. Are you aware that Dr. Shanley is in favour of it?—I did not hear him express it. The Guardians of Athlone did not discuss the question at all.

14068. But have you heard any expressions outside the Board?—The feeling of the Board of Guardians at Athlone is that amalgamation would be useful.

14069. But as far as the treatment of consumption?—I have not had any opinion upon that.

provision of opinion that there is no saving in any question of proposed amalgamation?—It is according to how the unions are situated.

14084. There are 150 odd unions at present. Supposing fifty or seventy of these were broken up, say you not see that the country at large would probably be a saving?—I would want to know how they were valued at present.

14085. Certainly, but if you saw that a large number of staffs and officers would disappear—the salary of the clerk of the union would vanish, subject to a life interest; the payment of a pension; and the salaries of the masters, matrons, and minor officials would vanish. Yes, but it would take some time.

14086. Coal and fuel, and various other expenses for keeping up the light and heat of the house, would go, you would also have the upkeep of this house coming to be a Poor Law expenditure. You can see that if you halve the number of houses in Ireland there would be, at first sight, a very large saving in it; but when you come to apply that from the general idea to the Co. Westmeath, then you say if you take one of the three workhouses away, that is if you take 50 out of 150, you would have no economy, you say?—Yes, reducing to Delvin, I mean.

14087. Is that because they have such an abnormally low rate?—Yes, and the extra cost it would mean to Mullingar conveying paupers to that district.

14088. Do you think the same ambulance would not be available?—Certainly not, because the union is very large at present.

14089. Did you get any statistics as to the number of trips the ambulance makes in a day, or week, or year?—No; I don't know what is the exact number.

14090. Are you aware that there are unions a great deal larger than the proposed Mullingar Union that are worked with only one ambulance. It is a fact, I may tell you?—Perhaps there are not so many people in them.

14091. You are supposed to be a very thinly-populated country here?—Yes, but there are a great number in the union always—about 300.

14092. I think there would be as much in some of the parishes in the West as there would be in Mullingar?—It is the big gross lands that are pushing them all into the union.

14093. You have not gone into it on a close pound, shillings, and pence calculation. You have only an impression that the rates are so low in Delvin that to scheme that you have in view would effect a saving. Is that your view?—Yes; and I don't think we would

-Feb. 16, 1884

Mr. Nicholas
Mr. Mahon.

have sufficient accommodation at present in Mullingar for the inmates we would take from Delvin Union without going to a lot of further cost.

14098. Are you aware how many sick you have one time with another in the workhouse, including both fever hospital and ordinary infirmary?—The clerk is present, and can tell you.

14099. I may tell you, you may take 90 a fairly high figure, including both fever hospital and infirmary; then you would have just double of that, 180, and again 180—There is not accommodation for that number, or over 84.

14100. You are building for them?—The buildings are finished, and the present accommodation is for about sixty, not more.

14101. You have got twenty-nine children?—Thirty.

14102. And you have got very few—only ten inmates and epileptics?—Yes.

14103. If a scheme of amalgamation or dispersal were suggested by which the inmates would all come to be inmates of a workhouse, that would get rid of ten, and if, further, all the children were taken out of the workhouse, that would take away thirty more; and again, women who come in to have illegitimate children in the workhouse, if for the future the workhouse maternity ward was not open to such persons, but if the maternity ward should only be a ward of the district hospital open for married women, that would get rid of a certain number of objectionable people from the workhouse?—Yes, it certainly would.

14104. We had a suggestion that I will go into later on with you about that. Then a large number of aged and infirm. You are very much overcrowded in Mullingar with those, and you would not have room for them, unless getting rid of those classes would give it to you; but if Mullingar was made a county alms-house, Mullingar Workhouse, outside the hospital, if that were made a county alms-house, and if you had only two classes of paupers in the Mullingar Union, if one part of it was an hospital for the sick, and if the other part was what we might call an alms-house for the aged and infirm, do you see any advantage or disadvantage in that idea?—I still think the union would be too large; you could not have proper means to convey the sick people.

14105. This would be even worse from your point of view, because it would be proposed to take into the Mullingar Workhouse, or Alms-house, or wherever it might be, it would propose to take in from the county all the aged and infirm. Do you know what number that would be?—I know the different districts, but I don't know the number it would mean. It would be Killebeggan, Ballymore, and Cool.

14106. You may take it that there are aged and infirm in the county, 120; there would be no difficulty whatever in your comfortably disposing of those 120 aged and infirm, in addition to the sick, at Mullingar if the whole workhouse was at their disposal?—No; we would have sufficient accommodation for up to 300 or 350.

14107. Take the number I have in this return, which was made in mid-winter and must be pretty nearly the height. You had in Mullingar 145, in Ashboro 120, and in Delvin only seven, the reason being that Delvin had very few inmates, and most of them were up in the sick ward?—You should count in portion of the Tallisore Union, Killebeggan, Ballymore also, and Cool.

14108. Even taking 400 or 500 as a possible number, would you not still have enough room?—Not for 500.

14109. But with no other class?—I don't think we would be able to accommodate more than 400.

14110. Well, 400 is more than you would have to accommodate, but even if you were pinched to it, would you not have room for more than that?—Yes.

14111. So that this workhouse of Mullingar would be sufficient for the aged and infirm of the county and the sick of its own neighbourhood?—In a case of emergency up to 500, whether the doctor would recommend that or not.

14112. If you had only one class in the workhouse, would it not be possible to sub-divide these according to their respectability and character, and you would have some wards for people of good character, and you would be able to have some wards divided into cubicles for old married couples?—It would be a great advantage, too, having 400 or 500. I don't think you would have sufficient accommodation to classify them that way.

14113. You could classify them according to character; at all events, if any old couples did wish to be together that might lead to some little structural alterations?—Yes, you could not accommodate the same number in that case.

14114. But you could classify them according to character, roughly. People of decent, well-behaved inmates could be separated from many, turbulent, troublesome people?—Yes, but you would want to do away with the stamp inmates altogether.

14115. The tramp would be excluded; he would be looked after in one central institution for each province of Ireland, or something of that sort; he would be taken possession of and put there?—If all you suggest was carried out, I would not be opposed to amalgamation, and I am sure the Board of Guardians would not.

14116. Always providing that there would be no additional expenditure?—Yes.

14117. That is a view we have heard. We are bearing that in mind. We consider that the origin of this Commission was a desire to reduce taxation, if possible, without impairing efficiency?—That is our motive also.

14118. But we should be sorry to suggest anything that would not be an economy, so that if that scheme could be carried out, and at the same time economy preserved, would you approve of it?—Yes.

14119. We were speaking just now of girls coming into workhouse to have illegitimate children. We received a good deal of evidence about that, in large towns, such as Dublin, Belfast, and elsewhere, and the suggestion that were put before us were somewhat to this effect, that girls who were about to have illegitimate children, their present course of action is to come into the workhouse some few months before their confinement, when they can no longer remain outside without observation. They come into the workhouse, and for three or four months before their confinement they are associated with rather a depraved class, and owing to workhouse classification, it is really impossible to keep them apart; you know that as a Guardian?—Yes.

14120. Then it was suggested to us that in future workhouses should not be open to that class, that they should be sent at the expense of the rates—nothing very much in excess of the present expenditure—that they should be sent to a penitentiary. There are various penitentiaries conducted on religious principles by different religious bodies, and that these girls should be sent to these institutions, when they would remain prior to their confinement. That either there should be, as in some, lying-in wards attached to the institution, or, in others, that they should go to lying-in hospitals outside and come back to the penitentiary; and the object of these institutions should be to reclaim these girls and start them on life, and provide with produce for the child, requiring the girl to contribute to its support, and to try to prevent the poor girl from falling again, as they so often do now?—And keep the child out of the workhouse?

14121. The child would never be in the workhouse. It would only be until it reached the age that it could eat what was going in this institution, and then it would be boarded-out?—I think that would be a splendid arrangement. It is very defective at present in the workhouse. You have girls of the class who fall once mixing with bad classes.

14122. We have seen them coming back with five or six children?—The accommodation they get in the workhouse the first time they are in does not tend to bring them back again.

14123. There are obvious objections to it?—It would make it more known.

14124. No; make it less known. They would be out of their own neighbourhood, and it would make it comparatively easy for a girl to get rid of her child. But the evidence we have got is that a girl gets her first child without any thought of the child, and it really would not operate as an immoral incentive, the fact that another girl was able to start again fresh and get rid of her child?—It would be a great improvement on the present system.

14125. The present system is bad?—Very bad.

14126. Did it occur to you when you expressed an opinion against amalgamation strongly, that it would cause great hardship to the sick if they were obliged to travel long distances?—That is one of my principal reasons.

14127. The hardship that would be inflicted by closing Delvin and obliging the Delvin sick to come very long distances, as from Clonsilla, we will say, eighteen Irish miles, into Mullingar; that would be a hardship?—Yes; and then in case of an urgent call, the van going from Mullingar would be a long time going twenty-five miles and back.

14128. I think the Commissioners here would be all disposed to acknowledge the weight of that objection, and they have received, very generally, suggestions that

Feb 15, 1904.
Mr. Nicholas
McMahon.

even if a workhouse was broken up, some small hospital provision should be made in the centre where the workhouse is for dealing with the sick, for treating the sick, that the sick should never be obliged to go further than they do at present?—It would be very necessary, if a workhouse was broken up, to have something of the kind.

14126. You would have a little hospital, with a nurse or two nurses, and the doctor of the locality, and the chaplain of the locality; that would be just the expense you would have there; the great objection you had to it would then disappear. I suppose you would be rather afraid that leaving the hospital there might take away the economy of closing the workhouse?—It would mean a staff there.

14127. It would mean a small staff. You would still get rid of the master and matron, subject to those pension rights?—If all the suggestions you mentioned a few months ago were carried out, I would be in favour of amalgamation, and I am sure all the Guardians would be, too.

14128. But when you gave an opinion against it, you were rather affected?—By the long distance.

14129. By the idea that if Delvin was broken up there would be nothing to take its place, and it would be incorporated in the large Union of Mullingar?—Yes, and would overcrowd the Mullingar Union.

14130. Dr. BROOKE.—One of your reasons against amalgamation was on account of the difference of the rates?—It is one of the reasons. I have several reasons.

14131. Is what you did you make that out?—Because the cost of maintenance in Delvin is much less than in Mullingar Union. And I think small unions can be worked on a cheaper scale than a large one like Mullingar, and that Delvin can work its union much cheaper than we can work it on their behalf here.

14132. That is not a generally accepted view?—That is one of my reasons.

14133. For instance, now, if you have a small institution with a fixed number of staff, master, matron, porter, clerk, and schoolmaster, the salaries of these officers, and rations, and so forth, divided amongst a few inmates, would run up the average cost greatly?—Not having sufficient accommodation in Mullingar, it would mean a lot of extra cost being put in here.

14134. Do you see what I mean?—I understand what you mean.

14135. Did you get what it cost to keep the union in Delvin?—Yes.

14136. The food and clothing in Delvin, according to the report of the Local Government Board, is 4s. 7½d. and in Mullingar 5s. 5½d.; then, when you take the case of the officers, I take it it would be much higher per inmate in Delvin than in Mullingar, because the proportion of staff is much higher in Delvin in proportion to the number than it is in Mullingar. The small applies to all the small unions?—Yes, we have not so large a staff in Delvin as in Mullingar; we have a staff only in proportion.

14137. CHAIRMAN.—Rather out of proportion, you have more in Delvin than in Mullingar in bare numerical proportion?—I cannot account for it then unless it is better management in the Delvin Union.

14138. CHAIRMAN.—I don't think you may rely on that supposition. You may congratulate yourself that Mullingar stands a long way first.

Dr. BROOKE.—What other reason have you against amalgamation?—The inconvenience attend.

14139. CHAIRMAN.—The only figures you took were the cost of food and clothing?—That is all.

14140. You did not look at the total cost of the union and divide that by the number of paupers?—I did not.

14141. That would be, of course, the proper test?—No; but the paupers coming here would be put on the same rate as the paupers in Mullingar are getting.

14142. Dr. BROOKE.—Would it not reduce Mullingar, because you would not increase the staff in the same proportion as the number of extra inmates you might receive?—It was the other way I looked at it—that each patient coming from Delvin would in a short time be costing the same as the patients at present in Mullingar.

14143. Then, again, there would be a saving at Delvin, and Mullingar would get its proportion of that if it were one rate for the combined unions?—Not interfering with the District Council, Mullingar should not stand in loss or gain by Delvin so much.

14144. CHAIRMAN.—But you dislike the idea of any possible amalgamation of districts as opposed to unions?—Yes.

14145. Dr. BROOKE.—How far did that influence you in going against the amalgamation. Was it really on that ground?—Yes, until I heard it from this gentle-

man here, that the District Council would not follow the amalgamation of unions; of course it had a powerful influence against amalgamation.

14146. CHAIRMAN.—As I have said, we have nothing to do with that here. Our authority is only to inquire into Poor Law arrangements. We have no power to inquire into road expenditure, or anything of that sort?—Then it is possible for the district to follow.

14147. Dr. BROOKE.—What I wanted to know was, how far that influenced you in your idea against the amalgamation of workhouses?—It was a very strong factor.

14148. CHAIRMAN.—What is the secret of your objection. Is there a heavy expenditure in Delvin for such?—Yes; and they have borrowed a great lot of money in proportion to their valuation.

14149. Labourers' cottages?—Yes, and other public works.

14150. Dr. BROOKE.—You don't want to be an asset to liquidate their debt?—No.

14151. The Mullingar Guardians did not take into consideration the advisability of a sanatorium treatment for consumptives?—No, I don't think so.

14152. You have a great many consumptives in this district?—Yes, a good number.

14153. And of course you are aware that it is an infectious disease?—Yes.

14154. Still the Guardians have not made any arrangements?—No; they made no suggestions with regard to that.

14155. They made some little alterations in the infirmary?—I have often heard suggestions outside the Guardians for a central place for all Ireland.

14156. Would it not be better for a county, or a combination of counties?—Yes; to be worked in the same way as the asylum is worked, it might be better, but not at such an expensive scale.

CHAIRMAN.—A consumptive patient costs a great deal; no matter where they are, the dietary has to be very good.

14157. Dr. BROOKE.—But it might also tend to reduce the disease itself, which would be true economy, wipe it out. If the same care was taken with consumption in human beings as is done with diseases in animals; they can stamp out diseases in animals with precautions. However, you think it would be a desirable thing to have a consumptive sanatorium?—I think it would.

14158. And you think the Guardians should join in such a scheme?—I am certain they would.

14159. CHAIRMAN.—You have had experience of the boarding-out of children here?—Yes.

14160. How is it working in your union?—I don't think the children are given to the proper people. We don't receive applications from the proper people. It is generally from the labouring class, where they have no cost. And then going out of the union we always give an order for clothes; after that they get no clothes from the Guardians. I think it would be very desirable in the winter months for the children to come to the union, or some place outside, and get a suit of clothes, say £1, and in the summer months get half that amount, because the people who get the children are not able to support them on £7 a year. They are not able to buy boots. The children are good enough for the first six months, but after that they are in a terrible state.

14161. Then the practice of your Board of Guardians is to give them a suit of clothes going out, and after that not give any clothes, but let the people buy them out of the £7?—Yes. It is 1s. 2d. a month, and it is not sufficient to buy clothes.

14162. You would be in favour of the Guardians in some way supplying clothes?—Yes.

14163. And over and above the clothing to give them so much for the keep?—To give them the same allowance as at present, and 30s. a year, £1 in winter, and 20s. in summer for clothes; and another matter, the Guardians have not proper control over the children. There are twenty-nine children at present in Mullingar Union, and the parents will object to these children being boarded out. I think it would be a very advisable thing if the law was amended in such a way that the Guardians would have complete control over every person to whom they give relief.

14164. That they would have discretionary power. In some cases it would be, of course, intolerable and harsh to take away a child from a person who, owing to a series of misfortunes, became a pauper for a time?—Every case to be considered on its own merits.

14165. If you gave such power to the Board of Guardians, what appeal would you allow from that decision

in the case of a parent objecting?—I don't know what objection to offer in answer to that.

14156. Would it be a reasonable thing to allow them to appeal to magistrates at Petty Sessions?—I don't know. I could not give any opinion about that, but I know the Guardians have not power enough over the children.

14157. At all events it would hardly do that the power to take away children from parents should be given to a board sitting in a non-judicial capacity—that they should be able to separate fathers and mothers from their children without some appeal to a court of law. Do you see the force of that?—I do.

14158. You and I know how Boards of Guardians work. They have a great deal of business to do, and cannot afford to spend time over the case of a child—to think it out thoroughly; they would, like sensible men, come to a conclusion in a short time on the rough

facts of the case, but then it would hardly do to let such a decision separate fathers and mothers from their children—I think it would be hard in some cases, but without any reason they object very often in the union, where they are remaining in the union themselves.

14159. You would propose that a discretion should be left to the Guardians to pass a resolution, as they are in some places already, placing the Board of Guardians in loco parentis, and that they would then be able to board out children or deal with them as they thought fit. The only thing I was suggesting was that it might be fair to have an appeal for a parent objecting?—It would be only fair to the parent.

14160. Then all your suggestions about out-door relief are rather with a view to amending the present system. You don't object to the system, but merely like to improve it?—Yes.

Rev. HILL WILSON WHITE, B.D., LL.D., examined.

I am a resident of the Mullingar Union, but it is not proper of the union inquiry so much I have come to you to-day as a representative of the County Infirmary. The Board asked Mr. Nooney and me if we would come and represent the infirmary, and give our opinion about certain matters. What I was most anxious to speak about was the advisability of keeping our county infirmary intact, and that in any arrangement or re-arrangement that might possibly be made of infirmaries in the country, that no interference should be made which should wipe out our county infirmary, a place where a number of respectable poor people are quite willing to go when they are sick, who would shrink from going to the union hospital. Members of the better class receive great kindness and attention in every way in our county infirmary, and many of these I think would die in their houses if the alternative was being sent to the union workhouse.

14171. CHAIRMAN.—Of course there are a great number of cases who would be operated on by up-to-date methods in your county infirmary who could not be so dealt with?—Could not be so dealt with in an ordinary union hospital.

14172. Your argument would not be merely the maintenance of the institution was useful, but that it was one which, on account of its efficiency, should be recognized as a county centre for operations and for the treatment of the very poorest?—For the very poorest, where we would have the best surgical appliances.

14173. You have got a good operating-room?—First-rate; a very clever surgeon, and a first-rate staff.

14174. A beautiful ward; we went through the institution and were greatly pleased with it?—I would draw attention to the great economy with which our county infirmary in Westmeath is worked. It is worked on the very cheapest lines, consistent with efficiency; there is no waste-fulness of any sort.

14175. Do you find it hard to meet your out-goings and pay your way?—I think we pay our way remarkably well.

14176. Without any undue straggling or cutting down; you have not to deny your sick?—Nothing is more generous than the dietary which all our patients get.

14177. And the doctors and nurses are satisfied with the arrangements for treating the sick?—Perfectly satisfied. The only case where we have dissatisfaction is the treatment of consumptive cases, and for the last four or five years I have been personally agitating to have these cases isolated from the ordinary hospital cases. I think it unfair to bring consumptive cases into a ward—a criminal thing, spreading infection—what modern science has pointed out that consumption is one of the most infectious diseases, and the result of that agitation has been the reconstruction of the wards you may have seen the other day. We have had these wards properly boarded, and to a certain extent made suitable for these cases, but our great anxiety is for the erection of out-door shelters, and if anything could be done to modify the Act under which the county infirmaries are worked. At present no mounds can be erected on any external structure improvements; the house can be kept in repair, but no new building can be erected, and so if we want to have these out-door shelters they can only be erected by appealing to the public at large, and erecting them by public subscription. We have collected £12 towards this. I was greatly disappointed. I had an idea that when an appeal was made for a purpose of this sort there would have been a generous response to it.

14178. This Commission may have stopped the flow

of money for this purpose, for it is generally recognized that an establishment for the treatment of consumption is one of the matters on which we are to report?—I am very glad to hear that.

14179. Would you be in favour of treating consumption in your county infirmary in no other way except just merely as filling up the gap?—Scarcely not; in the possibility of this sanction being erected, it would be far better to treat them in that way; but then a large proportion of the cases that come to our infirmary are really tuberculous cases. I would fancy 70 per cent., at a low average, are from tuberculous. I have been a governor of the infirmary for twenty-five years, and before that for a number of years governor of the infirmary in Navan, and I have taken a great interest in the care of the sick in this way during all those years, and it has been a sad thing to see consumptive patients put into beds next the others, who perhaps might be confined there for months with a broken leg, and all that time inhaling the consumptive infection. Then I was anxious also to draw attention to the fact that of later years shop assistants and domestic servants are charged a small sum for their treatment in the county infirmary, and if any suggestion could be made by your Commission as to how we could extend that system of the reception of paying patients.

14180. You think you have not sufficient power to do a good deal yourself that way?—We have not sufficient power.

14181. I would recommend you to communicate with the committees of Fermagh and Antrim at Baniskillen and Lougharn. You will be astonished to find how much they are doing without having any more powers?—We have passed general resolutions. But there is no sanction behind our law. We have no power to enforce it. It is a broken falcon. We say we will charge any person who Poor Law valuation is over £20 a year. We furnish the bill, but we have no power to recover.

14182. You suggest that the law should be changed to enable public bodies who treat the sick out of the public rates to recover such proportion up to the whole of the cost as they may deem fair?—Certainly. And that would be an enormous advantage all over Ireland. In England they have a number of cottage hospitals, and others where paying patients are received, but we have not those advantages over here; and your experience, I am sure, is the same as mine, that there are numbers of people of moderate means who really have their lives sacrificed at a very early period from lack of medical attendance, which they cannot pay for, and which, if they had hospitals where they could pay 10s. or 15s., or even £1 a week, or even 1s. a week, that their lives would be saved to their families, and great economic loss to the country would be saved.

14183. We have had very good evidence to that effect from witnesses, pointing out the double advantage. People feel more independent, and they like it better. They could not, of course, pay 10s. or 15s.; but there are plenty who can pay a small thing?—And there are people who can pay 10s. and 15s. willingly. We have had cases of gardeners connected with the bank in Mullingar who were treated in the infirmary; it was impossible for them to pay anything.

14184. But they got free treatment?—Absolutely free. In some instances they made a donation to the infirmary on going away, but that was not exactly business, and there have been many cases in the county in my experience of well-to-do people getting necessary treatment in the infirmary from whom we could exact no charge.

Feb 19, 1904.

Mr. Nicholas
McNabes.

Rev. Hill
Wilson White

Feb. 16, 1906.

Rev. Mr.
Wilson White.

14183. How far do you live from any hospital?—Seven miles from Mullingar. I live at Wilson's Hospital, Mullingarham. One of the witnesses was speaking of ambulance accommodation in the county. There is a very admirable ambulance in connection with our workhouse here. I have had to use it several times in connection with sending patients to the fever hospital, and nothing could exceed the kindness in the fever hospital to the patients sent in there. I think it is better the public should know that, because in numbers of instances scarlatina patients are kept at home, people dreading to send them to the fever hospital, and if they knew the kindness in the fever hospital, and the comfort of the ambulance, and the attention the nurses pay to the patients coming in, more people would take advantage of it. I think there would be no risk, and cases would be selected at once.

14184. Dr. Broome.—How does the method of charging according to the rateable value work?—I think it works very badly; we get very little money.

14187. Does it exclude a large number of those who could pay, and would pay, and would wish to pay, which you cannot charge at present?—It excludes nobody; it is a *brasserie* between absolutely.

14188. You say it is not a good system. It is not on a good basis. The valuation of the person's property might be one thing, but they might not own the property.—That has been pointed out in many instances. A man with a large valuation might have a large family and be a poor man.

14189. CHAIRMAN.—A case for discretion?—Yes; but there should be some law behind to enable the payment to be enforced in cases where it would be equitable.

14190. Dr. Broome.—You say you cannot spend any money out of your grants for improvements?—That has been laid down as the law to us.

14191. Can you not build an annex?—Yes, we have built sanitary annexes within the last few years; that was simply for bath-room and water-closet accommodation.

14192. CHAIRMAN.—How did the Longford people manage to spend £1,200 or £1,300 on a new wing?—We would be very anxious to know. We were told distinctly that we could not build this shelter for consumptives.

14193. And the Co. Tyrone, 2000 or £1,200 for their infirmary?—Was that from the rates or public subscription?

14194. Partly from both?—Eighty some years ago built a splendid new ward, but that was out of Mr. Wynne's bounty; he gave the money for it.

14195. There are ways of managing these things, but you would like to have it put clearly?—Put perfectly clearly, that we would know where we would be.

14196. Dr. Broome.—You would not suggest that the treatment of consumptives should be in connection with the county infirmary?—I should do so if no other provision was made.

14197. You have not sufficient ground there?—I think so. I was sometimes ago at a consumptive sanatorium near Rossmore, and it struck me we were very much better off in the county infirmary at Westmeath. We could have a better place here. It is all surrounded with trees, and it struck me we had a far sunnier and more open place.

14198. That place is sheltered with very good walls and plenty of ground round it?—We have a great freedom from trees at the infirmary.

14199. What acreage have you?—I cannot tell you. I suppose 1 acre or 1½ acres. It is not an ideal place. But my idea was to have isolation for the present between tuberculosis cases and non-tuberculosis cases.

14200. CHAIRMAN.—It would be certainly better to have them locked after three than nowhere?—It is on the principle of half a loaf.

14201. Dr. Broome.—In any case you would propose that the treatment of consumptives should be a county charge?—Certainly.

14202. The same way as the county infirmary?—Certainly.

14203. CHAIRMAN.—I don't know whether you look into these financial matters very closely, but on the question of the sick, all over the county we have received suggestions, in some cases, that the maintenance of the sick should be a county charge. One argument in favour of that was that all the people pay for the county infirmary, but only a comparatively small number of the infirm get the full benefit of it?—We have patients from Meath and Athlone.

14204. But most of your patients are from a small radius?—Yes, about ten miles.

14205. But the people at Fines or Athlone will say:—We are paying for a hospital at Athlone and for a hospital at Granard, and if we are paying for a county institution, we think all the local institutions might be county charges, too?—That is local Poor Law salaries?

14206. Yes?—But are they not county institutions to a large extent?

14207. Yes, but they are defrayed out of local rates, not out of the county?—A certain amount of our income at the county infirmary comes from subscriptions.

14208. It is very little since the Act of 1868?—Yes, we have now only seventeen subscribers; we had a large number before, but we have a large number of life members.

14209. Did any one pay a life subscription since the Act?—Yes, Lord Castlemaine, in 1899; we have had five annual subscribers who have come in since; a great number of our annual subscribers fell off.

14210. How much do you get from voluntary sources?—£65 14s. was what we got last year, but then we have the interest on the life subscriptions, which comes to over £70 a year.

14211. You would pay a name out of that about?—Yes.

14212. Practically you get very little voluntarily; it is not anything special here; it is the usual thing?—I think we have more subscribers here than in many places.

14213. Dr. Broome.—What do your patients cost per year?—About £31 5s. 0½d.

14214. Per occupied bed, it is very low?—Yes; the daily average cost of patients is 2s. 6d., and that is including establishment charges.

14215. That does not work out £31?—I am reading our last audited account.

14216. 2s. 6d. a day is very nearly £1 a week?—The daily average cost per patient, including establishment charges, 2s. 6d.

14217. Then the yearly cost per patient must be nearly £50?—Here in the return (produced). I will for granted the figures are right.

14218. It is the average cost per bed per annum; it is not per occupied bed?—For the future I shall draw the registrar's attention to that, because it is misleading.

14219. How many beds in the institution?—Number of beds maintained, thirty. Our average number of patients during the year was 135.

14220. CHAIRMAN.—Do you treat typhoid?—We do; we have had three cases during the last month, we have two cases now. That is the only fever we have. There

another species of disease that I mentioned for years against its being admitted into the county infirmary, and that was diphtheria. It is extremely unfair that a patient in the hospital, as we commonly call it, should be brought into the county infirmary to the disturbance of respectable patients. It is too small an institution. If a man is in delirious frames he should go to the workhouse or to jail.

MR. MARK MURRAY EXAMINED.

Mr. Mark Murray.

14221. CHAIRMAN.—You see Chairman of the Dublin Board of Guardians?—No, of the District Council.

14222. I think the union and the rural district come to the same conclusion on the question of amalgamation?—Yes.

14223. What is your view?—That the workhouse be retained, provided that the union be enlarged.

14224. What enlargement would you suggest?—The Coole district.

14225. Grenard does not want to be broken up?—That is more than I can say.

14226. You think you can take in some of the Coole district. How far would they be from you?—Castlepollard is seven miles, and they would be ten.

14227. Would the most distant point be Fines?—Yes. Delvin goes to Fines Bridge ten miles.

14228. How far is it from Castlepollard to Delvin?—Seven. I never looked over the distance.

14229. Castlepollard to Fines is almost eight English, so sixteen or seventeen miles state is the distance?—If Delvin were amalgamated, how would you manage Free East and Free West.

Feb 16, 1904.

Mr. Mark
Murray.

14230. Supposing a hospital was left for the sick at Delvin—I would imagine that one workhouse is enough in the county. If Delvin was made the county workhouse, and abolished Mullingar and Athlone; it is more rural; it is too much congested about Athlone and Mullingar for a workhouse at all, and it is too near a resort for the tramps.

14231. You would make them go a little bit out of the way?—Yes.

14232. Would you take in anything else but Athlone and Mullingar. Would you take in Tallagore, the Kilbeggar part; take in the whole county?—I think with the service and locomotion in the near future it will be very easy to fit it.

14233. Motors?—Motors. We are getting a new railway from Mullingar direct. If you had a motor service one county workhouse would be sufficient.

14234. Would you think that it ought to be within a couple of miles of the end of the county. How far are you from the county bounds of Meath—two miles?—Far more.

14235. Dr. Baggot?—3 or 3½ miles; certainly not more!—Only union goes very near to Oldcastle.

14236. CHAIRMAN.—I am taking the nearest point?—It is very near Trim and not so far from Oldcastle; but then I am looking at the locomotion generally. Mullingar and Athlone are two very congested areas, in my opinion, and Delvin would be more rural to have a county workhouse in, that there can be a service from Oule or Castlepollard, a motor service.

14237. Is there any other suggestion you have?—In one the workhouse is abolished it should be turned into an infirmary asylum. That is the opinion of both the Commissioners and the Guardians.

14238. If it were abolished would you leave any provision in Delvin for the sick?—Oh, yes; have a hospital in it, for which a nurse and the medical officer of the district would suffice.

14239. It is very moderate, but it is not in tune with your first idea?—We are out of the first and into the second now.

14240. Query No. 3?—That an old-age pension scheme, on the lines of the Continental system, be passed by the Government.

14241. Can you refer me to any Continental system?—There are several you could refer to.

14242. Had you any scheme before you when you passed this resolution?—Yes, there was; I demonstrated it; it was mentioned. There is a witness here that will give the reference, Mr. Sutton.

14243. No. 3 was as an alternative to out-door relief?—Yes; for instance, England has an old-age pension.

14244. Are you thinking of possibilities or facts?—Facts.

14245. Is there an old-age pension scheme in England?—It is in Lancashire. I don't know about all England.

14246. What evidence have you of the existence of that scheme?—I have been an eye-witness to it myself.

14247. You know a person that is drawing money out of it?—Yes.

14248. How much did they get?—I did not take down what they were getting, but I know it is a common system to go on Sundays to the different churches to get assistance for those persons from the workhouses, and to apply to the workhouses then, if deserving, for 10s., 7s., or 5s.

14249. You would like Delvin to have the same advantages?—I would not expect Delvin to be exceptional to other parts of Ireland.

14250. No. 4?—We consider divisional rating, if reported to, would be more satisfactory than union rating, particularly in connection with out-door relief, as it would make each Guardian more vigilant to see there was no abuse, and we consider poverty, not destitution, should be the test for the granting of out-door relief. We consider also the decent poor should be kept apart from the vicious, and old married couples should be allowed to end their old days together.

14251. As regards the area of charge for out-door relief, how does the present system work. Do you think there is any extra generosity in cases under the present system?—I have been a Guardian these twenty years myself.

14252. You had, up to the year 1896, divisional rating; after that you had the union as the area of charge?—Yes.

14253. Do you prefer the old area of charge to the new?—Yes, I do.

14254. Now, why?—When a case turns up it does not interest the particular Guardians, and if it is not deserving it passes; nobody looks after it.

14255. A Guardian brings forward an applicant for relief?—Through the relieving officer.

14256. An application for relief is brought forward, and then you say that no one says anything against it, and it goes through?—Yes.

14257. Is that because it comes off a large area of taxation?—I believe so.

14258. Have you opinion that if a small area had to pay for it, the question of whether or not relief should be given would be left largely to the vote of the representatives of that district, and they would be very careful not to put too big a burden on their ratepayers?—Yes, or give it only to deserving people.

14259. Have you known any getting it who were not what you would call deserving?—I have, indeed.

14260. Under what circumstances—what class of undeserving people have you known to get it?—It occurred on several occasions when I would be administering it. I could not know, but I heard of it afterwards, where people did get relief and were getting relief, and drank it.

14261. Then you would get them knocked off?—Quite so.

14262. But they would have a pull out of it before they get knocked off?—They would.

14263. Do you think the same difficulty would not arise if the electoral divisions were the area of charge?—I believe myself that if a Guardian saw this system going on it would be questioned at the next Board meeting, but when it is union rating, why, nobody is interested. It has a tendency to become relaxed.

14264. What is everybody's business is nobody's business, and you think having it on the big area makes more get it?—I have found out myself that relief has increased since it has been administered in that way.

14265. Obviously you don't object to out-door relief, because you suggest an enlargement of the qualification?—I quite agree with out-door relief, only not to abuse it.

14266. And the chief safeguard you can suggest is that of narrowing down the area of charge so as to make people look closely into it?—Yes.

14267. We have received the same suggestions from all parts of the country. Now, No. 5?—That the hospital be detached and isolated from the workhouse proper as much as possible.

14268. And approached by a private entrance; that would be necessary if we shut up the workhouse?—Yes.

14269. Do you think that would be a good way of carrying out your recommendation, No. 5, to close the workhouse?—I have not a bit of objection to have it closed if it were worked as economically.

14270. Then if it could be shown to you that there would be a saving in it without any hardship to the sick or poor, would you be in favour of closing the workhouse?—I would before night, at once.

14271. No. 6?—This query was not replied to.

14272. We have been discussing some of them already, No. 7, whether paying patients should be taken into hospital and charged for their treatment according to their means. You have heard the discussion we have had here with other witnesses?—I have.

14273. About getting contributions and giving Guardians power to fix how much a man ought to be able to pay, and having legal power to enforce that. Would you approve of that?—You have legal power already, as far as I know, over any paying patient. I always administered it that way.

14274. You never made an order for payment of 1s. a week?—Not so low, but I have made it for 12s. a week.

14275. There is a good deal of difference between the two—the power may be there—but as all events in practice what you go for is to recover the average cost of maintenance—is not that it?—Yes.

14276. Well, the principle that is now suggested is that Guardians should have the power to make an order for payment of a contribution, not of the whole cost. Would you think that where people could not afford to pay the whole cost, it would be a wise thing to give the Guardians power to recover as much as the people could pay without hardship?—I would quite concur with that.

14277. Will you tell us the view of your Board about the tramp question?—That the tramp system can be dealt with by making the tramps work for their board and lodging, and that a colony should be taken over by the British Government, and to send those who persist in vagrancy out of the country altogether.

14278. What is generally meant by a colony is a colony within the country, and not outside the country. They call it a labour colony. There is no such thing as transportation at present; that has gone out of fashion. When they speak of a labour colony they

Feb 25, 1904.

Mr. Mack
Murray.

have an idea merely of having a farm, with suitable buildings and enclosures, and keeping them at work. That would meet your view?—It would.

14278. If they lost their liberty and were confined until they proved themselves worthy of being set again?—Yes, that would be a good plan. I think the proposal and accorder of this thought the Government might send them out in South Africa. The proposal is here in court.

14279. Did you second it?—No, but I approve of it. I happened to be chairman of the committee—to get them out of the country altogether. The County Council, as answers to 8, had a different view—that if they applied at the workhouse more than once a year, they should be sent away to some place.

CHAIRMAN.—They virtually wanted the application of the English law to Ireland, which enables the Board of Guardians to shut them up if they come back so many times, by periods increasing in length according to the frequency of the visits.

14280. Dr. BROWNE.—In answer to Query 5, you say the hospital to be detached and isolated from the workhouse proper as much as possible; do you think that would make the hospital more popular and more availed of?—I think so; if it were isolated properly a great many pauper patients would go into it.

14281. Do you think they would in its present state?—I don't think workhouse hospitals are popular at present.

14282. Did you go into it to inquire why they are not popular?—I did not. I don't know is it an objection the people have in the country generally to going into the workhouse hospital; it is very hard to get them to go in. I know that several who did venture have been properly treated, and are very satisfied with the treatment they get.

14283. Have you gone through it at all?—I have been in it many times.

14284. What do you think of the arrangements?—I

think they could be greatly improved. The arrangements, as far as I remember, in Dublin, are fairly good, but they are nothing like the hospitals I have seen in Dublin.

14285. You are in Mullingar to-day. It might repay you well if you just go and look at Mullingar Workhouse Hospital, and then look at Dublin tomorrow. In the interests of humanity I think it would be well to—There is one thing I want to bring under your notice, that Dublin is a small town, with a very small valuation, £53,000, and any little increase of £200 means 1d., and any little thing means 1d., and there is a regular scramble. In Mullingar there are forty-one electoral divisions, and any of the divisions is, by £1,000, larger in the valuation than any in Dublin. That makes a vast difference. You never could improve according to the inspection of the Local Government Board.

14286. Why could you not?—It would leave the rate too high.

14287. What is the rate in the 2 in Dublin?—About 2s. 1d.

14288. Do you know that there are many much larger than that, nearly twice that?—I don't know, but I know it leaves any chairman very unpopular in putting on a heavy rate.

14289. But is it not your duty to the poor to do it?—There are two parties always neglected—the poor and the ratepayers.

14290. Take my advice and visit the Mullingar Workhouse to-day?—Has it been newly constructed?

14291. No; it has been that way for years, and if you have any other Guardians from Dublin here, take them with you?—Mullingar is a very popular workhouse, I am sure.

14292. CHAIRMAN.—And if you want to Adonis you would see it very good there?—If Dublin is made the county workhouse, I am sure we will have it fitted up in the newest style.

MR. SAMUEL B. SUTTON EXAMINED.

Mr. Samuel B.
Sutton.

14293. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the Dublin Board of Guardians?—Yes.

14294. We had some conversation just now about old-age pensions, and I think you were to tell us something about it?—He confused it; it was the Continental system I speak of.

14295. Can you refer us to the Continental system?—Is there not such a scheme on the Continent?

14296. That is what I want to know from you?—I only know it theoretically. I believe in Prussia it is in existence.

14297. But you don't know?—No, except theoretically. I would not be up in the statistics of it, but I would be prepared to make the bold statement that workhouses could be abolished altogether by reverting to such a system.

14298. As the Continental system?—Yes.

14299. What is your idea of the Continental system?—Giving a certain sum per annum to the destitute decent poor, to be kept by their friends, and in the absence of having any friends, to go to Government institutions kept by various religious denominations at the expense of the rates.

14300. You would close workhouses and have these pensions for deserving old people?—Yes.

14301. And you would send others to institutions kept up by religious bodies?—Yes, in case they had no friends.

14302. Would you be afraid that there would be a great rush for these pensions, and many would go for them?—Of course it would need proper vigilance, to see that there were no abuses of the system.

14303. How would you safeguard such a system. Supposing that these pensions were to be given, would you give them to everybody in the whole country?—Oh, certainly not. I don't think so. I think the deserving poor are easily known.

14304. Some people say that everybody should get them, but let them not claim them unless they like; but you would say: "No; draw the line at deserving and aged poor?"—Quite so.

14305. Do you think a great many people would be apt to try to get themselves forward in that category?—It would need careful vigilance to see that there was no abuse of this system. But that is only an abstract question at present; the workhouse system must exist until we get a better scheme.

14306. If you give us a good system to replace it, if it is too abstract, we cannot get hold of it?—It is very hard to put it into the concrete.

14307. That system could not touch the sick. We must provide for the sick, apart from the poor. The class you are mainly concerned in are the class known under the Poor Law as the aged and infirm?—That is so.

14308. That is your idea, the idea that it would be cheaper and better to board these old people out with their relatives or friends than to keep up an institution for them?—That is my own individual opinion.

14309. You say in some cases they might not have any relatives or friends to take them?—Yes.

14310. What would you do in such cases?—I expect there would be religious denominations according to their creed to keep them.

14311. I don't think religious people keep up almshouses?—If the workhouses were abolished, could they not be formed?

14312. I am afraid you would be jumping into my if you did that; the economy would vanish?—Before the workhouse system it worked very well with non-profits.

14313. The population was very thin then?—Was it? I think it is thinner now.

14314. When Henry VIII. dissolved the monasteries you had a very small population in the country. If a destitute and deserving person had no friends or relatives, do you think there would be any hardship in doing as they do in some Continental countries. I am speaking theoretically like you. I have heard that in Switzerland they put a man up to contract, to be considered for; a bill on the wall says that orders will be reserved on such and such a day for the support of Pat Mooney and his wife?—I think it would be quite as cheap as the workhouse system at present.

14315. If that system of boarding-out the aged and infirm were adopted by a locality, say the Dublin Union, or any other locality you like, don't you think it would be extravagant to keep up an institution at the same time. Ought not the Guardians to be obliged to declare which of the two systems they would take?—I say, sir, you should abolish all workhouses under that system.

14316. Or abolish all institutions run on one line or the other?—Yes.

14317. Or if some places felt they could not manage the boarding-out system, like big cities, if they wished

Feb. 15, 1894.

to have the institutions, let them keep the institutions and not you the other?—Yes, let it refer to either.

14319. Is there anything else that occurs to you?—Except the hospital. I think one or more hospitals would be enough in a county; that is in the case of the abolition of the workhouse system.

14320. Assuming now the abolition of the workhouse system, where would you put the hospital for Westmeath?—I would say in the capital of the county.

14321. That is Mullingar?—Mullingar.

14322. You would be in favour of breaking up Delvin?—Yes, if all the workhouses were to go.

14323. Then you would have to go with the rest?—If you continue the present workhouse system, I suppose we compare favourably in rates with Mullingar, and if you go in for amalgamation of unions, I would go in on a more gigantic scale, amalgamating two or three unions in every province, and have a large quantity of land attached to them.

14324. As a means of employing the inmates?—Yes; I think amalgamation should be on a more gigantic scale than Delvin with Mullingar.

14325. Perhaps you are prepared to go further than you think? But do you not think it would cause great hardship if the sick were moved from distances like Fless, Adilone, and Clonsilla into Mullingar?—Take the case of Delvin Union.

14326. What are your extreme distances there?—There are parts of Delvin Union nearer to Mullingar than to Delvin.

14327. How far would it be from Delvin, and how far from Mullingar?—I think the extreme point would be twelve Irish miles. I mean if Delvin were amalgamated with Mullingar as a hospital, the extreme point would be twelve miles, that is Clonsilla. At present it is about five miles from Delvin; Castledrop would be five more. I think eight miles would cover the extreme point either way.

14328. How far is Athlone from Mullingar?—I suppose it would be thirty miles from Delvin; you would be nearer to Dublin at Delvin than at Athlone.

14329. Don't you think there are almost prohibitive distances to take the sick. You must remember the sick cannot go by train in the worst cases. They have to be moved carefully in an ambulance and driven from the home of the sick person to the hospital door. Would you not think it a terrible thing to drive sick people such long distances?—Except you maintain hospitals in the extreme unions.

14330. That is what I want you to come to—if you kept a large hospital for cases of acute sickness?—Yes, if it would not take a large staff.

14331. You would not need many officers in connection with a small hospital?—You would want a clerk to keep the accounts.

14332. You might not want much of a clerk there. You would want a doctor and a nurse or two?—You would want one at all events.

14333. And chaplains for the religious requirements of the sick?—But I think, as far as Delvin is concerned, that it is quite within reach of Mullingar, meaning you were not doing away with Mullingar Union.

14334. How far do you call Delvin from Mullingar?—Ten Irish miles.

14335. And you don't think it would be too much to send them that distance?—That depends on the illness.

14336. The people about Delvin have always been accustomed to a hospital at their door for a long time, therefore they would feel the loss of it a great deal?—I

would go in for workhouse hospitals more up-to-date than any hospitals I have yet seen.

14337. Do you know the county infirmary here?—I do; and I would say it is infinitely superior to any workhouse hospital I have ever seen.

14338. You would rather have them on those lines?—Most decidedly.

14339. Have you seen the workhouse here?—I have not.

14340. Dr. Siger has just suggested to the last witness that he should see the infirmary here. If you both went together you would get a good look at it?—It is a notorious fact that any sick patient I have ever met would greatly prefer to go to the county infirmary than any union hospital, not only in this county, but I am familiar with Wicklow and Dublin.

14341. I know plenty of people who go into workhouse hospitals now without the least objection, except that they dislike the idea of the connection of pauperism with it; but as far as the treatment in a great many workhouse hospitals goes now it is really very good. It is not good for surgical operations or things of that sort, but except for that it is very good—good nursing and good food?—The atmosphere of the workhouse is objected to.

14342. If you close the workhouse and leave the hospital you lose the atmosphere?—That is so.

14343. Dr. Broome.—You have heard it stated that the principal number of patients comes from a radius within a few miles of the county infirmary?—I believe it extends all over the Co. Westmeath.

14344. Patients coming to the infirmary?—As far as I know, I believe it is available for any case of accident.

14345. You can easily understand the difficulty of getting an accident case removed sixteen Irish miles is very considerable?—It would be.

14346. There is no ambulance at present in the county infirmary. They don't send for any patients, and the patients themselves cannot get an ambulance to remove them.

CHAIRMAN.—Don't you think there ought to be power in any case to keep an ambulance?—I think there ought.

14347. Dr. Broome.—I think you suggested that in addition to the county infirmary there should be small cottage hospitals in the outlying districts?—In case of Delvin being abolished, we would rather contribute to the county infirmary than to the workhouse hospital.

14348. CHAIRMAN.—Wait until you see Mullingar before you go home?—I know the deserving cases would rather go to the county infirmary.

14349. Dr. Broome.—If the workhouse was done away with at Delvin?—I don't think it would save the rates one bit.

14350. A small hospital left there, it would be practically the same as the county infirmary in a smaller scale?—But you have still to deal with the clerical staff, which would swell up the rates.

14351. I don't see how it would?—Would you not necessarily want a clerk?

14352. CHAIRMAN.—No, a doctor and nurse ought to be able to keep any books that are necessary?—The clerk at Delvin has about half the salary of the clerk at Mullingar.

14353. Dr. Broome.—There are 300 cottage hospitals in England with very small staffs?—Cottage hospitals would be a fine system in this country, too.

14354. CHAIRMAN.—You would rather have that than oblige the sick to go long distances?—I would say so; by all means look after the sick.

MR. EDWARD GARGAN EXAMINED.

14355. CHAIRMAN.—Are you a member of the Delvin Board of Guardians?—I am the Chairman.

14356. You have heard the evidence your two colleagues have given. Is there anything you would like to add to their views. Is there any point that they put forward that you dissent from?—Very little.

14357. Tell us, briefly, in your own words, what is your view?—My view is that if there would not be a hospital kept in Delvin it would be a terrible inconvenience to the sick poor.

14358. As regards the other part of the house—the aged and infirm—do you think it would be any hardship to oblige them to go to a central workhouse such as Mullingar?—I think it would.

14359. How many aged and infirm would you have, in a rule?—I am not able to answer.

Mr. Murray.—Last week the master told me there

were ninety-six inmates all told, children and all; forty-three aged and infirm.

14360. CHAIRMAN.—On the 1st of January you had only seven—three males and four females—you would not keep up a workhouse for seven?—I would not.

14361. I am taking the total at a good deal higher figure than you mentioned just now. I am taking the total of Delvin at 203 inmates, so I am allowing even a larger population than you are giving.

Mr. Murray.—It could vary from your data.

14362. It could, but how many people do you say are in the workhouse?

Mr. Murray.—Ninety-six.

14363. I am taking 103; but you put down forty something for aged and infirm.

Mr. Murray.—Yes, and the rest were composed of children and the tramp class.

Mr. Edward Gargan.

Feb. 16, 1904.

Mr. Edward
Gwynn.

14354. CHAIRMAN.—You had thirty children in the house and a large number of tramps. If you had a very small number both of aged and infirm, as long as the sick were dealt with as before, you would not keep up the house?—So long as the rates were not increased.

14355. And, if possible, economize the rates?—Yes; if the rates were not reduced I don't think amalgamation would answer at all.

14356. I must say I agree with you that unless you could get some great improvement?—Unless I could get an advantage; it is an advantage to the poor to have Delvin Union there.

14367. I think we all agree with you that if there is no saving on the money?—It is a great advantage to the poor in all cases to have the union there.

14368. Unless some very great advantage could be gained?—For the ratepayers.

14369. Unless some very great advantage could be

gained even outside the ratepayers, one ought not to touch it unless there is economy?—No, and great economy. I would not go in for very little.

14370. For what class is it advantageous to have the union there?—The old and infirm, and all the poor that are communicating with them; it is near them and they can be brought there, and then the sick and the lame cases.

14371. But in any case you would have a little hospital for them. I understand your position. You would be against amalgamation?—Unless there was a great saving.

14372. And if there was any hardship?—There is certainly hardship to the sick poor. If amalgamation goes on it is a hardship to bring the poor people such a journey as from the outside part of Delvin Union to Mullingar—sixteen miles—and we have a thickly-inhabited country over in North Westmeath.

Mr. MICHAEL GUNNELL examined.

Mr. Michael
Gunnell.

14373. CHAIRMAN.—From what public body do you attend?—The Rural District of Delvin and the Poor Law Guardians.

14374. What are your views on the question. Will you kindly tell us?—I believe that the Poor Law could not be properly administered, owing to the long distances, representatives would have to travel to Mullingar if Delvin was amalgamated.

14375. You think it ought not to be amalgamated?—Yes.

14376. You are rather looking at it from the point of view that if Delvin Workhouse were broken up the district there would become part of Mullingar or some other union?—Yes.

14377. And it would be too far for you to come to Mullingar?—Yes.

14378. But if you were allowed to keep your sick there, and had a local committee or body to manage the hospital, and if you just paid your share for any aged or infirm that went to the central workhouse, would you see any objection in that?—That would improve matters a bit, in the case of amalgamation, it would be the next best thing.

14379. Then as regards classification in the workhouse, what is your view there?—The decent poor I would suggest should be kept apart from the wicked or ill-conducted, and separate apartments should be provided for old married couples.

14380. It is very difficult to find out who the decent poor are, but you would leave that to the discretion of the local body?—Yes, they could easily find out that.

14381. Although it would often be a difficult question to decide which a man was?—No difficulty at all in deciding what a man's character was during life.

14382. You would give them the benefit of the doubt, and put them into a better class if you had a difficulty?—Yes, I would give them the benefit of the doubt.

14383. You would like the hospital to be separated from any other building for the relief of the poor?—Yes; it would give it a greater advantage.

14384. And the people would avail of it to a larger extent?—There is a certain feeling on the part of people against entering a poorhouse hospital, which would not be if it were a separate building.

14385. Did you ever try to find out in your own mind the reason why there is that feeling about the workhouse?—That is easily found out. People object to go to the poorhouse and any building in the centre of the poorhouse, as hospitals, usually are, must be poorhouses, and people object to go there.

14386. What is their reason?—The poorhouse has a bad name, and the reason is that they don't want to be absolutely supported by charity; their spirit is above that.

14387. That would influence a good many people, but don't you think what influences them more is what you call the bad name of the institution?—Yes.

14388. That is what makes people unwilling to go there?—That has a whole lot to do with it.

14389. Would that be because of the birth of illegitimate children and the class of people who are there. Is that what would keep respectable women from going in and using the institution?—That has a good deal to do with it.

14390. And then the class of tramps and rough people who are going there?—That, when they are hospital cases, should be kept in a separate part.

14391. What is your view about children?—That, as far as possible, they should be boarded out, and where there cannot be sufficient foster parents got, I would

have a central institution established to send them there.

14392. But preferably boarding-out?—Preferably boarding-out. I believe if there was a central institution established that education would be better looked after, and the more intelligent could get trade.

14393. Have you any experience of central institutions such as you refer to?—No; no personal experience.

14394. As regards the administration of outdoor relief, what ought to be the test for it?—I have known many cases where there was extreme poverty in a family when sickness would come upon them, and they could not be relieved because they were small farmers. They held a small portion of land and could not get relief.

14395. You don't like the present restriction of a quarter-acre?—The present restriction is objectionable.

14396. To the proper administration of Poor Law?—Yes.

14397. What restriction would you put. You know at present in the law a quarter-acre. What would you think a proper restriction to put?—If I was going to place a limit, I would say seven acres. I would have it a discretionary power with the Guardians.

14398. To relieve anyone that had not more than seven acres of land?—Yes.

14399. That might be a very valuable piece of property, the seven acres?—Yes, and it might not.

14400. Do you think the acreage in itself would be a sufficient test?—I don't think it would.

14401. What would you add to it. What do think would you make. Would you have valuation and acreage?—I did not consider that point. I would have it a discretionary power with the Guardians.

14402. You would have no test at all; that is, just repeal the quarter-acre clause and put nothing in place of it?—Yes; not have any limit.

14403. Now about tramps?—I would say that all tramps, men and women, should get a week's hard work on entering the workhouse, and be detained for a week.

14404. That is, all people who could be called tramps?—Yes; those persons that are coming in a flock night after night, I would detain them for a week's hard work, and if they came a third time, I would have them sent to a central institution that would be provided—one of these disused workhouses.

14405. Take their liberty from them?—Yes; and place them in one of these homes and make it self-supporting by their labour, until such time as they would improve in habits and become respectable persons.

14406. Would you take their children from them?—Yes, I think it would be a judicious thing.

14407. To prevent the continuation of the breed?—Yes; until there would be some hopes of bringing up the young children decently.

14408. Unless rating, that is the rate that exists at present. You prefer that to divisional rating?—Yes; the present law of rating better than divisional rating.

14409. What division do you represent in your union?—Ballinlough.

14410. That is a rural district?—Yes.

14411. And you don't object to pay your share of the town outdoor relief?—No.

14412. Why I suggest that is, there are some divisions that are very thickly populated with poor, and those divisions would require most relief, and consequently we would have the poor supporting the poor without any assistance from their better-off neighbours?—Yes.

14413. You would have union rating for outdoor and all other purposes?—All Poor Law purposes.

Mr. PATRICK JOSEPH TOHAN examined.

Feb. 16, 1904

Mr. Patrick
Joseph
Tohan.

14414. CHAIRMAN.—With what union are you connected?—Tullamore. I am Chairman of the Kilbeggan District Council.

14415. Does your Council agree with the Board of Guardians you belong to, or have you a different opinion to the Tullamore Guardians?—We have a different opinion.

14416. The Tullamore Board of Guardians are against amalgamation. You are in favour of amalgamation with Mullingar?—Yes.

14417. Or else that a part of Mullingar should be given to your district?—Yes.

14418. You think you have too small a district for the support of the poor?—Yes; it leaves our rates too high.

14419. About what are your rates of recent years?—2s. 10d. in the £.

14420. Do you happen to remember the valuation of the district?—I don't, exactly.

CHAIRMAN.—Well, we can get it; it must be very low when your rates are so high.

Mr. Downes.—£211,420.

14421. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose you have spent a good deal on labourers' cottages, have you?—Yes, we did, a good deal.

14422. The instalments are included in that?—Yes; there are about twenty in the district, and the roads are very high, principally main roads.

14423. You don't know how much of that is Poor Law expenditure?—It is about 2s. 3d.

14424. That seems rather more than it is likely to be. Oh, your district rate is 2s. 10d.; that would not benefit you under our inquiry here. What you really want is that your rural district be abolished, not the Union of Tullamore?—Not the Union of Tullamore.

We wish to be included in the Union of Mullingar.

14425. You don't mind about the Union of Tullamore. What you mind about is the Rural District Council you belong to for roads, and such-like purposes?—Yes.

14426. And in order to get rid of the rural district you would propose to get rid of the Union of Tullamore, so that you might be thrown into the Union of Mullingar?—Either that, or, as an alternative, to increase the area of the district.

14427. And so increase the area of the Union of Tullamore by taking part of Mullingar from it?—Part of Mullingar and Ashmore, the nearest parts.

14428. Did you look to see what parts you think might be put in?—Tyrril's Pass, and that district; it is nearer to Tullamore than Mullingar. Tyrril's Pass and Horseleap, and that direction.

14429. How far would they have to go from Horseleap to Tullamore?—It would be about eight miles.

Mr. MICHAEL ROSS examined.

Mr. Michael
Ross.

14430. Mr. Downes.—You belong to the Mullingar Guardians?—Yes.

14431. Did you form one of the committee that considered the question sent by this Commission?—Yes.

14432. On the whole, are you for amalgamation—joining in portions of other unions—or are you against it as a body?—We are against it.

14433. Is that because you considered the union large enough, or whether you doubted there would be any savings?—No; on both grounds.

14434. In considering the expenses, were you under the impression that the District Council expenses would come under the consideration of this Commission?—Yes, we thought it possible.

14435. Did that influence you in the decision you came to?—It helped to influence us, but I don't think that in itself would be sufficient.

14436. If the plan ultimately adopted would lead to a considerable saving, would you like amalgamation, or would you be still against it?—I think you cannot very well have amalgamation under existing circumstances.

The Union of Mullingar at the present time is a very large union, and amalgamation, taking in patients from other districts, would mean further expenditure on the part of Mullingar; part of it would be chargeable to the Union of Mullingar, and the Union of Mullingar has laid out a considerable sum of money in providing for its own sick poor, with a result that after this year, I think it is not very far-fetched to say we will have a large reduction of the rates. Then to take another union into it and additional sick poor and infirm would

14430. How far is it from Kilbeggan to Tullamore?—Six miles.

14431. Is it Meade you are looking after?—Between Meade and Horseleap.

14432. So you want to get a King's Co. Division. You would not get the benefit of that in Kilbeggan. You would be a rural district of Westmeath. You would not get the benefit of any part of the King's County that would go in?—We might get part of Westmeath between Horseleap and Meade.

14433. There is practically none of Westmeath there?—There is part of it in the Streamstown division.

14434. What is that in at present. That is the far side of the railway. There is not much valuation there, or anything of that sort?—It is thickly populated.

14435. What is the valuation of the district in Westmeath that you think you might get. Did you look into that?—I did not look into that.

14436. Is there anything else you would like to mention?—No, there is nothing else.

14437. Dr. Rogers.—What about patients and sick poor coming from Kilbeggan?—It would be a hardship on the poor to have to come to Mullingar.

14438. How far are you from Tullamore?—Six miles.

14439. And how far from Mullingar?—Twelve miles.

14440. Would you approve of the county boundary being the division, the Kilbeggan district altogether going into Mullingar?—Yes, sir.

14441. For all purposes?—All purposes.

14442. Sick and rural district?—If the sick could be treated in Tullamore Union and the Kilbeggan district included in Mullingar.

14443. Would you approve of paying to Tullamore as much per patient per week?—Yes, sir; if there was a small hospital established in connection with the large convent in Kilbeggan, patients might be treated there.

14444. CHAIRMAN.—You are six miles from Tullamore. Would not that be too short a distance to have two hospitals?

Dr. Rogers.—What is the population of Kilbeggan?—I don't know exactly; the town is 1,000.

14445. They could go to Mullingar without any great hardship?—They could.

14446. Would you prefer doing that to remaining as you are at present?—Yes, sir, that is the unanimous wish of the Council and people of Kilbeggan.

14447. CHAIRMAN.—And you think that desire would be made stronger if they had a legal right to board-out the sick in the Tullamore Workhouse?—Yes, that is the only objection we would have—the hardship it would entail on the sick poor to come such a distance.

mean further expenditure, and I think that would be a monstrous thing to ask the Mullingar people to do after doing so much themselves for the sick poor of their own union.

14448. You have all the provisions that are practically necessary or useful at present in your hospital and infirmary?—Yes.

14449. Supposing the reduction in the inmates, by taking away children and objectionable characters and tramps, enabled you to use the buildings without an increase of building operations, would you still consider that amalgamation would be undesirable?—I think amalgamation in a great many cases is very good and useful.

14450. But it is the local circumstances you consider?—In this particular case I cannot see how you can have amalgamation in Mullingar without bringing an undue burden on Mullingar, that has done, I think everybody must admit, fairly well for its own sick poor.

14451. You say you consider there is no necessity for an auxiliary asylum?—Yes; if you have an auxiliary asylum it means an additional staff, and additional cost again, and you have an asylum here in Mullingar, and the necessity for an auxiliary asylum in Westmeath does not exist that might exist in Longford or Meath, where they have long distances, at great cost, to bring patients.

14452. You have some observations to make in reference to the classification of inmates in workhouses?—Yes. I think there ought to be classification for well-known bad characters. I think they ought not to be along with deserving sick poor; but there is a great

Feb 16, 1904,
Mr. Michael
Keeve

difficulty in that. If you get an institution and put them into it, you have the question of their freedom to consider, and all that sort of thing. I think that even if there had to be some small apartments built, even in Mullingar, or adjacent to any other union, that it is so important that even that should not stop classification, even going to that expense.

14463. It would be going to some expense?—It would.

14464. But you consider that should be done in order to have proper classification?—I do. I think something should be done.

14465. Your committee considered the sending of children out of the workhouse?—Yes.

14466. What is your recommendation on that?—In Mullingar all the children that can legally be sent out are sent out, and in the National schools of the district I have come from, there are eight or nine of the children going there. I think the existing system is a first-rate system, but I think that instead of having an inspector appointed by the Local Government Board, a number of Boards of Guardians should group together—six or seven, or eight or ten—appoint an inspector; and the reason I say that is that in my district the lady inspector reported favorably upon two children which we had in a week's time to take in, and would have taken in before had we not been waiting for the report of this lady inspector, so that goes to show that her reports are not to be relied upon; anything I am speaking about is not personal to her—I never saw her—but it is the system. These children were taken away by the Board of Guardians on the ground that the relieving officer visited the school and found them not in a clean state, and the local Guardians also thought they should be taken away, although she reported favorably upon them.

14467. Your idea is that there should be a general inspector for a number of unions, who would from time to time examine all the children and report to your Board and the other Boards?—That is so.

14468. CHAIRMAN.—What are the precise grounds on which you took away these children from their foster parents?—The relieving officer came there and examined the children at the school, and found that they were not in a very clean state, and then the local Guardians also saw that these children were not properly treated.

14469. Now in what way, exactly?—They did not consider they were properly clothed; they did not think the parents should be foster parents for nurse children.

14470. They thought they had made an unwise selection in selecting these parents?—Originally; that is so.

14471. But beyond the dirt which the relieving officer found on this occasion, was there anything?—There might be local circumstances, which the inspector could not possibly be aware of, but this is what an inspector should make himself aware of.

14472. I was trying to come to the real ground why the children were removed?—It is not exactly in my district, and therefore I do not wish to go into it.

14473. You do know?—I was one of the members of the Board of Guardians.

14474. And there you heard the reasons why. You prefer not making public the reasons?—I have no objection to it, but one of the reasons was that one of the children, I believe, used to be sent to the public-house for drink.

14475. That is a very proper reason for removing. That, of course, would not be known to the Inspector, and even if you join with four or five other unions, and employ an inspector, would not the same reason still apply?—I don't think it would, for this reason, that if you have an inspector appointed by the Board of Guardians, or a number of Boards of Guardians, that inspector will very likely call to the Guardians of the different districts, and make inquiries, which a Local Government Board Inspector will not do; at least taking up the attitude that a great many of them do at present.

14476. I thought the complaint was that they inquired a little but too much sometimes?—Not at all; I don't think so.

14477. At present are you aware of anything in the law that would prevent your Board of Guardians, either by itself or in conjunction with other bodies, from having such an appointment made?—You would have two inspectors then. That would mean a Local Government Board Inspector and an inspector of the Board of Guardians, and that would mean additional expense, because, of course, the members of the Local Government Board out of their own pocket won't pay their inspector.

14478. The local bodies don't pay the Local Government Board Inspector?—I am aware of that; at all events it comes out of public funds.

14479. It comes out of the taxpayers' pockets, out of the country at large. Is it your idea that the local inspector appointed by a number of unions should be paid out of public taxation or out of the union funds—which?—My idea is also, that I would have an inspector responsible to the Board of Guardians and responsible also to the Local Government Board, or to some central body; that is my idea.

14480. By whom would that inspector be paid, and by whom would that inspector be appointed?—He would be appointed by a number of Guardians.

14481. A joint committee of the Board of Guardians?—That is so.

14482. Who would pay that inspector?—Out of the Imperial taxation, as she is paid at present.

14483. Then your suggestion comes to this, that the Guardians and not the Government should make the appointment of the inspector?—Quite so. I would have them responsible to the Board of Guardians.

14484. Paid for by the Imperial Government and responsible to the Board of Guardians?—That is a thing I would like, but not a thing that is very likely to occur—but I see quite clearly what you mean—but even if this inspector was to be paid by the Board of Guardians, I would have him responsible to the local bodies.

14485. There is no objection under the present law to your making such appointments. At the present time you have local inspectors in the relieving offices?—But they have a lot of work to do.

14486. And perhaps they are not exactly the kind of men you would select as inspectors of children, although they may be very good men as sanitary officers and relieving officers?—That is so.

14487. You would possibly select some lady who had experience?—Yes, she would want to have experience.

14488. There would be no objection, as far as I see, to Guardians proposing to appoint such officers if they could substantiate the necessity for such appointments?—I don't know.

14489. There is no doubt about it, the more these children are wisely inspected the better?—I think also that all children who are in the union should be looked-out, that is all who are properly chargeable on the union as the law at present stands.

14490. A great many are now in your workhouse, the illegitimate children of women who are in the workhouse. The mothers object to their leaving the workhouse. They won't have any separation. You think it would be wise to empower the Guardians to board up such children?—Yes; we did our best some time ago to have all these children boarded up, but the mothers would not allow us; we could do nothing. There is another matter I would like to refer to, and that is, first there should be some power given to the Guardians regarding inmates coming from other unions. A case came before the Board of Guardians three weeks ago, where a mother with a child and an infant, and her mother again, came from Galway Union in the train here for admission to Mullingar. We had no alternative, if we did not refuse admission and turn them out on the roadside, and that we could not do; and that woman, with her mother and two children, became chargeable on the rates of the Mullingar Union.

14491. If you succeeded so that you could make the Galway people pay for their inhabitants up here, we would have to make up your mind to pay the Dublin people for the Workhouse people that are in Dublin. You might lose on the exchange?—I don't think so, because the majority of the inmates of Mullingar are not natives of Mullingar at all. I remember two years ago getting a return about it, and there was a large number not natives of Mullingar Union at all.

14492. Mr. DEANE.—Your committee considered the necessity for proceeding for consumptives?—Yes; there should be some arrangement made, of course, for consumptives. If there was a disused workhouse a number of Boards of Guardians, I think, should contribute to the support of that institution, and have consumptives sent there for treatment.

14493. You say your committee have made no recommendation for the sick poor?—Yes, for Mullingar.

14494. With reference to the tramp unions?—I would put the existing law—the Vagrancy Act—into force.

14495. You would not consider it necessary to get any additional power such as was mentioned to-day?—The more power you get regarding that class the better.

14496. CHAIRMAN.—You need not use it if you don't like it?—No, but if the Vagrancy Act was put in force and the police took it up as they should, you would get rid of a good deal of the tramp unions. There is another thing, too, that crops up as the Board of Guardians in Mullingar very often, and that is the attitude

Feb. 16, 1904.

Mr. Michael
Rosen.

of the Local Government Board towards Boards of Guardians. It means very often a lot of wasteful expenditure. I will give you a case. In the fever hospital the fever nurse got leave of absence last summer. There was not a case in the fever hospital. There were no vacancies there; one had considerable experience in nursing, being for a few years in the county infirmary. The medical officer was quite satisfied she was quite capable of taking care of the hospital whilst there was nobody in it.

14934. I would say she would be equal to that, certainly—if you allow me for a moment. There was nobody in it. The medical officer was quite satisfied with the arrangement made, and it was with his approval the Board of Guardians made it, and notwithstanding that, the Local Government Board wrote insisting on a trained nurse from Dublin, and a trained nurse was brought down at considerable expense, and remained there all the time without a patient, and if there was a patient to be attended to, the medical officer could have got a trained nurse in two hours by wire from Dublin.

14935. I think there must have been some misunderstanding somewhere. I could hardly understand such a thing being insisted on. The arrangements, you say, seems to have been perfectly feasible. I cannot conceive that any other arrangement should be suggested. I think there must have been a misconception somewhere. Not at all; the thing was quite clear.

14936. There could have been no reason for the appointment of a trained nurse being insisted on unless it was to take charge of a patient?—But there was no patient.

14937. Therefore there must have been a misconception. I will suggest to you how the misconception may have arisen. Very probably your clerk of the union may have sent up a coupon of the fever hospital weekly to Dublin with a number of patients appearing to be in it. For instance, if Dr. Dillon Kelly kept other patients there who were not fever patients the names would go up, and without an explanation it would be assumed they were fever patients. I asked the other day some patients there who were not fever patients?—There are a few chronic cases.

14938. These people would be returned to Dublin, and there is nothing to prevent anyone in Dublin looking down the list and seeing a number of patients in the fever hospital thinking they were fever patients?—Yes; but they must have seen on the warrants from the Board of Guardians that it was with the medical officer's approval we were making this arrangement.

14939. I am afraid that would not be conclusive?—Don't you think when you have a medical officer there—a thoroughly qualified man, who understands the business—don't you think he will see that his patients are well treated and properly attended to?

14940. That is a very proper view for you to take, but if the Local Government Board send a number of patients put down in a hospital list they will naturally conclude they are fever patients, and in the absence of any explanation, prescribe accordingly. Were these patients there at that time of any sort?—I remember being through the hospital that very week, and there was nobody in it, not a single person of any sort.

14941. If you will look into the thing again you will find, I think, that there must have been a very great misconception or some misintention as to figures?—I am aware that there are a couple of chronic cases in the fever hospital nearly always.

14942. A good hand of them I saw there?—There may have been one or two of these cases out on the ground that day.

14943. They were in the wards eating their supper?—I am speaking of what occurred some months ago and I am speaking of a few days ago.

14944. I was speaking to Dr. Dillon Kelly, and he explained these people were regular inmates there. I think you will find it is capable of a simple explanation if we had the precise facts before us, but you may take it for granted that the Local Government Board would not do such a foolish thing as to ask you to get a trained nurse to take care of an empty hospital?—Rascally or unknowingly, it occurred.

14945. That is what I doubt. I think you will find that that hospital has not been without inmates?—I don't know.

Mr. Rosen.—Without fever inmates.

14946. CHAIRMAN.—Quite so, but if you get a return of inmates in a fever hospital you naturally come to the conclusion that they have fever, and that the doctor is not putting there any people who ought not to be there. Here I have, on the 1st of January, eighteen

patients in the Mullingar Fever Hospital. There was not that number of fever patients in the union on that day, I am sure. If the Local Government Board see a return of eighteen fever patients, and a proposal to employ a handy woman because she has had some experience in the county infirmary, they would not consent to eighteen patients being left in her charge. That is the explanation of it, of course.

Mr. Rosen.—Anyhow, as I take it, Mr. Rosen's real point is that we ought to have a little more home government; there appears to him to be a little too much interference.

CHAIRMAN.—And he gave us an instance that the Local Government Board asked them to appoint a trained nurse to take care of an empty hospital.

Witness.—Yes, and insisted on it.

14947. CHAIRMAN.—How are eighteen patients on the 1st of January, probably not one of them fever, how is the Local Government Board to know that?—Did that occur that there were eighteen patients in this particular week?

14948. The return is up there?—I would like to see the notebook of that particular week. I remember the matter being discussed thoroughly by the Board of Guardians.

14949. Where the misconception has arisen is, you are supposing that ordinary patients can be kept in a fever hospital. That is not so. The fever hospital is for fever patients. If a return comes up to the Local Government Board saying there are eighteen patients in the fever hospital, we assume they are fever cases?—Don't the Local Government Board know that no doctor is going to have eighteen fever patients without a trained nurse?

14950. I am afraid we cannot assume that?—However my evidence is this, that I think as far as Mullingar is concerned, regarding all events the sick poor, that if there was less interference from the Local Government Board—of course I don't mean to say you should not have a control body, you must have that—but if there was less interference as far as Mullingar was concerned by the Local Government Board, what I, as a Guardian, consider very often and in interference. I think the sick poor would be better attended to, and things would go on smoother and be done better. With the Guardians there is always a deterring feeling that the Local Government Board will step in, and they very often do, and do very evasive things.

14951. That is, of course, a matter of opinion. You have your opinion, and I am not in the least showing any disrespect to your opinion, but if you give a concrete case, such as you have done in the fever hospital case, I would like to go into it, but beyond that is your general view, and you are entitled to your opinion?—I understand that your Commission is supposed to be a reform Commission of the Poor Law, and I consider there is no part of the Poor Law wants to be more reformed than the Local Government Board, or, at least, the attitude which the Local Government Board takes up against the Boards of Guardians.

14952. From that point of view, what would you suggest their function of central government should be?—I think that the action of the central government should be open to discussion, and that the men should be men who were competent, or had some standing or learning in the Poor Law business, then they should be proven men, who understood the Poor Law and the working of it in the rural districts.

14953. Such as chairmen of Councils?—Ah, no; for instance, men who have made a study of the Poor Law. Another thing I think you should have upon it, some men appointed, of course, by the Government or the Treasury, because there are Treasury grants, but you should also have men selected by the local bodies.

14954. That is as regards the qualification and the mode of appointment. What function would you give them to do. What duty would you permit them to discharge?—The function of a central body.

14955. And what is that?—They will have to oversee and inspect, and all that sort of thing; very much upon the lines that the Local Government Board is supposed to do it at present.

14956. Is supposed to do it, or does it?—Well, I don't know. I am afraid we are getting into a debating question.

14957. Speak for yourself. On the lines that they are at present?—I believe that the Local Government Board is not acting the part of a central body towards the public bodies through the country—towards the Boards of Guardians. I believe that the Local Government Board, very often without due consideration,

Feb. 16, 1904.

Mr. Michael
Kenna.

hampers and ties the hands of the local bodies, who are doing the best they can, knowing the local circumstances, for the sick poor and the infirm.

14525. Have you any instance to point out what you mean exactly as regards Mullingar in that point of view?—To give you a particular instance, at present I don't know that I could, but I am giving it generally.

14526. I know that, but I would like a particular instance to explain the force of your argument?—I am after giving an instance of what they did with regard to the fever hospital.

14527. And I am after giving you what I think may be the explanation. Now is there anything else?

Mr. Downes.—Paying wards in district hospitals?—Yes. I think there should be paying wards in district hospitals. At present in Mullingar you have not room to lay by a ward for paying patients, but if you had a paying ward, cut away from the other parts of the hospital, you would have a number of people who are not able to pay for medical attendance at home at the present time, and whom you cannot get into the district hospital. They will die at home sooner than come into the district hospital, because they would be mixed up with paupers.

14528. You think these people would be anxious to pay in the pay wards?—I think they would pay in a great many cases.

14529. CHAIRMAN.—Why don't they pay in the county infirmary, where they cannot be got to pay?—There is a question regarding the county infirmary, regarding the issue of tickets. At the present time the people who issue tickets are governors. I think every medical officer and clergyman should have power to issue tickets for the county infirmary, for, after all, it is supported out of public funds, and there are some districts in the

country where for miles around there is nobody to issue tickets. I know one particular case where the person who got a ticket was the very person who would go to a district hospital.

14530. Are you aware of any case in which the Infirmary Committee declined to take in persons recommended by a doctor in the country?—I am not.

14531. Are you aware that the practice is to accept persons recommended by doctors in the country?—Oh, yes, I am aware. I do know a case that was not taken in when a doctor recommended it.

14532. Was that on account of the disease not being suitable for treatment?—No; I believe that the doctor did not think it necessary. I don't know the exact circumstances. I know such a thing did occur.

14533. You heard of such a thing having occurred?—I know it occurred.

14534. What was the case as far as you know?—It was treated afterwards in the union hospital, and I believe it should have gone there in the first instance. I am not questioning the right in that particular case. I believe, in the first place, it should have gone to the district hospital.

14535. Then you think it was a proper case for refusal?—In that particular case I do.

14536. That is the only case you have mentioned where there was a refusal?—But I think, at the same time, all clergymen and medical officers should have power to issue tickets to the county infirmary.

14537. Would not doctors be better judges of cases for admission than the clergymen of various denominations?—Yes, but the dispensary doctor has a very large district.

14538. Still he has to attend all the sick in it?—I would be even satisfied with that.

Mr. Thomas J.
Shaw.

Mr. THOMAS J. SHAW, J.P., examined.

14539. Mr. Downes.—You also belong to the Mullingar Board of Guardians?—Yes.

14540. Did you consider these various questions that were sent from this Commission?—Yes; I was Chairman of the Committee that considered them.

14541. I think I am right in saying that the report I have before me was drawn up principally by you?—Yes, as Chairman I drew it up.

14542. Now would you give shortly what your own views are, if they are in any way different from the views of the committee, and generally what the committee's view was about amalgamation, about hospital treatment, about the separation of the various sections in the unions, and also about this question of consumptives?—The committee, when considering the matter, took things as they found them. At present the rating is based on a combination of Poor Law and district charges, and they estimated in all probability that if there was a dissolution of any of the unions that district charges would follow, and they took that very largely into consideration when considering the question of amalgamation.

14543. CHAIRMAN.—At all events, there was the danger of their following?—That was one of the chief and principal reasons why the committee reported as against amalgamation with the adjoining unions; the second reason was because the cost of the Unions in Delvin Union was considerably lower than the cost in the Mullingar Union, and the third reason was, because the committee did not see any crying necessity for the use of the buildings of the Delvin Union for any other purpose in the county. They did not see it was required as an auxiliary system, and if it was shut up they thought it would inflict trouble and hardship on the poor from far-away districts, and also those in the neighbourhood; and taking the general question into consideration, they thought that as there were practically only two unions in the county, for Athlone only takes in a fringe of Westmeath, they would not recommend amalgamation. Further, the hospital accommodation we have in Westmeath is very excellent and well-conducted, but at the same time it is limited. Dr. Kelly informed me yesterday that the district hospital accommodates about seventy properly. There are about 500 or 600 passed through it in the year. For treatment for the quarter ending September 30th, there were 128 persons treated, of whom eighty-six were discharged cured.

14544. You have little over seventy in the infirmary?—About that. Of course if the committee saw the buildings of Delvin Union were required for any special purpose, they would perhaps have taken a somewhat different view, but they imagined if Delvin Union was

done away with the buildings would be left idle; and it should be maintained all the same, I presume.

14545. There was the case of a workhouse in Tyone, half-way between Strabane and Omagh. It was closed, and it was sold for old stores and road material. There is not a trace of it now, although it was in existence ten years ago?—We were inclined to think it would be a hardship on the sick poor to abolish it.

14546. You altogether considered the question from the point of view of local amalgamation, taking the inmates out of Delvin and putting them into another workhouse?—Very largely; it was dealing with the local question.

14547. I don't know whether you were here in the early part of the day and heard the suggestions about moving the different classes out of the workhouse?—I heard that.

14548. Leaving none in the local workhouse that might be closed except the sick, removing the aged and infirm to the central institutions, and so on with the different classes. If you were going into the matter again, and looking at it from that point of view, and if you found that the breaking up of, say, fifty out of 150 workhouses was feasible, and that a large gain to the country at large and the districts in particular would result from such a scheme being carried, would you still have an open mind on the subject, ready to consider the matter again, or would you be in favour of leaving things remain as they are?—There are some counties where there are a number of unions, and it would be very desirable to break them up.

14549. You have a number of unions or parts of unions in your district?—You have six unions or parts of unions?—The committee say, in regard to those, that—The districts of Killybeggan, Ballymore, and Coole form part of the Unions of Tullamore, Ballymahon, and Granard, the workhouses of which they closely adjoin, and from which they are administered, and they consider, leaving out the financial question, to which the committee pay considerable importance, that it would inflict hardship on the sick poor to have to come such a distance to Mullingar.

14550. Supposing the Coole people were authorized by law to board out in the Granard village or district hospital their acutely sick at so much a head, instead of sending them to Mullingar?—I brought forward that question.

14551. You see there is not a loss of money in it. If a person gets sick at Coole, instead of going to Mullingar, where the average cost would be 5s., or whatever cost you choose to put it, instead of that they go to Granard, where they might have to pay 4s. 6d. or

to it; it is as broad as it is long?—That is quite true. There is nothing of the sort in the existing law at present.

14545. There is not. We are looking at things with a fresh eye, to report what changes might be made. What I was rather anxious to get from you would be, whether the opinion against amalgamation that your committee has given, whether that opinion is really against amalgamation when removing all cases from one workhouse to another workhouse, or whether you think a great deal might be said in favour of such a proposal as has been outlined to-day?—I think it was a very good proposal that I heard outlined to-day—the removal of the children, the removal of the mothers, and the removal of the consumptives, which I think is a very important matter. The workhouse after all is a kind of refuge for persons without a home. I have known of cases occurring in Mallow where they had to seek a night, or a few nights' refuge, due to circumstances over which they had no control, in the workhouse, and under the scheme which has been outlined, I don't know exactly how they would be treated. I know the case of a young lad who had to be taken in for a few very bad nights. He had no money and no home. I authorized the relieving officer to take him in, or he would have had nowhere to sleep.

14546. Was he a decent boy?—A respectable young fellow.

14547. Is not that a case that would be met by an industrial school?—He was over that age; he was not what you would call an idler, but just force of circumstances. I think there are various cases where persons are forced to take refuge in a workhouse.

14548. They are very rare, and it is dreadful in those cases whether it is wise that they should have such a place to go to?—That is quite true. I admit that.

14549. Were you going to say something about the tramp?—The Committee considered the existing law should be strenuously enforced round about this district. There is a great deal of trouble from persons who are tramps but don't frequent the workhouse so much. It costs very much on the increase in recent years, of parties sleeping out in the road in tents, leading a vagrant, gipsy life.

14550. You have seen more of that than in past years?—Yes.

14551. Are those people in caravans selling baskets?—No; people living on their wits, in small little tents. The number that live that sort of life is very considerable, and increasing. You will see a regular number of people with a few donkey carts—fishers—out in all weather—a mixture of every class—well, generally, a lot of children.

14552. Would you be in favour of really strong measures for those, to put them under restraint?—I don't know what to say; the tramp question is a very big one. If they are not allowed into the workhouse it will add to the number of vagrants about the roads.

14553. Those people don't come into the workhouse?—Some of them do; they lead a nomadic life.

14554. Are those classes known to the police?—They are; the police may move them from one place to another. There are lots of them to be found about, especially in the summer portion of the year.

14555. What is their present pursuit?—Begging is their principal pursuit.

Mr. Moore.—They are criminals.

Witness.—There are a great number of them. As regards children, the Committee were unanimously of opinion that no children should be reared in the house; that they should be all boarded out, and a preference should be given to the foster-mothers who, otherwise complying with the necessary conditions, guaranteed to support or provide a situation for the child after the necessary limit has been reached.

14556. CHAIRMAN.—It is hardly necessary to put in that. They do hold together without any agreement?—In the majority of cases that occurs; very few go back to the workhouse.

14557. And I don't think you could enforce that agreement after the payment ceases?—Foster mothers apply to the Board of Guardians on special days, meeting in lovers of recommendation, and it is with reference to that point that we put in that proviso. As has been already mentioned, the Board have for some time endeavoured to board out all their children; they found it rather difficult, and some persons in the house refused to allow them to send out their children.

14558. You would like the powers of the Board extended?—Certainly; the Board are most anxious to board out all children, and if they got permission to board out all children, they would without any expense

practically be able to provide for the classification of inmates. In the Mullingar Union there are two practically deserted school-rooms and two yards, originally meant for children; those are practically idle, and the Committee had the view that they could be used for the better class of people.

14559. Mr. DOUGLAS.—You have some recommendations about consumptives?—They were unanimously in favour of recommending that power should be given to allow Boards of Guardians to send patients either to a district workhouse or to a sanatorium for consumptives.

14560. CHAIRMAN.—They have power now if the institutions existed, but they don't exist. You think it would be wise that institution should be started?—Certainly. There are a good number of consumptive patients there at all times; they form one of the wards of the hospital, and I think it is not the proper place for them.

14561. I don't know whether you are aware that a doctor in an adjoining county has started a sanatorium in the workhouse at Cootinell. He is strongly of opinion that any buildings that are to be put up for consumptives should be temporary—made of wood—because, he says, there is a certainty of stamping out the disease if it is simultaneously grappled with by all public bodies?—On Query 6, the Committee reported that more stringent regulations should be framed for the admission, retention, and discharge of persons who become chargeable on the rates, so as to secure, as far as possible, that workhouses should be hospitals for the sick and destitute poor, and not refuges for the lazy and able-bodied. One of the reasons that brought that forward was that some time ago a case was brought up in which a girl was charged with insubordination. It turned out that she could demand her discharge, and had demanded it the previous week. She went out and remained out two nights, and came back and had to be admitted, and on inquiry we found that any person who is an inmate of the workhouse can take a discharge on three hours' notice. The Board considered that that was a very extraordinary state of affairs, and, therefore, with regard to the discharge of persons, we recommended more stringent regulations, and much more stringent regulations for the admission.

14562. What would be your idea of stringency as regards admission?—In my opinion it is rather too easy to get admission to the workhouses; the onus is thrown on the relieving officer.

14563. To improve the allegation of destitution?—Yes; the onus is thrown on the relieving officer, and if he does not give a ticket he is responsible.

14564. Could you suggest any way in which you could restrict that?—I would limit the time in which admission could be sought. At present the relieving officer is bound practically to be at his post all day, and it is not very easy for him.

14565. You would hardly catch him at his own house, if that is what you mean. He has other duties to discharge?—His house is his office for giving out tickets.

14566. And the workhouse master?—The workhouse master is bound to admit anybody he thinks destitute.

14567. There is a discretion in the Board of Guardians to discharge, and there is a discretion on the part of the officers to refuse to admit. They won't readily refuse to admit, but serious consequences might ensue?—I would make them apply during certain hours. Admission to the workhouse should be sought between 3 and 5 in the afternoon, and application to be made at the workhouse by persons who were not sick, so that their cases might be more easily investigated. At present they can turn up at any hour at the workhouse, and the result is that between one thing and another it is rather too easy to get admission to the workhouse. The Board of Guardians, especially when they meet after District Councils, have not much time to look into cases that have been admitted. About a fortnight or three weeks ago a case was brought before the Board, when a woman and her five children had gained admission to the house. She had had a quarrel with her husband after Christmas. He was a man in receipt of fair wages. She came here demanding admission. The next Board did not look into the question; it was a local Guardian who raised it. It was found she and her five children had become chargeable on the rates. I think in every Board of Guardians there should be a Finance Committee, say of fifteen or twenty members, with the chairman, and four or five of a quorum, to examine the bills sent in.

14568. It is very bad management that there is not such a committee?—There is not one here; it is not compulsory to have such a committee.

14569. Yes, but what is compulsory is that all bills

Feb. 16, 1904.

Mr. Thomas J. Stan.

should be examined by the Guardians, and if they decide that to a committee, it is a businesslike way of doing it?—I think the committee should meet half an hour before the Board and go through all the bills.

14570. That would take the day from the Guardians and put it on the Finance Committee?—I would put it on the Finance Committee to report to the Board. At present, whereas the duty is on, they don't go into it closely. I think there should be a Finance Committee to exercise the same control over the payments as a man would over his own affairs. The present Board is composed of 105 members, and various members turn up at each Board. You would require a committee to meet at a specified hour.

14571. Do you think your Board is too big?—It works satisfactorily; these are times it is a bit crowded. If we got in Delvin and other places we would have to build a new board-room. Speaking of centralisation, it will make it much more difficult for the representatives

of these districts to come in and see that matters are properly discharged.

14572. If the local hospital that is to remain had a local committee to manage it. Supposing Delvin were broken up and the hospital remained, with a local committee to look after it?—You would practically have to have that. It would be the only way to manage it.

14573. Don't you think that would be a sensible and businesslike little body to deal with a small hospital like that?—The tendency recently was to abolish all committees.

14574. Dispensaries have nothing to do with us, but a great many people were anxious to tell us that they thought it a great mistake to abolish dispensary committees?—I think it was; it throws on the Guardians the duty of examining the books.

14575. Do they do that carefully?—They only sign their names. How can they examine them. It imposes a lot of expense and trouble.

MR. JOSEPH S. VAUGHAN EXAMINED.

Mr. Joseph S. Vaughan.

14576. CHAIRMAN.—I understood that the Athlone Guardians are not attending to-day?—No, sir, I am sorry that they are not here. There were two appointed to express their views, but they were unable at the last moment to attend, and they asked me to try to mention what they are. They did not go into the whole subject until the last meeting, and they asked me roughly to take down what was their opinion on certain points. They would, first of all, recommend the amalgamation of unions, and they would suggest that Ballymahon be amalgamated with Athlone on the ground of economy.

14577. And partly with Longford?—Yes; the Westmeath part with Athlone and the Longford part with Longford. And they also considered that one workhouse, as a workhouse, would be quite sufficient for the county, and would recommend Mullingar as the central workhouse. They suggested that Mullingar ought to be used entirely for tramps and able-bodied men. Then the number of inmates in the county they consider not sufficient for the sick poor, and they would consider that the Athlone Workhouse Hospital, owing to Athlone being so central to the two lines of railway, and to the fact that the workhouse hospital is said to be one of the best equipped workhouse hospitals in Ireland—I don't know whether it is the fact, but it is the impression of the Guardians—

14578. It is very good?—They consider it would be advisable to convert that into a district hospital, as distinct from a workhouse infirmary. In Athlone also there is no isolation hospital, but if this plan were carried out some of the existing buildings could be used for that purpose.

14579. Not the workhouse buildings?—Yes.

14580. For smallpox?—For smallpox.

14581. That would be rather close quarters?—The building is very large. The Guardians also consider that some steps ought to be taken to have a consumptive hospital, and perhaps a home for epileptics, in the county, and they would suggest that either Ballymahon or Delvin be used for that purpose; they are very strong on that point. I am sorry Dr. Shanley, our medical officer, was unable to attend to-day, as he was very strong on the point. He intended to come, but Sir Ashmun McCullagh is at Athlone to-day in connection with the smallpox.

14582. Have you smallpox at present?—We have one case in the fever hospital.

14583. When did it come in?—Friday last. As to boarding-out children, the Guardians adopted the plan some ten or twelve years ago, and found it a great success. Almost without exception the children turned

out well, and contracted ties in the various parishes they were sent to. The Guardians noticed that with the exception of Mullingar and Delvin, this boarding-out Act has not been availed of in the various unions, or to any extent at least, and if the Act were amended to embrace children other than destitute children, it might be more availed of.

14584. You don't mean that to refer to all Ireland?—No; but to our own county. Grassard has not done it, or Tullamore. Grassard has only one child boarded out; Tullamore one, at least by the last report; Killymahon has no children boarded out, whereas we have over thirty. Then, on the question of tramps, the Guardians are of opinion that as the majority of tramps are militia and reserve men, this could be greatly reduced by the period of training being changed from the summer to the winter. They can get plenty of employment in the summer, and we noticed that the year the South African War was going on the number of tramps fell to 827 for the year from 1,419 the previous year, so if the law could be changed we would get rid of a good deal of them; and we also suggest that they be kept longer in the workhouses and not allowed to get their discharge until they have done a certain amount of work; or twisting on giving them a cold bath would keep them out.

14585. That would never do; you might kill one of those men!—It would be subject to the opinion of the medical officer. They consider that the proximity of unions to one another is also a great encouragement to tramping; they have really only ten miles to walk every day. Those were all the views the Guardians expressed. They only considered the matter at the last meeting.

14586. They said nothing about paying patients?—No; but I am sure they would fall in with the views expressed to-day.

14587. From what you know of the working of the Poor Law system, you would recommend them to do so?—I would, by all means. I think it would be a very good idea if carried out.

14588. Have you ever sent away any consumptive patients to extern hospitals for treatment?—We applied to send two away, but they died before we could get a ticket for admission to the Wicklow Hospital. We got two tickets of admission for a certain date, but before the date arrived the patients died.

14589. They would not have suitable premises for admission. They don't take people in the last stage?—We had to wait a long time—six weeks; that is why the Guardians are most anxious that some consumptive hospital for the county, or for several counties combined, should be established.

The Sitting terminated

THIRTIETH PUBLIC SITTING.—WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 17TH, 1904. FEB. 17, 1904.

At the Court-house, Longford.

Present:—MR. MICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURNAUGHAN, and Dr. COBY BIGGER.

Mr. John Muldoon, B.L.—I appear for the Urban District Council of Granard and also some ratepayers who are largely interested in the Granard Union, and they object to the Granard Union being broken up or joined with the Longford Union in any way. It may be at first sight suggested, that as the Granard Board of Guardians have themselves passed a resolution by a majority of thirty-two to twenty-one in favour of the breaking up of their union, the ground is swept from under my feet. I will endeavour to convince you that the very contrary is the fact; and considering the character of the Granard Board of Guardians, the present body—it must not be forgotten that the present body are only elected for three years, and at the end of three years there may be an entire change of persons in these boards. At all events, lately constituted as the Granard Board of Guardians is at present, they were not unanimous on this question—a majority of twenty-one, some of whom will be before you to-day, have been opposed to the amalgamation of the Granard Union. First of all, if I am correctly informed, the Granard Union is one of the lowest-rated unions in this county; the rates there are much lower than in Longford, and, presumably, at all events, the amalgamation of Granard with Longford would lead to an increase in the rates which are now imposed upon the ratepayers of the Granard Union, and that is one of the reasons why my clients—whose position in the matter is perfectly intelligible—are opposed to Granard coming into Longford. My clients, upon the general question of amalgamation, coincide at once that there are too many unions in Ireland, but when it comes to the local question of the Granard Union, they say there are several circumstances in the case which would make it inadvisable, unwise, and independent to interfere with the integrity of that union. In the first place, the Granard Union—the buildings of which are admirably situated for their purpose—is now situated in the centre of the district; part of their union is in Cavan and part in Westmeath, and no portion of that union, if I am correctly informed, is more than seven miles from Granard, which is the centre. The purpose of the establishment of these unions was to ensure speedy relief to the sick poor, and if Granard is to be destroyed several of its divisions would have to come to Longford, which would be a distance of sixteen miles, or seventeen, Irish miles—that, at all events, does not appear to be in the interests of the sick or destitute poor of the Granard Union.

CHAIRMAN.—You might also consider the alternative of leaving the hospital there.

Mr. Muldoon.—They have considered the alternative of leaving the hospital there, but the question for the Commission is, whether when you leave the hospital there, and when you superannuate the staff, the saving that would be effected to the union would be considerable—in fact, some of our witnesses will go so far as to say it will be almost all, and in addition to that, it would not meet the needs of the destitute poor of that part of the union at all. Then, again, the ratepayers of a large portion of the Granard Union are small ratepayers; the rating of a large number does not exceed £10 in annual value; it would be a great hardship, in fact it would be impossible for some of these people to come into Longford, if elected on the Poor Law Board of the Longford Union. The breaking up of the Granard Union would lead to the disfranchisement of Granard, and they would be coming into the Union of Longford, which is at present highly rated—at all events, it would tend to prevent the best class of Guardians or representatives from coming into the town of Longford, because they could not be expected to give up their business and time to come into weekly meetings at Longford under the new regime. Then,

as regards the finances of the union, our contention is this—that when all the questions are considered, if a district hospital is to be maintained there with a staff, and if the present officers of the Granard Union are to be superannuated, the saving would be almost nil, if, indeed, it would be anything at all; it would not be worth the additional danger and trouble in reference to the sick and deserving poor. At present it is unquestionable the rates of Granard are very much lower than at Longford, and although the Granard Union have themselves gone in for amalgamation with Longford, no doubt some of them, perhaps, held the poor opinion that it would be generally in the interest of the ratepayers. The rates of the Granard Union appear to be 1s. 1d., while in Longford they are 1s. 7d., and if any of the ratepayers of Granard think that in five years' time they will still be paying 1s. 1d. in the 1d. I think they are under a complete delusion; and I would advise them to make a very large contribution to the poor-box in their own churches by reason of having escaped from a position of great peril. I venture to prophesy that they will be paying a considerable sum more, and that a great portion of the present Granard Union which is now in favour of amalgamation will be exceedingly annoyed and irritated about the way they are represented in the Longford Union, and the high rate which will eventually result. I am informed that the workhouse buildings at Granard are admirably situated for their purpose; they contain a great many more persons than are there at present; and quite recently, I am advised, that over £300 has been spent on workhouse buildings.

CHAIRMAN.—We have inspected the workhouse lately.

Mr. Muldoon.—The town of Granard is also a Quarter Sessions town, has a weekly market and monthly fairs, and as present it is the meeting place of three District Councils, who meet there monthly. This Commission is not concerned with the constitution or area of District Councils, and, I presume, at all events these Councils have to continue to meet there, and it will be manifestly inconvenient if, as District Councils, there would be three bodies meeting at Granard who, as Poor Law Guardians, will have to meet elsewhere. I submit that is a considerable inconvenience if amalgamation is to be carried out with any of the adjoining unions. The amalgamation of Granard is a very old question—it has been considered and decided several times. So far back as 1856 the Earl of Longford raised before the Poor Law Commissioners the question of the dissolution of the Granard Union, and the reply given by the Poor Law Commissioners to the proposal of the Earl of Longford may interest you. I believe it was published in a local paper.

CHAIRMAN.—It is published in the annual report of the Local Government Board.

Mr. Muldoon.—I assume you will have it before you, and I need not, therefore, take up your time with it now. And then again, in 1856, the dissolution of Granard was again so far before the Local Government Board as regards the taking away of the Cavan divisions to Cavan and that was considered by the Local Government Board and decided, and it was arranged that the integrity of Granard Union as a whole should not be interfered with. But, lastly, on July 26th, 1901, there was an inquiry upon this very question into a proposition placed before the Local Government Board by the Cavan County Council to annex Granard No. 2 Rural District to the Cavan Union; and, further, into the dissolution of the entire Granard Union, that is to say, to transfer Granard No. 1 Rural District to the Longford Union, and the Okeale Rural District to the Mullingar Union. That

Mr. John Muldoon, B.L.

Feb 17, 1904.

Mr. John
Muldoon, M.P.

was the subject of inquiry before Major Rutledge Feir on the 30th of July, 1901, practically the very question we are dealing with here to-day, and a great body of evidence was taken at that inquiry—expert evidence as to the result, from a financial and other point of view, and the Local Government Board considered that fairly, and here is their reply, which I would almost say except the Local Government Board from asking any other order as the result of this Commission of Inquiry. At all events, if they make an order which dissolves Granard Union, it will hardly be consistent with their order which bears date 18th of April, 1903:—"To the Clerk of the Granard Union.—Sir,—The Local Government Board for Ireland desire to inform the Board of Guardians of the Granard Union that they have received the report of their Inspectors, Major Rutledge Feir, on the inquiry held by him respecting the proposal of the County Council of Cavan to transfer Granard No. 2 Rural District to the Cavan Union, and the general question of dissolving Granard Union and amalgamating the three rural districts comprised therein with the adjoining Unions of Longford, Cavan, and Mullingar. The Board have given the two proposals mentioned their careful consideration, and in the case of the suggested transfer of the Granard No. 2 Rural District to the Cavan Union, they find that if such a transfer took place the result would be an increase of rates not only on the electoral divisions comprised in that district, but also on the remainder of the Granard Union, while the destitute and sick poor would be obliged to travel a much longer distance for relief. Under these circumstances, the Local Government Board are of opinion that the proposed transfer of this district to Cavan should not be carried into effect. With respect to the question of the dissolution of the Granard Union and its amalgamation with the surrounding unions, the Local Government Board find that although the financial effect of this scheme would be beneficial to the unions in Longford, Cavan, and Mullingar, it would be injurious to the ratepayers of the Granard Union, and it was not shown that there was anything to be gained in the interests of the sick or destitute by the change. The Local Government Board can find no sufficient reason for dissolving the union in opposition to the wishes of the Board of Guardians. I submit that nothing has happened since to make desirable that which the Local Government Board two

years ago considered to be undesirable from a financial point of view and in the interests of the sick and deserving poor.

CHAIRMAN.—That was a proposal to break up Granard and distribute it in accordance with the provisions of the existing law; now the question is whether any amendment of the law could be made so as to cause a general scheme of amalgamation throughout the country to become advantageous.

Mr. Muldoon.—I should expect to hear from those who are recommending the amalgamation of unions here to-day, and from Longford, if they propose to take in Granard, some evidence which sets made the evidence which the Local Government Board acted upon two years ago. It is for those who suggest a change to show that something is to be gained by making a change. Up to this moment we have no evidence from the Longford Union, or any ratepayers there, that they are anxious to take over Granard; and we have not any case to meet made by anybody since that, that it would be an advantage for Longford or Granard to make the change.

CHAIRMAN.—At Mullingar, yesterday, the evidence was in favour of taking over the Cooles Division to Mullingar.

Mr. Muldoon.—The view our clients take of this is, on the question of the general change, the Granard Union could not be usefully dispersed with; and from the geographical position of Longford county it would be best served, best poor-lawed by a union at Mullingar and one at Granard, which would serve the needs of the entire county, while a district hospital would suit Longford. At all events, my contention at this moment is—I have not any case to meet—that what was decided in 1903 by the Local Government Board remains; that nothing has happened since to make it desirable that they had to be undesirable in the interests of the sick and deserving poor, and in the interests of the finances of the Granard Union. The ratepayers of the Granard Union are immensely interested in the result of this Commission, and in their amalgamation with anybody; and on the face of the question as it stands, to bring a union rated as low as they are into amalgamation with a union rated so much higher, as Longford, would not be in the interest of the Granard Union, and it would not conform to the best interests of local government over such a large district of this county.

Mr. P. M. Rymar examined.

Mr. P. M.
Rymar.

14090. Mr. Muldoon.—Were you formerly a Guardian of the Granard Union?—Yes.

14091. For how many years?—Nearly twenty years.

14092. Where do you live?—In the town of Granard.

14093. Are you a large ratepayer there?—Yes.

14094. You have property situated in the Union and also in the Urban District of Granard?—Yes.

14095. Have you yourself considered the question of the amalgamation of the Granard Union with Longford?—Yes.

14096. Would you be opposed to the breaking up of the Granard Union?—Oh, yes.

14097. On what ground?—First, on the ground of inconvenience to the poor, the loss that the poor of the district would sustain by having to come to Longford. Granard Union is made up of a lot of small villages and towns, in which a lot of poor live; the union is large, and in addition to the loss to the poor, it would be a great inconvenience to the Guardians to have to come up to twenty Irish miles.

14098. First, as regards the poor. I believe at the present time the outlying districts of the union are no more than seven miles from the workhouse?—About that, all round.

14099. And if these districts had to come into Longford they would have about how far to come?—Some would have to come nearly twenty Irish miles.

14100. What are the means of locomotion?—Nothing—except on foot, car, or horse; there is no train.

14101. Are there good roads?—No.

14102. Therefore, you say it would be a great hardship upon the destitute poor?—Yes; and then it would be an inconvenience. I would nearly say the Guardians could not possibly attend; and if they would attend it would be at a considerable loss of time and expense.

14093. What are the villages in the union?—Edgeworthstown is the largest; Finis, in Wintesth; Scrubby, in Cavan; Kilscoy, Bunkley, and Ballinacree—these are all villages within from four to six miles from Granard.

14094. Are those all populous centres?—Populous centres, with a lot of poor in them.

14095. And, knowing the locality well, you would say that it would be exceedingly inconvenient to bring those to Longford, and difficult?—Yes.

14096. Generally, in the Granard Union, the rates are small?—Oh, yes; very much lower than in any other union of the county.

14097. You also suggest it would be difficult to get Guardians to take the responsibility and the pains when they would have to come to Longford?—I do. The Guardians, generally, cannot go away to a distance without money in their pockets; and the Guardians nowadays are poor men, as a rule—a lot of small men.

14098. At present any householders may be a Guardian of the poor?—He need not be a householder at all—any boy.

14099. If he has a smoke he can be a Poor Law Guardian?—Yes.

14100. And at present, as far as Granard is concerned, they are in the habit of attending these markets and fairs, and upon other occasions, and they make use of that opportunity of discharging their representative duties?—Quite so.

14101. A great portion of that district has no connection at all either in the market way or fair way or attending Quarter Sessions at Longford?—Nearly two-thirds have not.

14102. Would you say as a result of amalgamation that Guardians would not come in from those places?—I would.

Feb. 17, 1904

Mr. F. M.
Reilly.

14613. And, of course, that would mean taxation of that district without representation?—Quite so.

14614. Have you considered at all whether there would be any financial gain to Granard by being joined to Longford?—On the contrary, I consider it will be a financial loss.

14615. Do you happen to know at present what is the poor-rate in the Granard Union?—I cannot tell what this year's rate is, but it is less than last year. Mr. Edgeworth will tell you that.

14616. Have you a notion of what the poor-rate is in Longford?—I always heard it said that it was from 6d. to 8d. in the £ dearer than Granard.

14617. And amalgamating Granard would bring it into a union much more highly rated?—Yes.

14618. And you know the feelings of the local people about Granard well?—I do, well.

14619. And you gave evidence at the Inquiry before Hogg Rutledge Fair?—Yes.

14620. And you gave it then as your opinion that the local people were opposed to amalgamation?—I knew it, for I know the feeling of the people.

14621. You know that at that time there was a protest signed in the locality against amalgamation?—Yes.

14622. And do you think any of those people live in the division?—All over the Union.

14623. And do you think any of those people have changed their minds?—There might be some.

14624. But, generally, you would say the people are opposed to the breaking up of the Granard Union?—Yes; I think it would be quite natural they would. It would be very queer if they would not, for it would be a loss to themselves.

14625. The Granard Board of Guardians passed a resolution in favour of amalgamation?—Absolutely; I think so.

14626. By a majority?—Yes.

14627. Now do you account for their doing that—do you think they represent the feelings of the local people in doing so?—A good many of the Guardians did turn up at all, and the men that formed the majority were principally County Cavan men, who would like to get their five divisions that they are fighting for for some time into the County Cavan. I believe the majority of the County Longford people were in favour of retaining things as they are. The Cavan people, if they went away, would not suffer as much as the Longford people.

14628. You know the buildings of the Granard Union?—I do.

14629. Are they very fairly suitable for their purpose?—Yes; they may not be sufficiently attended to lately owing to the friction that has been going on, and this question of amalgamation was in the air for some time, and on those grounds the Guardians were so unsettled in their minds that they neglected to comply with all the requirements of the Local Government Board.

14630. The present board has not been getting on very well with the Local Government Board?—Not too well.

14631. But there is a minority there that carries the Union?—Yes.

14632. As minorities sometimes do?—Generally do.

14633. Are you aware that recently £200 has been spent on buildings?—No; I am not a Guardian this year.

14634. Did you hear that?—I heard that. I think there can be evidence before the Inquiry that will prove that.

14635. Are you aware yourself that this question of amalgamation has been up several times, and has been considered by the Local Government Board, and previously by the Guardians of the Granard Union?—I am aware that it went to a test twice.

14636. And amalgamation was refused to be carried out?—Yes; and the Local Government Board on the occasion when the Guardians, by a majority, asked for amalgamation refused.

14637. Has your Urban Council considered the question?—Yes.

14638. Have they passed a resolution one way or another—have they actually passed a resolution on the subject?—They have.

14639. And that is, opposing amalgamation?—Yes.

14640. On the ground you have stated?—Yes, and other grounds as well.

14641. On the general question of amalgamation of unions in this county, and in the event of the Commission being in favour of amalgamating unions, what arrangement would you suggest?—I was asked by the Urban Council as a ratepayer to state my views, which I forwarded to this Commission last week, and I gave my view then that I would recommend a reformation of the present Boards of Guardians generally. As far as I know in Granard there are too many Guardians, and the work cannot be done efficiently. I was there for sixteen or seventeen years in the old board, and everything went on very smoothly and nicely; I was there for three years under the new Act, and there were so many there things were not done well at all.

14642. In the multiplicity of Councils there is confusion?—Yes; I came to the conclusion that one elected Guardian for each division would be sufficient. I would be inclined to say that the clergy should have representation, either by co-optation or election, because in a matter where there are so many concerned the clergy have a good deal to do with them, and I would say that the clergy of all churches should have a say in the arrangements of all the unions; and, in addition, I would say that it would be only fair to large ratepayers, such as magistrates, in the union, who always take an interest in the work of these things, that half-a-dozen, or more, of the local magistrates should be co-opted every three years who would be a useful addition to the boards.

14643. In the event of some of the unions being swept away, where would you leave unions in this county?—As I stated to the Commission, I am not in favour of amalgamation at all. I would like that every union should be kept, because they are wanted in their own districts. But I would say there should be one in the north and one in the south division of the county; and if any union was done away with Longford, I thought, could better afford to be done away with, owing to having railways and water-power, and they could turn their businesses into factories. In Ballymahon or Granard there is no room for factories—there are no rivers and no means of conveyance. Anything you do with the workhouse in Longford would be in the hands of the County Council. They meet here monthly, and they could arrange to carry on factories and works in the town, with its large population of working people.

14644. And the Longford Workhouse would make a suitable auxiliary asylum?—Quite so, or factory.

14645. You think it would be a better arrangement to have a workhouse in each of the two ends of the county?—Quite so.

14646. If Granard were swept away you would have the two union workhouses as one Parliamentary division of the county?—Yes; but then Ballymahon and Granard take in a small fringe of the surrounding counties, and if they were taken away, not alone would the poor of Longford suffer, but the poor we have from Cavan would also suffer inconvenience more than we do, because they would have to go larger distances.

14647. Do you think that the carrying out of the suggestions you have made, of bringing in clergymen of all denominations and some magistrates into the boards, as at present constituted, would lead to harmony at the meetings of these boards?—I do; I have experience, too; of course, I have no experience of clergymen; but I really think that when they are eligible in England and Scotland for these boards, we should have them, too. They are very useful, and have a wholesome influence on the people.

14648. You think it would lead to harmony at the board meetings?—That is my opinion.

14649. Do you think the qualification of Guardians and District Councils is quite sufficient?—I would say they should have a reasonable qualification. I would like to have men of sound judgment and soundness and responsibility spending the money of the ratepayers.

14650. Mr. F. W. Delany—I appear for the Longford Rural District Council, and we think somewhat differently from Mr. Reilly. I would like to ask him a few questions. You take a great interest in this matter of amalgamation?—Yes; I was always opposed to it.

14651. You are aware that one of the grounds that induced the Local Government Board not to give way to the suggestion of amalgamation on the last occasion was the fact that the Guardians of Granard were opposed to it?—Yes; that is quite true.

Feb. 17, 1904.

Mr. P. M.
Rally

14652. You have told the Commission, I think, that the Guardians, by resolution, have changed their minds?—Yes.

14653. Do you happen to know if that was a resolution came to after notice to the Guardians to attend?—I don't know that.

14654. But there is no question about it that the present Board of Guardians is in favour of amalgamation?—I don't say that the majority of the Board of Guardians are.

14655. Has that resolution been rescinded?—It has not.

14656. Your view is that Longford, if there is to be amalgamation at all, should be done away with?—I don't say that; but I say Longford would be the most suitable house to turn into a factory or asylum.

14657. Would not that place these two unions of Granard and Ballymahon at least twenty miles apart?—No; Ballymahon comes in within a mile of Edgeworthstown.

14658. I am speaking of the houses?—They would be sixteen miles apart.

14659. And that is greater, I take it, than the furthest point any portion of the Union of Longford is from the workhouse?—No.

14660. Do you happen to know what is the furthest point in the Longford Union from the workhouse?—Oh, I don't know anything about Longford Union at all.

14661. Would you be surprised to hear it was fifteen miles?—I would—Irish miles.

14662. You suggest to the Commission that the furthest part of the Granard Union from the workhouse is only seven miles?—I am not sure if I said that.

14663. I thought so?—I said Granard Workhouse is situated in the centre of the union and I know myself that Rathnew is eight miles. I think there is a point in Arva which is about ten miles from Granard.

14664. How far is the furthest portion of Moyne from Granard—sixteen miles?—Not at all; not ten. Arva is only ten miles from Granard, and Moyne is not so far.

14665. Edgeworthstown is connected with Longford by railway?—It is.

14666. Bellinaloe is only six miles from Longford?—Yes.

14667. Bundaghy is within one and a half miles from Bellinaloe?—More; about three miles.

14668. Is it the distance that would keep the Guardians from attending?—Yes.

14669. How many Guardians are there in the Workhouse of Granard?—I may tell you there are ninety?—There are thirty-six divisions, and each division has two.

14670. And some three?—No.

14671. Do you happen to know what is the average attendance?—No.

14672. You have dealt with the question of rates—Granard, admittedly, has been lower than Longford?—Always.

14673. Has the Workhouse of Granard been maintained in a proper condition of efficiency?—Up to within the last year or two, but since this friction commenced it was neglected a little.

14674. In the dilapidated condition that is visible to anyone visiting it due to the neglect of the last eighteen months?—To the last two or three years. It might be in better order than it is now, but there has been a good deal of money spent on it within the last two or three years.

14675. Have you visited the workhouse recently?—No.

14676. Have you any idea of how much should be spent on it to put it in a proper state of repair?—I heard it said about £1,000.

14677. And has the neglect of eighteen months increased that condition of affairs?—It is more than eighteen months' neglect.

14678. I want to know how long it is neglected?—It is not in the condition that the Local Government Board have been trying to get it for the last two or three years, but it has been repaired several times during that time.

14679. You mean it has been tinkered. Has any proper attempt been made to put this into up-to-date repair?—Yes; I think there is an engineer here will tell you.

14680. The engineer has made many estimates, none of which have been carried out?—I think they have.

14681. Did you ever hear of Mayor Fair's report?—I did.

14682. Were they ever carried out?—Yes, some of them. The engineer will tell you that.

14683. Have you ever heard of resolutions of the Board of Guardians that they would not for several years carry out any repairs?—No; I heard that they would not put the house in repair until the matter would be finally decided as to amalgamation or not.

14684. Then they were always fearing amalgamation in Granard?—Not always; only within the last two or three years.

CHAIRMAN.—1858 was the first.

Mr. Mulholland.—1855 was the first proposal.

14685. Mr. Delany.—Long before I was born they were thinking of breaking up that union?—Oh, so; you were born before that. It was Lord Longford asked that first change, and the Board of Guardians objected, and the Local Government Board backed them up. The next thing that turned up was when the Coram County Council demanded their five divisions, and when that was under consideration the Local Government Board came in inquiry to see if it would be desirable to break up the union. While that was pending no repairs were done. I may say further that I attribute that neglect to some extent to the formation of the present Board of Guardians; everything was done before that as it was required; there was no friction as to repairs or anything else; it was all properly carried out, but the new board are rather reticent, and they don't like to spend too much money.

14686. They like to lose the ship. I take it from you that whatever happens you would like the present board reformed?—I was speaking of Granard specially, but this is a general remark.

14687. Then you admit things are not going on as they ought to go, and as business men would conduct them in Granard?—I admit they are going on very well, but they might be better.

14688. You say that the breaking up of the Granard Union would be an inconvenience to the poor; how would it be an inconvenience to the poor; do you mean that if any of them got stricken with sickness it would take a long time to get them into Longford, supposing our theory was carried out?—I mean that too.

14689. Or do you mean that there is not proper accommodation in the shape of relieving officers?—I don't mean that; I mean solely that from the number of poor in the union and those small towns that if the workhouse was changed to Longford it would inconvenience all these poor people seriously.

14690. You mean that if they had to take shelter in a workhouse they would have further to go?—Yes; and other things too.

14691. The breaking up of the union would involve the sending of the Coram portions to Coram and the Westmeath portions to Mullingar?—Yes; and by that people in those villages—Finis in Westmeath, over twenty Irish miles from Mullingar—people from that district would suffer seriously, and they are only three or three and a half miles from Granard, and people in the County Coram—that portion near Longford—would have a longer distance to go to Coram Workhouse than to Granard.

14692. Am I not right in saying that all the Coram and people from the Coram district want to go to Coram?—No; you are not right in saying that; there are some in favour of it.

14693. Am I not right in saying the majority?—Yes, you are, but the clergymen and priests and persons of that district have written to the Local Government Board against the amalgamation on account of the poor. I don't put down the Guardians for knowing everything.

14694. Do you happen to know how many people are in the workhouse from Finis, or that there are any?—I don't know anything about it.

14695. Who are the District Commissioners for Kilderry?—I cannot tell you.

14696. Are they in favour of amalgamation?—One or two of them.

14697. Is there any public board in the Granard district in favour of the retention of the Granard Union except the Urban Council?—I don't know what you mean by public board.

14698. You are a public man, and you know boards composed of men elected by the public; is there any

board of that character in the Grand district against amalgamation except the Urban Council of Grinstead?—I can only speak for my own board.

14703. You do not admit that there is not?—I don't admit that; I am only speaking of the Urban Council.

14704. How many police barracks are there in Grinstead?—I don't know.

14705. The Grinstead Guardians are in favour of amalgamation?—On several occasions they have passed contrary resolutions; that last one was on account of the fixtures going on.

14706. CHAIRMAN.—Did the Grinstead Rural District pass any resolution?—Not that I know of; you have the Chairman of that Board here, and there is one of the Guardians here too.

Mr. Mulsfoot.—I think the District Councillors thought the Guardians were quite sufficient to deal with that; the Guardians embrace the three districts.

14707. Mr. Delany.—You complain of the state of the roads in the Grinstead Union?—I did not make any serious complaint; they are not good.

14708. Is that due to a want of proper contracts; is

the starvation policy pursued on the roads of Grinstead as well as the workhouse?—I won't answer that question.

14709. You have a complaint of the roads of Grinstead; you cannot explain it?—No; I have nothing to do with the roads; it is not for me to complain of the roads.

14710. Mr. Mulsfoot.—Were you present at the Inquiry held by Major Rutledge Fair in July, 1931?—Yes.

14711. Did you see Mr. Healy and Mr. Delany there fighting the battle of the Grinstead Guardians against amalgamation?—I did indeed; it was I helped to employ him.

14712. Have all these people changed their mind, including Mr. Delany and the Guardians?—I don't think so.

14713. And don't you remember how successful they were in opposing amalgamation and convincing the Local Government Board that it was wrong?—That is public property; through the eloquence and shiffliness of Mr. Delany.

Feb. 27, 1904

Mr. P. M. Reilly.

Mr. FRANCIS REILLY, J.P., examined.

14714. Mr. Mulsfoot.—Are you a member of the Urban District Council of Grinstead?—The Chairman?—Yes.

14715. How long have you been an Urban District Councillor?—About seventeen years.

14716. And you know the feelings of the local people well?—Yes.

14717. Do you believe the local people are opposed to the breaking up of the Grinstead Workhouse?—Yes; entirely opposed.

14718. Are you yourself opposed to the breaking up of the Grinstead Workhouse?—Yes; I am.

14719. Did you hear the evidence of the last witness?—I heard it all, and endorse it.

14720. And you think it would be a mistake and worse to dissolve the Grinstead Workhouse?—I think

it would be a great mistake in the interests of the Poor.

14721. And that the Guardians would not come in from that distance to Longford?—You would have none of them surely.

14722. And you don't believe it would be a financial gain to Grinstead?—I think it would be a loss to Grinstead.

14723. Nobody suggests that it would be a gain to Grinstead?—Nobody.

Mr. Delany.—Except the moral effect.

14724. Mr. Mulsfoot.—Do you think you would gain anything from the moral effect?—I don't think so.

14725. Mr. Delany.—When you speak of local opinion I suppose you refer to the people of the immediate vicinity of Grinstead?—Yes.

Mr. Francis Reilly.

Mr. EDWARD O'REILLY examined.

14726. Mr. Mulsfoot.—Are you a member of the Grinstead Board of Guardians?—Yes.

14727. And of the District Council No. 1?—Yes.

14728. How long have you been a Guardian?—About five years.

14729. Where do you live?—Five miles from Grinstead—near Ballinacree.

14730. Have you considered the question of the breaking up of the Grinstead Union?—Yes.

14731. Are you opposed to the breaking up of it?—Yes.

14732. Were you present at the meeting of the Guardians when it was considered?—Yes.

14733. And there was a minority of twenty-one against the dissolution of the union?—Yes.

14734. How do you account for the resolution having been carried?—The greater part of the Guardians were not in on that day, and then there was a majority for the breaking up of the union.

14735. How many members in the total board?—About seventy-six.

14736. And fifty-three were present, and some of those who were in favour of it were from the Owen district?—Yes; the greater part were from Owen.

14737. Do you believe that a majority of the entire board, if they were all present, would be in favour of retaining Grinstead Union as it stands?—Yes, I do.

14738. They were not in favour of amalgamation in 1931?—They were not.

14739. Was the question then considered by them last?—I think so.

14740. And they engaged counsel and solicitor to oppose the amalgamation?—Yes.

14741. You think that if the Union of Grinstead was broken up the Guardians could not be induced to come into Longford?—Very few.

14742. They would not undertake the expenditure of time and money?—They would not come the journey.

14743. And it would lead to the disfranchisement of the country altogether?—Yes.

14744. Some portions then of the Union of Longford would be very far away from the town?—Yes.

14745. Sixteen or seventeen miles?—It would be more, I think.

14746. And these people have no connection in the way of markets or fairs, or any other business, with Longford?—No; no connection at all.

14747. Would they have any means of getting in by railway?—Part of them would, at Ballywillan.

14748. How far would that be from you?—About twelve miles.

14749. And how far would Longford be from you?—About six miles.

14750. You don't consider there would be any financial gain, at all events, to Grinstead from the breaking up of the union?—I do not.

14751. You know the workhouse in Grinstead?—Yes.

14752. What condition is it in now?—It is in very fair condition; it could be made better.

14753. Have the Guardians been expending money upon it lately?—They have expended £250 in the last two or three years, according to my opinion.

14754. Is Grinstead also the meeting place for three District Councils?—Yes.

14755. And the representatives have to attend these meetings monthly?—Yes.

14756. Were you present at the inquiry before Major Rutledge-Fair?—No.

14757. In the event of the Commission reporting in favour of amalgamation of unions generally in the county, what would you recommend should be the workhouse arrangements in the County of Longford?—There are more facilities for inmates in Longford than there are about Grinstead.

14758. You think Grinstead, as a centre, should be maintained under any circumstances?—I think so.

14759. You heard the evidence of Mr. P. M. Reilly on this general question?—Yes; I agree with him generally.

14760. Mr. Delany.—How many Guardians do you happen to know altogether are in the union?—About seventy-five or seventy-six; I am not very accurate.

14761. This meeting at which the resolution about

Mr. Edward O'Reilly.

Feb. 17, 1904.

Mr. Eugene O'Reilly.

amalgamation was come to, that was a summarized meeting?—Yes; some of the Guardians got commenced and more of them did not.

14758. We must presume that all got it; how many turned up?—Fifty-three.

14759. How many voted for amalgamation?—I suppose over thirty.

14760. From that day to this has there been any deliberate effort on the part of the board as a whole or of those who were present at that meeting to rescind that resolution?—Yes; there was.

14761. With what result?—A failure.

14762. So that the Guardians as a corporate body are in favour of breaking up their own union?—Not as a whole.

14763. I mean the majority?—The majority that was there that day, but not the majority of the whole Board of Guardians.

14764. I asked you was there any attempt on the part of those who were not present or were dissatisfied with the result to revise that result on a subsequent occasion?—There was.

14765. Did they revise it?—They did not.

14766. Was there a vote on it?—There was.

14767. And were the men for retaining the union beaten again?—Yes.

14768. Are you a regular attendant?—No.

14769. Are you aware that Major Fair from time to time reported in language expressive and forcible on the condition of the workhouse?—Yes.

14770. Was that referring to the good management of the Guardians?—Well, no; I think not.

MR. PATRICK MACKEN TESTIFIED.

Mr. Patrick Macken.

14782. Mr. Muldoon.—Are you Chairman of the Grand Board of Guardians?—Yes.

14783. How long have you held that position?—About two years.

14784. Were you present when the Guardians passed this resolution dissolving their union?—Yes.

14785. Did you vote against it?—Yes.

14786. You think the dissolution of the Grand Union would not work well for the ratepayers of the union?—Certainly; I believe we would have an increase of the rates.

14787. How many Guardians have you in the union?—Seventy-six, I think.

14788. And there were fifty-three voted on that occasion?—Yes.

14789. Is it your impression now that really a majority of the Guardians would be opposed to it if they were present and discussed the question?—If they were present; I would not be able to give you an answer.

14790. On previous occasions the question of amalgamation has been considered by them?—Yes.

14791. And they then were opposed to it?—Yes.

14792. One of the applications was successfully resisted by Mr. Delany?—Yes; at a special inquiry.

14793. Do you remember anything of a protest being signed in the union against amalgamation?—Yes; I recollect it.

14794. What was the date of that?—I think in 1901.

14795. And a majority of them signed that protest?—Yes.

14796. Do you think, in the event of the Grand Union being dissolved, that the Guardians would come into the Longford Workhouse to the weekly meetings to discharge the duties?—They could not come except at great inconvenience. It is very seldom they would come, I am sure.

14797. And as matters at present stand Grand Union is much lower rated than Longford?—Yes; since the passing of the Local Government Act we are working at least 7d. in the £ cheaper in Grand than in Longford.

14798. CHAIRMAN.—Is that for Poor Law or other purposes?—General rates.

14799. Mr. Muldoon.—For poor rate alone do you happen to know the figures?—The average for the last three years for poor rate alone would be 8d. in Grand and 7½d. in Longford, and 5½d. in Ballymahon; that is all round.

14800. Therefore there would be a disadvantage in amalgamating with Longford as things stand?—I believe so.

14801. Do you think there would further be some disadvantage as regards the bringing of the sick and destitute poor into Longford?—I am quite certain of that.

14771. What have the Guardians done to put their house in order?—They were waiting to see the result of this Commission.

14772. As a matter of fact, did not the Board of Guardians since after time pass a resolution not to spend a halfpenny on the house?—No.

14773. Did they ever instruct Mr. Thompson to prepare estimates of what ought to be done?—Several times.

14774. Did they ever carry out any of his recommendations?—None of them.

14775. Can you put your finger on one work they carried out?—I cannot.

14776. Have you gone through the house yourself?—Yes.

14777. Have you seen its condition?—I have not been through the house these two years.

Mr. Muldoon.—As I understand, you admit that the majority of the present Guardians are a bad lot?

Mr. Delany.—Don't put it that way.

14778. Mr. Muldoon.—Mr. Delany's clients of two years ago have done nothing he says to put the house in order?—I believe so.

14779. And in passing this resolution they have committed suicide to save themselves from slaughter?—I cannot swear that.

14780. CHAIRMAN.—One of your objections to the breaking up of the Grand Union is the fear that it would lead to higher rates?—Yes.

14781. If you were satisfied that the rates would not be raised, but might be lowered, would that change your mind at all?—No.

14802. During your chairmanship have any improvements been made in the workhouse buildings?—Well, there have been some.

14803. Some money has been spent upon it; how much do you happen to know?—Well, it is smaller, from £105 to £205; and I know that we are quite prepared to spend some more if things would settle down.

14804. A little friction, as we happen to know, has been going on there for some time?—Yes.

14805. And you have had more than one inquiry?—Yes.

14806. Do you believe that it is this friction and trouble that have prevented the Guardians from sending in to put their house in order?—I am quite sure it was.

14807. At the present time the town of Grand is the meeting place for three District Councils?—Yes.

14808. And these three District Councils meet there monthly?—Yes; often at the same time.

14809. And it is also a Quarter Sessions town and market town?—Yes.

14810. And the people mostly of the entire union have business which brings them to the town of Grand?—Yes.

14811. And very few of them would have any connection in any way with Longford; would have no reason to come, or rarely an occasion to come, to Longford?—Very seldom.

14812. You are quite sure that the Guardians would be very unwilling to come to Longford weekly to meetings of the Longford Board of Guardians in the event of amalgamation?—I speak for myself in the respect; I could not come, nor I would not be a Guardian for my division if I had to come to Longford.

14813. CHAIRMAN.—Is your residence in the County of Longford?—Yes; two miles from Ballinacorney. I live within four miles of Grand and eight Irish miles from Longford.

14814. Mr. Muldoon.—Were you present at Major Buttidge-Fair's inquiry?—Yes.

14815. Did you give evidence?—No.

14816. Were you then Chairman of the Guardians?—No.

14817. The Local Government Board after that inquiry decided against touching the Grand Union?—Yes.

14818. Except the frictional trouble in the Grand Workhouse, which has since taken place, has anything happened to alter the circumstances which then existed?—Not that I am aware of.

14819. You think amalgamation, as it was undesirable then, would still be so?—I believe so.

14820. Mr. Delany.—You were at the inquiry held by Major Fair in Grand; was there any attempt

tion on the continued refusal of the Guardians to spend money on the house at Gransard?—Command by you?

14821. By any person?—I don't recollect.

14822. Was it suggested that the house was maintained as it ought to be?—Oh, yes.

14823. That is as far back as 1893?—1901.

14824. You were a Guardian during that time?—Yes.

14825. From the time you were elected?—I presume you were elected after the passing of the Local Government Act of 1898—from that time on to the present here the reports of Major Fair, on the condition of the workhouse, have been that the house was in a dilapidated condition?—Yes.

14826. Will you tell this Commission what the Guardians have done to repair that state?—We did a lot of repairs.

14827. Give me the particulars of any one repair?—They were temporary repairs; we did not do any permanent improvements.

14828. I suppose when the wind blew off the slates you put them on, and when the windows were broken by refractory persons you had them replaced; have you done anything of a permanent character to put this house in order?—The Guardians have passed a resolution, and it is on the books, to expend close on £1,000 on the house. We have it in our minds to get a loan, if possible, to carry out improvements if we were sure that the union would be retained.

14829. How long ago is it since that resolution to spend £1,000 was passed?—It is not a year.

14830. Could you give me the date of it; was it before or after the inquiry held last March or April?—It was since the inquiry.

14831. Has anything been done to expend it?—No; in fact we were forbidden to expend any money until after this Commission would sit.

14832. Has it gone further than the minds of the few Guardians anxious to do right that that money should be expended; has it taken any tangible form; has the engineer been directed to make plans?—No; we were forbidden to go on with any permanent improvements until after this Commission.

14833. When?—I cannot give you the date.

14834. Were there repeated requests by Major Fair to get repairs done?—Not since that.

14835. Were there before that?—Yes.

14836. Were there repeated complaints by the medical officer of the workhouse as to the wretched condition which it was allowed to get into?—Oh, yes; he complained of that for six or seven years; probably ten.

14837. What was done to meet the doctor's requirements?—Well, there were so many things asked to be done I don't know.

14838. I will take it quietly; let me have any one thing that is done?—Could you ask me any one particular thing?

14839. No, I cannot; you are Chairman of the Board of Guardians; you tell me the doctor has been complaining for ten years; does your mind travel back to any one thing he complained of and that you did in the shape of an improvement to the house?—I know that he complained about not having a trained nurse there.

14840. I don't know that that is a happy subject for the Board of Guardians, nor do I think it born from the Board of Guardians would improve it; but I want to know of a structural character?—He complained of the floor in the infirmary ward being in a bad state; that has been repaired.

14841. Was that since the inquiry?—Yes.

14842. CHAIRMAN.—You don't mean to say that that has been repaired?—I understood so.

CHAIRMAN.—It is not a couple of weeks ago since we were there.

Mr. Delany.—I suppose you are alluding to the grave; there was a famous hole called the grave, which has been filled up.

CHAIRMAN.—But there were only loose stones thrown into it.

MR. DELANY.—I was told it had been repaired, but I did not see it myself.

14843. CHAIRMAN.—Don't you ever go through the house?—I was not through it for the last twelve months.

Mr. Delany.—May I put it to you, you were so disgusted with its condition you did not want to see it again?—I was not on the visiting committee.

14845. Have you a visiting committee that does not visit?—I must admit that they do not visit the house as often as they should.

14846. But beyond this grave, can you tell us anything else that Dr. Kenny complained of that you carried out?—There are apartments being fitted up which are going to cost us £25.

14847. How long has that apartment been in a dilapidated condition?—We did not require it ever before; certain parties were removed out of the infirmary that we had to fix up this apartment for, and we are doing it far from very well.

14848. You don't give an opinion what the whole Guardians, if they were present, might do, but you admit the result of the summoned board is in favour of amalgamation?—Yes; the majority.

14849. I think you have told us that the average rate on land in Gransard has been £2, since the passing of the Local Government Act, and in Longford £1; there was a slight disparity in the Agricultural Census in Aid; do you know the average grant on buildings in the Longford and Gransard Unions?—I don't recollect, sir; but I know we in Gransard are working at a disadvantage in that respect for the Guardians of that day struck an insufficient rate, and we are suffering since then.

14850. So that the Gransard Guardians have always been in need of a little reform?—Probably.

14851. Do you know now what any reasonable man with a little feeling about him for the condition of his neighbours—what any reasonable man would require to be done in the Gransard Union to put it in order?—Well, I don't think I would be able to go into that.

14852. Would it cost a couple of thousand pounds?—Certainly.

14853. And that would be to bring it into a condition that it ought to be in?—I am with you there.

14854. Has the workhouse been continually neglected in proper repairs?—Well, I believe there should be more done with it.

14855. Is it the case of not doing a stitch in time?—Probably.

14856. So I may take it if the house was properly maintained in Gransard the rates which were struck would not be sufficient to meet the expenditure?—Well, I believe so.

14857. Consequently, the Gransard Workhouse and the Gransard Union has been running on a paper rate, insufficient to meet its lawful and honest obligations. Is the question with you entirely a question of a possible increase of rates?—Well, no.

14858. If the rates were not to be increased would you still be in favour of maintaining the union in Gransard?—Well, I believe it would be a disadvantage to the poor and sick and to the majority of the Guardians to dissolve it.

14859. What convenience have you for bringing in the poor to the workhouse in Gransard?—We have two ambulances.

14860. Are those the ambulances that have been complained of and spoken of as antiquated?—One of them is.

14861. Has anything been done to improve their condition?—About a year and a half ago there were new wheels put on.

14862. Was that after the old wheels had broken down in the service?—Yes.

14863. Of course you have not considered the question of what effect divisional riding would have on amalgamation?—Well, I would not be able to give you an opinion on that; for my part the division which I represent would rather have divisional rating.

14864. As to the inconvenience of men coming to Longford Union, suppose Mr. Kelly's theory were adopted, that we would get one representative from each electoral division, do you think that would be a wise arrangement?—Would that be in case we were going to be amalgamated?

14865. Amalgamation or no amalgamation?—I fear if you were going to be amalgamated with Longford it would be a bad arrangement; if there were two they would contrive to come once in a while, whereas if you had only one he would not.

14866. Am I right in saying that you have too many Guardians in Gransard?—Yes.

14867. And if a number of them found it convenient to stay at home?—We would get on somehow.

14868. And if they had to travel to Longford the chances are that the workhouse would stand; what do you say to that?—That might be; it would turn very much on how the Longford Guardians would work for us.

Feb. 17, 1904.
—
Mr. Falrick
Mackin.

14866. Are not the Longford Guardians all respectable men who do everything right?—I have no fault to find with them.

14870. Of course the presence of three District Council meetings and the Board of Guardians every Monday at Granard is a consideration for the townspeople?—Well, of course, it is; there are few of us Guardians leave Granard without spending less or more.

14871. Mr. Muldoon.—As I understand, the Board of Guardians have made a minute to spend £1,000 on the workhouse, and the Local Government Board have asked them to stop their hands?—Yes.

14872. And you, personally, and the people you represent are willing to incur the additional expenditure

to put the buildings in proper repair?—As far as I know I believe they are.

Mr. Muldoon.—I have a couple more witnesses who are engaged on the County Council and some diagrams who are on their way. I would like to put in my copy of the evidence given at Major Rutledge-Fair's inquiry and the letter of the Local Government Board, which I am sure you will have, and I also put in the letter addressed to the Clerk of the Granard Union; I have also a report upon the question of rates affecting the three unions of the county made and signed by Mr. Edgeworth, who will verify it later on in the hot, and who is Secretary of the County Council here.

Mr. JOHN PRATER examined.

Mr. John
Pratt.

14873. Mr. Muldoon.—You are a member of the County Council of Longford?—Yes.

14874. And a member of the Urban Council of Granard?—I am not; I was.

14875. Where do you live?—In Granard.

14876. Have you considered the question of the amalgamation of the Granard Union with Longford?—Yes.

14877. You are opposed to that?—Yes.

14878. As a large newspaper of the district?—Yes.

14879. And you don't think it would work out usefully for the ratepayers of the Granard Union?—Oh, no; nor for the poor.

14880. Do you think it would also result in that district being practically unrepresented upon the Board at Longford?—It would be practically disfranchised.

14881. The people could not attend?—No.

14882. And how do you say it would affect the destitute poor?—Supposing Granard was amalgamated with Longford there are parts of the Granard Union twenty statute miles from Longford; the conveyance of a sick person for twenty miles would be rather a difficult operation, because there is no direct railway communication.

14883. There are, I believe, in the Granard Union a number of small populous centres where there are a great number of poor?—Yes.

14884. And the Granard Workhouse lies at the present time very convenient to them?—Yes.

14885. There would be a great difficulty in the transit of those from Edgeworthstown, Pines, Coole, Scrubby, Bunkahy, and Ballinacree?—Edgeworthstown is wrong, but the others are right.

14886. There are a great number of poor in all these places?—There are.

14887. And the Granard Union lies convenient to them?—Yes, and there is no other union near them.

14888. At the present time the poor rate in Granard is lower than it is in any of the unions of this county?—The poor rate in Granard is 5½d. under Longford.

14889. Granard is a good market town, a fair town, and the Quarter Sessions meets there?—Yes.

14890. And three local District Councils meet there monthly?—Yes.

14891. And the Guardians and the District Councils are the same?—Yes.

14892. And it would be a great inconvenience to have them meet as Guardians in Longford and as District Councils in Granard?—It would.

14893. Were you present at Major Rutledge-Fair's inquiry?—Yes.

14894. Did you give evidence at it?—No.

14895. But you are aware that the Local Government

Board, as the result of the inquiry, decided that there should not be any amalgamation?—Yes.

14896. You know the feelings of the local people?—Yes, pretty well.

14897. Do you think they are generally opposed to amalgamation?—Well, there are peculiar circumstances at present. There is a certain amount of friction going on in the workhouse, and the Guardians seem to have got frightened, and they are crying out for amalgamation, without, I think, seeing what its effect would be.

14898. Its effect on the finances of the union or the poor. Did you think the ratepayers, as apart from the previous representatives of the poor in the Guardians, are opposed to amalgamation?—Certainly.

14899. You are a large newspaper in the district?—Not very large.

14900. What is your valuation?—About £122.

14901. Mr. Delaney.—I suppose you are aware that the Guardians of the Granard Union for a long time have been allowing the workhouse premises to get in disrepair?—Yes, I have heard that.

14902. And in fact have not been spending money that any reasonable being would spend in keeping the house right?—I have heard it alleged.

14903. Have you any reason to doubt it?—I don't know anything about it.

14904. Have you ever been through the workhouse?—I have been through it, but not lately. I have not been through it for the last ten years.

14905. Was it beginning to go wrong then?—I am not an expert in workhouses.

14906. I think you made the complaint that there would be a difficulty about the Guardians coming to Longford?—Yes.

14907. You are a member of the County Council?—Yes.

14908. Gentlemen have to come to that County Council from beyond Granard?—Yes.

Mr. Muldoon.—How often?

14909. Mr. Delaney.—I presume as often as there is a necessity—once or eight times a year?—Yes.

14910. And the work is done efficiently in that County Council?—I cannot tell you that.

14911. Is there any feeling against the County Council?—No; I have no complaints.

14912. Do you hear complaints about the Granard Board that is doing its work at home?—Yes.

14913. Do you hear anything but complaints?—Well, they are not objects of admiration.

14914. I believe complaints are made about everything in the Co. Longford?—Oh, yes.

14915. Have you ever heard complaints about the Local Government Board?—Oh, yes.

Mr. JOHN MASTERSON examined.

Mr. John
Masterston.

14916. Mr. Muldoon.—Are you Chairman of the District Council of Granard, and a Justice of the Peace?—Yes.

14917. Have you considered the question of the amalgamation of the Granard Union?—Yes.

14918. Are you opposed to it?—Yes, I am.

14919. You think it would not be in the interests of the ratepayers or of the poor?—I don't think it would.

14920. Did you hear the evidence of Mr. Pettit, which has just been given. Generally speaking, do you agree with that evidence?—I do very fully.

14921. Has your District Council considered the question of amalgamation?—Yes, we did.

14922. Did you pass any resolution on the subject?—Yes, but that is some time ago.

14923. About two months ago?—At that time they were at war with the Local Government Board, but they are not now.

14924. What was the effect of the resolution passed?—In favour of amalgamation.

14925. Did they authorize you to give evidence before this inquiry upon this question of amalgamation?—Yes; about a fortnight ago.

14926. Did they know that you were opposed to the amalgamation?—Yes, they did. I voted against it.

14927. Then the very fact that they nominated you to give evidence before this Commission against amalgamation means that they have changed their view of two months ago?—Yes.

14928. Do you know if either of the two other District Councils that meet there have passed any resolu-

Feb. 17, 1894.

Mr. John
Kesteven.

tion on the subject?—They are here to-day to give evidence, and they are in favour of retaining the union at Granard.

14929. And you are aware that the Urban Council is in favour of retaining the union at Granard?—Yes.

14930. And you know the feelings of the local people?—Yes.

14931. Do you think that Guardians could be induced to come to Longford in the event of Granard being amalgamated with this union?—I don't believe they would. Some Guardians reside nearly twenty miles away beyond Longford. I have twelve divisions here that I have ridden down tonight. Abbeylara is less than twenty miles from here, and I firmly believe those Guardians could not possibly attend, and apart from that, the poor would find it impossible to come from that. At night, or other times, I don't see how long ones could be transferred twenty miles across the country. If you amalgamated the workhouses of Granard, I am afraid we could not convert it to any other purpose, because we have no water power in Granard as they have at Longford, and, of course, there are too many applications in at the present time for industrial and technical schools, so I would be very much afraid Granard Workhouse would be a white elephant at the hands of the ratepayers; apart from that our rate would increase 5d. in the £ if amalgamated with Longford.

14932. How long are you chairman of the District Council?—Four years.

14933. Have there been any complaints about the District Council?—Not a word.

14934. That is the only body of which we have heard of which there have been no complaints?—I never heard of any.

14935. Mr. Delany.—You admit now, I think, together with all the other witnesses we have had, that the Board of Guardians at a summoned Board passed a resolution in favour of amalgamation?—Yes.

14936. At which there were fifty-three members present?—Yes.

14937. Do you remember the Board at which there were three gentlemen appointed to attend to give evidence here?—Yes.

14938. That was subsequent to the resolution?—That was two months ago, and a reformation has taken place since then. No meeting has been held since, except the District Council meeting, where they appointed three members.

14939. Are you a representative of the District Council today?—Yes.

14940. You don't represent the Guardians?—The Guardians and Council are all one.

14941. How many members of the Board of Guardians are in the District Council you represent?—Something like fifty-four.

14942. Did they come to a resolution for or against on the question of amalgamation?—They did; they were getting annoyed at the way things were going on in Granard, and they wanted to get away from it; but since two months we changed our minds.

14943. When you found some victims that turned the attention of the public from yourselves, you were willing to remain?—Yes.

14944. Did your District Council pass any resolution on the subject of amalgamation?—No.

14945. Did they give you any mandate as to the view you should put before this Commission when appointing you to come here?—They knew I voted against amalgamation, and a month afterwards they appointed me to come here.

14946. Was your appointment to come here arranged at a meeting of which special notice was given that that would be a matter for discussion?—Yes; the paper came from the Local Government Board asking us to do so.

14947. Was there any notice sent to you as a District Councillor for that meeting, saying that the question of this amalgamation Commission would come before them, and it would be your duty to appoint deputies to come here?—No; but it was at a full Board, and they all knew what they were doing.

14948. But the Guardians' meeting, at which a resolution was passed in favour of amalgamation, was a summoned Board for that purpose?—That was two months ago; a number of charges have taken place since then.

14949. I think you mentioned Abbeylara was twenty miles from Longford?—Twenty statute miles as the crow flies, a division alongside Abbeylara, Newgrove, 14950. Do you know Moyne?—That is only twelve miles from here, but it is not in my division.

14951. Were you ever in Moyne?—Yes.

14952. How many miles from Granard is Moyne?—I am not quite sure.

14953. A number of Guardians who gave evidence here to-day admitted that the present condition of the workhouses in Granard is very bad?—Yes.

14954. And that that is due to neglecting to spend money on it year after year?—I heard you saying the contrary at the inquiry.

14955. I am paid for saying such things, but you are giving evidence?—And you proved the contrary in a very eloquent manner.

14956. I will do the opposite now. I suggest that the Guardians of Granard have not been striking proper rates. I suggest that they are attempting a starvation performance—carrying on two workhouses on starvation lines. Tell me the salary of the clerk of your union?—There are so many things tumbled up together.

14957. What is the salary of your clerk of the union?—I think it is about £20 a year.

14958. I want to know the salary which you pay the clerk of your union as clerk?—£65; you know there are emoluments.

14959. I want to know what the salary of your clerk of the union is as clerk—has he £10 a year?—As clerk of the District Council.

14960. As clerk of the union, the man who has to cater for seventy-six Guardians?—It is something short £15 a year, but his salary collectively is £250.

14961. Am I right in saying his salary as clerk of the union is £10?—It is not; it is £250 a year all told.

14962. He got an increase in salary on account of the District Council work?—Yes; an increase of salary was voted him, and the Local Government Board very wisely considered he had enough, and would not sanction it.

14963. How much was the increase?—It was £20 a year.

14964. How much was he getting as clerk?—£250 a year.

14965. Don't you know that that is not a frank answer to the question?—I am not sure what the exact figure is.

14966. What salary do you pay your relieving officers?—They are paid different salaries; there are three of them.

14967. What was the last one appointed?—I think £45 a year. They are paid extra fees for extra work now and again. They can't get a standard salary.

14968. You are in a difficulty. You have a sort of liking for this workhouse. You don't know what would happen to it if broken up?—I would not like to see it broken up; the poor would suffer and the ratepayers would suffer.

14969. There is nothing you could suggest that it could be turned to?—I am assuming it won't be broken up at all.

14970. You did not think it could be made a technical school, and you had an objection to its being made a lunatic asylum. Has it ever occurred to you that it would be useful as an object-lesson to the rest of the country to turn it into a museum.

14971. Mr. Muldoon.—The meeting of the Granard Guardians which passed the resolution in favour of amalgamation was composed of fifty-three Guardians?—I think about that.

14972. The resolution was carried by a majority of eleven?—Yes.

14973. And in the majority there were seventeen Guardians from Cavan?—Yes.

14974. You don't know what the actual figure of the salary of the clerk of your union is as clerk?—I don't know the exact figure, because there are a number of different emoluments. He is clerk of three District Councils.

14975. In the event of his office becoming vacant tomorrow, and you advertised it at this figure of £250, do you think you would have a few candidates?—I am sure we would. Nine or ten were looking for it when it was vacant before, about twelve years ago.

Mr. JOHN THOMPSON examined.

Feb. 17, 1904.
Mr. John
Thompson.

14976. Mr. Muldoon.—Are you an engineer?—Yes.
14977. Where do you reside?—In Glanard.
14978. Are you a ratepayer also of the union?—In a small way.

14979. Have you considered the question of the amalgamation of the Glanard Union with Longford?—Well, yes, I have.

14980. And you are opposed to that?—Yes, I am.

14981. Have you been engaged by the Board of Guardians in making estimates as to the repairs of the workhouse?—Yes, I have been engineer to the Board now for many years.

14982. Will you tell the Commission if, within the last five or six years, you were asked to make any estimate as to repairs?—Yes, I was. I was asked to go into the thing thoroughly and see what would the outlay come to to greatly improve the workhouse. For instance, to provide a proper kitchen with modern cooking utensils; to provide sanitary annexes for the buildings; and hot water supply; plastering walls; ceiling the walls and floors; and, roughly speaking, my estimate came to about £2,000.

14983. Were any of the works carried out which you estimated for?—Very trifling.

14984. CHAIRMAN.—Did you estimate for new windows?—Yes.

14985. Mr. Muldoon.—Are you aware that the Guardians put a resolution on the books to expend £1,000 on these works?—Yes, I am.

14986. Do you happen to know that the Local Government Board asked them to stay their hands for the present?—I believe it was an understood thing that they would stay their hands until something definite would be decided on.

14987. Have a number of labourers' cottages been erected in the union?—Yes.

14988. About how many?—There is a scheme which is in course of being carried out now, and I think we will have pretty nearly 200, perhaps over 200, cottages.

14989. Are you also an assistant County Surveyor?—Yes.

14990. And you know the roads and the distances of the county fairly well?—Yes, I do.

14991. In the event of the Glanard Union being broken up, and that they would have to come to Longford, some of the Guardians from the outlying districts would have a long way to come?—Yes; in one of the districts that was discussed here it would be fully 20 statute miles.

14992. About how far is Scrubby from Longford?—It would be considerably over twenty miles—twenty-five statute miles.

14993. Are the roads good generally. The railway is not accessible?—No; the roads are pretty good in the Glanard division.

14994. It would be a very long way to bring the poor?—It would be a very long way to bring the poor from the outlying parishes.

CHAIRMAN.—They would go to Cavan, not Longford, from Scrubby.

14995. Mr. Muldoon.—How far is Moyne from Longford?—I think about fifteen statute miles approximately.

14996. How far is Moyne from Glanard?—About thirteen miles.

14997. Mr. Delany.—I suppose if the workhouse were broken up your occupation would be gone?—It would not trouble me very much.

14998. CHAIRMAN.—Are you paid by a percentage on the work done?—

14999. Mr. Delany.—How many years have you had an intimate knowledge of the workhouse of Glanard?—Ten years.

15000. During that time has there been very much work carried out of an improving character?—Not very much radical change, but the upkeep was looked after.

15001. With the result that it requires £2,000 to put it in repair now?—The £2,000 includes putting in these works that never existed before.

15002. But ought to have existed?—These things were not so much in front when the workhouse was built.

15003. Am I right in saying the walls of the house are not plastered?—They never were plastered.

15004. What has been done with the roof—has it been rendered?—There is no ceiling; it is thoroughly rendered.

15005. Could you design a graphic ward that would describe the windows of the hospital?—They are of the old description.

15006. Assigned?—Yes; they are the ordinary windows, and open on hinges.

15007. I suppose the hinges have ceased to work a long time ago?—No.

15008. What condition are the doors in?—Wearing and worn.

15009. One of your proposals was to put in a proper kitchen. Don't you think in any kind of official life you should begin with a respectable kitchen?—Yes, it is badly needed.

15010. Is the present kitchen a disgrace?—It is worse.

15011. You were to put in a proper kitchen, and sanitary arrangements of an up-to-date character?—Yes.

15012. And you were to plaster the walls that were never plastered, and repair the floors that were laid?—Yes.

15013. What sort of a place is the mortuary?—It has been shifted. I sent a small sketch plan to the Local Government Board of a new locality for it, and that has not been carried out.

15014. How long ago is it since you first were asked to make any estimate about the repairs of this workhouse?—I think close on two years.

15015. Has it been carried out since?—Not in any extensive way.

15016. Has there been any honest attempt made to carry out the plans you made?—No, certainly not; but I would account for that by the state the workhouse is in. They don't know very well whether it is going to remain, and they have been occupied with other matters.

15017. Have they a sort of presentiment of judgment?—They have not.

15018. I think you told us they agreed to carry out £1,000 worth of repairs?—They did.

15019. Although your estimate for absolutely necessary work was £2,000?—The first estimate I made did not include as much as the last estimate.

15020. Does your last estimate include anything that ought to be left out?—No.

15021. Then if it took £2,000 to do that work, is it not remarkable for a Board of Guardians to say that by deciding to spend £1,000 they were honestly attempting to do their duty to the public or the poor?—The hope was that when the £1,000 was spent they would carry out some more of the work.

15022. Has there been any honest attempt on the part of this Board of Guardians to do its duty properly to the house?—I would go the length of saying that there has not been an attempt made to carry out these modern improvements.

15023. Did you hear about the grave that was filed to that sample of their intelligent way of doing business?—I did not hear about the grave.

15024. Have you ever seen it. Do you know the hole beside the bed in the ward where the old women are?—It is far-fetched to call it a grave; it is a hole.

15025. What has been done to improve it?—Everything is remaining as it is.

15026. You happen to know that Moyne is fifteen miles from Longford?—Roughly speaking.

15027. When you speak of thirteen miles from Glanard, do you mean from the extremity of the county?—The Glanard Union goes down somewhat further the Moyne?—I think it touches the Co. Leitrim.

15028. Does it not go at least three miles beyond Moyne Crossroads?—It is not there. I would say two.

15029. So that it is fifteen miles to the confines of the Moyne district?—Yes.

15030. Does not the Longford Union go down to exactly the same place?—It does.

15031. So that at the present moment there is just as much hardship inflicted on the poor coming in from there?—You have not much to choose when you take that point.

15032. Are you aware that repeatedly the Guardians of Glanard refused to carry out works by resolution?—I am aware they never ordered me to carry them out.

15033. I presume they went as far in the hanging as asking you to make plans?—That was not hanging.

15034. What have they done with the plans?—They have pigeon-holed them.

MR. PETER KENNAN EXAMINED.

15035. Mr. Muldoon.—Are you a member of the Council of the Co. Longford?—Yes.

15036. And of the Urban Council of Granard, and a large ratepayer?—Yes.

15037. Have you considered the amalgamation of the Granard Union?—Yes.

15038. Are you opposed to it?—Yes.

15039. As a ratepayer of the county, and a member for the duration, what is your valuation?—Really, I could not tell you. I pay £45 or £46 a year rates.

15040. As a ratepayer you don't think it would be an advantage to you to be joined to Longford?—No.

15041. Do you think it would lead to any difficulty in the division of Granard being represented on the Longford Board?—I do.

15042. You think Guardians could not be induced to come to Longford?—They might periodically come, once every twelve months, if there was anything on special, but I think from the way the Guardians are arranged at present, it would be an impossibility for them to attend.

15043. Is it your view that the local people are opposed to amalgamation?—They are.

15044. And you think the resolution passed by the Guardians in the Granard Union did not represent the views of the ratepayers?—I don't think there was any passing in it.

15045. What division of the county do you represent in the County Council?—Bunclahy.

15046. Where is that situated?—The nearest point of Granard would be about two Irish miles, and the extreme eight or nine.

15047. How far are you from Longford?—24½ miles.

15048. At present you have to come in here to the County Council?—I have.

15049. About how often in the year?—Between committee meetings and agricultural meetings, I do so it would be twenty-four or twenty-five times a year.

15050. Do you find it convenient to come in?—Very inconvenient.

15051. And, of course, expensive?—Very expensive.

15052. And the chances from whom the Guardians are now drawn are not able to incur the expenses?—I believe not except in very few cases.

15053. Do you think it would also lead to difficulty in the transfer of the sick poor?—I do. I think if fever broke out, as there was within my own recollection in twenty-five years, I think it would be a matter of impossibility to remove the sick people from Granard town.

15054. Do you know anything about the Granard Board of Guardians?—Except what I see in the papers. I am not a member.

15055. You don't know anything about the union buildings?—Not much.

15056. You do know that the rate in the Granard Union is smaller than it is in Longford?—I do.

15057. And as things stand it would be a disadvantage to the ratepayers to come into this town?—A great disadvantage.

15058. Granard is the market town for a very large district there?—It is.

15059. And it is the meeting-place of three District Councils?—It is.

15060. In the event of the Commission being in favour of lessening the number of unions in the county, what arrangement would you suggest should be made?—I would say that Granard and Ballymahon should stand; they could not be utilised for any other purpose except as workhouses with advantage, and Longford is the only one that could be utilised with advantage for any manufacturing or industrial purpose.

15061. One union would be too few in the county, and the county would be best served by having one at each end?—Yes, and they have a county hospital in Longford in addition; but I would be in favour of the

hospital of every union being retained. It would be very detrimental to the interests of the poor of the county if any of the three hospitals at present were disturbed.

15062. Have the County Council considered the question at all of amalgamation of unions on the county?—To-day they have been working at it.

15063. Have they come to any determination?—They have been voting.

15064. Are there any complaints about the County Council in this locality?—None, that I have heard of.

15065. You know the feeling of the local people in the district you represent?—Yes.

15066. And generally in the Granard Union do you think the ratepayers are opposed to amalgamation?—I am sure any sensible ratepayer is, and that they are generally.

15067. How do you account for the Granard Board passing the resolution?—Some of the Guardians I have been speaking to could give me an explanation of why the resolution was passed.

15068. They passed it in a panic?—They all say they would like to get out of it as Guardians to say plain; in fact if there were paid Guardians they would be in favour of them.

15069. Were you present at Major Rutledge-Fair's inquiry?—I was.

15070. The bulk of the evidence there was against amalgamation?—It was.

15071. And the Granard Board of Guardians successfully opposed it?—They did.

15072. Mr. Deasy.—The Longford County Council held a special meeting to-day to consider this question?—Yes.

15073. Did they pass a resolution in favour of amalgamation?—By a majority.

15074. Everything is done in this world by a majority, and they had your disapproval and your facts before them?—I did not say any more on the matter.

15075. Were those members of the Longford County Council as unable to express their reasons as the Granard Board of Guardians?—They did not give their reasons very strongly.

15076. They gave their votes?—They did; they said that the public were in favour of amalgamation, and they passed a resolution by nine to seven in favour of it.

15077. I think you told us that you don't think there was any meeting in the Granard resolution?—I don't.

15078. Does that show a want of intelligence in the Guardians?—There are other complications.

15079. Is one of the complications a want of intelligence?—Outside influence.

15080. And want of intelligence?—I think really on a good many points they are very intelligent.

15081. But they don't understand their resolutions. You are a County Councillor. Have you taken any steps as County Councillor to ascertain the feelings of the people on the question of amalgamation?—Oh, certainly.

15082. Are there any of them here to-day?—I am here on their behalf.

15083. Did you call a public meeting?—I am in touch with them every day of the week.

15084. And you are also in touch with the Guardians every day of the week?—Yes.

15085. You are a large contractor to the union?—If I was not the lowest man I suppose I would not get it.

15086. In 1905 I am told you supplied £180 worth of goods to them, and in 1908 £76 worth, and in 1901 £107 worth?—I don't know that those figures are right. I don't care twopenny if I never had a contract.

15087. Your interest is entirely a ratepayer's interest?—Certainly.

15088. And if you could be shown that the blotting out of the Granard Union, with all its facilities, would lower the rates, you would be in favour of it?—I would.

MR. FRANCIS BROWNE EXAMINED.

15089. Mr. Deasy.—You are a Guardian of the Granard Union?—Yes; deputed by that body to attend here to give evidence.

15090. Are you residing in the urban district of Granard?—I am residing in the Rural District of Granard.

15091. How long have you been a Guardian?—Something like thirteen years.

15092. During that time what has been the conduct of the Board of Guardians in reference to the house?

Have they done anything to keep it in running repair?—Nothing that was permanent; they were striving to repair, more or less.

15093. Do you agree with the description which has been given here as to the unfortunate condition of the house at present?—Yes, I do agree with it.

15094. And you admit, with Mr. Thompson, that it would take a large sum of money to put it in repair?—Indeed it would.

15095. Are you one of the majority who passed this

Feb 17, 1904.
Mr. Peter
Kennan.

Mr. Francis
Browne

Feb. 17, 1894.
 Mr. Francis
 Browne.

resolution about amalgamation?—On the 27th of April last, I served a five weeks' notice of motion to consider the question of amalgamation. On June 1st, the following motion was proposed by myself, and seconded by Mr. Patrick Liddy:—"That we ask the Local Government Board to reconsider the question of amalgamating the Grandard Union, in consequence of the heavy expenses likely to be incurred by the proposed improvements in the workhouse and hospital, and likely increase in officers' salaries." There was an amendment proposed:—"That the subject be postponed for the present, the Local Government Board having recently appointed a Commission to inquire into the question of amalgamation." There were twenty-nine for the motion and twelve against. Then in October there came a circular from the Local Government Board asking us to answer certain queries with regard to this Commission. A committee was appointed, and on the 18th of November the report of the committee was submitted. The number of Guardians at that meeting was twenty-eight, and they passed it unanimously, and it is a report for the amalgamation of the union on a general basis. In December the chairman got a meeting called so as to have his views with regard to amalgamation before this Commission, and on the 4th of January the chairman put it to the meeting to consider the question of amalgamation, and he stated the object he had was to have the opinion of the Guardians whether they were in favour of amalgamation or not, as he would be guided by their decision. The majority on that date was thirty-four to twenty in favour of amalgamation.

15095. After thirteen years as Guardian in Grandard Union, are you of opinion that it is in the interests of the ratepayers of the Grandard Union to list on the union?—I know that if they were required to put the house in proper order, as it should be, it would have increased the rates so that we would be nearly equal to any other union.

15096. On the assumption now that Grandard is blotted out, you know that that would lead in time to a lessening of the management expenditure?—I will give you my own idea. As far as demeritary classification, we have accommodation in Grandard for about seventy mothers and children. But the other day, when we made inquiries, we have only twelve of that description. It takes the same amount of fire, light, and attendance to look after them, and if it was divided—and the same thing applies to the whole place—one apartment could provide for them all. The house is built to contain 1,003.

15098. In your time has the population of the workhouse gone steadily down?—Steadily down. The inmates at present this year are something more than they were during my time.

15099. Are there any matters that you would like to tell the Commissioners as to the feeling of the public. We hear a lot about public opinion in Grandard. Outside the Urban District of Grandard, what is the public opinion?—The feeling of the people of the district that I represent is in favour of amalgamation. At the time of my election it was partly one of my plans.

15100. I believe the former chairman of the Board of Guardians was Mr. Higgins?—Yes.

15101. He was opposed amalgamation?—Yes.

15102. And he disappeared at the election?—He was not returned.

15103. During his three years of office were there repeated resolutions by the Board of Guardians not to do any work?—Generally speaking, there were. I remember to act on several committees and hiring matters of reform before the Board, and they would be rejected afterwards.

15104. You are here in pursuance of a resolution in favour of amalgamation?—In pursuance of those whom I represent.

15105. Mr. McFadden.—Where do you live?—Close on two Irish miles this side of Grandard.

15106. How far from Longford?—About ten Irish miles.

15107. How do you get home?—By my own horse.

15108. Have you a farm?—Yes.

15109. What is your valuation in the Grandard Union?—Between £20 and £30.

15110. What is the exact amount. Tell us the truth?—I am not able to tell you exactly. I have it in two or three different places.

15111. What is it now. Is it £30 in the entire?—It is more; I have a valuation in three townlands.

15112. Can you write your name?—Readily.

15113. Is that "Francis Browne" there (as does—and) underlined with pencil?—That is the very name, and my own handwriting.

15114. Listen to this:—"To the Local Government Board, Dublin.—We, the undersigned, Guardians of the Grandard Union, hereby protest against either taking away from the Grandard Union the five divisions of the Co. Carrow, or the dissolution of the Grandard Union, on the ground that either of such changes is calculated to inflict increased hardship and inconvenience on the poor, to whose wants it is the duty of the Guardians to see." Is not that very fine?—Yes, it is.

15115. And such change will cause an unnecessary waste of the ratepayers' money, and practically disfranchise most of the present Union of Grandard. What did you sign that?—I would like to know the date of that.

15116. Who presented that to you?—I did not read it, but I believe it was the Rev. Fr. Connolly.

15117. When did he tell you. Has he changed his views?—I could not say whether he has or not, but he came to me one night something in or about 11 o'clock. I was then in bed. He told me he was going around getting a petition signed; that there was a removal or something to that effect, that five divisions were going to leave our union, and leave an inconvenience on the remainder of the union. He asked me was I for amalgamation or not. I said I was for amalgamation. He asked me would I be a party to take away the living or salary of the priests that were there. For his own part he did not care; he was only there for seven or eight months, and perhaps might not be there much longer, and he asked me to sign. There was not much time for me. It was out of my bed I had to go. I did not read it, and I signed, when my wife asked me not to be keeping the priest waiting at such an hour, only to put my name.

15118. This was before the inquiry that took place before Major Rutledge-Park?—That is since the inquiry.

15119. You said you did not remember when you signed it?—It is since it; but I cannot give the date when it was.

15120. Were you at the inquiry?—I was.

15121. And you swear this has been signed since that?—Since that.

15122. What were your views when you were at that inquiry?—My views were that I believed we would be better by amalgamation, but I gave no evidence.

15123. Then you signed this protest afterwards?—Against the five divisions going, as far as I was led to believe, under undue influence.

15124. "On the ground that either of such changes is calculated to inflict increased hardship and inconvenience to the poor, to whose wants it is the duty of the Guardians to see, and such change will cause an unnecessary waste of the ratepayers' money." Do you state here publicly that you, a Guardian of the poor, signed that without reading it?—I did.

15125. On the statement of the clergyman that it was opposed to amalgamation?—Yes.

15126. Did you say to him that you were opposed to amalgamation?—I did.

15127. And were opposed to amalgamation at the date you signed that?—To a certain amount I was.

15128. Now you are a whole-hogger?—I may tell you that any person would have the same body removed.

15129. Is it entirely because of the composition of the present body that you go in for amalgamation?—Not altogether. I believe from the way our population is dwindling away that in the near future our rates will be far lower than they are.

15130. When did you come to that conclusion?—I see every little household removed; that has been the cause of increasing these rates. I see labourers' cottages put up, and the poor diminishing.

15131. Are you opposed to the erection of labourers' cottages?—Not one bit. I gave evidence at the last inquiry, and the houses even were not built that I had sworn to.

15132. In 1902 you were opposed to amalgamation. When did you change your mind; was it in 1903 or was it since what are called the Grandard scandals?—I did not change my view.

15133. Are you still opposed to amalgamation?—I am not—I am for amalgamation.

15134. You stated a minute ago that you signed you were opposed to amalgamation, and told the clergyman

501.—I did not. I told you under what circumstances I signed it.

15135. Did you not tell me you told the clergyman you were opposed to amalgamation?—I did not say so.

15136. Did you tell the clergyman you were in favour of amalgamation?—I told him I was in favour of amalgamation.

15137. Completely?—To a certain amount.

15138. Tell me what you said to the clergyman?—I am after explaining it; it is needless to repeat it.

15139. Did you say, "I am opposed to amalgamation"?—To a certain amount.

15140. What did that mean?—I may tell you this much—it is not my own vote when I give, it is the vote of the people who put me there.

15141. Then it was a natural thing for you to sign this because you were opposed to amalgamation?—It was the way it was put.

15142. You said a moment ago it was due to the undue influence of the clergyman—do you adhere to that statement?—He asked me the question to know what I be a party to that leaving, and I said I would not.

15143. Did you not say that it was his undue influence that led you to sign it?—I am telling you the influence.

15144. Did you say that a minute ago?—I have given my evidence, and you can go back on it if you like, and I won't repeat it more for you.

15145. I cannot make you be courteous or gentlemanly, I can only press you on the answers you are giving.—If I was giving evidence on your behalf you would be very courteous to me.

15146. You were very careful to bring here a resolution that you proposed about amalgamation?—I am very careful always to know what I am talking about.

15147. Although you don't know your valuation, did you happen to bring any resolution with you which you proposed at the board about the repairs of the house?—No.

15148. When did you propose any resolution at the Grand Board about repairing the house?—I don't know; I am not in the habit of going in for very large repairs.

Mr. MICHAEL CASEY examined.

15155. Mr. Deasy.—You have been a Guardian of the Longford Union for a great number of years?—Twelve years.

15156. During that time you have taken a deep interest in the working of the union?—Yes.

15157. Has your head always been ready and willing to comply with anything that was reasonable in the way of keeping the house in proper order and meeting the march of the times?—Always.

15158. Of course, there is a natural objection to expenditure?—Certainly.

15159. That has been got over, and you managed to do the right thing in the end?—I always objected to anything I considered unreasonable myself.

15160. Has your board considered the question of amalgamation?—Yes.

15161. You were summoned together to consider these queries from the Commission?—Yes.

15162. What result has your Board of Guardians come to?—They have come to the conclusion that they consider amalgamation of great benefit to the County Longford. Longford is substantially a small county.

15163. And the town of Longford is the centre?—Yes.

15164. At the present moment the furthest part of the union is at Dungort, beside Arragh—the furthest part of Granard from Longford would not be farther than that?—It might be about a mile more.

15165. During your term as a Guardian the poor had to be brought in from the confines of the county and the furthest parts of the union?—Yes.

15166. Has there been any difficulty?—No difficulty whatever.

15167. I believe in the union here you have a proper fever hospital van?—Yes, we have a van for ordinary cases.

15168. From your knowledge of the County Longford, and I believe you have been everywhere in it, do you think there would be any substantial inconvenience or hurt to the poor if Longford was to be

15149. I suppose you agree generally with what the Guardians did there?—At the last time I strove to make any reformation in it it was moved that it would be adjourned for a number of months or years.

15150. Who suggested that?—It was the late Chairman.

15151. Are you not aware now that the Local Government Board asked the Guardians to stay their hands on account of the expenditure?—Well, it is only reasonable.

15152. Was not that the object of your own resolution?—They were always pressing us to do something with it, but we were never in the mind.

15153. Did you ever complain about the Local Government Board?—What would I complain about them for?

15154. About their pressing you to spend money upon the house?—did you ever do it?—Who would I complain to?

15155. At the board?—I did not, to my knowledge.

15156. You complain sometimes without knowing it?—No, never.

15157. You have no resolution now that you ever proposed about the repairs to the Grand Workhouse? I remember to be on a committee recommending certain alterations with regard to the isolation of convalescents and other things in the workhouse, which were not carried out.

15158. When was that?—I would say it was two years ago.

15159. Did you ever bother about it since?—I did not.

15160. Were you there when it was proposed by the board to spend £1,000 in repairs?—I must have been.

15161. Did you approve of that?—I let it go.

15162. You did not oppose it?—Because I saw it was necessary.

15163. Did you support it?—Yes; and would support it to-morrow if it was going to be.

15164. A change was made some time afterwards?—There is no changing my mind in it, because I see the repairs are necessary.

retained as the one union?—Not that I could say, in my opinion; we never had any difficulty whatever in bringing in patients.

15179. You think you ought to go back to divisional rating?—you, personally, don't think so?—The other members of the committee are for it.

15180. But you think union rating ought to be maintained?—Yes.

15181. Is there any matter now that you think you would like to mention to the Commission yourself?—I don't think so.

15182. You think Granard and Ballymahon might very well be done without?—Certainly, as a union Ballymahon might be turned into an industrial school, as there is sufficient accommodation there—water-power and everything to carry on a factory, which we have not in Longford. It was suggested that there might be an auxiliary asylum wanted for the County Westmeath.

15183. In Longford, I believe, you are sending children to the National Schools?—Yes.

15184. If that were done it would get rid of a lot of the expense of the union?—Yes.

15185. Has that arrangement worked satisfactorily in Longford?—Most satisfactorily.

15186. Do you think that ought to be extended?—Yes.

15187. You think there is quite enough accommodation in the Longford Workhouse, assuming the other two unions were broken up?—According to the estimates we have accommodation for twice as many as are in the three unions.

Mr. Deasy.—Would it be open to make a suggestion to the re-arrangement of dispensary districts?—

Chairman.—We have no function about the dispensary districts.

15188. Mr. Muldoon.—You live two miles from Longford?—Yes.

15189. But you come frequently into this town,—

Yes.

Feb. 17, 1894.

Mr. Francis Reeves.

Feb 17, 1904.

Mr. Michael
Cassidy.

15190. Your interests lie here, and you want to bring the entire county into the Longford Union?—I differ with you as far as that is concerned. I take no interest in that; I merely look for the interests of the county-at-large.

15191. You are a humane man?—Yes.

15192. Devoted to the interests of the poor?—Yes.

Mr. James
O'Sullivan.

15193. Mr. Deasy.—You are Chairman of the Longford Board of Guardians?—Yes.

15194. Are you in any way interested in the town of Longford?—Not directly, beyond that I am interested in every town and village in Ireland.

15195. You were a member of the committee appointed to go into the question?—Yes.

15196. Will you tell the Commission what conclusions your board has come to—are they in favour of amalgamation?—They are in favour of amalgamation generally.

15197. Are they desirous of breaking up the Unions of Ballymahon and Gransard?—Yes; I believe one workhouse in the county is quite sufficient.

15198. I believe in addition to being a Poor Law Guardian you are a valuer of land, and go all over the county. Do you know what the general feeling on the question of amalgamation is?—The general feeling is in favour of amalgamation, principally on the ground of expenditure.

15199. Do you think it would be the smallest inconvenience to the poor if Longford be retained as the only union for Longford County?—I think, in the case of amalgamation, Longford is the only union workhouse that should be retained, for it is placed in a central position. I got the map of the County Longford sealed, and it is placed in the centre of the county, and the destitute poor would have as far to come from the extreme portion of the Longford Union almost as they would from the extreme portions of Ballymahon or Gransard.

15200. You know that from your knowledge?—Yes.

15201. Was one of the recommendations of your board that there should be a going back to the electoral divisional charges?—Oh, yes; that is a most essential point if the poor law system is to be revived at all, because union charges are a bribe to indifference on the part of the Guardians, and it is an inducement to people, who could earn their bread honestly otherwise, to flock into villages and towns, and occupy houses let to them for a small profit, in order to sit out on the rates, and plead that they could get no work. On the question of amalgamation generally, I could show that it takes considerably off the amount that it takes to supply the wants of the destitute poor to maintain one of these institutions. Now, the electoral division that I represent is one of the poorest in

15202. And if it were shown to you that the poor would suffer by your arrangement would you press it?—I would.

15203. If the result of it would also be to increase the rates you would oppose it?—I think if we had amalgamation it would decrease the rates all over after a short time.

MR. JAMES O'NEILL EXAMINED.

the Longford Union, and its valuation is £1,850. Out of that division there are only three paupers in the workhouse and six in receipt of out-door relief. It costs for the actual upkeep of these only £55, whereas the division pays in rates £135 5s. 7d.—that is, it takes £80 2s. 7d. to administer £55 5s. 7d.

15204. Chairman.—I am afraid you have not gone deep enough into the matter?—That is without the maintenance of the institution.

Chairman.—Your view of the figures I understand, but you have not gone deeply enough into the matter to assist us by your statistics. I know what you mean exactly.

15205. Mr. Deasy.—Another matter that your board is anxious about is the question of sending home paupers from England and Scotland?—Yes.

15206. You think you ought to have reciprocal powers?—That is a great question, I may say, to the Poor Law system of Ireland; because recently there was a pauper deported from Scotland into the Longford Union of the name of McGeehan, who admitted on his oath in Scotland that he spent forty years of his life in Scotland, and was born in the parish of Compeh. Now, I was speaking on Sunday to the only man I know of bearing that name in the parish of Compeh, and there it got another facet of that name living in the parish. And his father emigrated into that parish from Lifford, so, consequently, whatever unions those men see treat the poor best they set themselves down as coming from that union.

15207. Your board is anxious on the question of amalgamation for reduction of the rates?—Yes.

15208. Your board has always been anxious to meet the requirements of reform?—Certainly.

15209. Mr. Muldoon.—You are Chairman of the Board of Guardians. You are not a candidate for Parliament, are you?—No, sir.

15210. The Longford Guardians want amalgamation, which will bring all the Guardians into the town of Longford?—I don't understand that.

15211. Would you be in favour of amalgamation if it was proposed to bring the Guardians into Gransard?—Certainly not; the few that are in Gransard should be brought to some other centre.

15212. Where else would you bring them?—To say central point in the county. It won't add to the dignity of any person to go to Gransard.

MR. THOMAS JENNINGS EXAMINED.

Mr. Thomas
Jennings.

15213. Mr. Deasy.—How long have you been a Guardian?—Five years.

15214. You are able to tell us that the Guardians are unanimous on the question of amalgamation?—I am.

15215. Have you considered the question of the convenience of the poor?—I have.

15216. Will the central workhouse in Longford be quite sufficient for the poor of the county?—I think so.

15217. Would there be any substantial inconvenience?—No inconvenience I can see whatever. The distance will be very considerably increased, and the roads will be much better.

15218. You have a higher opinion of the roads than the Gransard men. Do you agree as to the electoral division charges instead of union?—I do.

15219. From your experience as a Guardian, can you tell the Commission whether amalgamation will eventually result in the reduction of the rates?—I have been a long time in favour of amalgamation. I consider pauperism should be concentrated as much as possible in order to lessen the cost; the more concentrated it is the less cost it will incur. Besides, it is a temptation to paupers to avail themselves of these places when you have too many of them, and they are too convenient.

15220. Has your board erected a large number of

labourers' cottages?—Yes, I am very glad to say, a number of them.

15221. Do you think they have contributed somewhat, at any rate, to the falling off of the rates as you as a body for out-door relief?—I entirely think so. They have made good members of society of adults that might have been paupers. I would like to see a revision of the dispensaries.

15222. Mr. Muldoon.—You think if there was only one union in the county there would be less paupers?—I do.

15223. And if we had no unions at all we would have no paupers?—I would not go to that extent at all.

15224. Everything, you think, will be delightful when you get amalgamation—the rates will improve and the persons will improve?—Yes, and I hope we will have less Commissioners.

15225. That is when we get amalgamation bringing all the Guardians into Longford. Did you ever hear of the proposition to have amalgamation with Ballymahon as the only centre for poor law in the county?—I would not be very much against it, as far as able-bodied paupers are concerned, but not otherwise.

15226. Chairman.—Not for the sick?—Not for the sick or infirm—the able-bodied pauper. We have only eight miles or ten miles in Longford as an average.

Very Rev. Dr. LANGAN, R.P., examined.

Feb. 17, 1904.

15227. Mr. Muldoon.—Where do you live now?—In Athlone. I have fourteen years in Athlone, and was chaplain to the workhouse until recently.

15228. That is the extreme point of the Granard Union?—Yes, within the County Longford.

15229. And you know the views of the local people and the ratepayers there?—Pretty well.

15230. And you believe that they are opposed to amalgamation or to having to come into Longford?—Well, they are divided in opinion. The majority of the Guardians in Granard recently expressed themselves in favour of amalgamation, but some time ago a considerable number of Guardians were opposed to amalgamation, and the reason they assign for their change of opinion is that there have been some little differences, and they are more or less disgusted; but they certainly do advance any solid reason for their change of opinion. I think it is more a whim than anything else.

15231. But the great body of the ratepayers remain opposed to amalgamation?—Their views have not been altered.

15232. As far as you could ascertain, is not the feeling of the local people against amalgamation?—I really have not put the question to them.

15233. Do you think it would be inconvenient to the Guardians and the poor to have to come in from that district to the town of Longford?—I do. I think it would be a hardship on the poor and a serious inconvenience on the Guardians. I am quite sure the Guardians would not attend, except a very small proportion of them; and it would be almost an outrage if the sick and infirm were obliged to come in—they might die on the way. I know if a sick person had to come from that remotest part of any parish the journey had to come to-day, he would be in danger of dying. As a rule, the country poor only seek admission when they are sick or are feeble-minded.

15234. These people have a business connection with the town of Granard which takes them there?—They have.

15235. And it is convenient to them?—It is the market and fair town, and three District Councils meet there?—Yes, and the meeting of the Guardians is on the market day.

15236. Would you venture your opinion that it would be a hardship on the ratepayers generally to amalgamate with Longford?—I have not entered deeply into the matter of finance. That point would have to be considered; but my view of it is that it would be an increase in the rates if they were amalgamated. I presume, in any case, if the unions were dissolved, the fever hospital and infirmary should be retained. I think that would be a matter of necessity. Then, one of the retiring officers would have to be superannuated; the most expensive portion of the hospital would remain; there would be only a small outlay in expense. In the case of amalgamation, the number of the poor in Longford would be increased; you will have a larger staff of officials, and, perhaps, extra buildings; so, when you put one thing against the other, it is very doubtful whether the rates would be generally lowered. In my opinion, the rates will be increased in Granard Union. Of course, it is more or less a congested district. Columbkille parish is highly congested, and in Mullabera and a large portion of Scabhy they have all small farms. In Columbkille the farms are scarcely economical holdings. If you look at the valuation of Granard as compared with Longford or Ballymahon you will find a very material difference. Granard has thirty-six electoral divisions, there are only sixteen in Ballymahon, and sixteen in Longford, and still the Poor Law valuation in Granard is only about the same as Longford. We know Ireland, because a poor country, suffers in comparison with England always in case of taxation. If you have a poor part of Co. Longford it is bound to

suffer in any case of amalgamation as compared with the wealthier portions, and, therefore, in my opinion, the rates in Granard Union would be increased. On the question of convenience, there can be no difficulty at all. Anyone can see that Granard is more convenient for the poor and the local representatives. It is more convenient for the Longford poor—that is, the poor residing in the Longford portion of the Granard Union—and more convenient for the poor in Granard, to some extent. If the Caran districts were united to Caran they would be as far from their own union as Athlone is now from Longford, twelve or fourteen miles; and, similarly, the Westmeath portion of the Granard Union would be almost equally distant from Mullingar. The ratepayers would be disfranchised, as their elected representatives could not, except at great inconvenience, attend the Board meetings in Longford, and on the principle that there should be no taxation without representation, I think it would be very unfair.

15237. Abbeylara is a very poor village?—Very poor—a wretched village; the number of poor is out of all proportion to the inhabitants.

15238. Mr. Delany.—I am informed that in the Union of Granard there are very large districts of land without many people living on them?—In some portions.

15239. In your portion?—Yes; there is a large grazing tract there, only one farm; the rest is fairly divided amongst the people.

15240. They have very large farms?—No, medium-sized. In the lower portion of my parish, Carragh, there are small holdings. In Derragh, also, the holdings are small.

15241. Does not the description of their being large grass farms apply to the portion of Granard in Westmeath?—A great part of it is bog; but where the people are they are brought together a good deal, and occupy only small holdings or gardens—the village of Coole, for instance, and the town of Finnas, which are both poor.

15242. Are they not well off?—It is a poor parish—the tail end of Westmeath.

15243. Westmeath generally is good, rich land, with very few people on it?—If you go to the better part no doubt, but some portions are poor, and thickly inhabited.

15244. As to the bringing in of the sick poor to the hospitals, their treatment while being carried in will depend largely on the machine in which they are carried?—I don't care what machine you had a day like this, it would be a terrible hardship on the poor patient—he really might die on the way. In addition to the length of the journey, some of the roads leading to the congested districts are bad, and, in a few places, dangerous, being quite unprotected.

Mr. Muldoon.—I am asked to put in the resolutions come to by the County Council?—That there be amalgamation, carried by nine to seven. That Granard be dissolved and added to Longford, carried by ten to four. That if Ballymahon be dissolved the union buildings should be utilized as an industrial school, carried by twelve to three. In case of amalgamation of Granard, that the hospital remain, and that buildings be utilized as an auxiliary asylum, not carried. That district electoral divisions be identical with county electoral divisions, with two members for each division, carried unanimously. No additional accommodation required, and that all fever cases be sent to Longford, the present hospital being retained for other purposes, carried by eleven to seven. That the rating for union purposes and application of agricultural grant shall be as at present, carried by nine to eight. That there should be a discretionary power to make a charge whose petitioners can pay, carried unanimously.

Mr. JOHN PHILLIPS examined.

Mr. John Phillips.

15245. Mr. Delany.—You are Chairman of the County Council?—Yes.

15246. And I believe you called a special meeting of the Council to consider the query about the Commission?—Yes.

15247. Does the document I have read to the Commission represent the resolutions come to by the County Council?—Yes.

15248. And it is signed by you?—Yes.

15249. You have long experience of local life in Longford County—you have been a Guardian for many

Feb. 17, 1864.

Mr. John Phillips.

years and a member of the County Council since we had County Councils?—Yes.

15250. Do you think it is to the advantage of the ratepayers and the poor and every interest concerned that we should have amalgamation with Longford?—I do.

15251. That Longford should be the union for the county?—Yes, it is more central.

15252. Do you think there would be any substantial hardship to the poor?—I think not the slightest hardship with a motor ambulance.

15253. And in time it will lead to a reduction of the rates?—Most certainly.

15254. And more efficiency in the discharge of the poor law duties?—Yes.

15255. The view of the County Council is that the representatives making the union should be two members for each County Council division?—Yes, forty Guardians.

15256. And from your knowledge of the working of the County Council, do you think that would make for the advantage of public business?—The smaller the committees the better the work, and the less talk.

15257. Mr. Muldoon.—You live near Longford yourself?—About five miles.

15258. Are you a member of any Council except the County Council?—No, I am not.

15259. I suppose most of the Council members are from the outlying districts?—They are pretty generally divided.

15260. Did you happen to see any figures that your secretary has prepared about the result of amalgamation?—Yes.

15261. When did you see them?—I saw them to-day.

15262. Did you discuss them?—Merely to take them as he had prepared them.

15263. You know your secretary is one of the ablest financiers probably in the country?—I believe so.

15264. Has he not demonstrated that amalgamation would not be in the interests of the ratepayers of the Grand Union?—Yes—but after a few years it would.

15265. Or of Ballymahon?—The answer I would give you is that it is after a few years it would.

15266. Has he done so since?—He has not. That it would be a small loss to Grandard for a time, and a very small one to Ballymahon for a time.

15267. And it would be in the interests of the Longford Union?—I don't consider the interests of the Longford Union at all, sir.

15268. But if it is against the other two it must be in favour of Longford?—It would not be in the interests of Longford either I am sure, as improvements would have to be made in the house.

15269. Mr. Muldoon.—To get in two large unions lower rated than yours—do you want to persuade the Commission that as so?—After a time it would.

Mr. T. N. Edgeworth.

Mr. T. N. Edgeworth, M.P., examined.

15270. Mr. Muldoon.—Are you the Secretary of the County Council?—Yes.

15271. I believe for a number of years past you have been considering the effect of amalgamation on the county?—Yes, I have looked into it. I am a fairly large ratepayer myself.

15272. You were examined at Major Rutledge-Parr's inquiry at Grandard in 1861?—Yes.

15273. And gave evidence against the breaking up of the Grandard Union?—Yes.

15274. Do you still think that the evidence you gave there was fair and accurate?—Yes, the monetary part of it.

15275. What is that in your hand?—This is a return that I prepared. The first item in it is the union rates for the six years ending 1905; that includes the estimate of rate we made to-day for the three unions, Ballymahon, Grandard, and Longford. The next item on it shows the difference in the rates between Grandard, Ballymahon, and Longford.

15276. CHAIRMAN.—What expenditure is included in that union rate?—The only expenditure is the payment that we pay to the union; but then explain it; we have no control.

15277. Are you aware of a good deal of that expenditure is not on Poor Law purposes?—I believe it is not, but we have nothing to do with that on the Council.

15278. That, therefore, would not be the basis on which we here would make our calculations. We would only make our calculations on Poor Law proper expenditure; therefore the figures there, I am afraid, would not do?—We, as a County Council, have nothing to do with the expenditure. We simply provide the money demanded by the unions. This does not include the rural district expenditure in any sense.

15279. Mr. Muldoon.—From your investigations and inquiries, have you come to the conclusion that an amalgamation suggested would work inferentially to Grandard and Ballymahon?—Urges advantages as provided, which I have indicated in this return.

15280. Mr. Muldoon.—Did you take into consideration the expenditure of the different unions?—No; the only expenditure I took into account was the demand that they make on us for the year.

15281. You did not consider whether there were any provisions in Longford and none in Grandard, or in opposition?—No; I merely took into account the actual money we pay them.

15282. CHAIRMAN.—As it is not based on the line in which we would make our own calculations, I am afraid it won't assist us?—The expenditure for non-Poor Law purposes will probably be about the same proportion each of the three unions, so that these figures will probably remain.

CHAIRMAN.—That would be rather a large sum for us to go on, I am afraid.

15283. Mr. Muldoon.—For instance, if the contemplated improvements in Grandard Union had been placed, and that £2,000 or £1,000 had been got for your Council, it would alter the state of the rate considerably?—If it had all been got in a short period of course it would, but if it was got by way of local aid, it would not.

15284. If it had been got over a period of five years, say £200 a year?—That would add about two-thirds of a penny, added to that, but that would not very largely affect these figures. The differences are very slight.

15285. CHAIRMAN.—All the discrepancy expenditure there, and that we don't touch at all; that is not within our warrant?—That would be about the same proportion in each of the three unions.

Mr. John Ross.

Mr. John Ross, J.P., examined.

15286. Mr. Delany.—Are you Chairman of the Ballymahon Board of Guardians?—Yes.

15287. Have you been a member of the Board for many years?—About twenty.

15288. You have an extensive knowledge of the district. What are your views on amalgamation?—My views now are what they always have been. I was always in favour of an industrial school there.

15289. Are you in favour of an amalgamation between Longford and Ballymahon as regards the portion in Longford, and with Athlone as regards the portion in Wexmouth?—That is my own view; not the view of the Board.

15290. Your view is that that would be to the advantage

of the ratepayers?—I am not appointed by the Board of Guardians but by the County Council.

15291. You are in favour of amalgamation, and that there ought to be an industrial school at Ballymahon?—Yes.

15292. CHAIRMAN.—You think as soon as possible drop there will be a bigger saving?—I think there will. If Grandard had the workhouse in the same repair as we have at Ballymahon, I think there would be no difference.

15293. Mr. Delany.—You have maintained your workhouse in a proper condition?—I think we have maintained it, I won't say fairly well, but well.

15294. You have never striped it in expenditure?—No; what we considered right ourselves.

Mr. H. GARRAHAN, J.P., examined.

Feb. 17, 1904.

Mr. H. Garrahan.

15305. CHAIRMAN.—Are you from Ballymahon?—Yes; I have been asked to represent the District Council.

15306. Mr. Muldoon.—Has your District Council considered the question of amalgamation?—The Board of Guardians has.

15307. Are they opposed to amalgamation?—Yes.

15308. Is it upon the ground of the inconvenience of the Guardians to come into Longford?—It is principally on behalf of the poor infirm and old people who would have to be taken into Longford, and the sick poor, and also having regard to the distribution of out-door relief.

15309. You think out-door relief would suffer?—We think it would not be so effective as at the present time, because it is necessary to have Guardians from the locality in order to know who are entitled and who are not to out-door relief, and we think we would not have representation if we had amalgamation.

15310. The Guardians would not always be in attendance?—There would hardly be any attendance. It is such a distance it would be impossible for the Guardians to attend.

15311. How do you come to Longford?—I drive or cycle—drive in winter and cycle in summer. I would not represent the division if we had amalgamation. I could not do it.

15312. Of course the same applies generally?—No; only to the outlying districts.

15313. Did your Board consider and pass a resolution on the subject?—Yes.

15314. When was that?—About a fortnight ago.

15305. Was it carried by a majority or unanimously?—Unanimously.

15306. Against amalgamation?—Against amalgamation.

15307. CHAIRMAN.—You and your chairman differ in opinion?—He did not express it. We think it would be a great hardship on old and infirm persons to be taken thirteen Irish miles. I know the distance myself. In case of sickness that hardship would be aggravated.

15308. If there were a hospital left at Ballymahon?—In that case I don't know what the advantage would be of amalgamation. It certainly would not lessen the rates to have amalgamation. The expense of keeping a hospital at Ballymahon would be very considerably less than maintaining the workhouse as it is at the present time, and you could not very well utilize the Ballymahon Workhouse for the purpose suggested by the County Council if you retained the hospital there. I presume the fever hospital would be retained, and the other hospital; and then to keep premises for nurses would occupy the greater portion of the workhouse, and the expense would be very little, if any, lessened, without having regard to the additional expense which would be entailed in Longford by having amalgamation. Another reason that we took into consideration was that there would be great difficulties placed in the way of stamping out contagious diseases in the case of an epidemic. Under the present arrangement we find that it was often intimated to us by one of our doctors that he was afraid there was concealment of cases of scarletina; people did not give notice. Of course that danger would be increased very much by a long journey having to be undertaken by children.

Mr. HUGH MULVILLY examined.

Mr. Hugh Mulvilly.

15315. CHAIRMAN.—Are you a Guardian of the Ballymahon Union?—Yes.

15316. You have heard the evidence of the last witness?—Yes.

15317. You also were appointed to represent the views of the Guardians?—Yes.

15318. Do you agree with his view?—I do.

15315. In all respects he mentions?—Yes.

15316. Is there anything more on which you would wish to add your personal opinion?—No, there is nothing more.

15317. You don't desire to add anything except to express your concurrence?—Yes.

Mr. P. GIBBY examined.

Mr. P. Gibby.

15319. CHAIRMAN.—Are you also a member of the Ballymahon Board?—Yes.

15320. Is there any special matter you wish to mention?—Nothing, except that I agree with Mr. Garrahan.

15318. You would prefer keeping the house for the reasons he gave?—Yes.

15319. Is there any other consideration you would wish to put before us?—Nothing at present.

Dr. J. M. S. KERRY examined.

Dr. J. M. S. Kerry.

15321. CHAIRMAN.—The first matter that you wish to express an opinion on is the need of a public sanatorium on modern lines for the treatment of pulmonary tuberculosis?—Yes.

15322. From your experience and practice, have you seen a good deal of that disease in the country?—A good deal.

15323. Are you inclined to think it is spreading, or stationary?—It is spreading.

15324. Do you think it is absolutely necessary in the interests of public health that some isolation and proper treatment should be adopted?—It is absolutely necessary to take some means of preventing the spread.

15325. I suppose you don't wish to indicate any site or place for such a hospital, or would you leave that to the counties or districts that would combine?—Yes.

15326. You would not say whether it should be for a county or a group of counties?—The only matter I would mention to the Commission would be that when it would be dealt with it should be dealt with adequately, on modern lines, not in any temporary way.

15327. No patched-up structures?—No patched-up structures.

15328. The next matter you mention is the need of a properly equipped hospital for the Union of Granard, distinct from the workhouse. You refer to the provision in the Local Government Act for district hospitals?—Yes.

15329. You consider that a district hospital would be more advantageous?—It would be far and away better than the present system.

15320. Explain the reasons why you think it would be more liked in the country?—My experience of the working of a workhouse hospital is that a great number of cases suitable for hospital treatment will not come into it, on account of its association with the workhouse; and then there is the question of the clothing, and the regulations and rules that are in force at present.

15321. In force in the workhouse, and should not obtain in the hospital?—Yes; have no connection at all with a properly-conducted hospital; those all enter people from coming in.

15322. Would such a hospital require any expenditure in the way of maintenance so far as the staff goes, except the doctor, the nurses, the matron, and the chaplain?—None.

15323. Is there anything else that occurs to you with reference to this question of the district hospital?—In a general way, what I have stated would be a good commencement.

15324. Would you have it so that you could perform emergency operations?—Yes.

15325. A fairly well-equipped local hospital?—Yes; and on that point I would like to mention what I consider a great need in country districts, that is, to have a suitable place to meet emergencies, especially surgical emergencies, that arise. From my experience a great number have to go to Dublin hospitals. That means they are going from home; they never do well. I don't mean to rule on the Dublin hospitals, but the effect

Feb. 17, 1896.

Dr. J. M. S.
Kenny.

of having to go long distances from home acts badly on them.

15335. You think they grow a little away from home?—Strongly; and if we had suitable accommodation these cases would not go.

15336. The next matter you refer to is the need of proper provision for the aged and infirm?—I beg your pardon; about the hospital, I think in the district hospital there should be some system of payment, that it would not be a pauper institution altogether.

15337. That the governing body would have power to make them pay in accordance with their means?—Yes.

15338. From 1s. up to the full cost?—Up to whatever would be considered right.

15339. Then the need of proper provision for the aged and infirm, that is, I suppose, assuming that the workhouse might be closed, would you think that proper provision ought to be made for the aged and infirm. Where would you put them? Would you provide for them in-door or out-door?—I think a great number could be provided for out-door, under a proper system of boarding-out and looking after.

15340. Do you think it would be likely to tend to economy to have the double system in operation in any place.—Both boarding-out and treating in an institution.—Do you think that might not lead to extravagance?—There are some cases that could not be met by the boarding-out system.

15341. You mean people without relatives or friends?—Yes.

15342. Would you see any objection to boarding them out with people who were no friends and no connections?—I think it would require very strict supervision.

15343. Are not people when they reach that age rather quick than slow to complain if there is any grievance?—Sometimes you see cases where old people are wholly neglected.

15344. What would you do for the in-door keeping up of the aged and infirm?—Merely domestic attention.

15345. In the central workhouse at Longford, or wherever it was?—Yes; a central workhouse would meet the requirements.

15346. Therefore you would have classification of the inmates according to respectability, and if they were married, you would not separate married couples?—Yes; I think that is a very great hardship on the deserving married couples, and aged and infirm, to be associating with the disreputable element that is now in the workhouses.

15347. You also very strongly object to the rearing of children in workhouses?—I do.

15348. What idea have you on that subject?—I think the boarding-out system.

15349. You would not begin the boarding-out until their disposition was equal to taking what was going. What age would you say, about two or three?—First, any way; possibly more.

15350. What would you do with them in that state of infancy?—In the case of illegitimate children, there should be some sort of penitentiary for the mothers and the children until they could be boarded out.

15351. In connection with district nursing, have you seen the need and want of nurses to look after the sick who can be treated in their own homes and cannot be moved very well?—Yes.

15352. There is the serious ailment that seems to be moved, and the trifling ailment that would be treated by prompt and regular looking after?—Yes.

15353. And you think district nursing?—It would be very necessary.

15354. One for each dispensary district?—Yes; it would have an elevating influence on the community, and help them to understand the character of disease, and how to live in a healthy way, better than they do.

15355. The only other topic you touch on is one we have no warrant to look into, that is the need of proper house accommodation for the poor. We have no power to make recommendations about that. Is there anything else you would like to mention?—In connection with tuberculosis, I have remarked that a great number of that disease comes over to us from America by the emigrants being turned back. Young people going out there fall into ill-health, and are sent home to us that America dying and spreading the disease. I have known numerous instances of that.

15356. Not enough to materially affect the amount that is in the country, but you have seen enough in your own practice to make it serious?—Yes; in the district I practice in, nearly every family have tuberculosis. America then come and go; and recently, with the easy transit and short passages, and cheap rates, they come and go very frequently, and I have noticed a number of cases coming home in bad health.

15357. Mr. McNamee.—It may be that they come for health purposes?—Yes; the doctors tell them to come back to their native air, but they come to spread disease.

15358. You would hardly refuse the people?—I could not refuse them, but I mention it as a factor in the spread of this very serious disease.

15359. Mr. Deasey.—You know the Longford County Infirmary?—Yes.

15360. And that two very comfortable wards have been added in recent years?—I have seen them.

15361. Would that meet the suggestion you make to the surgical hospital?—It would not. I want it in the district.

15362. How many would you want in the Co. Longford?—I am speaking of the district I am aware myself.

15363. You have an infirmary at Cavan, and so at Longford, and also at Mullingar. You don't suggest that there should be a surgical hospital at every halfway house?—No. I suggest there should be provision made for each district, a unit. I consider the General Union a very important unit that should be provided with requirements of that sort.

15364. So you think that instead of workhouse hospitals we should have surgical hospitals.

CHAIRMAN.—A village or district hospital, with an opportunity for doing urgent operations?—Yes.

15365. Mr. Deasey.—In the majority of parishes I understand you have nurses attached to parishes?

CHAIRMAN.—There are only midwives?—There are no district nurses in the general sense.

15366. Dr. Broome.—Are there any in the Co. Longford?—I think not.

15367. Mr. Deasey.—Suppose attached to each dispensary you had a place properly fitted up?—Then a dispensary doctor could deal with the cases.

The Sitting terminated.

THIRTY-FIRST PUBLIC SITTING.—THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 18TH, 1904. *Feb. 18, 1904.*

At the Courthouse, Tullamore.

Present:— Mr. MICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. COBY BROSKE.

CHAIRMAN.—Our usual custom is to get evidence from the County Council as to what the views of the County Council may be on the subject. Are there any County Councillors present?

Mr. William Adams.—I belong to that body. There was a special meeting called, but through some informality or omission on the part of the under-secretary

he named in the circular inviting the County Council to hold a special meeting for that purpose "Tuesday, the 18th inst.," a good many came, but not sufficient to form a quorum.

CHAIRMAN.—Then we have not got, formally, the views of the County Council?

Mr. Adams.—No, sir; on that account.

Mr. WILLIAM ADAMS examined.

Possibly it might facilitate matters to state that the Clerk of the Union is here.

15368. CHAIRMAN.—I think later on, perhaps. That (produced) is a copy of the queries we have issued to the different bodies. In King's County you have three workhouses—Birr, Edenderry, and Tullamore?—Yes.

15369. You know the county, I suppose, pretty well; have you yourself come to any opinion as to whether you could manage with fewer workhouses in the county or not?—Owing to the formation of the county it would be very hard to say we could do with less than three; as far as Tullamore is concerned, to have our area a good deal increased; although we have a large and populous estate I don't suppose there are half a dozen really good farms in the place, and our valuation is very low; consequently, when it is compared with the adjoining unions of Ashmore, and Mullingar, and Birr, they are double our valuation, they collect as much money as we do, although our rates appear to be double theirs.

15370. It is the soundness of your valuation that makes your rates appear high?—Quite so.

15371. You would, in the interest of the ratepayers, be glad to have a larger area for taxation if it could be managed without hardship to the sick poor?—Owing to the fact that there are several divisions belonging to other unions immediately convenient that would not, I think, run any risk of causing any inconvenience or danger to the poor.

15372. You have no direct railway communication, except in a very roundabout way, with either Birr or Edenderry?—We are very badly served with railway accommodation.

15373. How long would it take a person to reach this place from Edenderry by rail?—We have none.

15374. They would go to Enfield and round to Ashmore and up here?—I think that is the way they should go.

15375. And I suppose an Edenderry man coming here to the Asylum would be some all round?—They all drive; it is only about seventeen Irish miles from Edenderry here; Edenderry is the extreme point of this county.

15376. Now, as regards Birr?—It is the other extreme end of the county.

15377. And when Birr people are coming here how would they come?—They generally come to attend the County Council meetings; Roscrea, Portlannington, and here; and sometimes they drive a car to Banagher—five or six Irish miles—and they are here at nine o'clock in the morning.

15378. So that the communications between the poor and this place are much better than with Edenderry?—Quite so.

15379. And there are portions of the Birr Union communally near Tullamore; is Frankford in Tullamore? Birr and considerably this side of Frankford; there are divisions in Birr.

15380. How far is Birr?—Ten Irish miles, and a good road; but we have a suitable conveyance for bringing in the sick any time the doctor recommends them.

15381. If a hospital were left at Birr and at Edenderry to look after the sick would you see much hardship in having the people who are not sick, but either able-bodied or infirm—that is able to travel by railway

—would you see any hardship in bringing them from the parts of the King's County in the Edenderry Union and Birr Union here?—I could not see any great risk of inconvenience or hardship, but the Guardians of Edenderry and Birr would think so; I think not, because they have dispensaries well attended by efficient doctors.

15382. I am saying if there were a local hospital left?

—There would be no hardship at all then.

15383. Because the only people would be to the aged people and the able-bodied, and they would be fit to travel by railway?—I think so, if they had the means.

15384. Have you considered at all, personally, the idea of having each county self-contained for Poor Law administration; your union is altogether in the King's County?—No; we have two divisions in Westmeath—Killeggan way.

15385. Supposing those were to go to Westmeath, and supposing that all the rest of the county should be one area of taxation for Poor Law purposes—in fact have you seen for the King's County, at a central place in the County, Tullamore—do you see any objection to that?—I could not see any if there was accommodation for the sick poor in the other ends—the Birr and Edenderry ends.

15386. Leaving them good hospitals?—I think not; we have a county infirmary here and a well-equipped workhouse infirmary.

15387. It is greatly improved from what I saw it in 1885?—It is; the Tullamore Board of Guardians did not ever grudge the amount required to keep it up to date.

15388. The fever hospital, unfortunately, is very close to the infirmary?—We have that in our minds' eye since the outcome of this Commission; the probability is there will be something done in that direction, but owing to the fact that we got into debt by expending a lot of money on the sewage plant—that cost beyond £3,000.

Mr. Graham, Clerk.—The loan was £3,200; I should say the sewage would cost £2,000.

15389. CHAIRMAN.—Now, taking up the different classes in your workhouse?—How would these parties living on outdoor relief be attended to in Birr and Edenderry?

15390. That is a point I would like your opinion on; we will get the opinion of Edenderry Board of Guardians and Birr on that point; they might be either managed by the District Council or a committee appointed under the County Council?—Where there is a will there is a way always.

15391. We have come to no determination or opinion on that, but we have heard different opinions; some people say, let the Boards of Guardians there, other people say, let the District Council do it, and other people say a committee of the County Council, and which of the three ways would be adopted would be a matter for consideration for us as soon as we have gone through Ireland?—I think the District Council would be the best; to leave it in their hands, because they see Guardians as well, and know their duties; they are painstaking and economical. Tullamore Union is very central in the county.

15392. If there were only lines of railway between Edenderry and Tullamore, and Birr and Tullamore, it would be no inconvenience at all?—We keep a good

Feb. 18, 1904.
Mr. William Adams.

horse and two covered vehicles, and at present when there is a notification from the doctor to send for a sick person—of course there is telegraphic communication—and it is all carried out on the one day.

15393. Mr. WYNNASTON.—Have you much ground round the workhouse?—Yes. We have about five Irish acres; got it lately by exchange of the smaller hold, but there is portion of it used for the sewerage system, and the other part we use for vegetables and that sort of thing.

15394. CHAIRMAN.—Now, coming to the number of inmates you have got in Tuillamore; we heard to-day you had about eighty sick in the infirmary; that is above the average?—I don't think there are eighty; some time ago there were eighty on the medical officer's books, but owing to the late circular from the Local Government Board he can reduce it one half.

15395. The number I have got here is fifty-three?—That is about at new; it used to average eighty until six or eight months ago.

15396. At all events you have accommodation easily for eighty?—And more.

15397. The next class you have got, you have got a very large class of aged and infirm, 114?—Yes; it is a very populous union.

15398. If you became a county workhouse you would, of course, have accommodation for a great deal more than the 114; if you could get rid of some of the classes that are already in the workhouse in addition to the aged and infirm at present, you have an enormous number—the largest number we have met in a union like yours—of ninety-six children?—Yes.

15399. Can you tell me how it is you have so many children so much in excess of what they have in other counties?—The number is an exception at present; I never remember that number of children there before.

15400. Take the large union of Mullingar; they have only twenty-nine?—It is only lately we made an effort to get the orphan children boarded out, and we found great difficulty in getting suitable people to take them. In the last two or three months we have put up hand-bills round the union, and we have had three children within the last few weeks taken out.

15401. You and the Board of Guardians are favourably disposed to that?—Certainly, as long as we get suitable people recommended by the District Commissioners and deacons of the different denominations; we are very cautious who we give the children to.

15402. If there were any change in the Poor Laws would you approve of a system that would aim at boarding out children and not keeping them in a workhouse at all?—If they were all conveniently located near schools.

15403. The evidence we have got about children all over the country is that there really is not any difficulty as soon as the people understand the system and as soon as the Guardians offer what would be a fair amount?—That is the guarantee of the whole thing; the amount offered at present is not sufficient to induce people that we would like to take them.

15404. You are only offering 2s. 6s. 1?—Yes, and a suit of clothes or two; that is hardly enough; another 5s. or 1s. would do. I can speak in the name of the Tuillamore Board of Guardians; they would approve of the principle of boarding out the children as long as there is proper care taken in the selection of where they go, but even so far as that is concerned there are inspectors going about the country looking after that.

15405. They can only assist the Guardians, but the Guardians of the locality and the ladies of the district could co-operate by wise inspection?—Yes; as I think they should.

15406. By wise inspection; not continually interfering, but throwing a friendly eye on the children occasionally?—We have got very favourable reports from our relieving officers every month.

15407. If you got that large number of ninety-six out of the workhouse that would leave you a very large space?—It would, certainly.

15408. Then you have twenty-seven lunatics, idiots, and epileptics?—Yes.

15409. Is it a claim that, in your opinion, ought to be kept in a workhouse?—Most certainly not; most undesirable. I think there should be a sort of auxiliary asylum for two or three or four counties, and have them properly looked after and cared for.

15410. At present your lunatics go to Mullingar?—We contribute to Marybone Asylum, and they get some care from time to time. But we find it costs a great deal more there.

15411. I think you are under a misconception; what do you take as the cost of an inmate in the Marybone Asylum?—According to what the County Councilor who represents our County tells as it was £40 a year. Do you recollect what Mr. Corbett said?

Mr. WYNNASTON.—Yes; but I agree with the President.

15412. CHAIRMAN.—Do you know the amount?

Mr. GRAHAM.—No; I do not actually.

Witness.—But that statement had a great effect in preventing us from making application to send other inmates over there.

15413. CHAIRMAN.—What is the expense in your own union?—I suppose they come to, on an ordinary average, 4s. 2d.

15414. That would be for the food and clothing, merely?—Of course that goes to pay for all other expenses as well.

15415. Oh, no; that is where the mistake arises. Then if you take all your establishment charges and salaries, as the asylum people do in making their calculations, you will find that year's is up rather close to them. Then, on the other hand, the Government comes forward and gives 4s. capitation grant a statement, and I think you will find that your inmates are a much lighter cost as the asylum on the capitation than they would be in the workhouse?—If there was a suitable place for epileptics and lunatics, and the children were taken out of the workhouse, you would have more room than would accommodate the pauper and poor people of the county.

15416. The able-bodied are very few in your workhouse; you have only eighteen?—We never had as many before.

15417. And these are very largely women who are there with children?—At present, owing to the want of labour about Tuillamore for what we call these casual labourers, we had to admit whole families in lately. There are three or four men that generally work the whole year round stone-breaking and other work, occasionally with farmers, and they could go to work, and they made such a pitiable case, and on making the necessary inquiries we came to the conclusion that it would be inhuman to refuse them on account of the little children.

15418. Over and above that you have healthy single women who have illegitimate children?—Very few in comparison with the population; we have a very clear record as far as that is concerned.

15419. That is a claim that I daresay you consider causes a great deal of difficulty with people coming into the workhouse?—They are kept principally by themselves, and they are kept at laundry work.

15420. They are really backwards and forwards through the house a good deal?—I think, owing to the construction of our workhouse, they mix very little with the other inmates; of course the less they mix the better.

15421. There is a certain amount of it; would you be in favour of excluding that class altogether from the workhouse if a good system could be started for dealing with them elsewhere; that they should never be admitted to the workhouse at all, even to have their laundry?—I think it would be a very necessary and desirable reform to keep these fallen girls by themselves.

15422. They have their first baby, and go into the workhouse and most other women like themselves who have had two or three, and they go on having these illegitimate children, and they are rearing up a whole generation of illegitimate paupers. We have had some suggestion made to us in different parts of the country; a single woman as soon as she is about to have a baby she generally comes into the workhouse some two or three months or so before she has it, when she can no longer remain outside owing to her appearance, then she is with these undesirable women working in the laundry and elsewhere; she is with them in the workhouse; and it was suggested to us that such women should be sent to a religious penitentiary, conducted for Catholics by Magdalen Nuns or some such Order, and Protestants should have such penitentiaries also for Protestant girls, and that these women should be reclaimed so far as possible on the occasion of their first fall, and that the child should be taken and provided for until it was of an age to be boarded out; would you see any objection to that?—No; but I would very strongly approve of it, and the unfortunate girls that fall in that way and come to us you would be more inclined to pity them than be severe with them, they feel their position as keenly; there is no poverty or disgrace they feel more than that, and I know for the

first child they give birth to they are more to be pitied; it is very rarely I have known one to come in a second time with an illegitimate child.

15433. That, unfortunately, is not our experience; we find throughout the country we have travelled as many as five or six—some innocent country girl is taken advantage of by some ruffian, and the partition they occupy coming before the board to be questioned; one may get a case against the putative father; you find it, you pity these more than being mixed with them. Was there ever an instance in our union where after a girl reared a child she went out and came back again? Mr. Crookes.—Oh, there was.

Witness.—I think some of these were reared in the workhouse.

15434. CHAIRMAN.—Very likely; it goes on from generation to generation. You would approve of dealing in that way with these poor girls?—Oh, most certainly.

15435. And you think it would be a fair thing, and it would be no additional expense for the Guardians to pay for these girls in a penitentiary?—Even if it was a little additional expense no Guardian would be so inhuman as to refuse to give them a chance of reformation.

15436. And you would have fewer children born?—If these ladies took an interest in them after they came to the conclusion that the mother was really reformed, to get them a suitable place they should have the prospect and the possibility of doing good for the poor girl.

15437. Mr. MURKIN.—They would feel they had some human sympathy and be encouraged not to fall again?—Yes; when they go among the older ones in the workhouse it has not a good influence.

15438. CHAIRMAN.—Then they would go to one of these penitentiaries, and in some of these there is a ward where they could have their child, and in other places, like Dublin and Cork, they could be sent to lying-in hospitals outside and brought back to the penitentiaries in a fortnight or so, so as to be under good influences all the time?—We find it impossible to be able to prove a case against the putative father; there is no corroboration; we did go as far as to bring one or two cases before the County Chairman here, and always failed.

15439. Mr. MURKIN.—Would you like to see the law strengthened in that respect; there is a law in England that enables Guardians to go further than we can in Ireland?—Of course it will be necessary to protect the accused and give him fair play. I knew a very grievous case myself when I became a Guardian first where there was a wrong name given, and as soon as the report went abroad the young fellow felt it so keenly that he left the country, and in a few months afterwards the girl admitted that she got money to say so, and the poor fellow was allowed to go scot free. I knew one case of that.

15440. Taking away three classes—300 children, thirty lunatics, and the eighteen able-bodied—would give much more space in your workhouse, and you could easily take in the aged and infirm, which would be the only class coming from Edenderry and Barri?—I think there would be plenty of room. When our workhouse was built it was built for a considerable number more than we ever had in it, and even at the commencement there were auxiliary workhouses attached to it at the time of the Famine. I would be very anxious to see harmless lunatics and epileptics taken out of it, because it is hardly reasonable to expect, under the present system, that these poor things can get proper education.

15441. Mr. MURKIN.—You have one and came in the house, a young girl of sixteen or seventeen—a nice epileptic—she is associated there with insane women?—It is very hard.

15442. CHAIRMAN.—Then the only other class we have to refer to are the tramps; you have a fair number of them here?—Indeed, we have; more than are welcome; there should be something done to give more power to the Board of Guardians.

15443. I suppose on nights before fairs—like last night and to-day—you will have a good crowd?—Indeed, we will.

15444. Supposing your workhouse became a county workhouse, and there was nobody there except the aged and infirm—a sort of large almshouse where the respectable people could be kept in one block, and married couples in another, and the less respectable in another block—supposing you had that arrangement too, would you be in favour of excluding tramps from the workhouse altogether and making any other pro-

vision for them, or what would you do?—I know it is very difficult to interfere with the liberty of the subject, but still at the same time I think there ought to be brains enough in the English legislature or among our Irish members of Parliament to suggest some remedy, because there is a remedy required. It is an awful abuse to allow these people to come in droves, pilfering through the country, and come in at night and get their supper and bed and breakfast, and go away in the morning to carry on the same practice.

15445. We have received a good deal of evidence, even in the last few days, even at Mullingar and Longford, from witnesses who did not hesitate to suggest that the children should be taken from these people when they were bringing children through the country; would you approve of that?—I would if it could be done with any sort of reason, but it would be a terrible piece of business, exposing a man and a woman with one or two children—

15446. It is not that there should be a hard and fast law, but that the Board of Guardians should have a discretionary power to make an order putting themselves in the place of the parents; that they should then board them out or deal with them as they would children under the Poor Law, subject to the right on the part of the parents to appeal against the Guardians' decision to a magistrate in Petty Sessions or some other tribunal?—It would be a good thing for the future prospect of the poor children at all events, but I think it would not be an easy matter in some instances to wrench the children away from the parents, although we know, and everyone knows, they are bound to be reared up wrong.

15447. If you thought that, would it not be a good thing to take them?—Yes, if it can be done.

15448. I mean if the law were changed; of course this Commission is sitting with a view to collect opinions that might involve a change in the law to carry them out?—I would go further; I would have the law so as you could take the children from bad parents, even residents in the union, who neglect them or either them to go out begging.

15449. The law is strong enough to deal with those?—We find a great deal of difficulty in trying to prove the cases; we certainly did succeed in one or two cases lately and got the children sent away to an industrial school.

15450. Then, as regards the tramps themselves, a great many people have suggested that these people are not profitable members of the community—that they are dangerous, and pests—some of them are decent labouring men going about looking for a job, but a very large proportion of this casual or tramp class are people not deserving of any consideration, and they suggest that they should be deprived of their liberty for certain periods and put to labour work in one or two or three central institutions where they would be obliged to work hard for a certain time, as tramps or vagabonds, and that attempts should be made in that way to reclaim them?—They should make an attempt; it is most necessary.

15451. Would you approve of some such plan?—I would, if it could be carried out at all; we have a rule but we find that when we put it in operation we cannot carry it out; that is if any one applied for admission twice within six months we would have him examined and brought before the magistrates. But the difficulty was that he would get out in the morning, and before we could get a summons or a magistrate to sign it we would not know in what direction he went, and you would not get a policeman very anxious to go and serve the summons, and if he got the summons he might put it in his pocket and not appear at all. There is something required to strengthen the hands of the local authorities to do something with these tramps; they are the greatest nuisance we have. Then we went through the form of getting them to break stones; they did more injury to the tools that we supplied them with than the stones they broke, and they appear to know the Poor Law better than we do ourselves. It is the way they live, pilfering throughout the country.

15452. Mr. MURKIN.—You think the police ought to be called in to give some assistance in regard to tramps?—I would be very glad to see them called upon to give some assistance, for they are a heinous nuisance in the country.

15453. If they had to report themselves to the police when they came to seek admittance do you think that would have any beneficial effect?—That would be only

Feb 12, 1864.

Mr. William Adams.

Feb. 12, 1896.
Mr. William Adams.

a matter of form; they would not consider it a very difficult job to tell a policeman, if they met him, "I am going down to get a ticket for the workhouse."

15444. Some people think that if they are left at large they might do damage to country houses!—That is the harm; that they would set fire to the hay. I know an instance where a hotel proprietor here had a large hay-rack; one of those tramps did not get a ticket for some reason or another and he went and lay in the hay-rack, and the hay was burned; we could not say whether he did it maliciously or not. And some of these bad cases they might put an end to themselves—drawn themselves—and then the Board of Guardians would be held up to execration as inhuman people; it is so difficult to manage these tramps; and some of them you could see in their countenances they knew what they are doing; they have been at it a lengthened time, and intend to continue it.

15445. The closing of the workhouses would have an additional beneficial effect; they would have farther to walk!—I think it would.

15446. Chairman.—I don't know whether you have considered whether any towns, such as Banagher, or any other town has any serious complaint about being too far from a hospital; whether they want a little cottage hospital of their own. How far are you from Banagher?—Banagher is near Birr—about six miles.

15447. Well, that is near enough; do you know any other thickly populated part of the county?—Clonsilla is six miles from us, and there is a railway there, but still when people are taken sick with an infectious disease we always send the car there; it would not do to have those travel in a railway compartment.

15448. Portlinton is partly in the King's County?—Yes; the river divides the town from the King's County.

15449. Portlinton is in the Mountmellick Union?—Yes; but there are portions of Mountmellick in this county, and quite convenient to us.

15450. Would you go in, even in the case of the Mountmellick Union, for taking part of the Mountmellick Union that is in the King's County, would you go in for the idea of the County Council of having the entire of the county under some local body in the county, and not having any body outside dealing with it?—I think you would want bodies to look after the wants.

15451. That is not what I mean; at present at Edenderry you have part of the union in two other counties besides your own?—Yes.

15452. Would you be in favour of taking all the parts of the King's County and putting it off completely for Poor Law purposes from any other county?—I would if there was a proper provision made not to have any hardship to the sick poor.

15453. Take the case of the town of Portlinton; what do you think about that?—It is thirteen miles by road, and you have a train coming from Portlinton three times a day.

15454. Have they any hospital there?—Not that I am aware of, but I think it is six or seven from Mountmellick.

15455. Yes go down as far as Cloughjordan?—Yes. This is a large county; it is not an easy county to manage, as far as amalgamation is concerned; this is about sixty miles in length.

15456. Take that part that is down near Cloughjordan and Monagall, supposing that the farthest of part of the barony of Clonsilla was part of a King's County union, if there was only one union in the King's County, these people at Monagall and Cloughjordan would have too far to come to Tullamore; that is quite evident?—Yes; there should be some provision made for them in Birr.

15457. Well, Roscrea is close to them; how would this do—if you had the power under the law to board out the sick in the union hospital, say, of Roscrea, at so much per head, whatever Poor Law authority had the barony of Clonsilla it would pay, we will say, 5s. or 6s., 7s. or 8s. a week for each patient sent there, according to the cost of the patients in the hospital?—If there was no risk or danger to the poor person, and if it carried out economy, everyone would go for it.

15458. Roscrea is where they go at present, or Nenagh; and then you would continue the hospital for them except that you would pay for them so much a head; instead of their being in the Roscrea Union they would be under the King's County Poor Law system, but being so near a hospital in another system they would pay so much a week?—That would be easily carried out if on calculation it was shown that there

was no inconvenience in carrying it out, and that it led to economy.

15459. The same way in the case of Portlinton, paying to Mountmellick, and the same way as regards the portions of the Edenderry Union that are in different counties; they would come into the King's County and pay you so much a week for taking them in; do you see any objection to that?—It is very hard to form an opinion at the first look; it looks as if it was going in the way of my doing away with so many existing institutions and officials.

15460. And the cost of fuel?—And you would have more in each institution, and there would be more work for the officials to do.

15461. Of course we would only leave, we will say in Birr or Edenderry, the infirmary and sick wards there, and you would only require to have nurses and the doctor of the place, and chaplains?—Yes; and a couple of attendants.

15462. Of course I mean the nursing staff?—I don't know the exact number of what we call the ordinary infirm inmates in Edenderry and Birr, but I think if Tullamore Union was relieved of the epileptic and children and able-bodied we would have room enough for them.

15463. There are in Birr ninety-eight and in Edenderry fifty-two, and a great many of those belong to other counties; you could easily put them up?—Yes; I often go on inspection on a commission, and I see there is plenty of room; the infirmary is not half full; there are eight large wards in our infirmary, or six, and I hope you will see that we have paid sufficient attention to it.

15464. I saw a great improvement?—We do everything we can, and we have in our mind to have a heated with a steam boiler, and we are getting an opinion from Kays Parry to see whether we can utilize the steam for cooking and washing.

15465. The only other point I wish to ask you about is about whether you get much payment from persons who come in and use your workhouse or infirmary?—Well, only from pensioners; we send their certificates; and a few come into the infirmary and they may pay, but very few; we have a county infirmary.

15466. You don't get much payment?—Not as a rule; I think we have made an order on several occasions to make the patient pay.

15467. Would you be in favour of the suggestion that we received elsewhere that Board of Guardians should be empowered by law to fix an amount in their discretion that a person coming into their wards should be obliged by law to pay; we will say, for instance, a labouring man at the distillery here or anywhere you like will be earning 12s. a week, one of his children will be sick, he will send in the child to be treated in your sick wards; would you be in favour of being able to make an order that that man should pay some small thing, say 1s. a week, whatever the child would cost at home; would you be in favour of making him pay that?—I think, in justice to the ratepayers, they should have that discretionary power; I think they have it at present.

15468. It is a little doubtful, but at all events it has not been exercised, but if there were special powers given to them you think it would be good?—I think it would be honest and business-like.

15469. And don't you think that very probably the people themselves would be very glad to pay a small amount to get off the idea of being considered pauper?—I think they would forget that portion of it; I think they would be as soon considered paupers and keep the money.

15470. We find in the North of Ireland that in two institutions this system was actually in active operation and that receipts were received in one of them more than sufficient to pay for the medical staff; that the receipts were very large, and in small amount?—They must be of a different class of workmen and strikers from what we have about here, or the Northern employers must give them better pay, for they rarely get more than 12s. or 11s. a week here.

15471. At all events a child would cost very nearly 1s. a week?—It would be very difficult to get them to leave in a child, except the child met with an accident, in any kind of sickness the mother keeps the child, and if it is any kind of accident they go into the infirmary, and we have a rule there that every one who can pay must pay.

15472. As every year goes on more people are getting persuaded of the desirability of going into a public hospital?—Yes; that is increasing.

Feb. 18, 1904.

Mr. William Adams.

15433. And if you take away the unpleasant association of the workhouse from the Guardians' hospital, you will still further increase the desire of the people to have their sick treated there?—Quite so; and I think the infirmaries should be amalgamated too.

15434. If you put the corresponding liability on to the Guardians, do you think that would be fair?—It is a pay a little do the Guardians to carry it out, and if there is any weakness in the law the Guardians should be strengthened.

15435. You said just now you thought it might be a good thing to have the infirmaries amalgamated; what do you mean?—We have two infirmaries in Tullamore—one is an old infirmary established by law that we cannot interfere with.

15436. We are here to receive suggestions, and the county infirmaries come within our jurisdiction?—We have a county infirmary here that costs the ratepayers between £900 and £1,000 a year.

15437. And this people at Moneygall have to pay for their?—Yes.

15438. Is it not a hardship?—It is, and there is a small average in it, but they are very well attended to there is no doubt.

15439. I don't know whether you consider medical and surgical questions very much, but if you were to consider them you might see the desirableness of having a county hospital that would be managed on a higher level, where operations could be carried out in a way that they cannot be in an ordinary hospital?—That is the intention, I believe, of the formation of county infirmaries—that they were for surgical operations—and anything that does occur in the county within ten or twelve miles generally comes from broken arms or dislocated joints. There are no infectious diseases allowed there.

15440. We saw some chronic cases of rheumatism that had been there for months?—There was an order at the very last meeting of the governors to exclude those in future. We thought some of them were scheming.

15441. I was asking one patient a few questions with that idea in my mind, too. Then you would be in favour of the system of getting payments where it could be done without hardship?—Certainly.

15442. And you would leave it to the discretion of the local people?—Yes; policemen pay when they go in there. I cannot tell you the exact amount we receive, but in cases brought before the justices by the master, we inquire into it, and don't hesitate to make an order that they shall pay, and the moment a prisoner comes in, thinking he can lay up until his pension is due, we make the master apply to the paymaster of the War Office, and get the amount of his expenses.

15443. Mr. McNamee:—What do you think of giving Guardians power to board out aged and infirm inmates, if they could find suitable homes in the neighbourhood from which they came? The principle may work after a trial. I would not like to give an answer to that. It would be very difficult to board out old infirm people; when they get old they sometimes get contrary, and it would be very hard to get a person minding well off to take them.

15444. CHAIRMAN:—Don't you think people get more patient and better able to put up with things the older they grow?—I don't know. It would be necessary to be very particular where you board these people out, and the class you would be inclined to select would be the class that would not like to be bothered with them.

15445. Mr. McNamee:—We found in the body of the house a number of old people huddled together in a room, and it does look very sad to see them confined in this way; whereas if the Guardians had power to board them out, where they could have exercise, freedom, and fresh air, their life would be brighter?—If a person looking for out-door relief is old and beyond their work, if there is any aid in the locality connected with them by family ties and relationship, it is a great reason for us to keep them out of the workhouse, provided we learn from the relieving officer or local Guardians that they are fairly treated.

15446. You have not a power of inspection in these cases?—But if they were badly treated they would soon complain.

15447. Do you think it would be well to give the Guardians the choice of sending to a central institution the aged and infirm, or boarding them out in the locality?—I think the Guardians should be allowed to use their own discretion in those cases; that would assist in creating a greater interest to look after the wants of

these people. If a Guardian is to be a Guardian, and he is selected by those whose money he is disbursing, I think he ought to have that power.

15448. CHAIRMAN:—You have a good many recipients of out-door relief in your union?—There are a good many, but those are heads of families.

15449. You pay a good deal—three Burr and Edenderry put together. Your bill for out-door relief in the last return is £2,506. In Burr it is £264, and in Edenderry £2,241?—We find it more economical, after due consideration of every application when there is a deserving case made, to grant it, and in fact we keep a very bold front to applications, and refuse more than we grant, after due investigation.

15450. What class of people generally get out-door relief from you?—Old and infirm people beyond their work; or a wife and family during the sickness of the breadwinner.

15451. Those people would get £1 6d. from you. With whom would they live?—It might supplement their way of living. They may sell stockings, or do light indoor work, and that £1 6d. is a means of keeping them out of the workhouse; or it is a working man is sick and in the infirmary, and has a wife and five or six children, we think it very hard to have the house broken up and we give them £1 6d.

15452. Dr. Hession:—How are the patients admitted to the county infirmary?—By tickets issued by the governors, and every member of the County Council is an ex-officio member of the governing body—about eighteen. They all have power to issue tickets for deserving cases. They are supplied with two books—one a book for paying patients, and you see supposed to put the necessary questions to the applicant to find what he is able to pay, and you put down 5s., 7s., or 10s. a week.

15453. Is he bound to pay that?—He is.

15454. Are those the only persons that can give tickets?—That is all, I think; that is the active governing body and the management of all denominations.

15455. Are all the members of the different denominations on?—They are. I don't think the Wesleyan deacons in Tullamore is a member, but the Protestant deacons and Roman Catholic deacons are. Dean Craig was our chairman.

15456. The county is very large, and sometimes on eighteen, or even twenty-eight, members might mean a considerable distance for a person who wants a line signed?—We guard the public against inconvenience, because every County Councillor has leave to supply a ticket.

15457. CHAIRMAN:—I suppose Dr. Hession would receive a patient on the recommendation of any doctor of the county?—I think he would; in fact he attends extern patients. It is more like a dispensary than anything else. He is a very attentive little man.

15458. Dr. Hession:—Does he give medicine to the patients that come?—I am not sure; they get medicine from Dr. Moorhead.

15459. Would it not be unfair to give medicine for the district round Tullamore at the expense of the whole county-at-large?—It would be if he gives it, but I cannot say whether he gives medicine or not.

15460. Because the whole county pays equally for the support. I thought you said very few patients from the far end of the county ever come to Tullamore?—It has been increasing of late. It has become more popular since it came under the County Council. Moreover it was looked on as a close borough; any deserving applicant will get a ticket from a County Councillor. I know they come from below Clighan and Banagher, and regularly from Frankfort. I get a few lines from a doctor to ask me to give a ticket to so-and-so, and the moment he applies at my residence I give him a ticket.

15461. Frankfort is only ten miles. Are there any patients from Moneygall?—I don't think we ever get one.

15462. CHAIRMAN:—How many from Edenderry?—I don't think there are many.

15463. Dr. Hession:—Therefore they are not served really by the county infirmary?—I don't think they are very much.

15464. What means of conveyance have you at the county infirmary?—We have none; they generally have their own conveyance to bring them in.

15465. Would you not think it a desirable thing that all parts of the county should get some benefit from this county infirmary?—If it could be arranged it would be only honest and just to every corner of the county, but it is open for them.

15466. If it is not convenient they cannot come there?—

3 X

Feb. 18, 1904.
Mr. William Adams.

—It is hardly accessible as far as Moneygall is concerned, but there are very few other portions of the county but occasionally read patients; there are never very many in it, I don't suppose it would average twenty-five all the year round.

15597. What is the cost of the upkeep of the county infirmary?—I think \$900, if not over. Before the County Council got control of it a good many ladies and gentlemen used to contribute very generously, but since then they never gave 1s.; the whole thing is now direct taxation.

15598. Have your subscriptions practically ceased?—Completely ceased.

15599. Do you know how much you receive from paying patients?—No, but it is something considerable.

15600. You try to get as much as you can?—Yes. We are alive to that; in fact so much alive are we to that point that we get a fresh book printed a few months ago, that each governor is supplied with, and there are queries in it to be put to patients; and I think, in comparison with other infirmaries, we stand very favourably for economy. We are not nearly as expensive as other county infirmaries.

15601. That is not always the best economy; efficiency and economy should go together.—There is efficiency, too. With all the unfortunate people that come there with accidents and for other cases, I never heard of a complaint.

15602. CHAIRMAN.—People are very good that way. They never saw anything better!—I know myself a good deal of it is on the surface, as far as saying "I am well treated," and all that sort of thing. If you went to those when they went home they might have a different story to tell, but from the appearance of the place and the kindness of the officials, and attention of the doctor, I don't think they have any reason to complain. There is not a more attentive doctor in Ireland.

15603. We were thinking that the room for performing operations is not quite as good as it might be?—Not on the large scale you refer to.

15604. Dr. BUCKER.—Not even on a moderate scale?—The last few years it has been wonderfully improved. Did you see the sanitary annex?

15605. Those are very good.—That is owing to the kindness of a deceased gentleman in the county; the newspapers did not contribute one penny. This gentleman left \$1,000 in his will to be expended for the upkeep of the infirmary.

15606. CHAIRMAN.—It was very well spent money!—There is something to the credit yet for other things.

15607. Dr. BUCKER.—Am I to understand that all classes requiring infirmary treatment are received into the county infirmary?—Certainly.

15608. Whether they can pay or not?—I think so. I never knew of a case being refused. If they cannot pay we won't insist on their paying.

15609. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—What is the proportion of paying patients to non-paying?—There are very few pay; policeman pay. If a farmer, or a farmer's son, came there that had met with an accident in the harvest time with a machine, he pays.

15610. CHAIRMAN.—Now, having regard to the fact that the whole of the county there from Moneygall to Edenderry contributes to the county infirmary, do you think it would be a fair thing to have the maintenance of the sick at Edenderry, Burre, and Tullamore all made a county charge, the same as the county infirmary is at present?—If the same accommodation was given to the

sick poor in Burre and Edenderry, I would say it would.

15611. Do you mean as good treatment?—Yes.

15612. Burre has a remarkably good hospital, exceptionally good, a wonderfully good hospital, one of the best local hospitals in the country, and you would be in favour, where there is such a hospital, of making it a county charge?—I don't see how it would alter the existing state of affairs very much if it was a county charge; it would come to the same thing.

15613. It would not be very big one way or another?—Supposing there were thirty in Burre, twenty in Edenderry, and thirty in Tullamore, I cannot see that it would make much difference.

15614. And all the sick in the county would be a county charge. They are not a class that sham very much?—Very few sham sickness if they can avoid it, though I believe there are cases on record where they were detected shamming sickness; but we would expect a little more from our doctor than to allow himself to be deceived in that way.

15615. There is not the same temptation as there is for out-door relief?—They are able to make a very good case on behalf of themselves when looking for out-door relief.

15616. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Do you not think the local Guardians would have to bear the expending of their own money in their own area?—So they would; in fact some would go for divisional rating.

15617. CHAIRMAN.—Of course I mean they would have the expending of the money. Burre Hospital would be where it is. Edenderry hospital would be where it is; but I mean that the cost of the sick should be a county charge?—But would not the representation of the county have a voice.

15618. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Do you not think that the Guardians themselves would desire to manage their own particular area, apart from the county altogether?—I think they would.

15619. CHAIRMAN.—I am not talking at all of the question of management. I am only talking of charge-ability. I am saying here you have a county infirmary paid for by the entire county. That suggests the question whether it might not be a fair thing that the net all over the county should be a county charge apart altogether from the question of local management?—I think the different localities would prefer having the expenses of the sick collected in their own locality. Speaking for myself, I could not see any great difference in having it a county rate for the maintenance in the three places of the sick poor.

15620. Would you then be in favour of restricting the area of charge for the county infirmary to the Tullamore Union, which chiefly gets the benefit of it?—On condition that the others would be excluded from coming to it.

15621. Or paying for it?—But there are several cases here out of the Burre Union.

15622. You would leave the area of charge for the county infirmary on Tullamore Union, and charge the Burre, Edenderry, and other people who come here, so much per week?—I think it would be a fair way of meeting it. But speaking from my own personal point of view, I would rather leave it the way it is.

15623. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—But on the ground of fairness, it is rather hard on Moneygall or the extreme end of Edenderry to pay for the upkeep of an institution that they don't benefit by.

CHAIRMAN.—Are there any other County Councilmen to give evidence?

Mr. DAVID SMITH examined.

I am not deputed by the County Council. I am from Edenderry.

15624. CHAIRMAN.—You have heard Mr. Adams' evidence, and if there is anything you wish to express a contrary opinion on, I would be glad to hear it?—With regard to the injustice done to Edenderry by having a rate levied all over the county for the county infirmary, we think it a great injustice when we derive practically no benefit at all, and we had a couple of applications for an increase of that rate since the County Council came in. I think there was not more than one patient relieved in Tullamore from the Edenderry district.

15625. What would you think of the idea of making the maintenance of the sick a county charge, as the county infirmary, the same area of charge?—I don't think it would work out fair. I think the area would be too big.

15626. You are afraid Tullamore would get too much out of it?—Yes, as it is getting already.

15627. Dr. BUCKER.—If your sick were supported out of the same fund, where would the injustice be?—That would be a different thing.

15628. That is what the Chairman says, if the sick in Edenderry were supported out of the same fund?—Would it they have to come here?

15629. CHAIRMAN.—No; stay where they are, but be paid for as if it was a county infirmary?—Paid by the Board?

15630. No, but the actual expense of your infirmary?—I don't think we are as populous a district as Tullamore, and I suspect they would have the best of it then too.

15631. And you are more highly valued?—Yes.

15632. Is there anything else you would like to add?—Not with regard to that; of course, I have other objections with regard to the Board of Guardians.

15633. You would like now to give your evidence from Edenderry?—Whenever it is convenient.

Feb. 12, 1904.

Mr. Deak
Shel.

15544. What are your views about Edenderry?—I would be entirely opposed to abolishing the workhouse, from the bad accommodation we have to other unions.

15545. If your hospital were left, would you still object to amalgamation?—I don't think it would conduce to economy at all.

15546. If, on the other hand, a scheme were devised on a very large scale all over the entire county, some such scheme as was suggested in the questions put to Mr. Adams, if such a scheme was started, and if it were clearly apparent that there would be economy, would you still object to the closing of your workhouse, except the sick wards?—I think too large an area would be unavailable.

15547. You have a very large area at present for a leucic asylum?—Yes.

15548. These are people in sufficient bodily health to be removed. You would only have people in a similar state of health to be dealt with if your hospital was left open. In what way do you think it would be unavailable?—In the case of lunatics, it is compulsory on them to be removed there, but in the case of healthy old people, they will have a decided objection to go as far as twenty miles. There is portion of the boundary of the union not within twenty miles of the workhouse in their own county, there is portion of the boundary of the union twenty miles from Tullamore, if you proposed sending them to Tullamore, and then portion of the Co. Kildare would be twenty-three miles from Naas, which is the union that, of course, it would be proposed to send them to; and the same in Meath—it is seventeen miles from Trim—and these people don't like to go too far from their relatives and their native place—respectable old men who have to seek refuge in the workhouse. For instance, I know one man who worked at the building of the workhouse. All his family are dead but himself. He just lives immediately outside the town of Edenderry, and I think it would be a great hardship to send that man away to Naas. He takes a turn and steps out for a month with his friends, and if he went to Naas he never could get back; and I would say he would have a decided objection to go, and it would be a hardship to insist on his going.

15549. If there was a big economy in it, do you think the objection you make would be fatal to the adoption of a decidedly economical system?—I think the sentiment ought to be taken into consideration.

15550. As against a very large saving?—Where there would be a very large saving, I would not, but I don't see where it comes.

15551. If you had a large saving, would you then object?—I would always have the same objection.

15552. Do you live in the town of Edenderry?—I live within a mile of it.

15553. Mr. Peyton.—You are a Guardian of the town?—With regard to removing the villages and imbalances, I would entirely approve of having them removed.

15554. CHAIRMAN.—I don't want to be asking the same questions of each witness, but we had an exhaustive examination of Mr. Adams. You heard his evidence, and if anything struck you on which your own opinion is different, we will be very glad to hear it, and if there has been anything omitted?—With regard to the children, I would be greatly in favour of having them boarded out, but our difficulty is we cannot get people to take them.

15555. What do you effect?—£9 a year, the actual cost in the workhouse, and £1 for clothing.

15556. The actual cost in the workhouse would be more than double £9?—I think not; we are giving them the actual cost.

15557. You are only giving them the cost of their food?—And the clothes.

15558. If you take the cost of the child you have to add something more than the mere cost of food and clothing?—I think we would be willing to do so, but we took the average cost; we considered the children cost less than the able-bodied. We have a difficulty in getting them boarded out, and I would suggest if the Guardians were empowered to give money grants. Our principal difficulty is we cannot get suitable people—men with cows.

15559. That is right?—We don't like to give out a child to any person whose there is not milk, so I would suggest that if the Guardians were empowered to make money grants by way of loan to people in labourers' cottages; there are a good many labourers' cottages through the country, clean habitations, and they were empowered to make money grants and get it back by instalments; we would have no difficulty.

15560. To buy a cow?—To buy a cow. I am totally opposed to the rearing up of children in a workhouse.

15561. Where could a man with his half-acre or acre of land feed a cow?—A good many of them do; they can get grass outside.

15562. Mr. MURKHAM.—Does it not cost a good deal of money?—Not so much; they have the milk cheaper than otherwise.

15563. Where would he get his fodder for the winter?—Half-an-acre of good meadow could be bought, and he would have the milk for his own family.

15564. You say you would see no economy in doing away with some of the workhouses in the county. Would you not see a saving in getting rid of half of the staff of some of the present workhouses?—I think there would be an increase of staff with regard to providing the hospital, which would be a matter of necessity.

15565. You have a hospital already. The staff of the main body of the house might be dispensed with?—I don't see who can be taken away except the master and clerk, and you would have to provide a clerk and stewardess.

15566. CHAIRMAN.—How many people have they in the county infirmary house—a master, nurse, and couple of assistants, and the doctor and chaplain?—You would want landresses and night nurses.

15567. No more than you have got at present?—But they are able-bodied people out of the body of the house that are in the laundry now, and, of course, you would want some one in the kitchen, two or three persons; then you have a couple of workmen.

15568. Labour must be very plentiful when you draft so many as that in?—There are only about eleven, and five are taken up with the infirmary. I see a great objection to amalgamate us with any union around, because we are the lowest rated.

15569. Mr. MURKHAM.—But if the management remains as it is, how would that affect you?—We would have to take over the burden of another union.

15570. If you still manage your own area, how would it affect you being allied with another. You would only be paying for the upkeep of your able-bodied and infirm?—The president suggested a county charge.

15571. But there is an alternative to that, to continue the present system as it is: let every union manage its own expenses. How would it affect you in Edenderry?—We would be better off still.

15572. Then you see no objection to an arrangement like this?—I would see no objection if our rates were not raised, and we had not to take up the burden of those who had higher rates.

15573. You would only have to pay for the poor of your own particular area?—But there would be some expense sending away the poor. We have no direct railway communication with these places; somebody would have to pay.

15574. The expense of sending the people to a central workhouse would not be so great as the expense of keeping a staff permanently?—I don't know that that would have to be figured out yet. I am of opinion that it would.

15575. Does not your firing cost you a great deal?—The bill for firing is £230 a year, and the infirmary takes most of that, probably £220.

15576. A very moderate-sized workhouse costs from £200 to £400?—We are very well situated with regard to turf; we generally use it, with 50 tons of coal.

15577. If you get rid of that expense, would it not be some benefit to the ratepayers?—If you keep a hospital you could not get rid of that expense.

15578. The hospital only takes its share?—It takes the largest share.

15579. You see no advantage in amalgamation then?—I could not see it as far as our union is concerned. I think it would be the reverse.

Mr. MATTHEW MOORE examined.

15580. CHAIRMAN.—You have heard the evidence of your predecessor. Do you agree with his views?—I do.

15581. You are strongly opposed to amalgamation?—Yes, from long experience.

15582. And you think, as far as any calculations have

been made by you or your officials, you think it would be against the interest of the Edenderry Union, owing to the low rates you have there?—Yes, and the way it is looked after.

15583. If you found your rates would not be in-

Mr. Matthew
Moore.

Feb. 18, 1906.

Mr. Matthew
Stevens.

creased, but somewhat diminished?—I am doubtful about that.

15584. If it did happen that the calculations which are in progress of being made would show a saving, would you still be opposed to amalgamation?—No; I am afraid there would be new appointments—new clerks.

15585. But supposing, on the contrary, there were far fewer clerks?—I don't see how the poor could get here. We don't send any one to this infirmary. I am about the tenth largest employer in the district. I have thirty-five years' experience of the Board of Guardians and of the District Council since it came in; in fact I have a good deal of my time in it, unfortunately for myself.

15586. You don't see how there could be any economy in amalgamation?—I am afraid not.

15587. If you could imagine for a moment that it was possible that there are methods of bringing down taxation even in the present Edenderry Union, would you still be opposed to it?—I would not be opposed to it.

15588. Supposing there was a decided rebellion, say one-sixth on the rates, would you be opposed to it?—In a way, I don't know how I could come here seventeen miles, or how the poor would get here.

15589. Supposing there was a local body there, or a local committee, or a District Council, or a Board of Guardians continued—all these alternatives have been mentioned to us, and we have not come to any opinion as to which, if any, of them is a good suggestion—but suppose some local body were left there still, and you would not have to travel more distance?—And have control of our own district, at our own average rating, the same as electoral divisions were long ago.

15590. You would like to go back to the electoral division rating?—None or less I would. I hold, in three electoral divisions, valuation something over £1,100.

15591. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—If you continue to man-

age your own union as you do at present, and there could be economy shown to you, would you then be opposed?—I would not exactly, but I would not like to have the Board go a long distance where people could not be expected to go.

15592. You would not have to go elsewhere if you continued to meet as you do at present. Would you not go to the same place you go at present?—Yes.

15593. And you would simply pay a certain sum per head for the people you send to the central institution?—I don't expect to send them to the central institution. I followed Mr. Adams pretty closely about sending away these unfortunate women.

15594. You would not object to boarding-out the children?—I go in for that.

15595. And the income to be sent to a more suitable place?—Yes.

15596. CHAIRMAN.—And the aged and infirm to go to a central workhouse?—I don't know about that. I am afraid it would create new establishments. I have great experience of new officials appointed from time to time, and I have a great horror of them.

15597. The people throughout the country have the same impression, and that is the reason we are sitting here to-day, to see if we can reduce instead of increase it.—I hope so.

15598. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—If the change that has been outlined here to-day takes place the staff could be considerably reduced, and the cost correspondingly so. How would you get the infirm treated?—You would have to keep on a hospital.

15599. CHAIRMAN.—Yes?—I suppose you know where the infirmary lies. You have had the evidence of Messrs. You will have Kildare later on. I don't think it would be fair to let it in with anywhere else at the rating.

15600. Is there anything else that occurs to you?—No; I fall in line with what Mr. Sheil says.

Mr. R. B. PETERSON examined.

15601. CHAIRMAN.—Are you the same man that you were the other day at Nenagh?—Absolutely. You referred to the rates. I don't think it would be a fair thing for us to amalgamate in any shape or form unless the rates were left as they are now. The standard rate of Tullamore is 1s. 10½d., and while they got 11½d. deduced on their rate, we only get 6½d. reduction on ours. So unless that basis is maintained I am absolutely opposed to any amalgamation; but provided that is maintained, I am very strongly in favour of amalgamation in the county. The cost of Edenderry Union for establishment charges, as given to me by Mr. Kennedy, the clerk, was last year £1,570, that is mostly for establishment charges; that is 4d. in the £ on the entire union, but that by no means represents the expenditure we have to incur on the upkeep of the establishment. The Local Government Board is insisting we shall spend £1,300 on drainage and sewerage works.

15602. I believe it is the Public Health Act insists on that?—Yes; I don't wish to abuse the Local Government Board, but at all events that has got to be spent, and we are asked to spend a considerable sum on the indoor—empty wards, which are absolutely useless to us.

15603. Was that explained?—Yes; but the building must be kept right.

15604. To keep it from falling down?—The establishment charges of keeping up such a building.

15605. It would be cheaper to take it down if you don't want it?—Probably. At any rate, as we stand now, we have only got forty-two permanent paupers. Many parishes of the district, that is the part of the union situated in the King's County, are absolutely nearer Tullamore than Edenderry, and I can see no possible objection at all to removing a great many of the permanent paupers there; and it would seem to me that that would perhaps enable us to treat a few of the old and infirm of good character in the infirmary, or some little establishment at home, such as Mr. Sheil suggested. Of course the difficulty I see is that representation and taxation should go together. If you amalgamate for in-door relief only and charge us on the valuation for the county for the establishment charges at Tullamore, making that a county central infirmary—

15606. Central almshouse?—Then I should be disposed to say we ought to nominate a few members from the Edenderry district to act as governors.

15607. Or would you not be satisfied with paying so much per head. You would be rather afraid that they might get extravagant, and you would have to pay too much a head, and you would have no means of local

representation to keep it down?—Yes, it does not give us any control in the maintenance of the workhouse at all; therefore I should be rather disposed to nominate governors—I am only throwing this out—for the upkeep, and establishment charges, and maintenance of Tullamore Union. Provided that is done, I see no possible objection to the amalgamation of the union, and I believe if the vast masses of the ratepayers and District Councillors understood it perfectly, and were assured from the start that there would be no economy, they would not have the slightest objection. Mr. Sheil represents the town of Edenderry, and he may think it his duty to represent the feelings of the town, which would be adverse to amalgamation because they would lose a large share of the contracts. But he takes to some parts of the outlying districts. As it happens, these outlying districts as parishes are not very far from the railway, and people can come more easily to Kildare, Portlanning, and Tullamore than from the other parts of the union. Then, of course, there is the question of the county infirmary. We pay, I understand from the Secretary of the County Council, £1,300, and I believe as a matter of fact we have nobody there, and I have asked Dr. Millin, the medical officer, and he tells me that if he had a proper ambulance he would not have the slightest objection to send a great many of his patients to Tullamore Infirmary, and from all his patients they would very much prefer to go there than to go to the workhouse hospital in Edenderry; so it would seem to me that if that central hospital were made more efficient, it would enable us to reduce considerably the infirmary—if we keep a small infirmary at Edenderry—and reduce the expense to everybody concerned.

15608. And do away with a grievance as regards the county infirmary?—Yes. The only thing I wish to add is in reference to the children, and that is, that there are thirty-five children in the union, and we have boarded-out all we can.

15609. Do you happen to know how many you boarded out?—Seven or eight now. I only mentioned Mrs. Barrett's Home, not merely in reference to education, but as showing that that kind of training did produce good citizens. Unless the law is strengthened to over the Act of 1880, we shall find it very difficult to deal with these thirty-five children in boarding-out, because parents come to the workhouse and stop them for a year, and then go out and take the children, so that unless some provision is made that we can secure the guardianship of these children—

15610. Would you be in favour of power being given

to the Board of Guardians to take away from parents who are guilty as to mismanage and bring up badly their children. Would you be in favour of taking these children from the children away from such parents, but I think in connection with that the law should be strengthened in connection with the desertion of children; there should be a very heavy penalty for that. It would be possible for parents to desert these with the law in view that they would be taken by the Guardians and get rid of their own responsibility. I think the law should be strengthened and vigorously enforced.

15611. Would you be in favour of having places to which to send these people who proved their inability to be parents?—That is a very large question.

15612. To send them in places where there would be no danger of their having further children?—That is a very large question to interfere with the liberty of the subject; that is against constitutional law.

15613. You would have to get a court of law to act in that way. Would you be in favour of it?—I would be disposed to be in favour of it.

15614. Leaving it to the discretion of the body or court who has to decide it?—Yes. I have just estimated that if the establishment charges of Tallamore did not increase we should save about 3d. in the £ by amalgamation on the basis I put before you, and that would be £1,200 on the county.

15615. We should be very glad if you could favour us at your leisure with a copy of your calculation?—Certainly. I may say the public want to be educated on the subject.

15616. Persons are unable to grasp the effect of charges that are newly proposed?—I still think that out-door relief should be maintained. The work of the Board of Guardians is only a beguile since this new Local Government Act, so many duties have been put on the District Councils. I think all the work of out-door relief should be discharged by the District Councils, and there should be amalgamation in the county for indoor relief, with power to us to appoint governors. Absolutely great part of the district is nearer Tallamore than Edwinstown.

15617. Dr. HOSKINS.—Did you calculate the cost per inmate in the workhouse?—No, not in the establishment charges.

MR. PATRICK GARNEY examined.

15618. CHAIRMAN.—You are Chairman of the Birr Board of Guardians—what is the view of the Birr Board of Guardians on the question of the amalgamation of unions generally?—They are not in favour of amalgamation with any other union.

15619. Have they any view as regards the idea of general amalgamation throughout the country?—Birr could accommodate fifty more paupers than they have.

15620. Then you have not approached the question beyond your own union?—We believe that amalgamation with any other union would be a great mistake; we oppose it tooth and nail.

15621. Do you think that financially and as regards hardship to the sick in removal?—Yes; and I don't believe, no matter what way the law is changed, that by amalgamation of unions, the way Birr is situated, you can save anything to the ratepayers.

15622. There are at present 150 unions?—Take the King's County—

15623. Take the case of Ireland—there are 150 unions, if you close thirty won't there be a big saving to the country?—That depends on how they are situated.

15624. It would look as if you would have a big saving?—But how would that saving come in an Birr in an amalgamation with Tallamore and Edwinstown?

15625. You have looked into it yourself, and don't see how it could?—No.

15626. Well, what we want is to hear your views?—I think it would be a great hardship to send poor people to Tallamore. Perhaps they might not be a bright or these weeks there when they would die, and then they would have to be brought back by their friends.

15627. What happens when you send a patient to a lunatic asylum?—That is very different.

15628. What does happen when a patient dies there?—The friends generally send for them. Birr is twenty-eight or thirty miles from Maryboro', and the relatives of the deceased remove and a hearse for them, or sometimes bring them by rail.

15629. In the total expenditure on the workhouse?—£1,500 is the total expenditure for last year up to 31st of March, 1903, not counting food and clothing.

15630. How many inmates?—Forty-five paupers and fifty-five in the infirmary.

15631. That is £16 a head for establishment charges?—You could nearly send them to the South of France for that. We want to keep a grip on our expenditure.

15632. CHAIRMAN.—You are a Guardian?—Yes, a District Councillor. There is an item of £240 in that £1,500, but then we have got this £1,000 coming, and a lot of other expenditure, so I don't think it would be at all an over-estimate to say £1,500 for establishment charges, and that is nearly 4d. in the £ on the union.

15633. Mr. MURPHY.—What is the full rate?—Is 10d. the standard rate.

15634. Is it more or less now?—The out-door relief is considerably less. I have not made an absolutely accurate calculation, but the out-door relief we did do, and that has considerably reduced.

15635. Dr. HOSKINS.—You made a very strong point about the standard year—what did you say the establishment was?—About 5d.

15636. And you save 4d. by amalgamation?—Oh, yes.

15637. Would that not compensate you even if the standard rate was not taken into account?—No. I think when people manage their affairs economically they should get the whole advantage of it.

Mr. SHELL.—I wish just to remark that that £1,500 that Mr. Peyton says is establishment charge includes £240 for repairs.

Witness.—I said so.

Mr. SHELL.—He says the Local Government Board ordered us to spend £1,000. It is an understood thing. They asked us to prepare plans, do.

Mr. MOORE.—I forgot to mention that I have a great objection to paying patients coming in. I am a farmer, and made myself, and bought my land, and from the abuse I see of paying patients coming in, they might slip into the infirmary, and, perhaps, be three months there, and they only bring five miles away.

15638. Is something like that what you would object to with regard to the aged and infirm?—Yes. Take Berrisokane, that is a very small union, if that was dissolved we could accommodate the paupers; they are about forty; it adjoints us.

15639. And it is close to Nenagh, too, and it is in the same county as Nenagh?—Yes.

15640. Mr. MURPHY.—Temporary men would like to have that themselves?—I don't think so, because it is a very small union, and I think it would be a great saving to the Tipperarymen to have it joined in with Birr.

15641. You think they would not rather have it joined in to Nenagh?—I think it would be nearer in one point to Birr than to Nenagh.

15642. CHAIRMAN.—Is not all the populous part of the union much nearer Nenagh?—When you take in Berrisokane itself and Cloughjordan, I would say it is about half and half.

15643. At all events, there is no great advantage on the side of Birr?—Unless that we have room for forty inmates.

15644. Nenagh would have room for Berrisokane and Birr as well?—Well, we could take portion. We have already some divisions of Tipperary in the Birr Union—six or seven divisions.

15645. Mr. MURPHY.—When the house was built was not the population much larger than it is at present?—Yes, it was.

15646. Do you not see a waste of money in keeping a place vacant?—Not as regards the Birr Union itself.

15647. Does it not take a good deal to keep it in repair?—Very little, because it is a fine, substantial building, and we are after spending £1,000 on a wing of the hospital.

15648. CHAIRMAN.—I don't think any praise could be too high for your institution at Birr—you have a magnificent workhouse—and we have a splendid hospital away altogether from the workhouse.

15649. Mr. MURPHY.—Your infirmary is excellent, no doubt, but if you had that infirmary still re-

Feb. 18, 1904

Mr. E. E. Peyton

Feb. 18, 1904.

Mr. Patrick
Gandy.

tained and could get rid of the children—I would be in favour of boarding out the children.

15550. If you did board them out, would you be in favour of sending the means to an auxiliary asylum?—I would.

15551. And as regards the mothers of illegitimate children?—Certainly, I would be in favour of that, too.

15552. Having sent such classes away, you would have few but the sick and infirm?—I would be opposed to taking away the sick and infirm.

15553. But to leave the sick where they are, in that excellent infirmary, would you not think that by having a central institution for the infirm it would relieve the rates very considerably?—I do not believe it. I would like to see it in black and white first.

15554. You would get rid of the staff, the coal bill, which is very considerable, you would get rid of the register and register, and getting rid of all that cost for the healthy, would it not be some advantage?—You would think by looking at it in one way it would be a saving, but you will find in years to come there will be no saving. You may save it one way, but you will lose it another.

15555. CHAIRMAN.—How would you lose it?—If you had a central house at Tallamore you would have to have a staff for that, and then the cost of the conveyance of the poor people—would not that be an extra cost?

CHAIRMAN.—The cost of removal would be extra, undoubtedly.

15556. Mr. MURKIN.—That would be only at rare intervals. I know a workhouse that has been joined to another workhouse, there have been twelve or thirteen years' experience, and the rates are very much reduced in that particular instance, and no particular hardship was experienced in the locality?—We find the very reverse. I remember in the District Council first there was nothing but applications for pumps, it was a Rural District No. 1 charge; everywhere we were applying for pumps; we said the best thing we could do was to make them dispensary district charges, and since that was done we have had very few applications for pumps. They work with more economy when it is a county-at-large charge.

15557. CHAIRMAN.—You think the smaller the area the more careful the inquiry?—Certainly.

15558. Would you approve of restricting the area to a smaller area than the county?—I would; I would approve of electoral division rating.

15559. Are you connected with town or country?—Country.

15560. Would the town Guardians agree with you?—We had a meeting, and were equally divided.

15561. Town against country?—Yes; half and half. But when the idea goes out that it is a county charge, only Old. In the S, people are not very slow in increasing the expenditure. Then that quarter-acre section is a thing I think should be repealed, and greater power given to the Guardians.

15562. How far would you modify it?—I would say

one and a half acres or two acres. We find great difficulty in relieving poor people in Birr; desiring your cases come up, and we find we cannot give it a while.

15563. We have got that suggestion from other unions, too?—I think it would be a great mistake with a fine union like Birr, after all the expense on average and the hospital, to dissolve it now, and bring all the sick and poor to Tallamore; you would have no profit in the end.

15564. Mr. MURKIN.—Not the sick. Would you be in favour of giving the Guardians power to board out the aged and infirm?—I think you would find great difficulty in getting people to take these old people; they are in the way, like; and they would be better off in the house than with people round. We are giving out-door relief, and we think that is tantamount to boarding out.

15565. Do you think it is a humane or proper thing to have these poor people closed up in a room for five or six months of the year?—I think it is better to have them in the house than out in the country, where they might be neglected.

15566. Even if it cost 6s. or 7s. a week?—It only costs 2s. 6d. a week in the workhouse.

15567. You are mistaken?—I am not mistaken. Mr. Dooley is here.

15568. CHAIRMAN.—That is only for food and maintenance?—I am only referring to the maintenance.

15569. Mr. MURKIN.—The average cost per head is at least £17 per year in the workhouse?—That is including clothes.

15570. CHAIRMAN.—The average for maintenance is only 3s. 6d. per head and in hospital 5s. 6d. We have a splendid hospital fitted up—a fever hospital with a trained nurse, and I think everything is up to the mark.

CHAIRMAN.—We don't commit ourselves to the same opinion about the fever hospital that we do about the rest of the hospital. We saw a great deal there that might be improved on.

Dr. BOGGER.—You have only two wards there.

15571. CHAIRMAN.—You have got a large building, with no proper arrangements and wards. The best part is taken up with officers' quarters and dispensaries, that have no connection really with a fever hospital; but you have got a very good building?—We did a good deal since we went there to the hospital.

15572. The ordinary medical and surgical hospital you have in beautiful order, but the fever hospital?—I suppose the Guardians don't go as much there to look after it as to the other?—There is a visiting committee that goes once a month.

15573. If you put the nurse outside in a little building and made the whole of the big building a fever hospital you would be nearer the mark, and put the dispensary out of it?—I think you would be right in that.

Mr. GEORGE HACKERT examined.

Mr. George
Hackert.

15574. CHAIRMAN.—Are you also opposed to any idea of amalgamation?—Decidedly. I would be in favour of Berriestown Union being added to Birr. I think we could have accommodation for about fifty additional inmates; and, originally, some of the divisions of Berriestown were in Birr Union.

15575. Berriestown was one of the new unions formed about 1860?—Yes.

15576. And part was taken from Birr?—Yes; three or four divisions at least.

15577. So there, at least, you think might go back?—Might go back to Birr; and we have ample accommodation for the number of inmates that belong to this district.

15578. How far are you from Berriestown?—About twelve miles.

15579. You don't propose anything with regard to Berriestown Union—you leave it as it is?—I think so; I don't see what change would be desirable. Then, as regards the boarding out of children, I am at one with our chairman and other witnesses, that it would be a very good thing, provided we could get parties to take them. That is the difficulty; we would want to pay them liberally. I am sure the influence of the workhouse are not very conducive to their future welfare. They will never become good citizens trained in the

workhouse, except with very few exceptions. And, as regards the boarding out of aged and infirm inmates, I would not do that. I think they would be much more comfortable and better taken care of in the workhouse.

15580. It is an experiment that never has been tried?—I would not like to try it.

15581. We have got some suggestions about it?—I am afraid their wants would not be attended to—they get a little cranky.

15582. Would you be afraid that a large number of people who might support their aged friends would try to get them in on that system—sons and daughters who would never dream of putting an aged parent or relative into the workhouse would yet try to put them boarded out?—On occasions it might occur.

15583. You would not be afraid of any abuse in that way?—I would not. That is my candid opinion.

15584. It is merely the want of sufficient care you would be afraid of?—Then, as regards a central institution in Tallamore, I would be totally opposed to it. King's County, from Tallamore to Moynagh, is thirty-four Irish miles, and I think the unions are admirably placed, except Berriestown, and I think that might be easily amalgamated with Birr. At present there are six divisions of Birr Union in Tipperary.

I am one of the Guardians for Tipperary, and Chairman of No. 2 District Council. That is the Tipperary portion of Birr, and I think Roscrea, or a portion of it, might be suitably amalgamated with Birr, and, if thought advisable, the remainder might be amalgamated with Nenagh; that is the natural life of the country.

15683. You are not in favour of having poor law unions continuous with the county boundaries?—Decidedly not.

15684. You don't see any advantage in that?—I don't believe that there could be any possible advantages by that arrangement; I think it would be the contrary, in fact.

15685. Mr. MURKIN.—What is your objection to it? Some people have an idea that each county should be self-contained, not only as regards the poor law, but also as regards the upkeep of roads?—I don't look at them from the same standpoint. The upkeep of roads is a county charge; but my own impression is that there would be no advantage whatever, but rather a disadvantage, by having a county arrangement as regards the poor law. I don't look at the upkeep of roads at all from the same standpoint as I do the upkeep of workhouses.

15686. Could local bodies that look after the roads not also look after the poor law in their own area?—They are Guardians at the present moment; they are in the dual capacity.

15687. Do you not think the county is the natural area for all purposes?—I do not as regards the poor law. I can understand the upkeep of roads and that sort of thing.

15688. CHAIRMAN.—You don't feel humiliated by being joined with the King's County for Poor Law purposes?—No, sir; I am a borderer; I could throw a stone from where I was born into the King's County.

15689. Mr. MURKIN.—Don't you think that each county should manage its own affairs?—I am not in favour of making change. I know Roscrea, and I think it is working admirably. The arrangements in Birr are very suitable, and going on very well, and I don't see the advantage of any change.

15690. Still, we do hear occasionally that the workhouse system could be improved?—There may be cases where it might be such, but I cannot see them.

15691. Do you think these houses are utilised to their full capacity at present; don't you think something more could be got out of them?—I don't know, really.

15692. They are half empty, are they not?—We have about 260 inmates in Birr Union.

15693. Built for 1,000?—At that time they went them up to the garrets, near the sky, very often, and in sheds, and even in barracks; now a man has several more cubic feet than he had then. I remember 1,000 men in Birr Barracks; it would not accommodate under present arrangements more than 250.

15694. Notwithstanding all that, there is a large portion of the house unoccupied?—We could afford accommodation for forty or fifty inmates more, and no more under existing arrangements.

15695. Do you not think that by adopting centralisation as regards some of the classes and making suitable provision for the rest, some improvement could be brought about without adding any additional cost on the ratepayers?—So far as I know the workhouses around this district, I really don't see how they could

be improved upon, except as regards the boarding out of children, and the arrangement about those unfortunate women that come into the house. I certainly would take the children from them.

15696. Having agreed to the boarding out of children, and having also agreed that unaccompanied mothers should be sent to some reformatory institution, and having also agreed that the lunatics should be put in some place better than a workhouse?—Certainly; I would like to see them in a recognised female asylum.

15697. Having got rid of these various classes, there will be very little more in the workhouse except the aged and infirm?—You have a number of patients in the hospital.

15698. Provided hospitals are continued, can you see any real objection to the Guardians of the Birr Union being empowered to board out or to send to a central institution the remaining class, the aged and infirm?—I do; there is one objection that has just struck me—it is about the burial of these people. A person comes, say, twenty-five or thirty miles here to Tallamore; it would prevent a great many from coming. Where they are within reasonable distance of their friends they generally claim their remains, and sometimes they are not buried in a pauper's coffin or a pauper's grave, in a good many instances; and I think that would be a great objection. Take from Moneygall to Tallamore, it would be a terrible tax on the poor relations.

15699. Are you going to keep up a workhouse for that?—Not for that; but I mention that among the objections I would have to a central place in Tallamore; and really I don't think, as I said at first, that we can improve on the management or arrangements; and my experience is that, that any changes I have seen always tended to a pecuniary loss. I never saw them improve things.

15700. If there is a pecuniary loss there is certainly a great improvement in the treatment?—I don't think so, sir.

15701. Have you been in the Birr Infirmary lately?—I have been in it within a month; I am on the visiting committee.

15702. You must admit that something has been done there?—There has been a great improvement I know; and I can tell you what the improvement is largely owing to—getting in the Sisters of Mercy there as nurses twenty or twenty-two years ago. They have changed the state of affairs. I heard my father, who, at his death, was senior Guardian of the Birr Union say that the state of the inmates in the hospital was something deplorable until the Sisters of Mercy were admitted.

15703. Has not what you have said just now contradicted what you said before?—I don't see where it does.

15704. You said you don't see any improvement?—Excuse me, I did not mean to say so.

15705. CHAIRMAN.—Each change caused great expense, you said?—I believe it is generally more expensive, but still there are improvements that might be equivalent to the expense. I know that there is not perhaps in Ireland a better kept hospital than the workhouse hospital in Birr; the arrangements there are admirable. I often said myself that I would not have the slightest hesitation if I got ill, and had no home of my own, to be sent there, when I saw the condition, the cleanliness, and everything.

Dr. GEORGE A. MORRIS examined.

15706. CHAIRMAN.—We learn that you consider much might be done as regards provision for treating pulmonary tuberculosis?—Yes.

15707. Would you kindly mention what you would suggest, first saying how far it is prevalent in the district?—The number of deaths which we have registered for eighteen months is 124, and of these fifty-one were from general and pulmonary tuberculosis. This did not include tuberculosis of the peritoneum, which used to be called miliary, or of the brain, meningitis, or tubercular disease of the bones.

15708. For what period was that?—Eighteen or twenty months.

15709. Dr. BIGGER.—If you had included all the other tubercular cases, have you any idea what the number would be?—If we put on that which I look on as an allied disease, caused by much the same con-

ditions, that is, cancer, there were nine cases of cancer registered during that period, it would make sixty-five. There was one from cancer.

15710. CHAIRMAN.—Apart from the record of deaths, can you tell us how far it is prevalent in the district?—This would be for the district.

15711. Were those more than an average percentage?—Oh, yes; I think it is very much on the increase.

15712. Have you at the present moment a large number of cases under treatment?—Yes, an unusually large number in the hospital.

15713. And the death-rate for the next year, as far as you are, will not be lighter?—No, certainly.

15714. Dr. BIGGER.—In the district in which you are medical officer, is it pretty general outside the town?—It is; it is in the country.

15715. No particular district?—It is not confined to

Feb 18, 1904.

Mr. George A. Morris

Dr. George A. Morris

Feb. 15, 1904.

Dr. George A. Monahan.

any particular district. The classes that have suffered most from it are the labourers and the farmers. Out of that number I have given you three were twenty-seven deaths occurred in the labouring classes, and in the farmers seven occurred. Then the rest of them are of various occupations; no particular trade seemed to be marked out specially for it; we had only one factory hand.

18718. When you speak of farmers or labourers, you mean the children of those?—As a rule, I mean the fathers and mothers. Two postmen were in that.

18719. CHAIRMAN.—Did they die?—They did.

18720. How long did they remain as postmen?—One of them had eleven or twelve years' service, as well as I recollect.

18721. How long had he been ill?—About eighteen months.

18722. Did he continue to act as a postman?—I think not; I think he was invalided for a considerable time. The number of adults on that was forty-six, and the number of married twenty-six. With regard to the conditions to which you might attribute the prevalence of it—first, the natural dampness of the soil; secondly, the insanitary condition of the houses, damp and ill-ventilated, and with insufficient air space, and particularly in the spreading of the disease by spitting, which is very prevalent.

18723. Do you think the disease ought to be notifiable?—Certainly; it is curable and preventible, both.

18724. Dr. BUCKER.—Have you noticed cases where after one death has occurred in a family others have followed in a year or eighteen months after?—Yes, very many, and frequently in married couples; if the husband gets it it is only a question of time when the wife gets it, and vice versa.

18725. CHAIRMAN.—It used to be considered that this was proof of its hereditary?—It is really proof of its infection.

18726. Dr. BUCKER.—You have noticed the same thing in other members of the family sleeping in the same house?—Certainly; the prevalent idea of the country people in treating this disease is, that they cannot keep them too close; they must exclude every breath of air, and they keep them in a moist, warm atmosphere very favourable to the growth of the bacilli.

18727. Are there any steps taken after a period to disinfect the house?—The sanitary authority, when they ascertain the cause of death, disinfect the house as well as they can with lime-washing. I have always ordered that whenever I detected the disease; and in the dispensary and workhouse we supply them with spunk fuses—as much as possible, Ventnor fuses.

18728. And try and educate them to the proper use of them?—Quite so.

18729. What would you suggest with regard to the treatment of these cases?—The best results are to be had from these sanatoria, which are all over the country.

18730. I am sorry to say they are not all over the country?—Wherever they have been tried the statistics seem to show that they are successful.

18731. CHAIRMAN.—You don't mean in Ireland, but generally?—There are a few in Ireland.

18732. You think there ought to be one in which poor and destitute people ought to be able to go for each group of counties?—Certainly so; I think it would be an immense saving to the rates. When the bread-winner is stricken down with this disease, or his wife, his family are left helpless on the rates; and we have a great many instances of that in our union—helpless families and destitute children.

18733. Dr. BUCKER.—Have you anything in your mind about the site of the sanatorium for a county, or do you propose there should be one for each county?—Well, if they take every district; we have at present twelve cases under treatment in the union; those don't represent all the cases in the district.

18734. What proportion do you think they represent?—I should say about three-fourths.

18735. So much as that?—Well, considerably over half.

18736. Of all the cases in your whole dispensary district and the other districts of the union?—My dispensary district.

18737. I am speaking of the union?—They very seldom come from outside my own district.

18738. What is the reason of that?—I cannot tell you; they have a strong objection to coming into the hospital, to begin with.

18739. CHAIRMAN.—They come more readily to their own medical attendant?—Quite so; they have more confidence in their medical attendant, and I have frequently to use very strong arguments to get them in.

18740. Dr. BUCKER.—The other dispensary districts are even worse served, because they don't get them in?—I suppose they must be.

18741. CHAIRMAN.—As far as you know from conversations with your colleagues, is there a great deal of consumption prevalent in the union?—Any of them that I have spoken to have noticed that there is an increase.

18742. Dr. BUCKER.—Then there are twelve cases in the union at present?—Yes.

18743. That would indicate a sanatorium of a fair size for King's County?—I should say one for the King's County should have at least 100 beds in it. Of course, if it were made compulsory to notify these cases, and they were compulsorily treated, as they ought to be, all grades of society would have to come in.

18744. CHAIRMAN.—If they could not be separated, the same as infectious diseases at present?—Yes.

18745. Dr. BUCKER.—Is the Notification of Infectious Diseases Act in force in the county?—I think it is; it is in force in this district.

18746. You mean to say in the town of Tallanstown?—In the urban district.

18747. Not in the rural district?—It is in the rural district also.

18748. Then it would not be so very difficult to add an tuberculosis?—It would be very desirable.

18749. CHAIRMAN.—Is there anything else except this matter of consumption you would like to mention?—No, sir, I think there is nothing else.

18750. Dr. BUCKER.—In the treatment of surgical diseases what would you recommend—operation cases and so on?—There is a surgical institution in the town.

18751. You don't encourage them to come to the union for operations?—For major operations I do not. We only operate, as a rule, in cases of urgency, not from selection.

18752. You think the county infirmary would be the proper place for the treatment of cases of operations or large operations?—Certainly, it ought to have a proper equipment—an operating theatre, with proper up-to-date conveniences.

18753. Do you think if it had a proper ambulance, or more than one ambulance, would it serve for the whole county? It would be a matter of great difficulty bringing a patient thirty miles. Our county extends from Ballymore to Shinnore, nearly forty-seven miles.

18754. Say from Tallanstown to the extreme end of the county?—Birr is twenty Irish miles from here, and Shinnore is seven or eight miles beyond, and Moneygall is further still. I would look on twenty miles as a very undesirable journey in a serious surgical case.

18755. CHAIRMAN.—You could not take a bad compound fracture unless it was put up temporarily by the local dispensary doctor?—You could run considerable risk.

18756. Dr. BUCKER.—You think it would be desirable to have any surgical hospital in the county, in any case?—Certainly; I would have an up-to-date surgical hospital, with a proper theatre and appliances—absolutely appliances of every sort.

18757. CHAIRMAN.—Have you ever considered the question of district nursing—nursing the poor in their own homes in comparatively trivial cases, too trivial for removal, but which may become cases for removal if not properly attended to, and some, perhaps, so serious for removal?—We have no system whatever for dealing with that. I would look on it as very desirable.

18758. Would you feel it an enormous assistance to you and a great benefit to the sick if you had in your own dispensary district a trained, competent district nurse, who would look after the people in their own homes?—Unquestionably, it might be the means of saving many from coming into the hospital, as at present. The only district nurse we have is a midwife; she is not a medical and surgical nurse in any sense.

15758. Your fever hospital is, unfortunately, very close to your other hospital?—It is, it is dangerously close.

15759. Was it built originally for a fever hospital?—Yes; it is the best building we have, and the best ventilated one. The Local Government Board always insisted on doing that part themselves, but its proximity to the hospital renders it very undesirable.

15760. It would be most useful to you in seasons of overcrowding for an ordinary medical and surgical hospital?—Yes; at present we have neither a convalescent ward nor an observation ward. It would be

an invaluable adjunct in both those capacities, and its proximity to the hospital would almost point out the desirability of having it there. The fever hospital would not require such accommodation at all.

15761. You very rarely have a large number?—Twelve beds would be quite sufficient. We had ten cases recently; with the improved water supply and, undoubtedly, improved house accommodation, we would have less.

15762. Your fever is chiefly from Killebeggan?—The last lot of cases were from Killebeggan.

Feb. 13, 1904

Dr. George A. Macbeath.

MR. EDWARD BUCKE EXAMINED.

I am from Clonsilla Rural District; there was another delegate appointed, who was in possession of a great many more facts than I am, but owing to the lateness of the meeting he failed to come.—Mr. Ewells.

15763. You can tell us what the feeling of your district is. At present you are in with the Mountmellick Union. In your District Council is there any desire to separate from your partnership with Mountmellick?—No, sir; from one particular reason, that it would entail a great hardship upon our sick poor to remove them for such a terrible distance.

15764. Supposing the sick poor still continued to go to Mountmellick, would you think it a hardship to remove the other classes?—To answer you candidly, the general feeling, as far as I can understand, is that they wish to be regarded and to be purely King's County people, but in consideration of their destitute poor they would not wish to be connected with Tallamore for that reason.

15765. You would not care to go into the Queen's County for your roads?—Not by any means; of course, we are represented here on the County Council.

15766. But for Poor Law purposes you are against having Mountmellick?—Yes; purely for considerations of the destitute poor.

15767. As regards the rating for the relief of the sick poor, do you like the present system of rating or do you think any change necessary?—No; we are considerably lower than the people of Tallamore, and that is another thing that stimulates our people's ideas to stay there, to keep our rates within the Mountmellick Union.

15768. What is the biggest village that you have got in your district?—North Portlannington. We only embrace one-half of the town in our five electoral divisions—North Portlannington, Clonsilla, Hamer Lane, Umay, and O'Donoghue.

15769. There is no place in your district that the hospital accommodation is too far from at present?—Oh, none whatever.

15770. How far is North Portlannington from Mountmellick?—The extreme end of North Portlannington would be about three miles from the workhouse.

15771. But take the town?—Any part of the town in your union?—Oh, yes, one-half of it.

15772. Is that a great deal more than three miles from Mountmellick?—It is only five miles from Mountmellick to Portlannington, from square to square; but from the southern end of North Portlannington would be within one mile of the Workhouse of Mountmellick. I am living within half a mile of the town of Mountmellick.

15773. Do you know whether many sick and poor people pay for their maintenance in the Mountmellick Infirmary?—Mighty few.

15774. Would you be in favour of power being given to the Guardians to recover such proportion, or the entire cost of maintenance, as they might in their discretion think fit?—I would; and I think I am only voicing the views of the general community when I say so.

15775. As regards tramps, have you many of these passing your place?—I have been specially appointed to make a few remarks—at least, I believe they overestimated my abilities for doing so when they appointed me—on that particular point. To commence with, I just want to point out to you one grievance.

We are situated in my particular district between Tallamore Union and Mountmellick, and then it is a general pass-way from Abbeyfeale or from the Dublin unions; there is a regular circuitous route that gives a regular train of tramps. I might divide these into three particular classes, and the most numerous and grievous is the one with long-staffed ears and donkeys, and dilapidated donkeys, that come out at night, and they go from place to place, and not only set the people at defiance, but root up their potatoes, and take their hay in the early part of the season for their ponies and donkeys. The other class is the class that go about, and in the absence of any male attendants in the farmers' houses, go about searching for horse-hair about the stables. All in fish in their nets; they pick anything they get, and the unfortunate people about the house, in the absence of male attendants, are terrified.

15776. Do they ask for money?—They do, but in the event of not getting that, they will ravish the place, and go in search of old bottles. They are a formidable army, and I was asked to say that any way that could be pointed out to put them down—if it was possible to make it criminal—that would sweet the views of the general community, because it is becoming intolerable. Then there are the single couples that go about.

15777. You mean couples of single people?—Men and wife tramps, that go about and find out from house to house where there is some helpless female that they can really terrorise, and take possession of the house; and they will not only sleep a night there, but sleep night after night, and go out during the day, phoning and parading of what they can get, and come in at night, making a general lodging of the place. The police authorities may be very far away from these people, and the people in many cases do not know how to avail themselves of police protection.

15778. They are forced guests?—They are, indeed; and very unacceptable ones.

15779. Mr. MURPHY.—What would you suggest as a remedy?—Unless we could make vagrancy a criminal offence I have nothing to suggest. I am not very well posted on the Act, but, as a grievance, I would like to lay it very fully before our Parliamentary representatives.

15780. If the Guardians had power to detain them three or four days?—We had power in the Mountmellick Union to leave extra duties on them, and they were not carried into effect; there was too much time lost on it.

15781. CHAIRMAN.—There is a country abroad where a man going about not on lawful business is locked up; would you approve of that?—I would.

15782. Mr. MURPHY.—Do these people have children with them as a rule?—Yes, sir; they are generally attended by a train of very disreputable women and children, and these fellows, after making a night's plunder, the women go out and seek alms during the day, and these fellows back off in the sun, if they can avail themselves of it, or bed their kettles, and lie around all day, and go out at night and plunder the hen roosts and potato pits and hay fields, and, as I said before, they are a formidable body in the country.

15783. CHAIRMAN.—There are a good many of that class about you?—A tremendous amount, for the very reason that I have pointed out, that it seems to be a circuitous route for a line of unions.

Mr. Edward Bucke.

DR. MACBEATH FURTHER EXAMINED.

I would like to say I have extensive experience of these tramps, and I think the proper way to deal with them is to take the children away from them. As medical officer of the workhouse I see gangs of these

every morning, the ponies and trap which this gentleman has described are there, the children are put into them and brought round, and they are trained up in vice and neglect, and they know nothing else; I would

Feb. 18, 1864

Dr. George A. Molesworth.

take the children forcibly from them and have the children put in proper surroundings. The men themselves and women I look upon as too far gone; jail is a comfort to them.

15725. CHAIRMAN.—At all events it would be a comfort to people outside, like our friend, not to have them raiding and looting premises?—Yes; it would be a comfort to them.

Mr. PATRICK POWER examined.

Mr. Patrick Power.

15726. CHAIRMAN.—On behalf of what Urban Council do you appear?—Tullamore.

15727. What is your view on the question of amalgamation?—I was here to-day, and I agree with Mr. Peyton, of Edenderry.

15728. You would rather approve of amalgamation if you could be satisfied that a material reduction of the rates would follow?—I believe it would, myself.

15729. That was Mr. Adams' view?—I would agree with it.

15730. Is there anything you would like to add to what Mr. Adams and Mr. Peyton have said on the subject?—No; no more than it would do away with a good deal of the officials. And, of course, with regard to boarding out of the infirm people, there are exceptional cases at the present time in Tullamore Union which, if the board allowed a sum, they could be maintained outside; these are exceptional cases; there are others that could not.

15731. You don't think the boarding-out system of old people could be carried out universally?—No; only in exceptional cases.

15732. Do you think there are such a number as would make it worth while to alter the law to enable the Guardians to board out old people if they wished?—I don't believe it would; you might not get sufficient; of course in all the unions you might find sufficient.

15733. You heard the evidence about the tramps; I suppose in the towns you don't see much of them?—No; there are a certain class—thinkers—that are a terrible nuisance; but there are exceptional cases of tradesmen whose trade has run down in other parts of Ireland.

15734. Those are the honest men really looking for work?—Yes; there are often tramps that it is a necessity for them to go into a work, but these country Guardians include these people all in one group.

15735. You would see the difference, that there were some bona fide decent men looking for work?—They include all. I have known plasterers, and carpenters, and masons looking for work.

15736. Tailors?—Yes; and men of my own business; their trade has run down in other parts of Ireland, and they would have to come to me for work; they are included in the tramp class also.

15737. We don't include them in that?—Yes; the majority of the country Guardians would.

15738. Naturally, you would treat that class of people with consideration; they are honest men, whose only fault is that they cannot get work?—They cannot get work in their own place, and if they stopped at home they would be a burden on the ratepayers in their own union; they would rather look for work than go as paupers.

The Sitting terminated.

THIRTY-SECOND PUBLIC SITTING.—TUESDAY, MARCH 22ND, 1964.

May, 22, 1904.

At the County Council Office, Rathdamney, Dublin.

Present:—MR. MICKS (Chairman), MR. MURNAGHAN, and DR. CONY BIGGES.

Mr. P. J. O'NEILL, S.D., examined

15799. CHAIRMAN.—You are Chairman of the County
Public Health Council?—Yes.

1880. Did the question come before your Council as to whether you thought that former unions could, with advantage, be maintained in the County Dublin?

with advantage, be maintained in the County Council.
—Yes; the question was considered by the County Council, and the main feeling that seemed to prevail was that some effort ought to be made to relieve the congestion in the two unions of Dublin—the North and the South Dublin Unions—wherein an enormously large number of persons are housed at the present time. And with regard to the North Dublin Union, space there does not lend itself to any additional buildings. They are bounded on all sides by public buildings—towers, banks, arcades, and obstructions, in many ways. As regards the South Dublin Union, with regard to the health and well-being of the inmates of the institution would be exercised upon for the purpose of providing additional housing accommodation. My Council approached the question of amalgamation from two points of view. They believe that it would be more equitable and in the interests of the ratepayers generally that one union, or one administrative body, ought to take charge of the entire of the North and South Dublin Unions.

1908. That is that the two unions should be amalgamated?—Yes, amalgamated; and they believe it would lead to economy, and, above all, that it would enable the governing body to establish a better classification than exists at the present time. From the inquiries I have made I am inclined to think the classification is not at all satisfactory, especially in the North Dublin Union, where the space is so terribly congested. The question arises then as to whether it would be possible to relieve this congestion by adding to the area of Ballyrothery and Oulibridge, both of which have workhouses that are only partially occupied at the present time, and if that were impossible would it be possible to transfer from the congested unions in Dublin a certain number of paupers in order to avail of the housing accommodation which exists in the other unions, and, of course, the Guardians of these other unions would be indemnified to the full for whatever cost would be entailed by this transfer. I am rather inclined to think that the latter course would be perhaps somewhat objectionable, not from the North or South Dublin Union point of view, but from the point of view of the rural unions, because it is a notorious fact that certain people frequent the city unions who, happily, are very much fewer in the rural unions.

10832. What class do you refer to particularly—the men and women?—Yes, and as well as that I refer to women of immature character. It is a well-known fact that there are great numbers of these who mist of maturity go into all city unions, and the question is whether it might be objectionable from that point of view to introduce these into all forms of public life. But as all across the general belief is that some effort ought to be made to amalgamate the unions of North and South Dublin, and have them placed under one administrative board, and that some effort ought to be made to relieve the congestion in these unions, be enable the governing body to carry out better classification than exists at the present time. There is another aspect of the question, that is with regard to the wages.

1963. As regards the classification, before you leave it, did you think at all how this classification might be carried out, whether by making one workhouse for the males and another for the females, or anything of that sort?—Well, we thought it might be possible to have, say the boys of the entire union housed in one particular place—

18804. *Calce.*, say?—Yes; and the girls elsewhere.

15866. Palletstown?—Yes; and as well as that I would be strongly in favour of having an age classification, because I think it is extremely hard on the destitute poor in their old age to be obliged to herd with people of a different time of life, and whose temperaments at this particular time differ so much from those of old people. I think the age classification ought to be introduced into the unions so that the aged should be kept by themselves.

15856. That is, of course, within the power of the Guardians at present?—It is within their power if they had space, but they have not, of course. Then, with regard to the rate, I think it would be more equitable there should be a uniform rate—more business-like—in the two unions. There is a difference in the rates in the North and South Dublin Unions at the present time. I believe, of something like from 8d. to 10d.

15607. We will have that more fully from the desks of the members—Then there is another point I would like to direct attention to. I believe the representatives of the North Dublin Union were somewhat unfortunate with regard to the agricultural grant, which was based, as we know, from the figures for the years 1896-97, and through some unfortunate coincidences—

1880's. Economy?—It was not economy. It might have been for the time. It has been sadly otherwise since. The agricultural grant in the North Dublin Union is entirely different from what it would have been if the rate in that year had been a rate to meet conditions under the Poor Law heads.

15809. It was under the average rate 1--It was under the average rate.

18810. Mr. J. C. Jones. I happen to know how much below the average it was. The Clerk of the Union will be able to tell you that, but I am rather inclined to think there was an election in prospect at the time when the war was three years was being struck, and I suppose it sometimes tends to popularize their names with the newspapers if they are able to give a show of the rates being reduced, even though it is only temporary; and in this instance it has been a source of considerable loss to the union up to the present. My Council would be also in favour of having idiots and insane removed from the workhouses altogether. I am rather inclined to think that they are not as well cared there as they should be in most instances. Of course I do not suggest that they should be all transferred to asylums, where they should be expensively treated and guarded, as they are in the Richmond Asylum, because I do not believe that most of these patients would require the same supervision as patients suffering from acute mania, and I think it might be possible to create lunatic asylums, so to speak—

15321. But at all events you would be in favour of getting them out of the warehouse?—Yes.

10812. Our warrant does not enable us to go further than that—I understand.

15813. You, then, would approve of having an auxiliary lunatic asylum rather than a full-blown county or district asylum?—Yes; I think it could be more economically managed. I have no doubt it could.

15914. Have you gone into the relative cost of inmates, say in the North or South Dublin Union and in the Richmond Asylum; did you compare them together?—No: I have not compared the figures.

19615. You are under the impression that there is a very startling and large difference, are you?—I don't think, when you take into consideration the grant in aid—the recurrent grant—that the figure would be so very startling.

15816. It might be on the other side; it might be cheaper to the ratepayers to have a man in the asylum, possibly?—I don't think it would be cheaper to have them in an asylum at the present time, because the cost

Nov. 25, 1884.

Mr. P. J.
O'NEILL.

of the Richmond Asylum, by reason of the enormous sum spent on buildings, is very large, and the rate per head, though not largely in excess, is certainly higher than the rate in some other asylums in Ireland, as we know.

15817. It is higher than a good many?—Yes. That is mainly due to the enormous expenditure recently undertaken. They have spent between £300,000 and £400,000 on buildings.

15818. Have you any accurate idea of all as to the cost of an inmate in the workhouse, say a sick inmate in the workhouse?—I know that the cost in Balthethery is very small, say about 5s. or 6s. a week.

15819. What would that 5s. pay for?—The entire upkeep and the establishment.

15820. No; only the food and clothing. If you want to get the real cost of an inmate you would have to add the officers' salaries, the establishment charges, and gratuities on leave, to put it on the same level, and when that was done we have been surprised in a great many instances in the country to find how little difference there was between the two charges?—I would be altogether in favour, even if it would mean an increase of rates, of having them taken charge of by an asylum authority and removed out of the workhouse. It should be also borne in mind, especially with regard to the North and South Dublin Unions, where the congestion is so acute at the present time, that some expenditure must be undertaken to provide housing accommodation for them if the present state of things is to be maintained.

15821. That would get rid of a large number from the workhouse—the inmates?—There has been a very large transfer within the last two years from the workhouse, and the number of inmates in the workhouse has been considerably reduced.

15822. About 500 between the two houses?—Yes. I don't speak with so much authority regarding the South Union, because I understand the mentally afflicted there are specially provided for, and I have been given to understand, though I have no personal knowledge of the fact, that better provision has been made with regard to means than in most instances in workhouses, but that is not true, unfortunately. I am afraid, with regard to the North Dublin Union. I would be also in favour of increasing the powers conferred on Guardians with regard to the granting of outdoor relief. I think when old and infirm people are, through bare necessity, driven to pass the declining hours of their lives in the workhouse by reason of their domestic arrangements—an old infirm parent may be resident with a young boy or girl, a son or daughter, and they may have an idea of getting married, and don't wish to handicap the household by keeping this old non-earning individual resident in the house—I am only dealing with it from the economic point of view—I certainly would be in favour of enabling the Guardians to grant such relief in that case as would warrant the son or daughter, or keeper of the house, maintaining and keeping that old person resident in their own home; and I believe, from humanitarian motives and from all others, they would be better taken care of than they would be in an asylum or an institution. I think it is extremely hard on persons who have led honest, industrious lives to be obliged to pass the end of their days in an institution of that kind, and I think some provision ought to be made whereby the Guardians would be enabled to make such grants of outdoor relief as would enable these people to keep their aged parents in their own homes and to maintain them. With regard to the granting of relief to a woman with an old child only, she might be in just as necessary circumstances as one who had a large family, and I think it is a great hardship that she should be deprived of all right of receiving any relief from the rates.

15823. You would extend the power to give relief to women having one or more legitimate children?—Quite so.

15824. Are your opinions generally—not in detail, of course—the opinions of your Council, as far as you are aware?—There was a meeting of the Council for the purpose of enabling the members to express their views, in order that the views of the general body might be considered and the evidence of the County Council put forward. We discussed the question from various points of view and in all its aspects as regards the Dublin unions.

15825. Your general conclusion was it would be well to amalgamate North and South Dublin Unions. Did you not come to any definite conclusion as regards Balthethery and Colbride?—These were merely suggested

with regard to the effort to be made to relieve the congestion in the Dublin unions. We would not advocate an abolition of Balthethery or Colbride, but we would think it desirable that the buildings which are there available should be utilized if they could be economically utilized to relieve the congestion in the North and South Dublin Unions.

15826. Did you consider the Rathdown Union as all?—The Rathdown Union seems to have a fair number of inmates at the present time. I think they have got 600 there already.

15827. They have got a large number?—I don't think they have got very much surplus space, and it has been also represented to us that their housing accommodation was pretty well taken up.

15828. So your scheme would not propose any interference with the existing state of affairs in Rathdown?—No. Of course there is a great difficulty in dealing with a union which is at present partly in one county and partly in another. For my part I would not be in favour of one local authority declaring and determining that a union in an adjoining county which serves both counties should be disestablished simply because one of the counties thought it would be to their advantage that it should be done. I would be very slow to make a general recommendation with regard to unions that were not situated entirely in our own county.

15829. Have you considered at all the questions that have been raised at a good many of the inquiries before us, the question as to whether or not the county boundaries should be coterminous with union boundaries?—I think I would be rather in favour of that, because I can see considerable difficulties arising from the contrary fact, but at the same time I think it has been found to work moderately well.

15830. For the convenience of the sick it has worked well, as far as you are aware?—Yes; I have not heard any complaint to the contrary with regard to Balthethery, with which I am more familiar. Of course now, since the Act of 1886 came into operation, the union boundary has been made the county boundary.

15831. You speak about getting all inmates out of the workhouses; are there any other classes that you think might, with advantage, be removed from workhouses; take the children?—Certainly, I would be in favour of the boarding out of children. I think the want of the workhouse strikes at any child that is reared within its precincts.

15832. Do you prefer boarding out to an institution for the rearing of children?—I would. I think they are more likely to be brought up in habits of thrift and industry, and more likely to make useful members of society if they are reared in a family circle than they will be in an institution, however well managed or governed.

15833. Would you be in favour of a change in the law; at present you can only board out orphans and deserted children. A very large number of children in workhouses are the children of vicious or drunken parents, who are rather hopeless people to put in charge of children. Would you be in favour of a change in the law that would give the Guardians, subject to some appeal, we will say, to some court or other, the right to place themselves in loco parentis and take charge of the child and board it out?—Certainly I would; because though I am a strong believer in the law of heredity with regard to the human race, still I think if there is any chance of these children ever becoming useful members of society they would best obtain that chance by contact with the world and by the example of those around them and by the example of the children among whom they would be reared and who would be under the control of their parents.

15834. Then you would give that discretion to the Guardians?—I would. I admit there is a risk, undoubtedly, in it, but at the same time I think for the greatest good of the greatest number I would be in favour of running the risk, because I am firmly convinced it would be for the best.

15835. At all events you would give the Guardians power?—Yes.

15836. As regards an appeal—conceivably a Board of Guardians might, in the hurry of the day's business, make some order which could not be sustained on very careful inquiry—you would provide for some appeal, say to the Petty Sessions Court or to some other court?—I am rather inclined to think that the local governing bodies at the present time might have the right of appeal to a committee of the County Council or some body.

15837. I am speaking rather from another point of

view, as regards the parent of a child who feels himself aggrieved by the decision of the Guardians taking away the child from him; in such case would you give the parent the right of appeal to a court of law for a legal investigation of the grounds on which the Guardians propose to take away the child?—I think that would be reasonable, perhaps, from the parental point of view, but at the same time I am rather inclined to think that it is not a power that would be exercised to any considerable extent, because, unfortunately, these people do not take as much interest in their offspring as they might be expected to take when they become inmates of a pauper institution, but at the same time it is rather a sentimental than a practical safeguard, in my opinion, to give them the right, but possibly it might be an advantage to do it.

15838. If such a change were made in the law would you anticipate there would be very few children to be provided for in an institution; do you think there would be any difficulty in boarding out practically all the children that would come into the hands of the Guardians?—I would not apprehend there would be any difficulty in rural districts, but in the rural districts attached to the North and South Dublin Unions I would be distinctly inclined to think there would be great difficulty in finding a sufficient number of proper people to take charge of the children there.

15839. I suppose you know that in the South Dublin Union they board the children altogether outside the union—in the County Wicklow?—I was not aware of that fact. Outside their taxable area altogether?

15840. Yes; there is no limit on them?—Certainly, I would be in favour.

15841. I have seen in some of the Welsh or South of England unions that they are boarding out children in the North of England?—I certainly would be in favour of sending the city children into the country, perhaps outside the unions abutting on the city altogether. I think they would have a better chance if they got with the associations of city life entirely.

15842. And were reared up for agricultural labourers or some other healthy occupation?—Quite so. I think if they are allowed to remain in the confines of the city they are much more likely to be absorbed into the vicious classes.

15843. That would take the children out of the work-house?—Yes.

15844. Another class we have to think of are the mothers, or girls, who come in to be confined in the workhouse of illegitimate children. At the first meeting we held here in Dublin, some months ago, the suggestion was made it might be desirable if, instead of going into the workhouse, as they do at present, some two or three months before their confinement, where they meet with a vicious class, it would be better if these women were sent to a sort of reformatory, or refuge. The men could take charge of these institutions for Catholic girls, and it would be under Protestant management for Protestant girls?—I think that would be a most desirable change.

15845. You would be in favour of that?—Strongly.

15846. You think the rates would be well expended in paying slightly more to take them away from contamination?—Yes.

15847. It was very strongly put before me that one might expect that these girls who come in with their first children might be reclaimed?—Quite so.

15848. And would not continue to lead vicious lives, as so many of the workhouse girls at present do, having two, three, four, five, and sometimes six children dependent on them—all illegitimate?—I think that would be a most desirable change, and even if it should increase the expenditure from the rates I would be strongly in favour of it.

15849. That would take away another very large class from the workhouse?—Yes; and a most desirable one to eliminate. That is the class that gives the most trouble.

15850. And produces the taint, as it is called?—Yes.

15851. That would refer to all workhouses in Ireland, of course?—Certainly. I think that would be an enormous advantage.

15852. Then you would have left, practically, the sick and the aged and the infirm?—Quite so.

15853. These could be classified in the way you indicated some time ago, according to their respectability, and age, and other matters?—Quite so.

15854. There would be another class—the class of tramps or vagrants?—They certainly are the pests of society, and it is extremely hard to know what to do with them. I certainly have not been able to derive anything in my own mind that would at all deal satis-

factorily with them. In Drogheda we suffer considerably from that class, as it is on the highway between Dublin and Drogheda, and great numbers of them partake of the hospitality of Drogheda on their way to and from Dublin—over 2,000 in the year.

15855. Mr. Murnaghan, my colleague, gave me a Bill which was introduced into the House of Commons a few days ago, proposing to deal with that class in England by depriving them of their liberty and sending them off to labour colonies, where they would be detained and an effort made to bring them into working habits?—Yes; that certainly would be a drastic remedy.

15856. It is extensively adopted in Belgium at present, where it is said to be a great success?—Of course, in the first instance, it might work a hardship, but, ultimately, when that class learned what they were likely to get by following this nomadic life, they might alter their ways, seeing that it would be impossible to follow the practices of the present time, so that I think we might not have too much consideration for them if they had sufficient warning that if they were to follow the habits they had been indulging in the law would provide this method for dealing with them; and if they then came within the meshes of the law I think they would be entitled to no consideration.

15857. You contemplate vagrant classes composed of able-bodied persons?—Precisely.

15858. A great many of the casual class are composed of persons who are not profitable labourers, who would not be likely to be employed for a full day's work, but still even they, if they were put into such a colony, could be made to work as far as possible?—As far as their capabilities enabled them. I think that would be distinctly useful.

15859. They are people who could not get work in a steady way outside?—Quite so. They can earn wages. They cannot follow ordinary occupations.

15860. Except these casual jobs?—Yes, I think that would be a desirable change, undoubtedly.

15861. I suppose you think that no smaller provision should be made for the sick than exists; even if a workhouse like Drogheda or Coleridge were closed, that a hospital ought to be maintained there if it were at a convenient distance for the sick of the locality or the district?—I am afraid no provision could be made for the abolition of the hospitals without causing hardship to the sick poor.

15862. So, even if the unions were broken up, you think the hospital ought to remain?—I fancy so. I quite understand that.

15863. Mr. MURKIN.—When this matter comes before your Council, was it on the notice given to the members that this matter would be discussed?—It was.

15864. Was there any division of opinion on the subject?—There was no substantial division of opinion on the subject. Of course members representing the districts which might be affected by the proposed changes might not look with the same favour on the introduction of the paupers, say, from the city workhouses into those in the rural districts, but there was no substantial difference of opinion.

15865. You were substantially agreed on the main question, that is, that the two unions should be amalgamated, and that the government should be under one body?—Quite so.

15866. You speak about the North Dublin Union as being very much congested. Suppose the two classes alluded to by the chairman and yourself were removed, the children and the inmates, would not that relieve the congestion considerably?—Undoubtedly; and that would be most desirable. In fact I believe it is scarcely possible to have satisfactory administration in the North Dublin Union as it exists at present, by reason of the congestion.

15867. Have you any suggestion to make, for instance, as regards the children for whom homes could not be found? We take it for granted that the children could be largely boarded out in the country. But suppose it did happen that some of the children could not find homes, would you suggest any provision for their temporary retention that could be made. Where would you suggest they should be kept?—Provision has been made for these children in the North Dublin Union at Cabre at the present time, where, I think, a very suitable building has been raised for the purpose of keeping them; and if the governing authority in the two unions, speaking of them in that way, found it impossible to find homes for the children when they desired to send out, I think they ought to be kept at an institution such as that; but I certainly would be in favour

Mar. 22, 1904.

Mr. P. J.
O'Neill.

Mar 22, 1894.

Mr. P. J.
O'Sullivan.

of mixing them with the population as largely as possible, and bringing them up as ordinary members of the community.

15888. Have you any particular knowledge of the working of industrial schools?—There is a very large industrial school at Acton, within a short distance of where I live, and I visit that from time to time, and I am very much impressed with the way in which that is conducted at the present time by the Christian Brothers, and I think they make the best possible effort to bring up their boys in habits of thrift and industry, and to lay the foundation of a useful life.

15889. CHAIRMAN.—Would not such a school be available as a safety valve. We are assuming that the Guardians would, as far as possible, board the children out. If for any reason it would be found impossible to board children out, would industrial schools be available so as to relieve the Guardians from the expense of having to keep up an institution like Cebra for children that they might not be able to board out?—Certainly; I think that would be a very useful way and a desirable way, because I am strongly of opinion that it is desirable that children should be placed under discipline, and where religious discipline can be combined with the other, I think it is desirable they should be afforded the opportunity of being brought up as useful and efficient members of society, and in whatever religion they are reared or professed to be.

15890. Mr. MURPHY.—In regard to the question of the county being self-contained, that is, that it should have the management not only of its own county business, but also of its Poor Law business, have you any special view on that point. For instance, if there were an institution of an adjoining union class by, should the Guardians have power to board out in the adjoining union some of their inmates, rather than have to send them long distances. Do you ever consider that question?—I am rather inclined to think that is a question that would be favourably considered. I am aware that the question of boarding-out lunatics, which is agitating the public mind at present, has worked well in other countries, but I am inclined to think that sentiment would, in a very large degree, prevent the Irish people from falling in with a general scheme of that kind, and I am afraid it would not be found to be practicable.

15891. But if there was the other union building close to the boundaries of a county, would you think it right to give the Guardians power to board out inmates therein instead of having to send them long distances?—Certainly.

15892. You see no objection to that?—None whatever.

15893. In our investigations we have not found that sentiment to be as strong as you think. We find the people who are chronic inmates of a house have very few friends to visit them. It is only in regard to the sick that the visits are any way frequent or regular at all.—I quite recognise that point, that it is to the hospital patients that most of the visitors who go to workhouses pay their visits.

15894. My query referred to the aged, and the infirm, and the chronic sick.—The idea is to still retain the hospitals for the acute sick.—Quite so.

15895. The idea put forward by some witnesses is that fewer workhouses should be in each county; that in fact in a moderately-sized county one workhouse for the aged and infirm might be enough. Of course that does not apply to a city like Dublin.—I don't think so.

15896. But the general trend of opinion is that the number of workhouses can be very much reduced?—I would not imagine that either the inmates of the institution or their friends would be in any degree aggrieved by reason of their being removed a distance from their homes in order to secure accommodation for them. It was not in that connection that I suggested there would be a sentimental objection. The connection in which I suggested there would be a sentimental objection would be this, that if it was proposed to board out the inmates with a family other than their own, the Irish people would not take kindly to that at all.

15897. You would not approve of the boarding-out system of lunatics?—I don't think the Irish people would take kindly to it. It is a question that has not been experimented on here.

15898. It is rather a new proposal.—Quite a recent subject, but it has been found to work very well in Belgium.

15899. On the whole you think the system would be better if there was an amalgamation of the two workhouses in the city of Dublin—that it would be beneficial to the poor?—I think a change is essential, and

I can see no other way in which it can be brought about except by that means.

15900. It would afford a better system of classification?—It would afford a better system of classification.

15901. It would reduce the congestion also?—Yes, it would reduce the congestion, as well as tend to more economical administration.

15902. Dr. BRUCE.—Has your Council considered the advisability of removing the inmates from the workhouses to the county asylum?—That is a question that has been under consideration from time to time here. We have discussed the administration of the Richmond Asylum at considerable length here for some years past, and there have been some rather harsh criticisms of the management of the Richmond Asylum with regard to the want of economy that was present there; and all these questions came up for discussion.

15903. That does not touch the question very much—the cost of keeping a lunatic in the asylum compared with the cost of keeping him in the workhouse?—That aspect of the question was not dealt with exhaustively, I admit.

15904. You contribute considerably to the Richmond Asylum?—Yes, a very substantial sum, about £30,000 a year, I think; more than that ever, because we contribute for the townships as well. Mr. Blackburne has got the figures. I think our quarterly contributions amount to between £50,000 and £70,000 a year altogether.

15905. That is taken up equally all over your county, and not in any of the counties which are joined with you?—Precisely. We get a demand from the Richmond Asylum authority previous to the striking of a rate, stating they will require a certain contribution from the County Council for the maintenance of our inmates in our taxable area, and we have got to pay that demand.

15906. That is equal all over the different counties?—Precisely; in accordance with the number of inmates.

15907. You say you received a very large number recently from the Dublin workhouses?—Yes, a great number have been transferred within the past year and a half from the North Union Workhouse to the Richmond Asylum; in fact the admissions there have increased and continue to increase at a rather alarming rate, to such an extent indeed that if it goes on as it has been there will not be provision to adequately house them in the Richmond Asylum in a short time.

15908. Sending in so many inmates from the North Dublin Union—in that fair to other unions that perhaps do not participate to the same extent, seeing that these inmates in the workhouses are supported entirely out of their own districts?—Yes; but certain conditions have got to be complied with in order to secure their admission to the Richmond Asylum, and if the Guardians of the union can satisfy the medical superintendent there that it is impossible for them to give adequate and proper treatment to the inmates at their institution, they have practically little option but to receive them. It is not for them to stay in inquiry as to whether the proportion between the North and the South Dublin Union is the same.

15909. Is not it a proper subject for a County Council to consider—some way of making it equitable by taking all the inmates and putting them all on the same basis. If you are only receiving part of it off the general rate and the other part is not in proper proportion, there is something unfair?—The South Dublin Union is better situated. They have made better provision for housing their inmates than it has been possible to make in the North Union. The result is they keep a large number of them there; but that is for the local authority to decide and determine, whether or not they have a grievance against the taxing authority by allowing a larger proportion of inmates to be sent into their asylum from one union than from another.

15910. CHAIRMAN.—At all events you consider they ought to be all removed out of the workhouses?—I would be in favour of it.

15911. Dr. BRUCE.—That is to penalise the workhouse authorities for making good provision in their own workhouses?—I quite admit it is, but personally I think the provision that has been made can be used to useful purposes in connection with the administration of the union affairs generally.

15912. Is it not time that this should be put on a proper basis for all the inmates, whether in a union or asylum, so as to have an equal equitable rule?—It might be possible to give unions that had made adequate provision for the insane a capitation grant.

15005. However the County Council have not considered it as all its bearings?—They have not dealt with that aspect of it.

15004. Have they much available space at Portlanoth?—Yes, there are 400 acres of land.

15005. I mean to say in the way of housing?—The housing accommodation is almost entirely availed of at the present time. Except for the temporary buildings, which were erected to relieve the congestion when the West-End broke out, eight or ten years ago in the Infected Asylum, the housing accommodation has been availed of.

15006. How many would the temporary buildings accommodate?—They do accommodate 400, but they are only wooden buildings.

15007. But they are equipped?—Yes.

15008. And nobody occupies them?—Yes.

15009. Would it not be infinitely better to have 400 there. Would that not tend to reduce your average cost of lunatics in the asylum?—The increase in numbers.

15010. Yes?—Well, I don't know. We have reached, if one might use the phrase, the grand total of 2,600 to provide for, and I don't think there would be much relief by increasing that by 300 or 400.

15011. It would not mean much, but it would be a proportionate reduction to some extent.

15012. You mentioned some time ago that there was a very large cost for maintenance?—Yes.

15013. And that the average, therefore, of the inmates was very high?—Yes.

15014. That would be reduced by the larger number?—They would be some relief on the capital charge per head, but on the maintenance charge I don't think they would be.

15015. Do the County Council contribute to the county infirmary?—They do contribute to a county infirmary, the Meath Hospital. That is a point I am glad you raised, because the feeling with regard to it at the present time is that the county does not get adequate recompense for the money which they contribute.

15016. Why?—The reason being that the patients are not so well disposed to go to a hospital which is not under the control or charge of those as they are to other hospitals in the city. I myself, for instance, have had applications in my own district, applications for notes of recommendation to city hospitals, and they particularly a hospital. I said: "I have no authority to give you any letter there; my letter would be of no use to you; but I will give you a ticket of admission to the Meath Hospital if you go, which will absolutely secure your admission there," and they said "No." That has actually occurred.

15017. Had they any experience of the second hospital?—I could not say. I don't for a moment suggest they are not properly taken care of in the Meath Hospital, because I have no knowledge of its working; but from inquiries I have made, I believe that patients are properly taken care of in the Meath Hospital, but the objection to going there is rather a sentimental one. In fact my Council were strongly considering the advisability of asking the Local Government Board to enable them to divide the contributions which they are obliged to make to a county infirmary with other hospitals which are situated in the county area, and which do an enormous amount of good in relieving the sick poor. Kingstown Hospital, for example.

15018. Would you think they should be a county charge?—If it is made mandatory on a County Council to contribute a certain sum for a county infirmary, the feeling we would have in regard to it is, the county authority ought to have some voice in deciding what the county infirmary should be.

15019. You would be in favour of the County Council contributing to hospitals generally through the county?—I would be in favour of the County Council when it is making a grant distributing that grant among the hospitals which confer the greatest good on the largest number of the community in their own area.

15020. CHAIRMAN.—What is your grant to the Meath?—£1,000 a year. There are twenty beds available for county patients in the Meath Hospital.

15021. Ten male and ten for female patients?—I expect that would be the division, but I don't quite know; but really I do not think that at any time these beds are fully availed of. I am not suggesting anything against the hospital authorities. It is simply because the people won't go.

15022. Dr. BODDIE.—Carry your argument a little bit further. Would you be in favour of having all the hospitals in the county under county management?—Do you mean hospitals other than union hospitals?

15023. I mean all the hospitals that would be wholly supported out of the rates, such as union hospitals?—

I would be in favour of enabling the county authority, if it were believed that these institutions were conferring a sufficient benefit on the sick poor in their taxable area, making a contribution towards the upkeep and maintenance of these hospitals if they desire.

15024. With regard to consumption, have you considered the desirability of establishing sanatoria for the treatment and cure of consumption?—That question was not raised.

15025. It is attracting great attention all over the country at the present time?—Properly and deservedly so.

15026. What is your own idea?—I certainly think that if a home, or hospital, or sanatorium for the treatment of that disease were established, I would be in favour of allowing the local body to send patients there, and pay for them if they so desired.

15027. The local body to pay for them?—To pay for them out of the rates.

15028. Who would be in charge of it. Who would start and administer it. What body would you propose to do that?—It is at present to be mainly supported out of the rates, I would certainly be in favour of having it under the control of a popular body.

15029. The County Council of a County?—The County Council of a county, or a joint committee of several County Councils, because I am rather inclined to think it would be hardly economical to have a home established in each county for this particular thing.

15030. CHAIRMAN.—Mind I fully you would want one in Dublin?—Yes; but I can quite understand if one were established for Leinster. In the first instance it would be the most economical way of starting, in order to see what amount of benefit would be conferred, and how largely it would be availed of.

15031. The doctors, I think, have made up their minds as to the extent of the benefit?—Doctors are an authority on the question, but even doctors without the co-operation of patients cannot accomplish everything.

15032. On the question of rating, is there anything that occurs to you?—I am not very certain.

15033. Dr. BODDIE has just alluded to the possibility of making the sick in all the counties a county charge as distinguished from a district or union charge. At present you have a county infirmary, and the £1,000 you spend on it is a county-at-large charge. Would you be in favour of having all the sick a county-at-large charge in the same way as the county infirmary and the lunatics are?—I am not very certain that that would work out equitably. I am rather inclined to think that the confines of cities would rather derive a considerable benefit from such organisation as that, because of course cities are really the homes of disease in many instances, and those who may be afflicted gravely in many instances towards the suburbs or outskirts of the city, and it would be rather hard on the remote rural districts to be compelled to bear whatever burden would be indicated on the rates by making all the sick county-at-large rather than district charges.

15034. We have had evidence from some of those outlying districts rather complaining that the people far away, in places, we will say, like Ballinagney, would never dream of going to a county infirmary, but go to hospitals close by, like Balrothery, and they don't think it is fair they should be paying for hospitals which they never use; and it has been stated by some witnesses that it would be desirable that the sick at Balrothery should be a county charge, just as much as the sick in Dublin city, who are relieved in the Meath Hospital?—I don't think distance with regard to the county infirmary has very much to say to the question. I think that the larger number of patients who go to the county infirmary—I am speaking now of the Meath Hospital—come rather from the urban districts; but I have known patients from Ballinagney to be sent to the Meath Hospital; for instance, patients who go in for a surgical operation.

15035. It is, of course, very near?—Very accessible, by rail.

15036. In a small county; but when you come to places forty and fifty miles away, as you sometimes have in places like Donegal?—Yes; but we have no district that would be separated by more than twenty miles from Dublin.

15037. Nothing further occurs to you about rating?—There is a question with regard to rating, but I am rather inclined to think that it would not perhaps come within the purview of your inquiry. It is with reference to the administration of the public health charges in rural districts.

15038. That would not come within our scope?—I rather thought it would not; but I have a view with regard to that, and I have known cases in which it has worked rather serious trouble.

Nov. 22, 1904.

Mr. P. J. O'Neil.

May 25, 1904

Mr. Joseph
Mooney.

Mr. JOSEPH MOONEY, J.P., examined.

15932. CHAIRMAN.—You have heard what Mr. O'Neill said, and you were present at the County Council when that question was discussed?—I was, but, Mrs. Mr. O'Neill, I think the ideas of the County Council were rather scattered, like my own. I had not any very exact idea of what should be done, and I am afraid I am in pretty much the same position now, and I don't know what I could say to you, or what you would wish me to say.

15933. You have heard the evidence that Mr. O'Neill has given. And anything strikes you as to that. Are you disposed to differ from him in any way?—There is one very fixed conviction I have formed, in which I think Mr. O'Neill agrees with me, and that is that the hospitals should be separated from the workhouses.

15934. That they should be converted into district hospitals?—Anything you like to call them; but that poor men or women when they get sick should not be obliged to become inmates of a workhouse before they get medical relief. I consider that a hardship on the poor people themselves. I don't think it is fair that a person who is not a pauper but is sick has to become a pauper, and wear pauper clothes, and be admitted as a pauper in order to get medical or surgical relief. I believe, from my experience of workhouses, that the inmates are largely recruited from the hospitals, when the person is cured of the disease. These hospitals are generally crowded, and they cannot keep them very well in the hospitals until they are thoroughly cured and fit to go back to work, so they are transferred to the infirm department.

15935. To the infirm ward?—Yes; and in that way it is found, although the philanthropists say they are not very well treated there, they are frequently not in a hurry to leave it; then when they do go back to their work, or into the city, they have less difficulty in seeking relief in the workhouse later on. They are more or less persecuted by the fact that they are sent to the hospital as paupers.

15936. You would cut off the hospital from the infirm ward?—Completely.

15937. And make it impossible to send a person there when convalescent?—Yes; I would treat them as Jewish-street Hospital or the Mater Hospital would treat them, for the disease, and when cured let them go back to where they came from.

15938. Or in convalescent hospitals. Would it not be necessary to establish some?—The Mater has a convalescent home.

15939. Most of the hospitals have convalescent homes now?—I hope soon they will all have them.

15940. Therefore you would say some convalescent places, Baldoonery, or some place of that sort, if it was not required, could be used to send them out to for country air. Would you approve of that, sending them to a diseased workhouse?—I would have the hospital managed altogether distinct from the workhouse. If the managers of it thought it desirable to have a convalescent home, I would let them get it, just as the managers of the Mater got theirs.

15941. Would you be in favour of their getting it cheaply, getting one of the diseased workhouses?—I don't like the notion of a diseased workhouse. There is a sort of sentiment against it. I would rather make them industrial places. I would rather like to see looms working in them, or something of that kind, make factories of them.

15942. Do you think they would be suitable for any industrial work. Could you put in machinery into those places, looms, for instance?—I think they would be as suitable for it as for the other purposes. They would not be very suitable for other. They can be made to serve industrial purposes, some of them. My knowledge is with regard to the Co. Dublin. I am entirely confined to it, and I don't see how any workhouse in the Co. Dublin could be closed. Baldoonery, although they have not a large number of inmates—they have only 160—I don't know where they could be accommodated.

15943. Is that owing to the fact of other workhouses being so full?—Yes; and besides, you see I am not a very advanced philanthropist with regard to poor people—I don't profess to be—and I have very often controverted some of the propositions of the very good people who put forward all these reforms; but I think it would be a piece of great inhumanity against the poor, whether they are few or many, to oblige them to go from a place like Baldoonery to the North Union or the South Union, or Celbridge or Rathdown, to get medical relief. I think they should get medical relief near where they live. If Baldoonery or Celbridge have

to be maintained for the treatment of sick people, I don't know whether they should be closed as separate ones. In addition to the sick people, the next class would be the aged and infirm people, who have to seek relief in workhouses. It would be very hard on these people to send them twenty or thirty miles away. A great many of these are decent poor people, especially in the rural districts, and it would separate them from their friends and relations; some of them have them.

15944. That does take place over a great part of Ireland at present, owing to the size of a great many of the unions?—Yes, but if that is a hardship it would be greatly increased by closing these workhouses.

15945. It has not been represented to me as a hardship where it is in actual operation?—That is the difficulty I see about closing any of the workhouses in the Co. Dublin. I would certainly have the hospitals separate in their management from the workhouse.

15946. What do you think of the question of amalgamating the two Dublin workhouses that Mr. O'Neill referred to?—The workhouses are so very large that it seems rather a strange thing to say they should be amalgamated, but I think there might be something gained in amalgamation of the management. I think that might not be very much. I suppose one of the clerks might go if they were amalgamated, but I don't think other points would have to be retained. There might be better classification obtained by the amalgamation. One class, say the boys, might be transferred from the North to the South, or vice versa. Better classification might be got reasonably, but I believe still, if my idea about the hospitals was carried out, that the amalgamation would be reduced in both these unions. I think there would not be nearly so many paupers in them if they had not that system of transferring people to the infirm department.

15947. You think a great many of the inmates are convalescents?—They are chronic; the inmates of the hospitals.

15948. A great many people are sent out of the hospitals owing to the want of space, and are sent into the aged and infirm wards before they are quite fit to go back to their homes again, if they have them?—They are obliged to transfer them. That has to be done.

15949. We noticed that ourselves in the South Dublin Workhouse?—Perhaps before I pass from the hospitals I would like to say that of course what I have said would involve doing away with the pauper students. If separated from the workhouse the hospitals would not have any of these pauper students at all. That would, in the first instance, increase the cost, but I believe that in a very short time it would tend to reduce it, because that is another of the things which attract people, and people of a rather workless class, who should be earning their bread outside the workhouse. In the hospitals they get little pots, and they get little tips from visitors, and they get that in all the hospitals, these attendants. I believe in the Mater, or Jewish-street, or anywhere, visitors who go to see patients frequently give some little gratuity, so I don't think workhouse hospitals are much worse in that respect than others; but I believe that owing to the fact that a considerable number of the healthy inmates do hold little positions of that kind, the workhouse hospitals have tend to attract them to the workhouse and keep up the number, so I think the separation of the hospitals from the workhouse would have more than one advantage. I don't know whether I might say a word about the nursing or not?

15950. Yes?—Well, I think the nursing is being overdone. In the North Union—since I left it I am told there is an increase there—for years there was a number of women who acted as night nurses, and although they were not what is called trained nurses—and, in my opinion, there was no necessity they should be—they were respectable, sensible women, who had a considerable knowledge of the art, and who had given satisfaction for years; and I may say the Local Government Board inspectors frequently said that the nursing there was satisfactory. That was stated publicly at the inquiry a couple of years ago before the Privy Council. But since then some of these women died or resigned, and the Local Government Board insisted on trained nurses taking their places. Now, I venture to say that it is simply wasting the skill of trained nurses to make them do night nursing in a hospital which is largely peopled by the sick people, by chronic cases. Of course, I could understand, and I quite agree, that some trained nurses would be necessary for day work, but at night time,

nurses in some very acute cases, most people are supposed to be resting, and they are not treated by doctors at night, and the assistance of a skilled, trained nurse is not at all as necessary at night as in the day time. I would like to see one or two trained nurses in a large hospital like that of the South Union, but I do not think that the twelve or fourteen—I forget how many it is, there is a considerable number of these night nurses—I don't think it is necessary they should be all employed by trained nurses, and I do not think it tends to the good working of the place. I am strongly in favour of the raising of the nurse. I had sixteen years' experience of it.

15948. They don't nurse at night in the South Dublin Union?—No, but the trained nurses have been put on for day work as well as night. It is the night I object to as a piece of extravagance, more especially as the cost, of course, is double that of the day; but I may say in the North Union the same as the nursing at night.

Mr. O'Neill (Clerk, North Union).—There are two night nurses.

Witness.—They did not when I was in it, but they became night nurses afterwards. The same in the South Union would undertake night nursing. But my point is, that it is not necessary to have all trained nurses at night. There is nothing for them to do.

15949. CHAIRMAN.—I don't say we agree with you. We have your views on that.

Witness.—In these any other question you wish to refer to—I have heard a great deal said about boarding-out the children. Of course you are aware in both the Dublin unions, in all the Dublin unions, the orphan and destitute children are boarded out. These are the only children that can be boarded out under the law as it stands; and then the other children of the North Union are in a very fine establishment at Cabra, and some of the children of the South Union are in a similar place, but it is not at all so good, because it is only a temporary place, bought in at Cabra where the workhouse got overcrowded.

When I was a member of the Board it was intended that the girls should be put at Cabra, as well as the boys, and for some reason or another that project has not been carried out, although the Pelletstown place was bought for the purpose of building a proper school for them. The children there are isolated, and the morals of the children have greatly improved since they were taken from the union. But I would be strongly in favour of having the children separated from the workhouse and put into schools such as those at Cabra; but I don't know whether I would go as far as to say—I am afraid I would not go as far as to say—that the children having one or both parents in the workhouse should be all boarded out. Philanthropy comes into it a little bit there, and I can conceive a decent man or woman with one or two, or three children; and though they may be poor and requiring workhouse relief, they may still have very great affection for their children, and they may be poor through no fault of their own, and I consider it rather infamous that these poor people, if they go into a workhouse or place they are forced to go into, and will not go into until all other sources of getting food have failed, that they should be separated from their poor little children, and have them sent out to nurseries in the country.

15950. It has never been suggested by anybody that such a thing ought to be done?—I understood that it was put forward that all the children should be put out to nurse.

15951. All the children that the Guardians would stand in face parents to?—But that is done, you know.

15952. But that you should have further powers in the case of vicious people who are unfit to take charge of children?—I have heard that mentioned, and I think the Guardians have the power as it stands. It is a most old, five or seven years ago. I have sometimes proposed resolutions at the South Union, setting forth that, in the opinion of the Board of Guardians, persons were not fit to have the custody of their children when they had been sent to jail or done something or another, and we took charge of the children in those special cases and refused to give them back to the parents.

15953. Would you have taken charge of the children of people who are not seeking their living by honest labour. You would not have power under that Act to do that?—There is a power under that Act to take children from respectable parents.

15954. Disrespectable is a strong word; it means a bad character?—I think it goes now far enough at all events. I would be very slow to put any further hardship on people whose only crime is their poverty.

These are poor women who have to go into workhouses; widows, and all that kind of thing, who have to go into workhouses with children. I would treat them leniently.

15955. There would be the power to give out-door relief to widows?—They may have that power, of course. But the practice in the South Union was to give it to a woman with two or more children under fifteen dependent on her for support. I don't know what alteration in the law would be necessary with regard to these children if any of them are to be kept.

15956. Do you think there are not now in workhouses a very large number of children, children of parents who ought not to have charge of children, if their future is to be safeguarded?—There are some, of course; a good many, I should say, in these Dublin unions.

15957. And that would not be governed by the law to which you refer enabling the Guardians to pass that resolution?—I think there are not very many. I think after all the bulk of these poor people with children are decent.

15958. Take tempers, for instance?—I am in a difficulty there, because there is no temperance in Dublin. There is no such thing known in Dublin.

15959. In Balmisborough they are well acquainted with it, and in Coleridge and Dunsborough there is plenty of it?—There is.

15960. And these tempers have families in a great number of cases?—Anything I say is influenced by the experience that I have gained in the one particular place, and my knowledge is not extensive with regard to these other places.

15961. Take the ins and outs. You have a very large number of ins and outs in Dublin. Do you know now the character of these people, what it is—people who come in for a short time, go out again, and come in again, exposing their children to consternation and everything else that is bad for them; would you be in favour of leaving those people the care of their children?—I don't think the best of their going in and out would be a sufficient reason for taking their children from them. Of course, if it was known that they were frequenting places where the children would learn bad habits, they should be dealt with, and they can be dealt with.

15962. Take frequenting the workhouse as a test—would you approve of that as a test, to leave them with bad associations?—I think they are fairly well managed. The children sent out to Cabra are under good supervision.

15963. I am speaking of the children in the workhouses?—They are not in the workhouses in Dublin.

15964. We saw a good many there. They are kept for a fortnight or three weeks before they are sent forward. They are kept in the probationary children's ward, as it is called, with a very unpleasant class of children?—In the South Dublin Union they are not kept.

15965. I mean in the South Union?—The boys are sent to Cabra after a little interval.

15966. A little interval, that is the point?—You must keep them for some time to see if they are free from disease. They are under observation.

15967. Under observation for a fortnight or three weeks?—I did not think they were kept so long.

15968. That is the impression in my mind; a fortnight, I believe?—They should be well looked after during that fortnight. There should be somebody to go round that would take good care of them.

15969. Workhouse officers themselves don't like the system; they don't approve of it?—Would they send them out to nurse? What is the suggestion with regard to them?

15970. The suggestion that we have got in a great many cases is that the Guardians would be at liberty to exercise their own discretion in such cases as to whether those children should be left in charge of the parents. It was further suggested to us that if the parent felt aggrieved the parent should have the right to appeal to some court of law?—I think that would do very well, but I don't think there is much necessity for alteration in the law, because the law, which I was pretty familiar with, enables us to take children from objectionable parents in a pretty sweeping way, and I would not like to see it too much extended.

15971. It would not touch the ins and outs—the ordinary run of them?—I don't think it is any harm that they should go in and out.

15972. It is not a life that is likely to bring up children well—it would be difficult for children to

Nov. 22, 1904.

Mr. Joseph
Keating.

turn out well after such a life?—Sometimes a poor woman goes out to some relative or friend, who keeps the children while she is looking for work, and tries that on for a few days, and has to go back to the workhouse again; then sleeps in for the winter, and then, perhaps, tries it again. I don't believe in your assuming that all these poor people are cool. I don't think that is fair to them.

19073. No, but their circumstances are very bad?—When they are very bad I would apply the law; but I would be very careful.

19074. I am sure the Guardians would be so. As regards the question of the amalgamation of the two unions, I don't quite gather whether you are in favour of that or not?—I am a ratepayer in both unions.

19075. Then you are impartial, unless you are a larger ratepayer in one than in the other?—I am fairly impartial, though I think my sympathies are more with the South than with the North Union. In the South Union we always held it would be unfair to have an even rate, because we always had a less poor or union rate on the South side. We always held in the South that we would not bear the burden of the North; but I would be inclined to take a broader view of it, and I don't think there would be very much difference in the rate when it all came to be worked out, all there was a sort of amalgamation.

19076. There would be economies?—There would be economies practised I think. For instance, all these advertisements that are inserted for supplies, there would be only one set, as there would be only one board.

19077. You would have fewer officers?—Yes, fewer officers, and a considerable reduction in the cost of printing and various other things, that would help to compensate the South Union for the loss.

19078. Does the fact of there being two workhouses in Dublin stimulate the pauper population in going from one place to another?—They do go from one place to the other. If the dietary scale is better in one than the other they go there. I think if there was one method of managing the two unions it would be desirable. In the South Union, many years ago, they used to get meat in the same way that they still get it in the North. They used to get prime legs of mutton without lap at 8d. a pound or so, and I know of my own knowledge that they were getting most inferior mutton. I had a good deal to do with the change in the South Union. I don't like to say I was the author, because Mr. John Byrne did a great deal. It was a difficult thing to carry, but we adopted the plan of buying the cattle alive, and having them slaughtered on the premises. We had a greater variety of food for the inmates; and after a year we tested the cost, and found, as well as I remember, that there was a saving of £22 per week on that plan, and I am perfectly certain we got very much better value for the money. I think, after the two boards were brought together, if something like that were discussed it is quite possible there might be economies practised which would blot out the inequality.

19079. You would not be very apprehensive, therefore, about an increase of rates in the South Union?—I would not. I don't think there would be much difference; but I would like to make it an essential condition of the amalgamation that the boards should be reduced in size. I would be very sorry to see the seventy-six Guardians of the South Union and the fifty-nine of the North in public meeting assembled dealing with a contract question or any other little trifles of that kind.

19080. The proceedings would be protracted?—I am afraid there would be all-night sittings. I think the boards are too large.

19081. You would take the opportunity of reducing this considerably?—I would; by one-half, at least. Of course, we all know that previous to the passing of the Local Government Act there were only half the number of elected Guardians. The other half were ex-officio Guardians; and in the Local Government Act at first it was intended to have only one elected Guardian for each of the electoral divisions, except in the city—of course, the city always returned more than one—but the number was doubled afterwards, before the Bill finally passed; and that was done, I think for the purpose of giving the ex-officio an opportunity of getting in. It had not that effect at all, because they did not get in.

19082. You think now you might go back to the old

numbers?—Yes, I would go back, and I would have a properly qualified one, too.

19083. For Dublin, what would you have?—I think I would make it £20 or £25. It used to be £31.

19084. You would not be scrupulous about getting such a provision enacted by Parliament now, would you?—No, I don't suppose I would. It would be regarded as a retrograde step; and, indeed, I am bound to say, I don't think any great good would come of it. I would attach much more importance to the reduction of the Guardians, but I don't think it is unfair. I suppose I am a sort of democrat, and I am in favour of the extended franchise, and would let the franchise remain as it is. I would let every man have a vote, as every man has practically; but I don't think where expenditure of rates is concerned it would be at all unreasonable that the man who is contrasted with that power should be a direct ratepayer. He ought to have some property qualification. I would not make it very high or exorbitant, and, as I say, I would not anticipate any very striking change from it; and, indeed, I am bound to say, I have often noticed on some of our committees that the very poorest men are not the worst.

19085. Mr. MURPHY.—Have you any reason for asking to go back to a property qualification standard when I mean to ask us, does the present Board of Guardians show any want of efficiency or want of regard for economy that would cause you to desire to revert to the old system?—My experience and observation lead me to suggest the change.

19086. Do you think the present body of Guardians is not doing its business as it ought to do it?—I think their work might be improved.

19087. Are they inferior to their predecessors in any way—in their methods of management?—I don't like to say that. I have not, as you may have observed, attached much importance to the change, but I have said I think it is not an unreasonable proposition, that there should be some property qualification for a man seeking one of these positions. I don't say that it would work any very startling change in the management, but I think it would be a reasonable and proper thing, and that it would possibly improve the management.

19088. But do you not think it does cast some reflection on the present body of Guardians; and before you cast any reflection on the present body, should you not have some reason for doing it? You don't say they are inefficient in any way, or worse than their predecessors?—I would not put forward the suggestion at all, only I think it would tend to improve matters.

19089. You say you don't think any workhouses in the County Dublin can be done away with, and still you say you are against the idea of having the workhouses in connection with the infirmaries; how could you bring about the two changes?—In the South Union I would put the occupants of the building which is at Kimmage, the place that was provided for the lunatics, and, I am sorry to say, it is not being used for them now, it is used for the sick and infirm, about half of it. Then there is a school out of which the boys were taken, and if the girls were taken out of it, and these two buildings appropriated to the purposes of a hospital, and the patients transferred from the places they are in, I think they could be accommodated, and that place could be kept altogether distinct from the workhouse, and the people who are in these buildings could be put into the wards where the sick are at present.

19090. Here in the city it is different. Cities like Dublin, Belfast, and Cork are hardly to be treated on the same line as the rural districts or the country towns. But let us deal with Balrothery, for instance. Do you think there is any real necessity for Balrothery being retained for anything more than a hospital for the sick, considering there are only some fifty inmates, and as aged and infirm? Do you think that arrangement could not be made, that the Guardians could board out in some neighbouring workhouse, say Drogheda, the nearest place possibly, and make some arrangement to get those people taken away, and the workhouse atmosphere removed altogether from Balrothery, leaving it simply a hospital—could some arrangement of that kind not be arrived at?—I fear say it might, where there are so few; perhaps there and Celbridge. But I think Rathdown could not be interfered with.

19091. That would leave the County Dublin one workhouse, for workhouse purposes alone, outside the

city: you don't see any difficulty in that on principle, if it could be worked out in detail and economically? No, except the one I have mentioned with regard to the feelings of the poor people—their being transported as somebody has said, from their own places to get workhouse relief twenty or thirty miles away. I am afraid they would feel that.

15292. If you compensate them for the outrage on their feelings by better classification and better treatment, do you not think you would make up for it?—I am afraid you would find they would not look on it in that light, but that they would prefer to get relief near the place where they belong to.

15293. That sentiment exists, but not really as regards the chronic inmates, who remain in the house for several years. We said they have very few visitors, indeed?—But I would be very careful in dealing with these people to bear in mind that there are two classes of people—the deserving and the undeserving; and I would not like to make a rule intended to strike at the undeserving ones and that would at the same time injuriously affect the deserving poor people. That is the difficulty I see in making any of these rules with regard to changes.

15294. Do you not think the deserving poor ought to get some better treatment than the undeserving?—I do; but the sending of them from Balrothery to Drogheda would affect the deserving as well as the undeserving.

15295. I don't specially mention Drogheda, but some institution where there could be proper classification. In that way, then, you could separate the deserving from the undeserving to a large extent, and you could take away that atmosphere that you complain so much about in connection with the hospitals—the atmosphere of the workhouse. If something like that was done?—It would not improve the atmosphere by sending the paupers of one workhouse to another.

15296. But would not it be taking away the workhouse atmosphere if you took away the workhouse altogether from Balrothery and left nothing but the infirmary?—But would not it be—by sending the paupers in Balrothery Workhouse at present to another workhouse?

It would.

15297. CHAIRMAN.—Another workhouse, maintained exclusively for inmates of one class?—Still, it would be a workhouse.

15298. You would not have that mixture of classes?—It would be more harmonious, according to Mr. Murnaghan's idea.

15299. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—You say you would like to remove altogether the atmosphere of workhouses from the hospitals?—Yes.

15300. A very desirable object; and one way of carrying it out would be to leave the hospitals in places like Balrothery and Colbride, and enable the Guardians to board out the aged and infirm in some neighbouring workhouse, where they could be classified, at a certain rate per head. Do you see any objection to that?—No.

15301. Would the poor dislike the change?—I am afraid they would. I don't know whether I am right or wrong, but I fancy some of the decent poor people would think they were being transported, and that it would be rather a punishment on them to send them away.

15302. Sentiment deserves respect, but even now inmates on the outskirts of unions are away from their former surroundings?—I give a great deal of consideration to the sentiments of the poor people. You would get over it better, I should think, by boarding them out in the neighbourhood and not sending them to the workhouses.

15303. You seem to think there is no great need for any further extension of the law as regards to these children. What about the children of tramps, for instance? I see myself when going through the country children following tramps along the road—would you not think it would be proper to take these children away?—I think that could be done under the present law.

15304. It is not done under the present law?—I think it could be done if the Guardians liked.

15305. CHAIRMAN.—I don't know how exactly?—I am sorry we have not the Act here.

15306. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—I suppose you are aware these children, when they grow up, begin to think the workhouses are their homes, and have no feeling of dislike to it, and, naturally, go into it?—Mr. Evans has given me a copy of this Act. Under section 1 of

the Poor Law Act, 1899, the Guardians can assume all parental rights in regard to several classes of children:—First, a child which has been deserted by its parents; second, where, by reason of mental deficiency or vicious habits, or mode of life, the parent of this child is unfit to have control of it; third, where a parent is unable to perform his or her parental duties by reason of being under sentence of penal servitude or being detained under the Insane Act, 1890; fourth, where the parent of a child has been sentenced to imprisonment for an offence against any of his children; fifth, where a parent is permanently bed-ridden or disabled, and is an inmate of a workhouse; or, sixth, where both parents, or, in the case of an illegitimate child, the mother of the child, are, or is, dead. That goes pretty far.

15307. In such cases the parents of the child must be proved to be vicious?—That is, if the Guardians are of opinion, by reason of the mental deficiency or vicious habits or mode of life of the parents of the child, they are unfit to have control.

15308. But where the Guardians would not like to take on themselves to declare people mentally defective, or where they could not be proved to be vicious, what would you do with the children of these people who go travelling over the country, bringing up the young children in the habits of life they follow themselves—do you not think the Guardians should have increased power with respect to these vagrants?—Perhaps they would want a little more power; but it would not be well to be giving power into their hands to separate children from their parents.

15309. I quite agree, if there was any danger that the Guardians wished to violate the parental feelings. I suppose your experience does not make you think that Guardians would take away children from other than most objectionable parents?—I don't think so.

15310. If the Guardians had increased powers with regard to the straggling class might it not be an advantage?—I think it might; if they had some more power.

15311. You say it is the opinion of the majority of the County Council that it would be well to amalgamate the two unions of the city of Dublin. You have told us your own personal opinion?—I am afraid I cannot give you any more, because, although we had a long meeting of the Council, and spent two hours discussing the matter, neither Mr. O'Neill nor myself got any particular instructions from them, and it was a case of go-as-you-please in giving our evidence. There were no representatives of South Dublin present. I am told, so we largely represent our own opinions about these things.

15312. But, as a magistrate in both unions and as a man of considerable experience of the working of the system, you see no objection to the amalgamation of the two?—No; I think, on the whole, it would be fraught with advantage.

15313. Dr. BROOKS.—You strongly favour the separation of the hospitals from the workhouse?—Yes.

15314. How would you administer the hospitals?—I am not quite sure. If the Guardians had any control I would have outsiders as well.

15315. With the Guardians?—Yes, a joint committee; like a technical instruction committee, or something of that kind.

15316. Or the infirmary committee?—Yes.

15317. In the case of counties, I am not speaking of round the city of Dublin, how would that work for the whole county; would you suggest a hospital committee for a whole county, with perhaps two or three hospitals in it?—I think the one committee would do.

15318. Do you think also there might be an interchange of officers if they were under one committee; if more nurses were in one institution than in another, where they were more urgently required, some might be interchanged?—I think there would be an economy in that, too.

15319. Do you think by such a change there would be economy, and the administration would be more equal all over the county, and patients would be more equally treated in the matter of diet, and so on, and a certain amount of facility would be gained?—Yes, I think so. A sort of uniform treatment would be the result.

15320. If that prevailed in the city of Dublin regarding the two workhouses here, there would not be so much interchange of persons going from one to the other?—No, I think there would not.

15321. As a matter of fact do they go from one to the other?—They do; and difficulties are sometimes

Mon 22, 1904

Mr. Joseph
Murray.

Mar. 22, 1904.

Mr. Joseph
Mooney.

put in the way of the admission of these really hopeless characters—these fellows that go in and out, and all that sort of thing. When it is made too hot for them in the South Union they go over to the North and get in, and vice versa.

16022. Chairman.—If discharged from one they go to the other?—Yes, they do, frequently; and tell lies to the relieving officer.

16023. Dr. BROWN.—Is that not a very strong argument for amalgamation?—It is. Many people who are chargeable to the South Union go to the North, and vice versa. They go to the North Union one time and to the South Union another.

16024. You have outlined a sort of arrangement for the South Union Workhouse in case the hospital were separated from the rest of the workhouse. How many sick people would you accommodate in that school?—The girls are in it at the present time. The other part is used as a hospital. There is a child's infirmary in it.

16025. It would probably accommodate between 300 and 400?—I think it would. It is a very fine building, and the new place built at Kilmannah would accommodate a large number, too.

16026. How many, all told, would the two places accommodate?—I would say 600 or 700.

16027. That is considerably less than the number of sick now on the books of the South Union?—It is about the number they have now; but I should hope that the number would be reduced very speedily.

16028. How would you reduce them, because that is important?—I think the alteration would have the effect of reducing the number; and I think the transfer of the consumptives ought to be part of the arrangement.

16029. What would you suggest regarding the consumptives?—I understood it was part of the arrangement in the South Union to put them into the sheds erected for small-pox patients, and that they would do that for the present.

16030. That is for the present, I think; but would that be a desirable arrangement for the future?—No, it would not be an ideal arrangement, but it would be better than having them mixed up with the others in the hospital; but they ought to be sent out to a place in the country, and it should be made available for the patients of all the hospitals in the county.

16031. The one large consumptive sanatorium should be available for all?—Yes.

16032. Would you suggest it for one county?—I think the County Dublin would be large enough. I don't think it is good to congregate large numbers of any of these classes together.

16033. You have disposed of the consumptives, and you leave all the buildings in that area you have mentioned—the school and the lunatic building in the South Dublin Union as a hospital?—Yes.

16034. That would accommodate, perhaps, 500 or 600?—Yes.

16035. Would you make it more an acute hospital?—Of course, it would have to be open to the poor people. I don't see how you are to distinguish between the acute cases and the chronic in a free hospital of that kind.

16036. As long as they are sick you would keep them there?—Yes; Dublin hospitals won't take chronic cases, and people have to go to those workhouse hospitals, and I suppose that sort of thing would continue, even under the altered management.

16037. You said something to the effect that you would have a separate staff over them, and you would have none of the pauper attendants in the hospital?—I would do away with them entirely.

16038. And have a paid staff?—And have a paid staff.

16039. You think that would tend to economy and efficiency, too?—Yes; because these people are made permanent paupers by the fact that they get these little positions, and they get better food and tips.

16040. And they levy a certain amount of blackmail?—I don't like to call it that; but there is that sort of extortion.

16041. Do you refer to the patients?—I don't refer to the patients, but money they get from visitors, under the idea that they would be more kind to the friends of the visitors, and they get that in all hospitals. I don't call it blackmail. I know it has been said, and I believe it is true, that in some hospitals there has been blackmail levied on the patients, and the patients

has to give something in order to get what he ought to get free.

16042. You may take it, it is true. In discharging patients from hospital, you would not discharge them into the workhouse. You would let them go out as they came in?—Yes, because at present they act as great levers of workhouse.

16043. You would just let them go home, and if they were destitute you would just let them seek admission to the workhouse?—Yes, in the ordinary way, just as if they came out of Jarvis-street.

16044. Do you approve of the lunatics being transferred to the asylum?—No, I have approved of that.

16045. What would you do with them?—Of course, there again, my experience is limited to the South Union, where they were properly treated, as certified by all the inspectors, at something like half the cost.

16046. What would you count in the cost?—I would count about 7s. a week.

16047. How do you arrive at 7s. a week?—I don't think it costs any more.

16048. What do you include in the 7s.?—Food, clothing, washing, and attendance.

16049. All the attendance; some of the attendance may be in the body of the house in certain circumstances. Were they included?—I have not gone into the figures particularly now, and I am speaking merely from recollection of what the cost was when I was there, but the chairman of the Board is here, and you will get it from other people, but I am under the impression that the cost for maintaining the lunatics and imbeciles in the South Union was 7s. per week, and it would cost about 10s. 6d. or 11s. in the Richmond.

16050. I am afraid all the charges are not included in the 7s. a week—chaplain's salary, interest and loans for buildings, doctors' salaries, and so on; also the clerk of the union?—The comparison may not have been fair. Those things were included in the rate per head.

16051. The rate—that is the number of inmates divided into the total of expenditures?—But then it appears that the circumstances of the South Union were exceptional.

16052. How were they exceptional?—They had a better place. They were separated.

16053. But they had not much ground. You could not give them occupation, and the best treatment for lunatics is to keep them employed?—But, of course, I had a good deal to do with the criticisms that Mr. O'Neill referred to of the Richmond Asylum there. I had, and I have, a horror of sending these poor people there, when I think they could be treated as well by the Guardians if they incurred a little expense in getting up buildings, and giving more room, and all that kind of thing; and then they could be treated well enough at much less expense. I do not like the idea of transferring them to these district asylums, where they have rather outrageous notions, I think.

16054. As chairman of the Guardians for many years, and also a member of the Asylum Committee—I was never a member of the Asylum Committee.

16055. Could you give any idea of how the difference of the 4s. could be spent in the asylum. You say it is practically 4s. a week less in the workhouse than in the asylum. 4s. a week is a large amount on one person. Each of them has to be fed?—They go in for comparatively good nursing in the asylum. They are dealing with the lunatics on a different basis altogether. Of course, it should be borne in mind that the cases in the workhouse are chronic and harmless. They are imbeciles and poor people who are not violent. The moment they become violent in the workhouse they were always transferred to the Richmond Asylum.

16056. A great many in the Richmond Asylum are of the same class?—Of late years the harmless ones have been sent there. That has gone to increase the number.

16057. But was there not always much the same class in it?—Not for many years.

16058. With the exception of a small proportion of acute mental cases, the rest of the cases were of the harmless type?—They were never sent from the union until late years unless they became violent. They were kept in the workhouse when they were admitted into the workhouse.

16059. They were sent from the city very often to the workhouse because it was an easier way of getting them into it?—When they are sent from the city direct the dispensary doctor has to certify that they are harmless, and that they are dangerous; when they go to the asylum the nearest dispensary doctor has to certify.

16060. Not necessarily a dispensary doctor at all?—When they are brought up in the police courts.

16061. A very large number have been sent to the

Mar. 22, 1906.
—
Mr. Joseph,
Mooney.

workhouse simply because it is a more convenient way of disposing of them—it is an easier way, with less humanity in it. Is that a proper reason why they should be kept in the workhouse?—I would not keep them in a workhouse at all unless they were correctly treated, but I certainly thought the Guardians could provide well and reasonably for them in three workhouses, because they are not going to be cured. All they want is to be fed and kept clean. They are not able to enjoy the luxuries that they receive at Portlaoine.

16062. CHAIRMAN.—If they could be kept at an auxiliary asylum at no greater cost than at the South Dublin Union, would you be in favour of letting them go to such an institution?—I would.

16063. Dr. BURGESS.—In one county in Ireland, if not in more, all the lunatics in the county are kept, or are to be kept, in the asylum; therefore that county will be receiving a capitation grant of 4s. per head for every lunatic in the county?—Under Section 70 they would not receive the full grant; it is only 2s.

16064. They do not go under Section 70; they are going on bringing them into the asylum proper, and getting the full grant?—I understood it is under Section 70. I think it was referred to in your letter.

16065. The 300 patients that have been sent in from the South Union last year they are getting 4s. per head for?—One of the queries here is whether such workhouses or workhouses could, with advantage, be taken over by the County Council as an auxiliary asylum under Section 70.

16066. CHAIRMAN.—That is what I was referring to just now when I asked you could they be supported in another institution, that is an auxiliary asylum?—Under Section 70, would not you only get a capitation grant of 2s?

16067. Do you think you ought to get more?—I don't see why we should not get more.

16068. That is the evidence we have received from some members of local bodies, that the capitation grant ought to be raised for auxiliary asylums to the same as the other?—Yes; I don't see why we should not get the same. My idea was, the advantage derivable from the capitation grant would disappear under the increased cost of maintenance in one of these district asylums. It is very high in Dublin. We had an inquiry here, and contrasted the cost of Belfast and Cork, and found it went into a difference of thousands per annum—27,000 in one and £10,000 or £11,000 in the other—

so there is an enormous prejudice against the Dublin Asylum, and we felt something should be done to prevent the increase of the numbers there because of the increased cost; and whether they are there or in the union, the ratepayers would have to pay for them.

16069. If you could get a report of your Committee on this point, we would be obliged—as regards the expenses of asylums and auxiliary asylums; we shall meet with an auxiliary asylum in Cork—and if you have anything definite, we shall be glad to get it?—It is in print, and Mr. Blackburne can give it to you.

16070. We shall be glad to get it?—What we had here was the cost of the ordinary district asylum.

16071. Not any auxiliary asylum?—There was no auxiliary.

16072. There is only one at present in Ireland?—It is not long started.

16073. Mr. MURPHY.—Even at the cost of the asylum, when you take into consideration the capitation grant, does it not come cheaper than keeping the patients in the workhouse?—Unless we miscalculated the cost in the South Union, it would not come cheaper than keeping the patients in the workhouse, even with the capitation grant. The capitation grant would disappear, and giving credit for it, the cost would still be greater than in the workhouse; and when I saw them they were very well treated. Before I left it the Board agreed on my suggestion to erect these new buildings at Kilmashnam, which, perhaps, you have seen.

16074. As I understand it, the cost per head per annum in one of the asylums in the North is £24, and in the workhouse in the same locality it is something like £18, or 7s. per week. The capitation grant amounts to £10, and that and the £18 would come to £28. That would mean a saving to the ratepayers of £4 in that instance alone, so there really is not the difference in cost between the two institutions that is ordinarily accepted. Even in the case of the auxiliary asylum, the 2s. grant of £8 a year would bring it almost equal, and then there is the advantage of having these people isolated and away from the workhouse?—I think that is a more practicable proposal than talking of boarding them out, because I don't think many of them would be taken here. I think that would be dangerous, because these homeless lunatics are liable to get dangerous at any time.

Dr. M. J. NOLAN, Resident Medical Superintendent, Downpatrick Lunatic Asylum, examined.

Dr. M. J.
Nolan.

16075. CHAIRMAN.—You represent the Medico-Psychological Association of Great Britain and Ireland?—Yes.

16076. Your Association furnished us with a memorandum. The Secretary called at my office, and mentioned that three members of the Association would give evidence that was desired. What would you wish to bring before us?—I present myself before the Commission in consequence of a communication which I received from the Secretary of the Irish division of the Medico-Psychological Association of Great Britain and Ireland, intimating that the Commissioners desire further information respecting the subjects embraced in the memorandum submitted to them by the Special Committee of the said Association. I am a member of the Special Committee, and also a member of the Council of the Association, and an Examiner for the Certificate in Psychological Medicine granted to medical practitioners by that body. My special knowledge of the insane and their requirements is derived from my experience in the Limerick Asylum at intervals between the years 1863-1894; in the Richmond (Dublin) District Asylum, between the years 1887 and 1893; and in the Downpatrick Lunatic Asylum, from the latter date to the present date. I have, moreover, visited many English, Scotch, and Continental asylums, and have investigated the "Family Care" system as established at Ghent and Lievercux. Before taking up the special branch of lunacy practice, I enjoyed extensive experience of general medical work in private practice, in general and special hospitals, in orphanages and industrial schools, in urban and rural dispensaries, and in military and constabulary barracks. I desire to emphasise my general knowledge of institutions other than asylums in order that the Commissioners may feel assured that my evidence is unbiased by the limitation of points of view which they may attribute to one who they may presume to have spent his entire professional life within the walls of an asylum. I also desire to state that inasmuch as the

County Council of Down have taken independent action in dealing with the lunacy requirements of the district with which I am associated, the findings of the Commission would in no sense touch me personally, though at the same time the deliberations and outcome of the Commission must of necessity be of the most profound interest to me as to all devoted to the care and treatment of the afflicted insane. Before entering into the details of the evidence which I am here to give to-day, I should like to say one word in explanation of my position as a witness. I understand from the Secretary of the Irish Division of the Medico-Psychological Association, that the Commission desires some expert evidence on the subject of the memorandum which has been submitted to them by that Association. With the terms of that memorandum I am in absolute agreement, and outside them I do not suppose the Commission will travel. The general question of lunacy in Ireland is too vast and complex a subject to be dealt with by a Commission constituted as this is. I would, therefore, desire to confine any representation I make within the limits of the question of lunacy in Ireland so far as it is likely to be affected by the operation of the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898. Under this Act it is proposed, as a measure of common humanity, to remove the insane from the workhouses throughout the country and to locate them in institutions more in accord with their necessities. With that object it is proposed to establish auxiliary asylums, either as independent establishments or as dependent departments of the existing district asylums; in either case it is proposed to grant a capitation rate of 2s. per head per week. With over twenty years' experience of general medical work, and some sixteen years of special work in connection with insane, I submit that the sum mentioned would be utterly inadequate to provide the necessary care and maintenance for the afflicted pauper insane. I have for years emphasised the fact that the insane admitted to asylums from workhouses embrace all forms of mental degeneration;

* The Memorandum referred to is printed at page 358 of this evidence.

Mar. 22, 1904.

Dr. M. J.
Nolan.

that the vast majority of them are recoverer in a state of extreme physical disease; that they prove to be the most expensive class of patients admitted to district asylums, inasmuch as they require more than the average medical care, supervision, and maintenance; and that some of them are of the weak-minded, destructive class, who require more than the ordinary supervision. There has been much talk of "chronic harmless lunatics." In my experience this class of the insane is extremely limited, and every day's experience in lunatic asylums tends to make me more cautious in placing individuals under this category. Chronically diseased, prolonged suffering. Those who are most familiar with the insane know that as years pass many mental phases appear in the same individual, and that apparently "harmless" individuals will now and again develop dangerous tendencies and become harmful to themselves and those with whom they are in association; hence it would appear to me to be a grave error to institute independent auxiliary asylums which would not be departments of existing asylums. In a poor country such as Ireland it would appear to me that the most expensive way of dealing with the insane would be to set up several classes of asylums adapted to treat the supposed stereotyped clinical forms of insanity, as differentiated by a Parliamentary draughtsman, when one knows and ascertains that the clinical features of such cases are so very variable. On the other hand, an auxiliary asylum which would be a department of an existing district asylum offers all obvious advantages to economy and efficiency. I do not suppose any very useful object could be attained by a comparison between the relative cost of the insane in workhouses and asylums, inasmuch as the accurate figures with regard to the full cost of inmates in the former cannot be readily ascertained. The condition of insane in workhouses was such that remedial legislation became a crying necessity, and the Local Government Board issued a circular letter stating that humanity demanded the removal of chronic lunatics from the workhouse wards. In the asylums, on the other hand, a great deal has been done of late years, more particularly under the regime of the present Inspector of Lunatics, to place the insane under the most favorable conditions, to promote the recovery of the curable cases, and to transform the more chronic cases into comparatively useful members of society, for it must be remembered that the latter class largely assist in the manual labour necessary to keep large institutions in order. If they were withdrawn from an ordinary district asylum, the attendant staff would have to be very considerably augmented. It may, however, be mentioned that it has been determined that the cost of lunatics in some workhouses was as high as 6s. and 7s. per week, and that this sum was not inclusive of establishment charges, which it was not possible to ascertain. The average cost in a district asylum, inclusive of all charges, is about 9s. It has been suggested that a certain proportion of the insane might be provided for by the adoption of a system of family care, or "boarding out." This is a subject to which I have given considerable attention, and I have recently visited the insane colonies at Ghel and Lierens. From my extensive knowledge of this country, both North and South, I am not sanguine that the Continental methods, which I have investigated could be introduced with anything approaching the same measure of success that they have attained in the places mentioned. No system of the kind could possibly be successful without an elaborate medical, inspectorial supervision, the establishment of which would not, I think, be warranted by the comparatively small numbers of the insane who could be safely and successfully treated by "family care" in this country. It is alleged that the increase of insanity in this country is largely due to the undue number of degenerates that remain in it, owing to the fact that healthy wage-earning members have emigrated; hence it would seem to me no easy task to find suitable households in which to place the insane whom it is proposed to treat outside asylums. Nevertheless, there is no reason why such a system should not be legalised for experimental adoption in Ireland, and if such should be done, I would hope to be one of the first to give it a fair trial, but though situated in one of the most prosperous counties in Ireland, I am not hopeful of any satisfactory results. In conclusion, I would say that the lunacy problem in Ireland should not be dealt with by any one stereotyped plan. Each district having examined into its own needs should adopt such local measures as concerned themselves for efficiency and economy. This course has been adopted in the county of Down, where the County Council have decided, after exhaustive investigation of all relative circumstances,

to enlarge the existing district asylum by the provision of annexes, which would enable them to receive into that institution the insane located in the workhouses. For this purpose they have decided to enlarge the asylum, irrespective altogether of the establishment of auxiliaries, as laid down in the Act, and they have succeeded in creating suitable accommodation at the extremely moderate figure of £75 a head. With the exception of some male and female students, no additions will require to be made to the staff of the institution, and it is anticipated that the net result will be a considerable reduction in the cost per head. At the same time the workhouses will be relieved of some of their most expensive inmates, and the incidence of taxation between Poor Law districts and county-at-large will work out to the great relief of the former and to the comparative relief of the latter. This satisfactory result was speedily attained by the hearty co-operation of the Inspector of Lunatics, who were strong in their desire to see established a scheme so economical and so suitable to the wants of the insane of the district. Speaking in general terms, it would seem to me that the county district asylum in Ireland should be constituted to embrace all classes of the insane of the district, that is to say, should contain a properly equipped hospital for the acute cases and recent admissions, industrial departments for those who are competent to work usefully at trades, and have a farm to give employment to the agricultural labourers and others; and it should also provide suitable accommodation for the violent, destructive, and noisy proportion of the inmates. The average population of an Irish county asylum does not exceed 600 to 800, and for the reasons already advanced, it would seem obvious that the centralisation of that number would tend to efficiency and economy of administration. If the numbers arose to several thousands, as they have done in the large English counties, there is no doubt a series of separate establishments might be advantageous, such as a hospital for the recent admissions, epileptic colonies, chronic asylums, and a system of boarding-out family care.

15077. Your Association disapproves of separate auxiliary asylums?—Yes; the auxiliary asylums as devised under the Local Government Act of 1886 would not be a success, either medically or financially. It appeared to me that the funds would be inadequate to keep the inmates as they ought to be kept, and that there was not sufficient arrangement made for medical supervision, and it would be a disastrous thing to accumulate in an auxiliary a large number of cases that were regarded as hopeless, but who may at the same time be preserved from a certain amount of suffering and degradation.

15078. You think that there should be a resident doctor in every asylum?—I think where a large number of the insane are congregated together there should be a resident medical officer in charge. The Act laid down that sanitarians might be created, but without particular reference to the medical supervision of them. It laid down, as I understand, that they might be created as a department of an existing asylum, or as an independent asylum, and what we considered was that the grant was not adequate for the proper maintenance of them in either institution.

15079. That is 2s. per week per head?—Yes.

15080. If the rate were raised from 2s. to 4s., would your objection vanish?—Not altogether, because I don't think you can differentiate the classes of the insane so strictly as to divide them in such a way that you could leave some of them permanently in an auxiliary.

15081. You can divide them into dangerous and harmless?—Not altogether. The most chronic are often the most liable to sudden outbreaks.

15082. Do these chronic lunatics require very great personal care?—A certain proportion of them do.

15083. Owing to their dirty habits?—Yes; and what we observed in the cases admitted from workhouses was they were so physically ill that they were greatly in need of the care of the most organised department of the asylum. They were the sort of cases that took up all the time of our medical staff, and required most nursing, medicines, extra nourishment, and all that sort of thing.

15084. You have received a good number of transfers in your asylum?—Yes, we have got a considerable number in late years. Three were yesterday, I think, in the hospital wards, and some forty of these had been workhouse cases labouring under various diseases.

16005. What number have you altogether in the asylum?—660.

16006. And 121 in the sick wards?—Yes; and about forty of these were admissions from workhouse labourers under nervous diseases.

16007. Do you attribute that in any way to their treatment in the workhouse?—Not at all.

16008. Was it noticed?—It simply shows they were admitted into the workhouse infirmary, and when they became insane they were sent into the asylum. A large number of them ought to have been in asylums years ago.

16009. They were proper cases for an asylum?—A large proportion of them should have been sent years ago.

16010. Do you think any lunatics should be left in the lunatic wards of workhouses?—None.

16011. Is that the general opinion among doctors who are resident superintendents of asylums?—Yes, I think it is the general opinion. The few that are left, weak-minded people, are usually the cannals who occupy the maternity wards coming in and out.

16012. You have alluded to the boarding-out system of lunatics. That is a matter of which you have had considerable personal experience?—I can hardly say personal experience, but I have made it a matter of personal knowledge. I studied it in operation abroad.

16013. You scarcely think that system would be successful here?—I think it might be introduced, and it certainly ought to be legalized, though I doubt if it would have the same measure of success in this country as it has had abroad. I am afraid that the social conditions, and other conditions in Ireland, would not make it the same success here.

16014. Can you give us any information as to the relative cost between workhouses and asylums?—It is hard to give any actual comparison because the actual figures of the workhouse cost are not available. You can only get them up to a certain point.

16015. You can get the sum spent under all heads?—No, we have not been able to get that; but we did work out that in a number of unions it reached as much as 2s. per head, while in the asylum the average would be about 9s.

16016. Dr. Broun.—Taken all over Ireland?—Yes, I think so. Of course every year it alters a little, but in our asylum it is from 9s. to 12s. 6d.

16017. CHAIRMAN.—You have had a great deal of building these?—Of late years we have had a considerable amount.

16018. Mr. MURKIN.—That only includes the cost of maintenance?—Not the repayment of loans and interest.

16019. CHAIRMAN.—Does it include salaries?—Yes, all salaries, but not the repayment of loans; everything but loans.

16020. Dr. Broun.—Everything included, would it be under 12s. 6d.?—In or about that.

16021. Mr. MURKIN.—I think the average is about 22s. per head per year?—Not so much in some. Where you have large salaries it is larger.

16022. But more than that in others?

16023. CHAIRMAN.—Dublin and Mullingar put it up?—I don't know what their figures actually are.

16024. Mr. MURKIN.—Have you much unused space in your institution?—We are adding to it just at present in order to take in all the people who are certified insane in the district. About 800 we shall have altogether then. Our present number is 660. There are only a comparatively small number in the workhouse at present. The County Council and Asylum Committee have enlarged the asylum with the object of taking all the lunatics of the county into the asylum.

16025. Dr. Broun.—What was it led to that decision?—The County Council held an investigation into the cost, and rating, and so on, and after an examination of all the financial aspects of it, they considered that the enlargement of the existing asylum would be the most economical course they could adopt, and the most efficient results would be obtained from it. The new wings have been erected at an exceedingly moderate rate. As I have already mentioned, the cost is only something like 42s. a head for the new accommodation.

16026. That is much less than the general?—That is much less than the general, and the building is most suitable in every sense. The sanitary arrangements, and everything of that kind, are exceedingly well done. It is not an administrative block—is only a residential block—and my argument would be that all asylums ought to be departments of existing asylums. If you make asylums at all they should be affiliated with the existing asylums.

16027. Your idea in that is to save the extra cost of administration?—Yes.

16028. The same supervision would do?—Yes; here, for example, it will not be necessary to add anything with the exception of a few attendants to each side of the house. The medical staff as it is already will be large enough to cope with the work, and the storekeeper, matron, and so on, will all be there.

16029. Do you anticipate when you have these two blocks occupied the average cost will be reduced somewhat?—Yes, largely.

16030. Largely reduced?—I think so.

16031. Would you bring it down to 2s. 6d. per head?—It depends so much on the methods. It is not a hard and fast thing. For instance, the war had a large effect in raising the cost of asylums. Before the war it was much lower. But I should say perhaps that 2s. 6d. would be the average after a while.

16032. That comes very near the cost of the workhouse, and their comfort and safety would be much greater in the asylum. Do you find that the class of lunatics who are in the workhouse cannot do much labour when they enter the asylum?—A large number of them are so ill that they go direct to bed. They are chronic invalids. As a medical gentleman, you can understand they have chronic nervous disease—disseminated sclerosis and other nervous disorders—but a certain number can act as workers. The latter have been sent to us because of some excitement in the workhouse or some expression of violence on their part, and they have to be sent to the asylum. It is emphasised in this memorandum that no lunatic is always effected in the same way. I cannot conceive that anyone with a medical knowledge of the insane would agree to build an auxiliary for a certain class of insanity, a disease which alternates so much that at any moment a man who appears to be very quiet may take a fit of homicidal mania or become suicidal. You have no guarantee at all of what they will do.

16033. Mr. MURKIN.—Do they, as a matter of fact?—A considerable number of them do.

16034. What is the experience of these institutions; is it not the reverse?—I don't think there is any institution where they are confined together.

16035. CHAIRMAN.—The only one is that started in the County Cork recently; I don't know whether that is in operation yet?—If the auxiliary you mention were mine the difficulty I would have would be to select a class of people to put into it. I could only send the deranged, old, feeble people who require constant medical supervision and require a resident physician—or I should send the more chronic mental class of people, whom you want in the existing asylum, and if you remove these people from the existing asylum you must add to your paid attendants. A considerably larger number of the latter would be necessary, because the chronic insane are capable of a considerable amount of work—cleaning and other work.

16036. Dr. Broun.—Do you find that many of the lunatics in the workhouses are of the same class as those in the asylum?—I see no clinical difference at all between them. Sometimes the only difference is, you get cases of extreme dementia, cases that for years have been regular automatons, but the average case from the workhouse is the same as you get from the ordinary admission channels.

16037. Why did they not go into the asylum in the first instance?—The beginning of all insanity, I think I am safe in saying, has a basis of physical illness. I think a number of them go to the workhouse infirmary out of sorts, suffering from different ailments, and develop insanity in the workhouse.

16038. Have you any knowledge that a number of them are sent there because there is no room to be got through and their friends can get them into the workhouse much more easily?—That possibly facilitates it; but still I think a number of them go into the ordinary wards of a workhouse and migrate from them into the lunatic wards.

16039. CHAIRMAN.—Have you any cases in your mind?—I know for a fact that it is the case; that a large number of them go in in such a way.

16040. They are transferred from other departments in the workhouse?—Yes.

16041. You could not have taken all these workhouse inmates without enlarging the asylum?—No; but we were on the eve of enlarging, and it was more desirable and economical to enlarge for the entire lunatic population. The committee were most anxious that the public should get the greatest advantage in

Jan. 22, 1904.

Dr. M. J. Nelson.

Mar. 12, 1904.
Dr. M. J.
Nolan.

the spending of the money, and they went into the matter with an open mind, and came to the conclusion that it was more efficient and cheaper to adopt this course.

16122. Mr. MURPHY.—Perhaps you were exceptionally well circumstanced for that experiment?—I cannot say we had any exceptional advantages. We have, perhaps, a little more land than some of the other asylums. We have a large farm of 170 acres that gives a large outlet for labour, and also is a tremendous help to the economical working of the asylum, as we

raise a very large quantity of our vegetables, meat, and milk.

16123. What is the cost of the new improvement?—About £20 a head.

16124. For about 160?—More—for 182.

16125. That is about £15,000?—112 women and 70 men.

16126. That is about £16,000?—Yes. There were other things as well as that, and the actual was £20,000 in all. There was only £15,000 in connection with the residential enlargement of the asylum. Some £4,000 was for a farmstead and other buildings.

Dr. CONNELLY NEWMAN, Resident Medical Superintendent, Richmond District Lunatic Asylum, examined.

16127. CHAIRMAN.—You represent, with Dr. Nolan and Dr. Leeper, the Medico-Psychological Association?—Yes.

16128. I think the chief matter that the committee of your association wish to bring before this Commission is the question of auxiliary lunatic asylums as compared with district or county lunatic asylums?—Yes; so I understand.

16129. What is your view on the matter?—On the whole I do not think I have much to add to as much of Dr. Nolan's evidence as I heard. I was unfortunate enough not to come in time to hear him begin. He has given, as I understand rightly, expression to a general opinion that an auxiliary asylum would not prove either efficient or economical. At any rate that is the conclusion I have come to.

16130. You agree with that opinion?—I agree with that opinion.

16131. He thought that the insane vary so much in their manifestations of insanity that it would not be safe or possible to classify them as harmless or non-harmless in the way that is suggested?—I am afraid that would present great difficulties, and I fail to see what division of insane could be safely relegated to an auxiliary asylum. If the patients who are in large numbers in the insane wards of a workhouse, who are old and feeble, are to be sent to auxiliaries these people, in my experience, require a great deal more care than they would get in any asylum that is not fully equipped. I get large numbers of old and feeble people from workhouses, and they are very anxious cases. They are very often restless; they are, generally, very frail in bodily health; they require very careful nursing or else they injure themselves or get injured, or break down more rapidly than they ought to do. Therefore, I think that class of case should be excluded from the classes who ought to be sent to an auxiliary asylum. Of course the acute cases and cases that require close medical attention with regard to their mental condition, I suppose nobody would think of sending to an auxiliary asylum. I get some such cases from workhouses, but they are very unsuitable for any place except an asylum. However, I suppose everyone will acknowledge that, so there is no use dwelling on it. Again, we get from workhouses a considerable number of idiots. I don't think an auxiliary asylum is a suitable place for an idiot. An idiot who is educable ought neither to be sent to an auxiliary asylum nor even to a general asylum. There is one matter I am glad to have an opportunity of drawing attention to, and that is that there is no place for the education of many idiots who could be greatly improved by suitable education in early life.

16132. You mean an institution such as the Stewart is supposed to be?—Of course, there is the Stewart, but, though it is an admirably managed, yet it is a small institution, and it is a private charity, and is not open to the greater number of the population who could avail of it. So that one is reduced to considering what cases would go to an auxiliary asylum, to look to the chronic cases—long standing cases, at least, of insanity—in good physical health and not too old. Now such cases could be drafted out of our lunatic asylums with a certain degree of safety. I quite agree with Dr. Nolan in thinking you could never be quite sure what will happen, and there is some risk in sending people out, but if you remove that class from the asylums you will remove a class who do a good part of the work of the asylums, as Dr. Nolan has pointed out—the people who work on the farm, clean the house; the people who enable the place to be managed with a comparatively small staff of attendants, as it is managed—and if you gain by sending that class away to an auxiliary asylum you lose by the increased expenditure in the parent asylum, so that I don't see

where much economy is to come in. One learns the phrase more commonly used of chronic insane; in connection with auxiliary asylums one hears of incurable cases. Now, I am opposed to calling any case incurable; I am opposed to treating any patient as being incurable. If patients are placed in an auxiliary asylum, and are to receive the minimum of care and attention, and are to have no occupation and no means of amusement, it might be cheaper, but I think it is very inhuman, and I think there are a very great number of patients who are, and as a matter of fact we feel to be, incurable, but their cases are often improvable by care and personal attention, and may be improved to a comparatively high level, whereas if they are herded together without a sufficient number of amusements, occupation, or amusements, which all mean money; if they are to be herded together without these things they will get worse, and their condition becomes degraded, which is a thing no one ought to contemplate with humanity.

16133. Do you think all lunatics ought to be removed from workhouses?—I do.

16134. You are not in favour of removing them, for the reasons you have given, to auxiliary lunatic asylums, such as are contemplated under the Local Government Act of 1893?—I am not.

16135. Then, you think they ought to be dealt with either by existing asylums or the enlargement of existing asylums, or by additional county asylums perhaps?—I think there are a considerable proportion of the occupants of our asylums who might be dealt with in another manner you have not touched upon, and that is by treating them by what has been called "family care." I do not mention that as being a particularly economical method, because, for reasons that I have hinted at already, if you remove the people who are suitable for treatment in a family from an asylum you remove the people who are an element of economy in an asylum.

16136. Whose labour is of value?—Whose labour is of value; but I think that such a method of treatment might in time be adopted in this country, as it has been in several other countries, with advantage to the individuals themselves, who would thereby be relieved from the painful and unnatural conditions of life in an institution, and, if it was done under careful supervision, with comparatively small risk to the peace and comfort of the general population.

16137. Do you think such homes could be got without difficulty in this country—suitable homes; would you look forward to getting them among relatives of the people or among strangers?—I would look forward among both. In Scotland, where a system of the kind has been carried out, there are rather more of the insane under family care in the hands of strangers now than in the hands of their own people. Formerly there were more in the hands of their own people. In some other countries there are more in the hands of strangers.

16138. Would you hope to get a sufficient number of families to board them out among?—I think that could be arranged. You asked me another question, whether I thought there would be suitable houses found for them to go to. That seems to me in this country to be the chief difficulty, but I believe it could be got over in time, and then there is an observation that has been made in other countries where patients have been sent out to family care that their labour and the remuneration received for their care has been sufficiently beneficial to householders to enable the latter to considerably improve their homes, and this has been said particularly in Belgium, where the system is largely carried out.

16139. As regards cost, have you made any calculation at all as to the relative cost of maintaining in

asylum, as asylums, in workhouse, and an auxiliary lunatic asylum?—No; there are no data that I am aware of—at least I have never been able to obtain them—for ascertaining the amount the lunatic costs in the workhouse. Certain items of cost appear, but there seems to be no element for the calculation of cost comparable to what we make in our district lunatic asylum.

16140. Unless you take the whole annual expenditure of a workhouse under every heading and divide it by the number of patients, and take all the inmates to be ordinary average patients?—I suppose that would bring it out. But in every workhouse, at least in late years, the insane have received more care than the ordinary patients, as it would not be quite a fair calculation.

16141. Hardly as much as the sick?—I am afraid hardly as much as the sick.

16142. They would have an untrained workmaster or superintendent with them—one who is not trained in the care of mental diseases?—In a good many of the workhouses now there have persons who have been trained.

16143. In a few, yes?—But, of course, the number of such persons is entirely insufficient compared to the number of patients. There is very little paid in one named nurse or attendant for a hundred inmates, or something of that kind, because that person cannot always be present, and if he or she is on duty at night then the person who is on duty by day is perhaps ignorant, and vice versa.

16144. Is there anything else that I have not touched on that you would wish to mention?—Perhaps I ought to say to you it might occur to you as a possible contradiction between my opinion as to the difficulty of finding suitable patients to put in an auxiliary asylum and the statement I have made that I think suitable patients could be found to send to family care. There are, in my opinion, a considerable number of the insane whose condition is ameliorated by being returned to the surroundings of family life, and who would be fairly manageable in conditions of family life, and yet who, if heeded together with a large number of other inmates in an auxiliary asylum, would be troublesome and would tend to degenerate. Do I make my point clear?

16145. Thoroughly. Is there any provision made for medical inspection of such boarded-out lunatics?—Certainly.

16146. Are they within reasonable distance of a doctor whose duty it is to see them occasionally?—In the countries whose systems I approve of there is such provision. In Scotland, whose system I do not approve of, the provision is, to my mind, imperfect. There are two assistant commissioners of lunacy in Scotland who visit the patients boarded out throughout the country. There are certain provisions also for the parish doctor of the locality to visit them periodically, but in my opinion that provision is hardly sufficient, and I think where family care and boarding out are carried out they ought to be from an asylum as a centre. Patients should be sent from there, and there should be power of sending them back if the occasion arose—if they got ill or unmanageable meantime—and they should be under the supervision of the staff of the asylum, who are familiar with their case and with their mental condition. That is done in France and in Belgium and Germany and elsewhere, but notably in those countries.

16147. You have a second asylum in your district in connection with the Richmond?—That is so.

16148. In what way did you classify the patients that were sent there; was there any special classification made or were they just sent—pretty much the same class of patients as you have in the Richmond?—At first there was a special classification made before the asylum was fully opened, and when the patients, who were sent to Portenae, were housed in temporary accommodation.

16149. That was owing to the bad berth?—Yes; and other causes. But since the asylum has been completed the patients who are sent there now are sent of any special class.

16150. They are the same class as the ordinary Richmond patients?—Yes; they are the same.

16151. You have a resident medical officer at Portenae I suppose?—There are three resident medical officers at Portenae.

16152. Dr. BOGGER.—With regard to the relative cost between the asylum and the workhouse, you said you could not get the full figures as far as you knew; have you gone into the question of relative cost?—As far as

I know I apprehend that the cost of the workhouse is less than the asylum. It must be. They don't have the same provision.

16153. How much less?—I really have not any idea how much less.

16154. What is the cost of the inmates per head in an asylum?—The cost is between £26 and £27 per year; say £27.

16155. A little over 10s. a week?—Yes; between 10s. and 11s. a week.

16156. Does that take in everything; does it include interest on loans?—Everything except interest on loans. It does not take in interest on loans.

16157. You have had very heavy expenditure, I understand?—Of course we have had enormous expenditure on building.

16158. Of course you have a very large number to provide for?—There are nearly 2,700 under my care at present.

16159. What would you say in a maximum number that should be in one institution?—I should say that 1,000 is the ideal maximum, if I may so express myself. The London county asylums—they have seven containing each 2,000. I think that is unfortunately large.

16160. If they had asylums with 2,000 could you have proper classification do you think?—I think so. I think 1,000 affords quite sufficient facilities for classification.

16161. In your hospital arrangements do you include consumptives in the asylum?—Not in my asylum. I am sorry to say we have not got so far yet.

16162. Has not it been discussed frequently in connection with asylums?—It has been frequently discussed in connection with asylums.

16163. Has your committee taken any action at all in reference to it?—No.

16164. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose insane cases could hardly go to an ordinary sanatorium?—No. The difficulty about what has been suggested in reference to special provision for consumptives, is a practical one. We are all agreed, theoretically, as to what should be done. The practical difficulty is that a consumptive hospital is an asylum would require to be a small asylum in itself; it would require to contain provision for every mental class—every social class for that matter, if you had paying patients and others together.

16165. Suppose there were an educational establishment for idiots, what size should such an establishment be for Ireland?—Speaking roughly, not having gone into the matter with any care, I should say such an institution ought probably to accommodate 1,600 people.

16166. Would there be so many, do you think?—There are mentioned in the inspectors' blue book between 600 and 700 idiots as being registered.

16167. Has the register any accurate definition; is the name not used often synonymously for lunatic?—No; perhaps it is the other way; there are more idiots than lunatics. The words are, of course, used in a loose way. A great number of patients come to me in middle life of whom I get no history at all. Some of them come from workhouses, some of them wandering at large, and so on—people of whom we get no history, and who, I think, very probably have been, if not idiots, at least imbeciles from birth, and are classed with lunatics.

16168. If there was such an institution do you think these people could be made self-supporting?—By no means all of them, but a considerable proportion of them could be taught trades and could be taught means of earning in earning their own living.

16169. Could they leave the institution and take care of themselves outside?—I think the majority of them could not leave the institution and take care of themselves, but the majority of them could return to their homes, if they had any friends, much improved by treatment and able to contribute to their own living and able to lead an orderly life.

16170. Then, of course, when they return to their own homes they would be utterly away from control; would that be good for them?—In a great number of cases it would not do. A great number of idiots, although they can be taught a certain amount of trade or occupation, are yet not fit to be at large. Those persons would either have to remain permanently in the institution or else go to an asylum; but what I think an idiot institution is particularly wanted for is not so much the protection of those people in later years or the community from them in their later years

Mar. 12, 1864.

Dr. Conolly
Norman.

as the education in youth of those whom it is possible to educate.

16171. Have you any experience of children, deficient, who cannot take their place in ordinary schools, drifting into insanity through want of care?—I have not much experience of such cases. I know the class of cases that you mean—cases for which special schools have been established in London.

16172. Quite so?—I have little experience of such cases. They don't come much in my way. Persons

are usually premonitory insane when they come to us, but I have had one such case recently.

16173. Are there many of that class in Ireland?—I should not say there are, but I cannot be sure.

16174. Judging by the number of idiots in such schools in England and the benefits they receive, would that assist you?—I am afraid I don't know very much about that subject. I know the thing has been wanted as you mention, but I cannot go into it. I cannot express an opinion as to whether the play has been worth the candle or not.

Dr. Leeper.

Dr. LEPPER examined.

16175. Chairman.—You are at present Medical Superintendent in Swift's Hospital?—St. Patrick's Hospital.

16176. It is generally known as Swift's?—It is wrongly called Swift's, because the name given by Swift is St. Patrick's Hospital.

16177. Before you went to St. Patrick's Hospital you were medical officer of a workhouse?—Yes.

16178. In that case you have had double experience that will be useful to us, both as regards cure of lunatics in workhouses and in an asylum?—Yes.

16179. What is your opinion as regards taking care of lunatics in workhouses?—When I first took charge of a workhouse I had previously had some knowledge of the treatment of insanity, and I was surprised to find the extraordinary number of acute cases that came for treatment to the workhouse in the first instance.

16180. Mental cases?—Yes. In the workhouse which I had charge of for some years there were a very large number of insane constantly resident in the workhouse.

16181. Between thirty and forty on an average?—Yes. Of this number a large number came in as acute cases—cases one would imagine ought to go to the county asylum direct—some of them suffering from serious mutilations that had seriously occurred as the result of an outbreak of insanity, others who had made suicidal attempts, others suffering from extreme bodily weakness. The first effort I made on taking charge of the insane wards of the workhouse was to try to get my board to give me proper attendants to look after them. I failed in that. They would not, and although I used all my influence and put the case as strongly as possible before them, I could not get proper attendants.

16182. Did you try to get these lunatics transferred to the asylum then?—The moment we tried to do that we were met by the very extraordinary difficulty—the difficulty in the Act, which specifies that the dispensary doctor, and not the doctor in charge of the patient, is the person to certify that he or she is a dangerous lunatic—so you are prevented by Act of Parliament from certifying for your own patient. That was the difficulty I found. When I had a violent and dangerous lunatic and tried to get him transferred to the asylum on one occasion I distinctly remember in the justice case and the dispensary doctors came and refused to certify, on the dispensary doctor's certificate, so I was still left with the dangerous lunatic. Of course the Act is very extraordinarily worded, and says very distinctly the justices shall summon to their assistance the dispensary doctor, and, in his absence, the next nearest dispensary doctor. Then in that form I was able for some time to get insane people committed to the district lunatic asylum, but that was also very unsatisfactory, because although the patient came in, brought on by the police, you could not get him removed until the chairman and the board met and signed the order to undertake his removal, and I was still responsible for a large number of acute insane cases. Before I took charge of this workhouse one woman had murdered another in it. During the time I had charge of it, by, I think, a wholly immoral system of bribery—with tobacco and other means—I got paupers and such other people as I could depend on, with a modicum of salary, to take charge of these. By that means I prevented any such occurrence, although I was standing on very thin ice on several occasions. In later years a woman was employed by the Guardians, which was a sort of case, but, as regards the power to treat them, she was not capable.

16183. In the asylum you have at present do the inmates differ from those in ordinary lunatic asylums?—Not in their mental symptoms, but they are taken

from a different walk in life. But insanity is the same all the world over.

16184. Then the mental diseases are the same as in a asylum cases?—Yes.

16185. Comparing them with the cases you had charge of in the workhouse, how would you compare them? would you think the cases in the workhouse were of quite much the same class, or were they of a different order and less dangerous class?—One is the educated class and the other is not. The workhouse class is an uneducated class. Therefore the insanity in them is less complicated in those belonging to the better class of society, because they have more mind to go wrong.

16186. Which is the more troublesome to go wrong—educated people or uneducated people?—The educated man requires much more delicate handling, but as far as the treatment of physical diseases is concerned there is just as much difficulty in the one as the other.

16187. Did you think the workhouse patients, so far as the actual diseases went, were pretty much the same class as the others?—Yes; the ordinary forms of mental diseases are just the same.

16188. And there is not any simple, quiet lunatic, patient to be found?—No; the dementia, or the weak-minded class of patient, who will hardly answer you very often, or who leads a vegetative sort of existence, is the very class who is subject to conditions of impulsive violence, in which he becomes exceedingly dangerous. Once the storm passes over they are quiet again, probably for months, before another storm occurs.

16189. Perhaps you have heard Dr. Nolan's and Dr. Conolly Norman's evidence? would you agree with them about these ordinary asylums?—I entirely agree with this evidence so far as my knowledge of the subject goes.

16190. When you were in charge of a workhouse did you find many women of feeble mind there?—I did.

16191. Did they meet with any misdeeds?—They did.

16192. Did you form any conclusion or opinion with reference to that?—I think there is a great need, and am glad to have the opportunity of saying so, throughout Ireland—in many parts of Ireland I am familiar with—to have the mental condition of the women that are classed among the healthy paupers in workhouses improved into, with a view of seeing how many suffer from absolute mental defect and how many do not. It has been an old score. Some years ago I gave evidence before the Royal Commission that inquired into the condition of Irish private asylums, and I wrote this pamphlet (produced), which I hold in my hand, which has this entry which I might read:—"The following is an extract from a Scottish blue book for the year 1837; and then in the same blue book the following extract is given on the report on alien lunatics. It is quoted here to show that the Irish lunatic system is not considered perfection by the Scottish Commissioners:—"We again call attention to the circumstance that pauper lunatics who are thus sent to Ireland are frequently, upon arriving there, placed in the ordinary wards of poorhouses, from which they soon discharge themselves and return to this country. In sending such patients repeatedly to and fro a needless expenditure of money and trouble is caused." I mention this to show my contention is that the classification of male, and particularly female, patients is not at all what it ought to be, and a great many people are treated as sane paupers that are really mentally defective, and lead vicious lives—not from viciousness, but simply because they know no better—and I think that attention in that direction would largely in future years diminish the number of insane in this country.

16193. You think the number of insane is to some

extent accounted for by them?—I think it is a very large extent, not alone the nature, but the class moderately known as degenerate, the increase of which is largely caused by a want of appreciation of moral defects in

these women who are frequently the mothers of very large families.

16194. You have had instances coming before yourself Dr. Looper while in charge of workhouses?—Yes.

Mr. JOHN BYRNE examined.

16195 CHAIRMAN.—You are one of the delegates of the Guardians nominated by the South Dublin Board?—Yes; the Guardians nominated me as delegate, but I would not come to give evidence, as delegate, giving their opinions, because in some respects I differ from their opinions, so my evidence will be individual. My opinion is, it would not be desirable to interfere with Dublin Union either by amalgamation or otherwise. We have vested rights in the South Dublin Union.

One, the principal, is that our rates differ materially from those of the North Dublin Union, and so protest against any amalgamation, and if we were amalgamated with Collingwood or any other union very likely the same thing would occur that I apprehend will occur in country unions—by removing the facilities for the poor obtaining relief and medical aid further out of their reach than they are at present. I think the poor have rights as well as the rich.

16196 If the sick poor were left in the local hospitals in Collingwood and those places you would not see the same objection then, would you?—Yes; for the poor becoming destitute, say two or six miles to the West of Collingwood, it would be a long way to the North or South Dublin Union. I think the poor ought not to be put at a disadvantage beyond the present facilities which the law has given them.

16197 That would be an absolute bar to any action founded on our report?—I don't mean to say it should be a bar; but it is a matter that ought to be carefully considered before amalgamating the South Union. Its country districts the workhouses are fifteen miles distant from some portions of the unions.

16198 And forty, even?—Forty in some cases. I don't think it would be a reasonable or a humane thing to double the distance for persons obtaining relief in the workhouse or medical aid. I think the evidence I am given before this Commission up to the present does not sufficiently take into account the interests of the poor and the inconvenience which amalgamation would inflict on them.

16199 We have always had it put before us very strongly at every sitting the hardship of taking relief farther away from the poor?—And my opinion is that no advantage could arise to the South Union by amalgamating with any other union, and that we are quite large enough. We have 4,000 paupers in the union.

16200 You are the largest workhouse?—Yes, very large; and it is quite large enough for any single administrative body to manage with efficiency.

16201 Were you here this morning when Mr. O'Neill and Mr. Mooney gave their evidence?—I was not.

16202 The opinion was expressed by some of the witnesses that amalgamation would be desirable?—It would be very desirable in a pecuniary point of view, as far as they are concerned, but our rates are about 1½. lower than theirs. Of course we protest against being involved in a partnership of that sort.

16203 Mr. MURPHY.—One of the witnesses said he was disinherited because he had property in both unions. He was formerly chairman of the South Dublin Union?—I am an owner of property in both unions, but I represent the ratepayers here.

16204 I refer to a witness how you was examined as one of the County Council, and he pointed out he was disinherited because he was an owner of property in both unions?—So he might be. So far as I am concerned, and others, I am here to defend the interests of the South Dublin Union which I represent, and I say it would be outrageous to amalgamate us with a losing partnership such as the North Union would be. Moreover, the removal of workhouses to great distances and the removal of the destitute from the acquaintance and the relatives who frequently, according to my experience, have taken them out and procured them employment, seeking them to leave the workhouse, would I think, be weakened considerably by the removal or amalgamation of workhouses to a large extent.

16205 Do you mean that people who go into workhouses and who are classed as able-bodied, are visited by their friends while in the workhouse?—Yes.

16206 And employment provided for them?—By their friends outside, who make exertions to procure them employment and take them out, whereas if these

were miles and miles distant between the friends' residences and the workhouses, that means of communication would be weakened.

16207 Do you think there is much of such intercommunication?—I am quite aware of it in Dublin.

16208 Are not the visits very largely to the sick as distinguished from the able-bodied?—Another point in relation to children—I think children with a parent, a mother, that the Guardians ought to have power to board them out in suitable cases only. For instance, if a widow has got two or three children brought to the workhouse, I think when those children are a year in the workhouse without anything being done by either the mother's friends or relatives, that the burden of those children and the mother is likely to be permanent, and the Guardians ought to have power to board them out and pay for them the same as they have power to board out the orphan children of the county, because when the mother is in the workhouse with two or three children of from two up to seven years of age, for a year she is likely to be a permanent occupant of the place, and the children ought to be placed then in the control of the Guardians, so as to do the best for them by placing them in beneficial situations, and a proper school, and letting them be merged in the general population when they come of age. I think the Guardians ought to be able to treat them as if they were orphan children when they would be a year under their care in a workhouse.

16209 CHAIRMAN.—You look at the matter as if the children were going to be left altogether in the workhouse. Is the workhouse a place where children could be reared to the best advantage?—What else can you do?

16210 Would you rather board them out?—Yes, I would rather board them out, except for the destruction which a general system of boarding out would effectuate upon parental responsibility.

16211 In any case in which obviously there was no sense of parental responsibility, would you object to boarding out such children?—I think we ought to maintain parental responsibility.

16212 You ought to act as if it did exist?—Decidedly.

16213 Even when you know it did not?—Decidedly. You are obliged to do it, because if you were to board out indiscriminately you would find parents who would go in to get rid of their children. That is the reason why I say a woman in the house with two or three children, when the children and the women become destitute for about a year, I would then transfer their child by law to the category of an orphan, and let the Guardians deal with it as an orphan, and shall would diminish considerably the numbers of children at present in the workhouses. In the South Dublin Union we have no children in the school of all except they have a parent in the house. All the orphans are boarded out and are looked after properly, and are merged in the general population, by their nurses adopting them or getting them employment when they come to sixteen years of age.

16214 You approve of the system as regards orphan destitute children?—I do, most decidedly. I know how effectually it has worked.

16215 Knowing how effective it is for good, would you not be in favour, if there was no great risk, after your experience, of giving a permissive power to Guardians, to try boarding out where the parental relations have not been operative?—I think any weakening of parental responsibility, and including parents to come into the workhouse for the purpose of visiting their children on the Guardians, should be provided for. We must steer between the rocks on both sides, and that is a rock.

16216 Would you be willing to have some experiments on the subject, and to give the Guardians a discretion so that they might try whether in practice those dangers would be as great?—I am afraid the Guardians would not exercise that discretion properly.

16217 When did you ever know them to be guilty of any indiscretion?—I think I would keep you until 5 o'clock to tell you the whole story. I am not prepared to trust the Guardians with that, because I know how compressible they are by influence. It is human nature.

Nov. 25, 1904.
Mr. John
Byrne.

16212. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Is not it human nature for the mother to retain her child as long as she possibly can?—In some cases.

16219. Would you not say, as a rule, except in the most degenerate class, and that is the class that you would want to take the children from?—Unfortunately, the workhouses contain the degenerate.

16220. You would not wish to leave the children with such mothers. Would not it be far better to take away the children from such?—Yes; and if the child was with her for a year I would then enable you to deal with it, irrespective of the mother.

16221. CHAIRMAN.—Don't you think that that year would inevitably be bad for the child?—The child would be in the workhouse school.

16222. Is that the best place for it to be?—I think as far as the North and South Dublin Union schools are concerned, they are not very bad places for children to be. Children are much better off there than in similar places outside. I am satisfied of that. Their literary education is well attended to.

16223. I am not speaking of your schools, of course, but taking workhouses all over the country, and taking the favorable opinion which you have expressed about boarding out children?—I am already of opinion that boarding out is the proper system except for understanding parental responsibility, and you must not do that with the lower classes.

16224. Suppose there is no parental sense at all. Suppose there is only a sort of responsibility such as some public people have?—I could not suppose that, because I know it is not so.

16225. Some of these fathers and mothers have no sense of responsibility at all?—Some, and that is the reason why, if I boarded out children, I would leave them out altogether, and would put them under a probation of a year.

16226. That would show altogether they are not fit Guardians for the children?—You are not going to take up all the children who have no fit guardians. You would want very large funds for that.

16227. Who come as a charge on the rates?—Some are not. As a matter of fact I have known several cases in which the South Dublin Guardians refused to give children to the mother, who was out in the city and earning her bread in some questionable way, and when they inquired and it was reported on by the relieving officer, the Guardians refused to give the children.

16228. That was because they knew the mother was leading a vicious life?—Yes.

16229. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—You would approve of backing up the action of the Guardians in such cases?—I did back them up always in such cases.

16230. CHAIRMAN.—Is there anything else you would like to mention?—There is a query here with regard to area of chargeability. It would be most inadvisable to go back to the electoral division chargeability. That would be most unfair. The present system of providing charges by the union-at-large is a very proper one, and was advocated by the Guardians for years before it was enacted.

16231. You would not care to go a step further and make it a county charge for the sick?—I don't think we need go further than the union. It would be too large an area to control.

16232. The area you have at present for the asylum and the county infirmary, you would not care to make the cost of the sick a county charge?—No, because it would be most unfair.

16233. To whom?—To the unions that are at present enjoying low rates. The rates in Cabbage Union are low, in Rathdown they are low, and it would not be fair to put a charge on them other than they have to undergo by the existing law.

16234. You have not worked out what the result would be?—I believe the rates in Rathdown Union are something about 10d. in the £; in the South Union, 1s. 6d.; in the North Union, 2s. 6d.; and it would not be fair to go to Rathdown Union and say your rates must be increased rateably and amalgamated with the North Dublin Union.

16235. I am speaking of one class only, the sick?—I think the relief of the destitute poor is all we are to be called on to meet.

16236. At present the people in the extreme ends of the county are paying for a county infirmary in every county in Ireland?—It is no great hardship in Ireland.

16237. There is some?—It is very trifling, and they have always done it.

16238. For a certain time?—Yes, since a certain time; and then they have enjoyed immunity from those high rates consequent upon their local position, and consequent upon the law, and it would not be right

now to make an inroad upon their resources by increasing their rates merely for the purpose of amalgamation, and squaring things, as it were, that should not be squared except with equity.

16239. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Therefore I take it your view is that the present area of charge for rating should be maintained?—I think union chargeability is fair and equitable, and should be maintained.

16240. And the area should be maintained as it is for all purposes?—Yes.

16241. CHAIRMAN.—There should be no change in the Poor Law as regards Dublin city?—I think not.

16242. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—In regard to the question of settlement, that does not apply to the city of Dublin. It would make no difference whether persons living on the south side of the Liffey came over to the north side?—No; that point does not apply to a town, but the rating point does. That is a very serious point.

16243. You look upon that as a startling blot?—Yes, as well as amalgamating two such pauper unions as the North and South Dublin Unions, which are so large at present, almost too large for good management.

16244. One of the witnesses told us there would be considerable economies effected if the union of the two did take place?—I doubt that.

16245. In the matter of management, printing, and several other matters, economies might be effected, and when all were put together perhaps the cost would not be much more to the South Union than at present?—I am not able to say that, because you would require a certain number of administrative officers, and you won't get them unless you pay them well. You could not give the management of two workhouses to one master, and, of course, the clerical staff should be considerably increased, and besides we would have to superannuate some two or three who might not be required, at very large sums.

16246. That would be a staggering charge?—I think the amalgamation of the Dublin unions would render the concern unworkable.

16247. If you take out certain classes whose removal you advocate, namely, to board out the children and send away the lunatics?—Through the children are boarded out they are under supervision. You must have relieving officers to inquire about their well-being, and sometimes full reports are made and visits paid.

16248. That has not anything to do with the responsibilities of the North and South Dublin Unions?—Yes; we have between 300 and 400 children boarded out, and suppose you were to double that, you could not supervise that with the same staff.

16249. You could get rid of a great number of the staff?—You could not.

16250. You could make better classification by amalgamation?—You would not, because you have no room for any increased number of inmates. We are just as much starved for room as the North Union, though we don't make so much outcry about it; but as a matter of fact a month ago we had a report from our medical officer that if we did not make provision, the next twenty admissions would have to take their beds on the floor. Fortunately they eased off.

16251. Suppose the 300 inmates in the two institutions were removed, would not that make room?—Yes.

16252. Would not the removal of the children make room?—If you show me how to take them away, I would be with you, but I see the greatest possible difficulty in removing one or the other to give the necessary room.

16253. If provision was made for the lunatics by the establishment of an auxiliary asylum, or the enlargement of existing asylums?—The raters are not prepared to face that. They are hardly able to bear the existing taxes.

16254. Suppose it would not cost any more or as much?—That supposition is so unlikely that I don't think it worth considering.

16255. It is not so unlikely at all if you go into the matter. The Guardians are not getting any per capita contribution for lunatics in the workhouses. They would get 25 a year for them if they put them in an auxiliary asylum, and they would get a contribution of £10 3s. a year in a district asylum?—The answer is this: the Guardians spend about 4s. a week at present upon the food of the lunatics. If they were in an equipped asylum, such as you have, it would cost more than 9s. for them.

16256. Not for food alone. You must make a fair comparison. The whole cost amounts to about 6s. a week. In the Omagh Asylum an inmate costs about £25 or £24 a year for maintenance and payment of officials.

aid for everything except repayment of loans?—Omagh is very low. How is it we pay so much in Dublin.

16257. The Tyrone Committee think Omagh too costly. The last report shows that the cost per inmate was between £23 and £24. If you had a contribution of £5 for each lunatic in an auxiliary asylum it would bring down the cost below what it is in the workhouse?—Then there are no buildings. You should erect them.

16258. Could you not use the buildings of some of your workhouses?—I don't see them in any such available state.

16259. Balrothery, for instance?—I don't know how many maniacs they have in that workhouse, but I don't think that Balrothery Workhouse would be able to accommodate the overflow of the North Union, or the overflow of the South Union.

16260. Would you not agree to transfer the lunatics suitable for these institutions?—We have 200 lunatics in the South Union, and we do the best we can for them.

16261. You may take very good care of them, but do you think it is a suitable place for them?—I think they are as well off, if not better, than if they were with my friend Conally Norman.

16262. Do you not think they would be better off if they were sent in the fresh country air?—Of course it all that could be accomplished, but it would take large sums of money to provide the buildings to carry it out. We may all know what is suitable and desirable, but we may not have the capacity to provide it.

16263. Still, would you see your way to make a change that would cost no more. Do you not think the lunatics would be better out of the workhouse than in it?—Show me that first, and I will give you my opinion.

16264. Chairman.—Is there anything you would like to add?—With regard to increasing hospital accommodation in Dublin, there is sufficient hospital accommodation in Dublin without adding to it, because the hospitals treat all acute cases. The only accommodation now required is for the chronic incurable cases, who spend a great part of their life, if not their whole life, in our hospital ward. The next point I wish to call attention to is, the dispensary doctors in the city and counties are in an unfair and anomalous position. The red tickets which they get—

16265. We have no warrant to go into that. We are inquiring only under the Poor Law, not under the medical charivari—I am very sorry, because I have some evidence on that point. The next point is the insane. I think when Guardians, such as those of the South Union, treat the harmless lunatics to the number of 200 in the workhouse and provide decent accommodation for them, then the Guardians ought to get the capitation grant without being enforced into providing expensively equipped lunatic asylums, which, according to my view, is only necessary, and the ratepayers should be called on to provide only for dangerous lunatics.

16266. We had the advantage of hearing three medical experts this afternoon?—I heard them with very great pleasure, but I do not agree with them, because I know as a matter of fact that there are a number of lunatics in the South Union Workhouse that are harmless, and that can be treated with moderate care and moderate ability. They are furnished with out-door recreation. They have land on which they can dig, and they have a garden in which they can cultivate flowers. In these 200 people we occasionally have, perhaps every three or four months one becomes unmanageable, and when that person becomes unmanageable, we get a form filled up and send him to Dr. Conally Norman. After a while they become partly cured. Sometimes they come back to us, and there is no necessity for their being sent again at all. So there are a large number of harmless lunatics that can be treated, and are treated, in the South Union Workhouse at the low cost of the general average cost of the workhouse, and the Guardians ought to get the capitation grant for them the same as the governors of the lunatic asylums.

16267. The 2s. or the 4s. 6d.—I think we should get the 4s. 6d. because when we provide that for them I think we are entitled to it, especially as the State regards lunatics as their special care. The State undertakes responsibility for their maintenance, and ought to give us the capitation grant. There is a question how far, in the case of a person not destitute, it would be desirable to introduce a system of payments or contributions in aid of the cost of treatment of the sick or insane in hospitals or other institutions. My opinion about that is this, that the Poor Law authorities should be only charged with the relief of the destitute, and that persons in a condition to provide themselves with medical aid or hospital accommodation, should provide it in hospitals where they take patients in for payment, and I don't think the Guardians ought to be called on to treat persons who are able to pay.

16268. That is as regards Dublin?—Yes, and as regards the country, too.

16269. Where there is only one hospital in the country and no other hospital. There are plenty of places where there is no hospital within reasonable distance?—I am aware of that; there are some places where there are no places but the county infirmary. I think the governors of the infirmary ought to be enabled to charge. I believe they are enabled to charge.

16270. As a matter of fact all the sick have to go to the union hospital?—Yes, but whether the county infirmary or the union hospital treats persons able to pay for maintenance, they should pay the full amount of maintenance—not only the cost of food, but the cost of management, the cost of doctors, and the cost of nursing, and so on; as, for instance, if a person able to pay were treated in our hospital, I would not only charge him 4s. a week for maintenance, but I would charge him 10s. a week for supervision, medicine, doctor, nursing, and so on, whatever a fair price would be. With regard to tramps, we have not much trouble with them in Dublin.

16271. There are a number of night refuges in Dublin?—Yes.

16272. They take away the tramp class from you very largely?—To a great extent. But I think, as a general rule, all over the country tramps ought to be treated with consideration and discrimination, because I hold that no man is a tramp from choice.

16273. Do you really think that?—I think as to a great many of the tramps that condition is forced on them. I think if the tramps were kindly treated, and their names and addresses taken—

16274. Addresses?—Their last address; and if that is taken by the workhouse authorities and reported to the police, and a supervision is kept over them, I think it would to a great extent curtail them and bring them more under control. I think they should not be allowed to go about the country without some account being taken of who they are, what they are, and where they came from.

16275. A passport?—A sort of passport.

Mr. RICHARD ROONEY examined.

16276. CHAIRMAN.—The Guardians of the Balrothery Union are not in favour of any amalgamation as regards their union?—They are altogether against amalgamation. The first reason is on the score of economy. It would undoubtedly be an enormous increase in the rates in the Balrothery Union, where they would be amalgamated with the North Dublin Union, which, in our opinion, would be the only one they would be amalgamated with.

16277. This Commission would not dream of recommending amalgamation for any reason except economy combined with efficiency, but assuming there would be economy, what other objections do you see to amalgamation?—On the score of convenience, it would be rather inconvenient if the members of the Board of Guardians had to come to Dublin. That is not a very important point, but it is a very long distance. I have to come fifteen miles to Dublin, and other mem-

bers have to come twenty-two miles to Dublin. There is no railway accommodation, and they could not attend so that they would be practically disfranchised if amalgamated with any of the Dublin unions.

16278. They would not be able to attend often?—They would not be able to attend as often.

16279. Mr. MUNDOGAN.—Where do your District Council meet?—At the workhouse.

16280. If the management continued as it is; if you discharged the duties of Guardians as you do now?—To discharge the duties of Guardians and amalgamate with Dublin, is that what you mean?

16281. Yes?—It would be objectionable on the score of economy.

16282. If you managed your own area as at present, and provided for the wants of the poor and sick?—If we did that how would amalgamation come in?

Mar. 25, 1904.
Mr. John
Byrne.

Mr. Richard
Rooney.

Apr. 22, 1904.

Mr. Richard
Kenny.

16282. It would not be amalgamation, but it would be the doing away of certain workhouses?—If you do away with our workhouses, which would be the necessity of holding meetings.

16284. You would have the sick to look after in your district hospital, and you would pay for the keep of others who are now in your workhouse in some other convenient place?—It would not be common sense to send the poor from our union to any of the Dublin unions.

16285. Suppose you had only a few, twenty-five or thirty, is it worth while to keep up a big institution for these?—We have more than that at present. We have 125 inmates in the house. About forty of these are sick, and at times we have got more. During February we had 130.

16286. You have twenty-five children there?—We have not. On the 15th of February we had only seventeen. I would be very glad to see all children removed from the workhouse.

16287. If the children were taken away out of the workhouse, also the inmates, you would not have very many except the sick and the aged and infirm. Now suppose the infirm were kept there for the accommodation of the sick in the neighbourhood, don't you think it would be useful if power were given to the Guardians to pay for the keep of the aged and infirm persons in some other institution, and not to have to keep up the expense of the establishment for the few that are there?—Probably it might be a good idea if we saw the thing would lead towards economy. We would not have any objection. For my part I don't see how it could be arranged, and I am sure the Guardians would strongly object to sending them, even on the score of economy, to the North Dublin Union, or to Dublin at all. Doughtyborough, of course, would be the next nearest. That is a very long distance away, too. Of course if it could be proved it would be a saving on the rates, and not a hardship on the poor, I for one would not be against it then.

16288. Witnesses say that the workhouse has a rather disagreeable name, and unless some change of that kind is made, how will you get rid of that idea, whereas if the workhouse as such were abolished, and nothing but the infirmary and district hospital kept in these places, it would get rid of that consideration?—I don't think there is that great objection so far as our union is concerned. It is principally a rural district, and principally the same class that frequents it—both hospital and the house—and I don't see that it would make any great difference. Of course I have heard Mr. Mooney's argument about that, and I agree with him as far as suggested unions are concerned. I don't think it would make much difference as regards care.

16289. You do think the children should be boarded out as soon as possible?—Certainly.

16290. And additional powers should be given to the Guardians?—Yes, some powers should be given to Guardians to board out particular children. We have in our union some children. They are illegitimate, and their mothers are in the house, and in some cases two or three of them belong to the same women; and as to these children, it is a notorious fact that all children reared in a workhouse, at least in our union, will grow up vicious and ill-conditioned members of the population; and on the other hand our experience of ten years—we have gone back so far—of boarding out children, is that not one of them has turned out in any way vicious so far as we could find. They have all turned out useful members of society; and another thing, those children who are reared in the house, it is impossible to keep them out of the house. In some cases we have had three generations reared in the house continuously. We have at present in the house some people whose grandfathers were reared in it. Unless

something is done by which these children can be boarded out and kept away from the surroundings of the house, and the bad company—the principal danger is, on leaving school they are sent into the body of the house to mix with all sorts of bad characters, particularly the women, and the result is obviously, I take it, a vicious and bad one. If boarded out they would be all probability turn out useful members of society.

16291. You would be in favour of boarding out children?—Yes.

16292. And sending away the inmates. You have not many in the house?—That is a matter that I scarcely worth considering as far as this union is concerned.

16293. Would it not be better to have them in a place where they can be properly looked after?—It is a dangerous thing to give an opinion on. We have had experience of Portlaoine, and our union would be very likely about giving an opinion which would lead to building another institution. We suffered considerably by the building of Portlaoine, and I would not like to give an opinion. The Guardians have given an opinion that if such a thing is contemplated, some of the disused unions would be a good place to turn into an auxiliary asylum, say one for the whole province of Limerick.

16294. Your Guardians have decided that?—They have simply mentioned it, but the general opinion was it would be better to keep away from the question altogether if they could.

16295. They are afraid of lunatic asylums?—They are, very much. With regard to out-door relief, although I have not heard it mentioned here, I don't think it was touched on. One important point is I think the Guardians should have a greater discussion with regard to the distribution of out-door relief. We will say, for instance, at present as the law stands we can only give out-door relief to persons holding less than a quarter-acre of land. I believe that is a great hardship, and the Guardians in my union are also of that opinion. There are a great many cases, or at least a number of cases, of people holding one or two acres who are most deserving cases for out-door relief, but the Guardians are prevented from giving it to the law stands.

16296. Do you mean small farmers?—As I understand, that class of people holding two and three acres of land; they are labouring men, but when they grow old or stricken, they are not able to do anything. The land is absolutely worthless to them, and they make no money from it, and it is a great hardship to them not to be able to give them out-door relief.

16297. Are they tenants of labourers' cottages?—Yes, we have some very hard cases.

16298. Can you instance some?—I remember one time the tenant of a labourer's cottage. She was a widow. She had a family of seven children, and we could not give her out-door relief unless we put her out of the cottage. We did not do that, but through the help of some good people in the neighbourhood she was enabled to live along without out-door relief.

16299. Were they young children?—Yes; her husband died. It was an extremely hard case.

16300. She was not able to pay the rent?—She did pay the rent. Her children after a few years became useful to her and able to help her. The neighbour helped her in the meantime. That is how it was. She was a good woman, and she was able to make a little roaring fire, and so on. We are also precluded from giving relief to a widow with one child. We can only give it to a widow with two children. That has been proved to be a great hardship in some cases. The Guardians should have a discretionary power to give it in deserving cases, even to those who have only one child. It has been found a great hardship in many cases.

Mr. THOMAS CLARKE, J.P., examined

Mr. Thomas
Clarke.

16301. CHAIRMAN:—You represent the Rathdown Union?—Yes; and I am Chairman of the Urban District Council of Blackrock, and I represent the Council here as a delegate. With regard to the location of Rathdown, as you are aware, it is so situated that I think it would be impossible to do without the workhouse at Loughlinstown, which serves five urban districts, Blackrock, Kingstown, Dalkey, Killiney and Ballybrack, and Bray, as well as two Rural District Councils, and which extends from the Co. Wicklow down to past Greystones, in the Co. Wicklow; so I think that this settles the question of doing away

with the workhouse at Loughlinstown, the extent is so great.

16302. It is a very populous district?—Yes.

16303. Is there any hospital in the whole of that district except St. Michael's Hospital at Kingstown and the urban hospital?—And a small hospital at Monkstown, but there is no other hospital.

16304. So that the large towns of Bray and Blackrock have no hospital?—Except the Kingstown one; but St. Michael's is not available for the destitute poor who are going to be ill for any length of time. In dealing with the hospital question—I intended dealing

with the out-door relief question first, but as I mentioned the hospital question I might as well refer to it now—we tried some time ago to get the hospital at Rathdown made a district hospital, because we find there is the greatest possible prejudice among the poor to send themselves to a workhouse hospital, and that the poor strongly object to go into these hospitals at all, because they think they are branded as paupers when they do go; and there is no provision made for them. They must wear the proper garb, and the decent people feel it very degrading to have to submit to that. But it was mentioned here to-day by several witnesses, I think very properly, that there should be a large disease hospital apart entirely from the workhouse. I entirely approve of that. As long as it is part and parcel of the workhouse some of the poor would almost go on the road before going into it. That is my idea in dealing with this hospital question. With regard to out-door relief, we are rather peculiarly circumstanced, having so many large towns in the district.

16324. Dr. M'GROGAN.—What about the apoplexy of St. Michael's and Monkstown—how are they supported?—By public subscription.

16325. They get no relief from the rates?—No; with the exception of a small grant we give from Blackrock Urban Council to St. Michael's, and £25 to Monkstown. That is the only thing from the rates that we subsidise.

16326. That is from Blackrock?—Yes.

16327. How much does Kingstown give?—I understand it gives a similar amount. The other urban districts contribute nothing.

16328. Perhaps they secure no benefit?—They receive equally in proportion. Recently Rathdown No. 1 Urban District Council made a contribution of £25. They were afraid it would not be approved of by the Local Government Board, but it has been sanctioned, and they have contributed £25. But the question of out-door relief is a rather serious one in our district, as there is such a number of poor, and some of them have little homes that they might not enter the workhouse at all, if this system of out-door relief could be extended and judiciously administered; and I would be greatly in favour of out-door relief.

16329. CHAIRMAN.—What class have you in your mind as being proper objects of this out-door relief?—In some cases a poor widow with a couple of children.

16330. She is eligible at present?—Yes; but it is given in such a way that it is perfectly useless to these people. The relieving officer must only give relief in kind. Where is the rent to come from.

16331. That is not the law. The Guardians can give it in cash?—They never do it in the Rathdown Union.

16332. That is in their discretion?—It is given in kind, and every deponent I sign as chairman of the Board is always in kind, but never in cash.

16333. You can give it in cash if you like?—If that can be extended it would be a very great advantage. There was a reference to where a poor woman has one child only. That is a very great hardship, because if the child is a mere baby, three or four months old, the poor woman cannot earn her bread, and if we insist for it might prevent her from going into the workhouse.

16334. These are cases in which there is absolute destitution, because there is a widow without support?—Yes.

16335. Are there any other classes?—There are those deserving old people, men and women, perhaps if their family have grown up, in many cases they won't contribute to their support. We have had several instances of that kind, of perhaps nephews and nieces, if they had no children. Instead of sending those decent old people into the workhouse, I consider the correct thing would be, if it could be arranged, to give them what they would cost in the workhouse, &c. for this old person, to board them with the family, and make them happy in their own little homes; whereas if they go to the workhouse it is mere or less of a prison. I had three cases of that kind where a benevolent lady in the district asked me to interest myself. She agreed to pay the rent of these three cases, who were taken out of the workhouse, and lived comfortably and happy. All they got out of the rates was £s. 6d. a person. These are cases in which out-door relief, to a judicious extent, would go a long way to keep these people without having to go into the workhouse.

16336. You would put in poverty instead of destitution as the test?—Yes; old age and poverty. There was another matter, about a sanatorium for consumptives, that has been mentioned. I think of all the things that cry out for redress in this country at present, nothing is so badly required as a sanatorium for

consumptives. In this country, as you are aware from statistics, we lose from 12,000 to 15,000 per annum between the ages of fifteen and twenty-five, and there is no place to treat those people, with the result that they die like rats from the plague. Where one member of the family contracts the disease it spreads to all the others. We have had several cases in Blackrock in which these people have taken it in that way. It is a subject I have given a great deal of study to, particularly a system they have at Nordrach, in the Black Forest, where Dr. Walker, the famous authority, says 80 per cent. of these people, if taken in time, can be cured. Here we are losing—worse than the Poor Law—12,000 of our population, and there is no place at all for them to shelter in. I went down to Newcastle, and I spent a day there, where we got one of the wards at Loughlinstown made specially for the consumptives, and the people at Newcastle told me they had always from 50 to 70 applicants on their books, and they could not accommodate them. The disease then got rooted into the system of these people, and the result was they died. If that could be brought to a happy conclusion, to have a sanatorium for the very poor in this Co. Dublin. There is nothing we want worse. The district hospital I have dealt with. Dealing with this question of children of vicious parents, in the early part of the inquiry this morning people were under the impression there was no law to deal with that, but in reality we have put it into force in Rathdown for the last few years. Where the parents are bad characters we get the relieving officers to bring them up all over the district, and as soon as it is found out they are vicious, immoral, drunken people, we deal with them and remove the children from them, but as Mr. Byrne mentioned here, there should be some system where a poor woman goes in, her husband dies, perhaps he is killed by an accident and she is left in the workhouse, don't you think the proper thing to do in that case would be to send the children out to nurse, as the exact possibly get out of the house with them?—And also those girls who go to maternity wards—they must remain there; they won't be allowed out unless they take the child with them; there should be some means of dealing with these people. The child could be taken from them, and they could be allowed to support themselves. At present we have two people to support instead of one. Of course the argument against that would be, she might come back again in a similar condition.

16337. Do you think the more likely thing is that having had such a warning once she would be more careful?—That is my opinion, that it would not occur a second time.

16338. Mr. M'GROGAN.—I wish to add this supplementing my evidence, that the Guardians ought to be able to give out-door relief to persons who are not permanently disabled from labour by reason of bodily infirmity, as, for instance, I will give you a case: a poor man takes sick working. He goes into hospital with fever, and it is six or eight weeks, or perhaps ten, before he recovers from that fever. Meantime he is totally disabled from labour and his family are destitute, but we are not able to give that family any out-door relief, although if we were able to give them out-door relief for a few weeks until the man came out recovered in health and went to work again, we could prevent the home from being broken up, and retain the solidarity of the family. We should be able to give, in suitable cases, out-door relief to persons who are not permanently incapacitated from labour by reason of bodily infirmity.

16339. Mr. M'GROGAN (to Mr. Clarke).—With regard to the children of vicious parents, what do you do with them?—Board them out.

16340. Have you had any trouble with the parents going to the houses where these children were?—The only trouble was one woman came to my windows threatening to break the windows for taking the child. That was the only case.

16341. You had no trouble, by reason of the visits of parents, in the houses where these children were boarded?—No; we took care the mother did not discover where the children were placed.

16342. The fear has been expressed elsewhere that a parent may hunt up the child and annoy the foster parent?—No; we manage to send them to a place where the mother does not find out. I might say within the last five years there is, to my knowledge, a great improvement in the Rathdown Union. Formerly it was not as well carried out, but since the advent of the nurse to the workhouse I consider there are fewer establishments better managed,

After 22, 1901

Mr. Thomas
Clarke.

Mar. 22, 1904.
Mr. Thomas
Clarke.

and I think the hospital portion, which you have seen lately when through it, would compare favourably with any hospital in the city of Dublin.

16334 CHAIRMAN.—All connected with your hospital, not forgetting the doctor, deserve the highest praise!—Yes, the highest praise.

Mr. A. K.
O'Farrell.

Mr. A. K. O'FARRELL examined.

16335 CHAIRMAN.—You agree with what Mr. Clarke has stated?—Yes, with everything he has stated. First of all, there is no necessity for amalgamating Rathdown Union with any other. With regard to the classes that might be treated outside of unions in other places, I think that, with regard to consumptives, there is plenty of room for that, but I am entirely opposed to boarding out insane people. I cannot see that any good will come of it. There are about fifteen insane males and twenty-five insane females in Rathdown. Several of these are epileptic. No person would care to take charge of them; they are all of such a class that there is no chance of them becoming any better. With regard to the hospitals, I think it would be just as well if the fever hospital could be turned into a district hospital. It could be easily managed at Rathdown to isolate the hospital from the establishment.

16336 Would you put fever into a new building? No, I would have it in the building it was always in; but a non-contagious district hospital might be created for Rathdown No. 1.

16337 In Broy?—No, towards Dondrum I think would be better. It might not be a very large one. There might be a better arrangement, but I think that would suit admirably, because there was a movement on behalf of Blackrock to amalgamate with us in establishing a hospital of that sort. We could not see our way at the time to go into that, but I think it very desirable that it should be done, and I agree with what Mr. Mooney was saying here to-day about the management of these hospitals—they might be managed by representation or getting the local bodies together.

16338 By a joint committee?—A joint committee.

I think it would be very advantageous, and beside I had an idea in my mind—I don't know whether it is worth talking about—perhaps they might be induced to contribute to the hospitals, and paying patients might be taken in at a reduced rate, not paying as much as in ordinary hospitals. I think there is nothing else to deal with except the tramps. I think the tramps should be registered. I think they are, to a very great extent, registered already, but there should be a thorough system of registration as regards the tramps. Of course the tramps are the product of the workhouse. I saw a few days ago a grandfather, a son, and a grandchild, all tramps, and all had been brought up in the workhouse; and there are a great many of that class of people. They are the product of the workhouse. Undoubtedly it is very difficult to know how to deal with them. I think by the judicious housing out of children the tramp nuisance will be, to a great extent, abolished in time, but of course at the present time some attempt ought to be made to deal with the younger portion of the present tramps at all costs; and I can see nothing but getting farms for them—waste ground or bog—and employing them on it, and letting them stay long enough to see if they could be induced to get industrious habits, and if they did not, certainly I would deal drastically with them as criminals.

16339 Mr. MURKIN.—You would approve of the establishment of a farm colony for them?—Certainly, I would be in favour of that. It is time to get rid of the tramp nuisance. Last week there were forty-four tramps in the Rathdown Union. It seems to be a happy hunting ground for them, though they are not ever kindly treated.

The Sitting was adjourned.

THIRTY-THIRD PUBLIC SITTING.—WEDNESDAY, MARCH 23RD, 1904.

Mar. 23, 1904.

At the County Council Office, Dublin.

Present:—Mr. MICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. COLE BINGHAM.

Rev. J. C. DOWSE examined.

Rev. J. C. DOWSE.

16338. CHAIRMAN.—You are incumbent of Christ Church, Leeson Park?—Yes.

16339. There are some matters you wish to bring before us about the Protestant children in the North Dublin Union?—In the North and South Dublin Unions. In the South Dublin Union there are on an average eight Protestant children provided with a Protestant teacher at school within the walls of the workhouse. The objection to boarding out these children is that if they are removed then there is no Protestant school for children of the same-and-sons, being Protestants; and also, frequently one or other of the parents of these children is in the house. In the North Dublin Union the Protestant children are all, to the number of about twelve, in Catholic schools.

Mr. GOGGIN.—No; eight.

Witness.—Here the children have a Protestant teacher, and are all taught in a schoolroom with Roman Catholic children. A Protestant paper woman sleeps in the room with them; they are, consequently, brought up in a Roman Catholic atmosphere.

16340. Have they a separate dormitory?—Yes. This being the condition of the children, I make the following suggestions: that a building be erected, in which the children of the North and South Dublin Unions should reside; that building situated in Castletown parish, and that the master of the parish, as at present, be chaplain to the children. The children resident in the new building should attend the National school in the district; that no distinctive dress should be worn; that the North and South Dublin Unions should, in due proportion, pay for the erection, equipment, and maintenance of the building, the salary of the chaplain, and the salary of competent persons to reside with and take care of the children.

16341. This would be a very large expense for about between sixteen and twenty children?—With regard to the matter of expense, I don't think it would be a large expense, from what I can learn with regard to the unions in England; the following are the facts:—In the Metropolitan Barnack School in London—this is the only, of course, giving you the average, I don't say that these figures would be accurate for this country, for I don't know—of the Metropolitan Barnack School the average is £29 per head per year, but in scattered homes, such as I suggest, the average cost is £15, just this more than half.

16342. Does that include building?—I can give you the expense in connection with the paying off of the building and the maintenance of the children's board in various unions. Here is a union in Blackfield, where there are two scattered homes built. The average number of children is six, and the cost per head is £1.10.2. I am not perfectly certain whether that includes the paying off of the building or not. Here is Blackburn, where there are four scattered homes accommodating from fourteen to fifteen children each, and the cost is 10s. 2½d. a head. Of this sum 2s. 2½d. is expended on the equipment of the room so that, I should say, the average, if you diminished the building expense, would be somewhere between 7s. and 8s. per head, and that would be very much cheaper apparently than the cost in a scattered home.

16343. Do you know much about the system of boarding out children?—I am only in favour of boarding out in a scattered form. I think it the second best.

16344. You are aware of the system adopted with respect of your church?—I am.

16345. Do you approve of that?—I approve of it, if the system of inspection is rigid and frequent, and if it is not, I do not approve of it. With regard to the Poor Law, as far as I can understand, I don't think we have as full sufficient inspection, and of course the objections I give here would remain even if that were perfect, which I don't think it is, and I think money

times those poor children come to the wall entirely owing to their foster parents.

16346. Do you mean that about the Protestant orphans?—No, but sometimes, of course, there are bad foster parents.

16347. Do you find the results in that case are disappointing?—Not entirely disappointing—in some cases they are—but they are under the direct inspection of the clergyman of the parish, and also of our paid inspector.

16348. Is the result, in your opinion, on the whole as regards the boarding out of these Protestant orphans, satisfactory or unsatisfactory?—I think it is satisfactory on the whole, owing to that very rigid system of inspection.

16349. Are their reports from the clergyman of the parish?—They are good; they report regularly to the Society's committee.

16350. Quarterly, perhaps?—I don't know.

16351. Is it a regular report or a report when there is something wrong?—It is a periodical report they give to the committee, but that report is very often satisfactory.

16352. What do you assume to be the inspection at present as regards children in unions who are boarded out?—The inspection, I think, officially would only be about once a year of these boarded-out children.

16353. From the union?—Yes.

16354. How do you come to that opinion?—I have heard so. I don't know absolutely, because I am not a member of any Board. It may be more frequent, but I understand there are only two lady inspectors.

16355. But as regards inspection by the local bodies themselves, by ladies' committees?—There are hardly any committees appointed; there are only two, I understand, one in Belfast and one in Cork.

16356. That is an entire misconception, and then there are the reports of the relieving officers. They need to be rather preliminary some years ago, but now they are rather close?—If that is so it does away, to a large extent, with my objection with regard to inspection.

16357. But the inspection is every day getting briske?—I think it wants improvement.

16358. I am afraid I cannot accept your opinion on the matter, having regard to your idea that they are only inspected once a year by a lady inspector?—That was my idea, yes; that was wrong.

16359. If the children when boarded out could be inspected satisfactorily, would you be in favour of the institution-reared child or of the boarded-out child?—I would not be in favour of the institution-reared child, but then these scattered homes I don't think would go under the head of institutions, because they would be very much smaller and much more homely than the institutions.

16360. But still there would be no home life there?—I think there would; they would have their home-mother, as she is called, and they would live a perfectly natural life, as the other children would, and go to the district schools.

16361. Have you visited any of these scattered homes in England?—No; but I have read an exhaustive report with regard to them, and they seem very satisfactory.

16362. If the system of keeping the children in any institution or home is continued after this inquiry, what you would suggest would be that the Protestant children of both unions should be placed in one or two homes?—Yes.

16363. At a cheap rate, and you would anticipate no further expense?—No; I am only going, of course, on these figures, but that is what I believe. I see a large number of unions in England are adopting this plan; some thirty-six up to last year.

Mar. 28, 1904

Rev. J. C.
Downs.

15355. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—I don't suppose you have any experience of country workhouses or of children boarded in the country?—Practically, not.

15357. Because I may state to you as a fact that the charge of all denominations make it a point to have regular inspection of all the children boarded out in the various unions. I myself am a member of a Board of Guardians, and I know we have frequent communications from the clergymen, and we have also a monthly inspection from the relieving officer. We have a ladies' committee, of four ladies, who make it a point to go round at least once in three months and look after the children, see how they are clothed, and their general condition as to cleanliness, and so forth—These are all surprise visits.

15358. CHAIRMAN.—All the visits are surprise visits. It would be utterly impossible to make appointments for visits—Do you not find some difficulty in getting foster parents?

Mr. Charles
Eason.

15353. CHAIRMAN.—Will you kindly mention to us anything you wish to say. We did not get an abstract of your views—I appear specially, I may say, in connection with Lady Meath's offer of a home for some epileptics. I have been deputed by the Philanthropic Reform Association to attend to express their views on that matter. I don't know whether I need say much about the proposal. I think you know in outline what it is. Lady Meath is prepared to establish a home for a small number of inmates, say thirty, provided that arrangements can be made for the maintenance of the inmates after the home is established. Now up to the present, although this proposal has been before the public now for some years, we have not been able to make arrangements for the maintenance of the home after establishment, and in consequence the offer has not been accepted, has not become practical, and we trust that as the result of the inquiries of this Commission public opinion may be stirred on the matter, and may be inclined more favourably to it, so the importance of it, and in consequence perhaps of recommendations, which I hope you will make on the subject, a sufficient number of persons may come forward to establish a home on a voluntary basis. One of the recommendations that I would also make would be that of the Boards of Guardians have not power to establish such a home at the present time they should have such power in the future. It is especially the case of some epileptics that I am referring to, and I would just like to say a few words on the principle of the question, namely, that the same epileptics should be treated in a special institution. With regard to the reasons for that—of course I don't speak as a medical man or as an expert on the matter—I am only relying on the information which has come before us from the result of existing institutions. No doubt it is well-known to you that Lady Meath has established an institution on the lines I am describing, although, no doubt, on a much more elaborate scale in England, at Godalming. Then you doubtless know that there is in England the National Society for the Employment of Epileptics, which has established a home at Chalfont, which also maintains epileptics and gathers them from all parts of England; so does Lady Meath's home. You will see in the report (produced) a statement of the different counties from which the patients are drawn. No doubt you know in Germany the system has been established to a very large extent; the best known colony is at Bethel, but there are many other colonies; that is the colony that takes epileptics of all classes.

15354. The one referred to in the book "Colony of Mercy"?—Yes. There is also a book issued by the Charity Organisation Society dealing with these institutions, which gives an account up to the date of the publication of that book, in 1882. I should also like to put before the Commission the address which Lady Meath gave on the subject at a meeting of our Association at Kilbride; that contains the argument for the project, and points out that there is no such institution in Ireland, for some epileptics, if they become destitute, are obliged to go to the workhouse. Now the special treatment which they receive—

15355. Before you go to deal with that, do you know on what basis the English home was started. How did Lady Meath come to start that; in Ireland she offered to build, as I remember, and equip a home, provided she could get undertakings from certain numbers of Guardians to pay a definite sum for the people that might be maintained there?—I think it involves a little

15352. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Not generally. There is great competition in some places for children; in fact we have applications ahead of—Of course there may be competition.

15356. CHAIRMAN.—The children are useful; they get into good farm life, and get absorbed in the ordinary ranks of labourers?—I know that in what is said, but whether these children are treated as they ought to be.

15353. Even in ordinary homes, of course you know, there are a great many parents who are not desirable, and similarly there are foster parents who are not desirable, but we have the great advantage in the foster system that we can change the parents?—I do think these scattered homes, if they could be conducted only, out very much additional expense, would be preferable.

15352. As regards institutions?—Yes.

Mr. CHARLES EASON, J.P., continued.

more than that; you cannot tell exactly what the maintenance of the home will cost, and what Lady Meath means is that there will have to be a substantial committee formed, who will be willing to accept the financial responsibility, no doubt relying on the payments from the Boards of Guardians; but still could she had persons willing to say: "We will guarantee, if there is any deficiency, to make it good."

15355. She wrote to the Local Government Board, asking them to ascertain would the Guardians look favourably on the establishment of such a home?—I thought it was another benevolent lady.

15357. It was some anonymous lady, and I thought it was Lady Meath?—No, I know it was not; I saw the result of that.

15358. The Guardians were in the position that they could not undertake to say: "We will send inmates to an institution that is yet in the air; we can only do it as soon as it is formed," but the resolutions of a large number of Guardians were distinctly favourable to sending them; if the time arose, and the cost was not prohibitive, they would be very happy to do so?—I will come to that when I deal with the financial aspect of the question. But with regard to the establishment of these homes, in each case they were established by persons who were willing to take the responsibility. Both Lady Meath's home and the society's home at Chalfont receive patients from the Boards of Guardians, and I believe the charge is 12s. a week. The reason why such a home is necessary is that the best treatment such persons can receive requires suitable occupation and suitable means of recreation, just as it has been stated here with reference to the barracks. It is, therefore, obvious that in perhaps none of the workhouses in Ireland can anything like that proper treatment be given to them. I suppose the South Dublin Union is as favourably situated as any for doing it, and yet I think they are quite unable and don't pretend to give anything in the way of special occupation or recreation to the same epileptics. And then with the small number scattered over Ireland, it is quite impossible to ask the Boards individually to make special arrangements. The figures for the last Local Government report work out like this:—Taking males and females separately, there are only three unions that had more than 10; there are 60 out of 141 male in five unions, and 81 were scattered over the rest of the country in ones or twos. With females it is very much the same. There were only six unions in which there were over five, and the remainder, 123, were scattered in small numbers. Therefore, it is quite plain that the same epileptics cannot receive humane treatment in the unions at present. Now there is a tendency to look upon these cases as if they were hopeless, and I was very pleased to see that Dr. Norman, in his evidence yesterday, said that even as regards lunatics he did not look on any case as incurable. Seeing that there is such a mass of evidence that some epileptics can be benefited by special treatment, it is positively inhuman to put them in circumstances which must tend to aggravate the disease and cause them to drift into the fringe wards. I suppose one reason why the public mind is so little stirred on the matter is the small number, but after all that is no consolation to the individuals themselves.

15359. What I would say would be the hardship in the South Dublin Union, where they have done all they could as far as separation goes, is that they are not able, being a pauper institution, to provide all the

amenities and occupations desirable for persons of that class?—The whole question of the transfer of the cases to the insane wards causes a very unpleasant impression, the feeling that the whole thing is in the power of one or two officials. Of course there are safeguards adopted that a person should not be sent to a lunatic asylum from outside, but once they are inside the power of officials is enormous, and we know from the proceedings how difficult it is to over-ride the decision of officials.

16370. Would you say it would be wise that any case of transfer from the ordinary healthy insane wards of the workhouse to the insane should be made formally on the certificate of doctors, as would be done outside?—I trust when the Commissioners have the matter before them they will carefully inquire what are the precautions taken to ensure that persons are properly admitted.

16371. I think you may assume that a person in a healthy ward, who was found to be insane according to the judgment of the medical officer of the workhouse would himself transfer?—I would like to know what record there is of the fact.

16372. Merely the change in the books—his own opinion?—Does that come distinctly before the Board of Guardians?

16373. No, the question of classification I don't think would?—I would suggest that such an important matter as interference with the liberty of the person should be done under very stringent regulations.

16374. And you think something like what is adopted outside should be adopted inside the workhouse?—I don't so. I now come to the Board of Guardians. I would like the Commission would be able to say something like this to them, first of all, to make it clearly known that it was legal for them to send a patient to any institution.

16375. That they have already been told by the Local Government Board?—But there were some doubts, and those have been dispelled.

16376. I was not aware there were any doubts?—Then if the Commission could express their opinion strongly that it would be desirable to have an institution established so that we might be able to appeal to the public and feel that we were backed up by the support of the Local Government Board, and then the Local Government Board should also inform the Guardians that they would sanction a payment, perhaps making a sum. We have received encouragement from the fact that the North Dublin Guardians definitely passed a resolution saying they would pay 7s. a week towards the maintenance of each patient, and we believe the South Dublin Union would do the same. They have enough between them to enclose the home in contemplation.

16377. What was the difficulty about supporting it?—That we have not found the voluntary persons willing to undertake the cost.

16378. What was the extent of the offer?—It depends on the cost of maintenance.

16379. Was the offer a building or a site?—The offer was to provide a house, whether by the building or the purchase of a house. I might mention that Lady Meath through her friends has been making inquiries in all directions for work a building, but up to the present the negotiations have all fallen through from one cause or another. Her wish is to present a suitable place to the responsible body or committees.

16380. Such, for instance, as a combination between the North and South Dublin Unions?—Yes, of course, if the unions would undertake to pay up any deficiency in the cost of the home.

16381. They would have power to take a present from Lady Meath of a building to be used for the same epileptic of their workhouse?—Yes.

16382. That would provide all the necessary machinery for carrying on the institution?—I am not authorised by Lady Meath to say how far that would carry out her ideas, but I am quite certain she would consider such a proposal.

16383. They have in their workhouses more than the number necessary?—If you take them as males and females, at that time there were thirty-two females and thirty-three males in the two Dublin unions; that would just cover it if they were all suitable, but they might not be all suitable cases.

16384. They are all classed as pure epileptic?—Yes; but at any rate, considering that other unions would, I think, undoubtedly, send them, there would be no difficulty in making up the thirty.

16385. Mr. MURPHY.—The difficulty would be the analysis of the institution as the cost per head would be higher?—It is an experiment. The

idea was that if the thing was once proved a success, and that it could be associated at a reasonable cost; 7s. a week certainly would not cover the cost; the lowest estimate we ventured to put before any one is 11s. or 12s., and that really stops one from carrying it out; if 7s. a week would pay the cost there would be no difficulty in starting it.

16386. CHAIRMAN.—Have you got an estimate for the working of your home?—I will give you the figures of the National Society in England. What happened at Clifton?—In 1895, the average number was twenty-two, and the cost for each was £73; in 1896, the average number had risen to fifty-six, and the average cost dropped to £43; 1900, the average number, 124, and the cost £52. No doubt all these English institutions are established on a more expensive scale than would be necessary in this country, but still we would not like to hold out the hope that it would be done for such a small number without seeing our way for 11s. or 12s. a week, and what we thought was that the Government should be asked to contribute a sum of £6, the same as they do at present for lunatics in asylums; that would require an Act of Parliament, but if that were done—

16387. A grant on the part of the Treasury?—With reference to that, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that two Parliamentary Committees have recommended such a grant, on the Cottage Home Bill and the report on Local Taxation in Ireland. That committee went very closely into the question of what services should be national and what local, and having regard to the circumstances of Ireland, they recommended increased grants for the maintenance of the classes that are permanently sick and defective.

16388. Mr. MURPHY.—But the danger is that if you wait until you get the contribution from the Treasury you are keeping back the great reform that you think so necessary?—We don't want to wait. We urge the general public to come forward. We are not suggesting that we will wait for that.

16389. Could you not, in conjunction with Lady Meath, try and find out the probable cost per head of a number of inmates, say up to 100 or 150, so that that would be likely to cost, and then place that before the Guardians throughout the country to see will they help you?—That is, I think, what we are doing at the present time. We are trying to stir public opinion, and one of the objects of making this Commission to consider the matter was that we might have at our back a definite recommendation that such a scheme would have their approval. Of course it would have to be a home that was established under conditions approved of by the Local Government Board as to management.

16390. CHAIRMAN.—What would be considered a satisfactory arrangement by the donor?—If a voluntary committee would come forward and enter into the necessary financial obligations.

16391. Jointly and severally?—Yes, I don't want to minimize it at all.

16392. That would be rather difficult to float, would it not?—It would.

16393. Do you think it is a practical proposal?—We are going to try it.

16394. How does one come to bodies that really have the material. Many of these people have the same epileptic. There are plenty of cases epileptic outside that would be glad to come in, but it will cost more than at present. We cannot hold out any hope to Boards of Guardians that they will be able to do it for 7s.

16395. It was only an off-hand opinion, I am sure, passed round the table on a particular day?—We have not quite found that. We have been before the Guardians several times. At first they wanted to limit it to 50.

16396. Why should there be any committee between the local body and the insane people?—If we could stir up the local bodies to such an extent that they would take the home.

16397. Supposing you go to the South and North Unions, and say: "Gentlemen, we will give you a house if you will maintain it and fill it with some epileptics," do you think you would be refused?—Up to the present we really did think we would, but from what you say now—

16398. It is only my surmise. I would be inclined to do it myself. I don't think you will get a committee jointly and severally to come forward and take such a heavy responsibility?—It is because we have not succeeded in doing that that nothing further has been done.

16399. You were trying for something you would not be likely to get?—The cost of maintaining the inmates

Mar. 22, 1904.

Mr. Charles
Eaton.

would be reduced somewhat by the work they would be able to do, but that comes into the accounts both of Clonfert and those other places. With regard to the impossibility of getting voluntary assistance, it should be borne in mind it is voluntary persons who have established it in other countries, and I don't see why the charitable resources of Ireland—

16405. A definite but not an unlimited liability?—You could easily keep it within certain limits. You can always free yourself of liability by saying you would be obliged to close the home if you could not get the money.

16401. People don't like to do that?—I think that embraces all I wanted to say about the same epileptics at the present moment.

16408. You did not give us the numbers for the whole of Ireland?—141 males and 217 females.

16403. You may say, roughly, 400 people?—That was on the 31st of December, 1901. Now I would like to make a few remarks on the question of children, because this also has been a matter under the attention of our Association ever since its formation, and the first thing that occurs to us is that the present powers possessed by the Boards of Guardians have hardly been utilised as fully as they might have been, and we fancy that Acts of Parliament are passed and the Local Government Board send out circulars informing the Boards of Guardians. They do their duty no doubt in that way, but the circulars are put away and get forgotten, and they deal with cases afterwards, quite oblivious of the fact that they may deal with them otherwise. There was an Act in 1902 extending the terms of the Boarding-out Order, and I doubt very much whether the Boards of Guardians generally have realised the powers that give to them.

16404. My impression is that they do. It is a good many people's interest to remind them of it?—We notice that in the evidence given before this Commission over the country, statements are made which show—

16405. The lady inspectors are aware of it, and wherever they go they keep pumping it into the Guardians?—Yes, and of course it is a new Act too; but I would suggest that perhaps in a short time the Local Government Board would ask for a return of the number of children sent out under the extended clauses.

16406. You mean whose stay out has been extended?—No, but who have been sent out under the extension; the extension enabled them to deal with children with whom they formerly could not.

16407. I thought you were speaking of the extension of age, not the extension of powers?—Then the children can now be sent to any school certified by the Local Government Board. We think very little use has been made of that power, and that is due in some extent, we strongly believe, to the power of vested interests on the Boards; that is the great difficulty in all these changes. The main difficulty is to try and recon-

16408. Are you aware of many schools that could be certified in Ireland under that?—No; there are not many, but there are some cases in which the children could be sent, and we knew they have not been sent; and behind that we believe are largely the vested interests of the schoolmaster and chaplain in having a certain number of children still remaining in the workhouse, otherwise their services might be more or less dispensed with. We think the Boards of Guardians should be urged to make use of these establishments more.

16409. Rather than boarding out?—No, I don't want to put it rather than boarding out, for I think where boarding out is possible it is a very good system, but then safeguards must be adopted. Now I am quite aware that there are provisions made for the inspection of children, but still in discussing it with ordinary persons, we find that the great objection is that a number of people have it in their minds strongly that the children are, as a matter of fact, sometimes not properly looked after, and they invariably tell you they know of cases of boarding-out children who have not been properly looked after, and I believe the result of the inspection by the ladies appointed by the Local Government Board has shown already that in times past the inspection has not been adequate. I wish to give credit to the Board of Guardians and the Local Government Board for the fact that they are now trying to work up inspection to the proper standard. I noticed recently a correspondence with the Local Government Board in one union, which showed that the difficulty was to get ladies appointed, and the opinion of the Board of Guardians showed that they completely misunderstood the nature of the inspection required from

the ladies. At Longhrea there was a Poor Law officer, and one of the Guardians, referring to the matter there, stated quite distinctly they would be willing to have it carried out, but could not get the inspection committees; therefore boarding out will always be insisted by such difficulties, and until those difficulties would be removed the Board of Guardians should in the meantime recognise that they have alternative methods of dealing with them.

16410. Would you like to see all the children removed from the workhouses?—I am quite sure that is not practical. There are temporary and permanent causes of poverty. It is not right if a power happens to be temporarily coming to the union that that person's child should be permanently taken and sent to an industrial school and boarded out. You must draw a distinction between temporary and permanent. Then, certainly, I would adopt the boarding out, as far as possible, but that it is not possible first of all, there are a number of children who are not sufficiently healthy to be boarded out, who require special care.

16411. You mean they should be sent to the hospital?—Well, that would require institution treatment of some sort, and a foster parent will only take a child that it likes, and they won't be willing to receive a child who is not physically strong enough to do ordinary work.

16412. They take them at a very early age?—Yes, but you have children ranging from one to fifteen. You have a child of eleven or twelve that becomes an orphan; you may find it very difficult to board that child out.

16413. You then would look forward to the workhouse being a necessary asylum for a certain number of children?—No, I think other institutions should, as far as possible, be utilised. Take that question as to the Act of 1899, Section 3 of the Poor Law Act. A child of a parent who is permanently bedridden or disabled, can, under the recent Act, be boarded out; but I would like a child who comes under the second section, the child of vicious parents. I would like that child to be boarded out, but I would also give the Guardians power to send that child to an industrial school. I would urge strongly that the Treasury grant should be given to children sent to the industrial school under this clause. I would say, with regard to the question of payments, wherever you have a matter that is the interest of the whole country and not of a particular locality, that should be a national charge by a sort of county rating, a national poor rate; that the children should be recognised as not liable to be paid for by the locality in which they happen to come into the hands of the Poor Law, but they are a national interest.

16414. Mr. MUNSTERMAN.—Would not that be encouraging institutional life?—No, because I would give the Guardians the alternative.

16415. You would be offering the homes on one side and nothing on the other. Would not that be giving encouragement to institutional life in opposition to home life?—I think not. I think the Guardians pay 2s. or 3s. for the boarding out of children. Now if they are sent to an industrial school they will have to pay 4s. or 5s.; they won't save anything by sending to an industrial school. But then there is no expense which will deal with all the cases. A child may be already of such an age with its vicious propensities that it ought to go to an industrial school. It is a mere accident that it comes into the hands of the State through the Poor Law instead of through the police, that it is sent to the workhouse. You cannot board out a child of twelve or thirteen; at least you will find it very difficult to get foster parents to take a child with perhaps a city taint upon it, that has contracted evil habits. These children require to be sent to such institutions on the same ground that they would be sent from the police court at the present time; but I would enlarge the opportunities for the Guardians to deal with the children as widely as possible, and throwing the onus on the Guardians to study the case, and consider what is best in each case, and throwing the onus upon the intelligent public to interest themselves in it, and see that the Guardians do their duty in these matters. The whole thing is one that depends largely on the co-operation of the benevolent public—greater co-operation than in the past between the voluntary and State agencies. Then I would allow children to be sent by Boards of Guardians, for unions to combine; even by Boards of Guardians, for unions to combine; supposing you were not able to carry out amalgamation, and the Guardians decided they ought to retain children in their schools, I don't see why children should not be brought together into one union and be paid for by the union that sends them.

Nov. 22, 1894.

Mr. Charles
Bacon.

15435. CHAIRMAN.—That is the system which exists at Gile and Tim?—Not necessarily. There are three things the Board of Guardians can do—they can establish a special place for children within their own control, as at Caffee; they can combine and establish an entire institution, but they can also send the children to one of the existing institutions, where they could undertake to look after the children better, on the same idea that is being thought of in connection with lunatics, viz., or those who are committing, and under the new arrangement there will be a proper provision made, say in one workhouse, and from the other workhouses children can be sent to that place, and the unions sending them would pay a contribution. The simple statement of the fact that there are thirty-five unions where the inmates are less than 100 shows that you cannot give special treatment for all classes in every workhouse, and when the benevolent public urge that special treatment should be given to those classes, they should recognize that there is no use suggesting a thing and then not according to the only method by which the proposal can be carried.

15437. Then you have the ordinary workhouse school, you have a school separate from the workhouse, as at Caffee, you have another school, such as Tim and Gile, and have you a fourth school?—No; there would be very great practical difficulties in carrying out amalgamation. I hope something will come of it, but what I want to suggest is, that in the meantime the Boards of Guardians could improve things by combining among themselves; the aged, and infirm, and chronic sick could be sent from one workhouse to another workhouse, where arrangements could definitely be made; if they did not see their way to amalgamation straight away, if such an interchange of the various classes could take place, it would lead to a considerable improvement in the treatment of the sick.

15438. We have three schools at present. You also refer to the certified school and the industrial school as regards permanent children. Is there any other idea you had as regards children?—I don't think there is anything else to suggest, but there is this to be said about children further, that is, that there should be some means of training these workhouse girls before they actually leave the workhouse. This would be in the nature of a certified school, a home where girls could be sent from the workhouse and receive an industrial training; it has been mentioned several times. Miss Barton mentioned it in her paper in connection with the Local Government Association, and some efforts have been made in Dublin recently to start such a home in which girls could receive training.

15439. Domestic servants, dressmakers?—I don't know what form of training they would adopt.

15440. Is there any suggestion that such a home should be opened by the Guardians, or how?—Again, probably by voluntary effort, in the first instance, and the hope that the Guardians would send the children there. Then there is a very important matter in connection with these girls, and that is looking after them and the children generally after they passed beyond the workhouse age. I don't know whether any effort is made to trace their after-care.

15442. Yes, at some of the schools I am aware they do. I cannot say whether it is universal. They take what steps they can to keep in touch with the children afterwards?—I think the general public don't understand the importance of trying to help the Guardians in that matter. I believe a great deal could be done if the Guardians would encourage the assistance of the public with regard to their work in various ways, and see to it that Miss Welpy mentioned, that there should be a committee of ladies, who would undertake to visit the girls in situations, and see that they are looked after. The Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants does that work for England with good results. And another suggestion was that the inspectors under the Infants Life Protection Act do the same work in looking after the children.

15443. That might be a drawback. Supposing a girl was well-conducted, she would not be anxious to have that link with her past?—If it was a lady who visited her it would not be a link with the past. I quite agree with you that it is of the utmost importance to prevent.

15443. Mr. MURKIN.—I may remark that the evidence of witnesses as to the after-care of these girls has been altogether in favour of the boarding-out system. Girls raised in institutions have not turned out, it seems, so well as those who have been boarded out. I am very glad to hear that, because it confirms my opinion very much. I have one or two remarks to make on the general question of amalgamation. Amal-

gamation would tend, of course, to raise the question of out-door relief. It would be necessary, if unions were dissolved, to arrange some local management. The medical relief would still have to be administered locally through the dispensary doctor. Formerly there were dispensary committees on which persons other than members of the Board of Guardians used to act, and it would be a very valuable thing if those committees were restored.

15434. CHAIRMAN.—For poor relief purposes?—Yes; they could certainly extend it to the supervision of out-door relief. If increased powers were given for out-door relief in these districts, it should be granted, subject to the supervision of such a dispensary committee.

15435. What would you expect would be the effect on out-door relief expenditure by that?—I don't like myself the enlargement of out-door relief. I believe very strongly it should be restricted as much as possible, it is so liable to abuse.

15436. Do you think if you put a number of people to look after it they won't be interviewed very much by poor people, and the result be an increase?—Every system is liable to abuse, and mistakes, and errors. We are all human beings, and our officials are liable to error, and no possible change of system will eliminate that factor from the arrangements; and the way I would say is this, to try and educate the public; let them feel that unless they will take pains and trouble to sacrifice a little of their time in giving attention to these matters, you cannot maintain a high standard among the officials, the doctors, or anybody else. I would like to see the distribution of the relief tickets taken out of the hands of the licensed trader. The excuse is that nobody else can be got to trouble themselves about it. The whole difficulty is that respectable people won't take the trouble to distribute the tickets. Apart from that everybody would agree that it would be very much better that the licensed traders should have nothing to do with the distribution of relief tickets.

15437. Where they do act as distributors it is generally in the case of country stores, where the same man sells everything?—Even in country places I should hope there would be traders who are unconnected with the licensed trade. In a city there should be no difficulty whatever.

15438. Where the licensed trader happened to be a Guardian?—It is not restricted to Guardians.

15439. Wardens and Guardians now?—Is not the appointment of wardens in the hands of—

15440. It is practically disorganised. Are you altogether on dispensary tickets?—At the present moment.

15441. Because that is outside our function?—It is only as part of the medical relief. When you consider the distribution of a workhouse you disorganise the present system. I was thinking partly of my own experience when I acted for a short time on a dispensary committee. I had a book of tickets, but practically no one came to me for them.

15442. You were in town?—I was in Dalkey, and there no doubt the local trader was a most respectable man, but still I think the system is objectionable. I am quite sure if other traders in the town would act on the dispensary committee and get the tickets, it would be very much better for the poor people.

15443. Mr. MURKIN.—Are you still on the question of out-door relief?—I don't think I have anything more to say. If out-door relief were granted locally, it is clear that a person who might be sent into the workhouse when the workhouse was on the spot would be given out-door relief if sending him to a workhouse meant sending him a great distance away, and if that were done I would suggest it should only be done under an efficient local committee, who would superintend the distribution and see that only suitable people got it.

15444. It is an economical method of giving help if properly safeguarded?—I believe it is almost impossible to safeguard it. Then with regard to tramps and persons of that character.

15445. CHAIRMAN.—You have seen the recent Bill?—I have heard of it, in the direction of establishing labour colonies. I would be inclined to suggest we should go slow in that matter, and rather wait behind England. I think the present powers in Ireland ought to be brought up to the English powers, the increased powers of detention, and I would hope that one of the results of this Commission would be that the Board of Guardians would in some cases see that they are not using their present powers with regard to tramps. The methods adopted vary very largely in different unions, and on that point I would like to make this suggestion, that a great mass of evidence is being taken, and if

Nov. 22, 1904.

Mr. Charles
Rosen

that evidence is not published until the whole Inquiry closes we shall have volumes of such dimensions that nobody will wade through them; it would not only assist, but the evidence would be more readable in small volumes, and it would help the work of the Commission very much, because the evidence already taken would be a guide to other localities not yet visited, showing them what sort of questions they would have to face, and what subjects to consider. We ourselves, in endeavouring to stimulate public opinion, would be very much helped if this evidence was published, because to see the reports in the local papers is most difficult. I have got some myself with a great deal of trouble.

16435. Mr. MULLENBACH.—You think the vagrancy laws as they are at present in England would be sufficient for this country?—I don't say sufficient, but as regards tramps the question is so difficult, and the question of labour colonies so difficult, that I think we might wait a little until we saw what method was adopted in England, and then follow their example.

16437. The experiment has already been in existence in England for some time?—I have noticed that the London unions do combine to a certain extent for the able-bodied, but is there the same power in this country? We know that in England the Local Government Board can authorize a great deal more than they can here. They have greater power under General Orders in England than they have here. Here I don't suppose the two unions in Dublin could meet together in reference to the able-bodied without legislation.

16438. Supposing we have legislation in regard to these matters?—I would give power certainly to the unions to combine and treat the able-bodied any way they thought fit.

16439. CHAIRMAN.—You have noticed from some of the reports in the local papers that you have referred to what the evidence has been about tramps. There is a good deal of local anxiety to have the present system changed?—Yes; but then I have also noticed statements from persons that the present powers were not used.

16440. What would you call the present powers?—They appear to have considerable liberty, and there are differences as to the amount of labour and the hours of coming in. One union won't keep them in on Sunday, another won't take them in except on Saturday night.

16441. Any of these people can take their discharge on three hours' notice?—I would certainly suggest the English law should be adopted to give power to control that.

16442. There are a large number of people living in Ireland habitually going about from union to union, some on carts and some on foot?—The general public must remember this, that if we are going to put a greater control over these individuals, it must be a greater police control. I don't say that that is an objection, but we must recognize that they will be required to verify their statements, which will mean something like the German system, of a register pass to certify where they slept the last night, and unless they are able to account for themselves they must be made liable to police procedure. If we are to have classification according to merit, people will have to be prepared to verify their statements, and have their history recorded and brought to light. We know from the Charity Organisation how difficult it is, and how people resent anything like inquiry. But with regard to tramps, there is one question in connection with taking children from parents who are unfit to have control of them. I think the utmost caution should be exercised in any such procedure, both as regards the tramps and the mothers of illegitimate children in the workhouse. In the first place, an effort should be made to carry out the reforms urged by Mr. Rodden, of Belfast, to make the putative father liable as he is in England. That would prevent a number of cases coming on to the Poor Law at all, and as prevention is always better than cure, I think that measure should certainly be adopted.

16443. An assimilation of the bastardy law in both countries?—Yes; we recognize that there are exceedingly difficult questions, and at present we have not touched them at all, but we certainly think a strong effort should be made not to take the children from the

mothers. I favour the idea of a mother of a first child being looked after, apart from the general inmates, by female assistants in homes; and you must remember, in your anxiety to look after the children, to be very careful not to increase the evil.

16444. Do you think it would be likely to cause more lapses?—There is great danger of it, undoubtedly.

16445. By treating first offenders?—I don't mean first offenders; but if the idea was that all the children were to be taken out of the workhouse and removed from their parents. At present I believe children are retained in the workhouse, and the mothers go out in the hope that they may live a more respectable life; well, I am not prepared to give an instance.

16446. It may be an individual case?—Then I would like to say a word on the question of the ratings. We all know that Dublin suffers from the absence of a law of settlement for Ireland. I am not suggesting that the English law of settlement should be adopted for Ireland, but I would like to recall the Commission to suggestions made something like thirty-five or forty years ago by the late Dr. Handcock in relation to settlement. His suggestion was that a limit of fourteen years—

16447. Was that by a pamphlet?—A paper before the Statistical Society, that fourteen years should be established as a complete basis of chargeability, and for shorter periods chargeability should be complete for a different union, without actually moving the person from one place to another, so as to get rid of the very great evil that Dublin suffers under from houses being sent, for instance, to Richmond Asylum, simply because they happen to become chargeable in Dublin; to a certain extent they get relief from the Treasury grant, but lunatic should be a national charge. If there were any idea of extending out-door relief, I favour going back to the system of electoral division rating for out-door relief purposes, because it is so essential that the representatives of the locality should be made to feel that if they are indulgent in granting out-door relief they will suffer themselves. In theory I would rather extend the area of chargeability, but if out-door relief was relaxed at all, they should go back to the former system. With regard to amalgamation in Dublin, I have not considered that specially, but I would rather like to see it if it was the opinion of the Local Government Board that it would lead to greater efficiency. There are certain directions in which it would; it would be a great thing to have the rates uniform, but I see very great difficulties in carrying it out.

16448. What difficulty, now, do you see in carrying it out?—The inmates of the two unions are a very large number to look after, and if you attempt to deal with all the cases you cannot have them all properly inquired into. Yesterday there was some question about making one workhouse for males and the other for females; that is the sort of thing to which I would not care to commit myself until you had the whole thing before you. I would have no objection to it as a sub-division, certainly—a sub-division, together with my family in both unions, our large business interests are, of course, in the North Dublin Union, but we have business premises also on the South side. I quite think the evils of a sort of competition among the unions relative to cessals and in-and-outs is a thing that should be checked, but I should have thought it could have been checked without amalgamation. I want to support the statement made by Mrs. Haas, that there should be a lady inspector under the Local Government Board.

Mrs. Haas.—Ours!

Witness.—You must begin with one, certainly; but considering that women and children form such a large element in the Poor Law, I do think that a lady inspector should be appointed, and also it should be introduced in the large workhouse hospitals, where you have several doctors, that one should be a lady doctor. And then there is another small matter; although it is a small matter it should not be overlooked. It was proposed by the Irish Workhouse Association that proposed by Mr. Wyndham, that is that the Boards of Guardians should have power to meet in conference and pay the expense of such conference, so that they might interchange ideas, and I am sure a great improvement might come from such an interchange.

Mr. T. C.
Harrington.

Mr. T. C. HARRINGTON, Barrister-at-Law, M.P., Ex-Lord Mayor of Dublin, examined.

I did not prepare any notes to send you, because I thought you might ask me questions. I really have not very much time to prepare notes, but I think I am conversant with most of the subjects likely to be touched on by your Inquiry.

16449. CHAIRMAN.—The main question that affects Dublin city is the question of how many men ought to be in the city and county?—I have prepared some figures on that, but if there are any questions that suggest themselves to you, I shall not in the least

Mar. 22, 1904.

Mr. T. C. Harrington.

plain of your asking me. I desire first to direct your attention to the necessity for the amalgamation of the two unions, or, at least, an assimilation of the rates of the whole district. In London, you are aware, since 1860 the rates of all the different unions have been amalgamated—they are pooled.

16480. To some extent, the metropolitan part—They are all pooled, and the excess in one district goes to the relief of the poorer district. The absence of that in Dublin causes some curious anomalies, and leads to bad administration between the unions, that is the absence of all care in the admission of persons to the unions. If they put the idea in their mind that they are treated better in the North than in the South Dublin Union, they leave the South Dublin Union and sleep one night on the north side, and then they are in the North Union.

16481. Or if they find the dietary a little monotonous in the North they will go to the South for change!—Yes. First of all they are a very undesirable class of persons in a union, and very unmanageable, and neither Board of Guardians really has any proper control or supervision over them; the moment they become troublesome they are back to the other union again. The strongest argument for amalgamation is on the question of the valuation of the unions. The poorer portion of the city is by far on the northern side; the valuation is going down every year; a number of houses have been re-valued; the valuation has been decreased, and a great deal of property on the northern side is going into tenements. The other side is not only a richer district as far as the city is concerned, but has a rich country district, the two wealthy townships of Penrude and Rathmines, and a large rural district, and the result is that the South Dublin Union has a total valuation of £792,045.

16482. It is up this year to £801,000?—I am taking last year; and the total valuation of the North Union is £406,033, so that you have a difference of practically 70 per cent. The difference between the actual inmates of the unions is only something like 21 per cent., whereas the difference between the valuations is 70 per cent.

16483. I suppose there is no doubt about it, the North supports some of the poor of the South, and the South some of the poor of the North?—Undoubtedly you cannot take the inmates as a test, but the unfairness of the present system is that you have so large a valuation contributing to the maintenance of a smaller proportion of the poor, and there is really no reason why a man living on the south side of the Liffey and one living on the north should be paying a different poor rate. Then, so far as the administrations of the unions are concerned, it would lead to great economy. In my judgment the amalgamation would be more economical than pooling rates. When they are both administered differently we have a much larger staff of officers than would be required if we had to administer them both together. I am strongly in favour of the idea of having one of the unions entirely for females. In the management of that union you should have a larger proportion of female Guardians. Naturally the public themselves would see the necessity of giving over the management of the union largely to the female Guardians, because they very rarely interfere with the male portion of the union; where they are Guardians their efforts are directed towards the women's portion of the union. If you have one of these unions devoted entirely to females, you could reduce the staff almost by 50 per cent.

16484. Considerably?—In each union you require a man to help the matron, and a great deal of it is the difficulty of keeping the inmates apart. Then at the same time this transition from one union to another would be stopped; then the cost of advertising, accounting, clerks, and all these would be largely cut, and in the management of the children it would lead to further economy.

16485. You would have two sets of books?—Yes, but we could be managed much cheaper than the other; you would only require one clerk to supervise the two accounts.

16486. You would have one set of clerk's books and two set of house books?—In the management of children it would also be very useful, because you could have all the boys of the two unions treated in one institution and all the girls in another institution, supposing that the treatment of children remained as it is. I am not quite in favour of the present system, the divided form of treating children. You should not have boarded-out children and a school in the workhouse at the same time for the children, either one or the other.

16487. On the question of amalgamation, are you in favour of amalgamation pure and simple?—I am in favour of amalgamation, pure and simple, and I consider it as absolutely necessary for proper uniformity of rating.

16488. You could not have uniformity of rating without amalgamation?—You could not under the present Act.

16489. But I mean under any circumstances?—You have it in London by means of pooling.

16490. You would only have two unions here to pool?—That is so.

16491. It would assume a different appearance here?

—I also believe, so far as the management of the unions is concerned, there should be some supervision by the local authority over the expenditure of the unions. I will take the case of the Corporation. We are presented by the two unions with a budget every year. We cannot say a word about it. For the south side the demand on the Corporation is £64,750, for the north side, £53,597; that just shows you immediately that we have a larger proportion of the poor on the north side than on the south, consequently the poor rate becomes higher on the north side. Why, if the proportion is larger and the proportion of population to contribute is smaller and poorer, why should it have the heavier burden; it is a perfect anomaly. We have no power in the Corporation of revising any one of those figures. I am a member of the North Dublin Union as well as of the Corporation, so I speak in the dual capacity. The Local Government Board can look into any question of extravagance, but the Corporation has to strike the rate; they have no discretion, and they cannot do as we do with our own committees. When we are presented by them with a demand, we often say: "We won't give you that money," or tell them to postpone the works for another year. We cannot do that in the case of the unions. And now the difficulty is the greater because they are not held responsible by the public for the expenditure. If the poor rate is larger nobody thinks of blaming the Board of Guardians for it, but they look to the Corporation.

16492. Don't they look on you as merely collectors?—Not only see we collectors now, but we give this sum to them the very moment they make the demand, and the result is the public look to us as the administrators of it, and all the criticism comes on us, some of which we deserve and some of which we do not.

16493. In Belfast there was an idea put forward that the unions should be co-terminous with the county borough?—That is a very good plan.

16494. They have no townships, of course?—In that case you would have only the one union, but here the question would be subject to continual change if there was any question of the extension of boundaries, but in reality our townships are portions of the city; only the canal separates them, and if you had separate unions the poor belonging to Rathmines would be sure to be picked up within the municipal boundary.

16495. The reason they made the suggestion in Belfast is because the city is extended out into the country?—Yes, if Dublin was the same I would have the whole thing as one union. If you had Penrude and Rathmines portion of North Dublin County might well go into Ballythorn, and portion of South Dublin Rural District might very well go into Rathmines; but you should extend somewhat beyond the boundaries of the townships so as to include building ground. That is all I intended to say on the question of amalgamation.

16496. The only thing I did not quite see was how any arrangement could be made for even rating without amalgamation. That is still not quite clear to me. If you have two Boards of Guardians, one spending profusely and the other carefully, you will have a good deal of difficulty, and you will have people very free in incurring expenditures on one side, because they know it comes off the other side?—You can simplify it if you have an Act of Parliament under which the expenditure in both unions should be reviewed by the contributing authorities, and that they would treat the two unions alike.

16497. If you came to work it out in practice I must say I see tremendous difficulties?—Of course there are a great deal of difficulties. The only way I can suggest to you is the pooling of it, as is done by the Metropolitan Act.

16498. That would work out in South Dublin paying so much a year to North Dublin as a contribution-in-aid?—Yes.

16499. Then there would be no inducement to economy?—Of course that is the difficulty about it. There is no inducement to economy in London except the general supervision of the Local Government Board.

Mar. 25 1894.

Mr. T. G.
Harrington.

16470. They are powerless in matters of that sort—Amalgamation pure and simple I am in favour of, and a diminution of course in the governing bodies, because the governing bodies are so large you cannot amalgamate them. I would suggest to strike out half the representatives of each, the Board is too large.

16471. The new body ought not to be larger than either of the existing bodies—Certainly not. I was going to say a few words on the question of out-door relief. The Guardians of the North Dublin Union prepared a statement of their views on that subject.

16472. Your out-door relief is administered in kind?—Yes, and very largely from the union itself, except in the rural districts. I would be strongly in favour of more discretion to the Guardians in the distribution of out-door relief for purely temporary distress. A great deal of the pauperism in Dublin is produced by the breaking up of the homes during periods of want of employment, or in very harsh weather. This winter we had a large number of people who were out of work; many of the large factories in the city, through distress of trade, suspended portion of their hands. They worked the whole time in Dublin, but with a diminished staff, and the result was some of our greatest concerns reduced their hands, and that led to distress. We tried in the Corporation to meet it, to some extent, by opening up works we would have to do in the year as quickly as possible, but of course it is a bad system and liable to abuse; but in a case of that kind I would suggest the Guardians should have more power to give temporary relief, but that that relief should stop automatically after a certain period. I would say temporary relief for a month, and it should cease automatically at the end of the month, and come specially again under review, so that every case would have to come definitely before the Board for review.

16473. Mr. MURPHY.—That exists in practice already?—Which branch of it coming up for review?

16474. Yes!—I know it does; but I am speaking of an extension of the present system of temporary relief, that there should be a little luxury in its administration during certain periods.

16475. CHAIRMAN.—At all events it would come up in a more formal way?—The relieving officer would not have the power of giving it without a special renewal.

16476. Would you be afraid that that would be rather formal if it was explained, "This is only a renewal"?—I would have it stopped, and he should make a fresh application.

16477. All the relief is given in kind—you don't propose any change in that?—No. A question that has occupied a good deal of your time is the question of the treatment of harmless lunatics. I am strongly in favour of excluding them from the unions and having them treated elsewhere, but it is a question which has to be dealt with very carefully. If you send them into an asylum with the present enormous charges in the asylums, it becomes a frightful burden on the ratepayers, one that it would be utterly impossible to bear. You have to keep a larger staff in the asylum for violent lunatics than for harmless lunatics, of course. What I would suggest is that if they are to be treated in an asylum they should be treated in a separate building, with a largely diminished staff, and not placed on the same chargeability as the violent lunatics, or the burden would be very heavy. Then I think with reference to those that the Government grant in aid should be given in their case.

16478. This is 4s. instead of 2s.—Yes. If that were done, and they were treated separately, there would be great safety for the public. We have a special grievance in Dublin with reference to harmless lunatics. If they become violent in either of the unions, North or South, and they are transferred from the union to the asylum, they become then a charge upon the district where the union exists. If you take an inmate of the North Dublin Union—say he landed from Holyhead destitute, or was an imbecile sent into the North Dublin Union—because he is transferred from that to the asylum he is charged to the North Dublin Union. Well, that is all right; but if it was a person sent into the union, say from Drogheda, or to the South Dublin Union from Pembroke or Whitehall, or any of the districts outside, if that person is in the union and becomes insane in the union, and is transferred to the asylum, he is charged not to the Co. Dublin or the district he came from, but to the city of Dublin, because the union is structurally situated in the city; that is very unfair and oppressive in the working out. Then, of course, intimately associated with that is this question of settlement.

16479. You heard Mr. Eason's views?—I did.

16480. Do you think that plan of his would be effective?—I was rather taking notes during his evidence. The question of settlement affects several lunatics, lunatics and ordinary paupers. In Dublin many of those who are sent into unions are cases of girls who got into trouble in the country, come up to Dublin to one of the maternity hospitals, and won't go back to face their people. They go into the union; they are only a few days in Dublin, and they are sent direct; very often they get rid of them from the maternity hospital by getting a cab, paying for the cab, and sending the girl to the union. We had a case recently in one of the Dublin Unions where the lunatic was discharged as Curlew, and they very cleverly paid him fare to Dublin; the moment he landed in Dublin he was a violent lunatic. He was transferred to one of the unions, and we will have to pay for him for the rest of his life. It was a great piece of economy buying him the ticket. These things are very absurd, of course. In Netley Hospital after a soldier has been there for some time they send him across to Dublin, if he is an Irishman; the moment he lands on the North Wall he is taken to the North Dublin Union direct, and charged to the union, or he is sent to the asylum and charged to Dublin borough. We have had numbers of cases of that. We have made protests over and over again to the authorities, but there is no relief whatever; we get no contribution from them. Very often they take the precaution, if he is a lunatic, of allowing the police beforehand that he is a lunatic, and to look after him, and the police are there to take him to the asylum. If he is destitute or an imbecile the moment he lands he is brought in contact with policeman, and brought to the North Dublin Union, and we have to pay for him there. We have had cases where they have been sent direct from English unions to unions in Ireland. You are perfectly familiar with that, but I am speaking more of the pressure on us from cases outside. Owing to our position, all passengers are landed at the North Wall. A large prison is situated on the north side. We have a case in the union of a girl sent from Armagh. She was confined in Mountjoy Prison for some time, and got out of her mind. She was transferred immediately into the asylum. They are not contributing for her from Armagh. With reference to the children, the present manner of treating children in unions is very varied according to the unions, and very varied in the same union. In the North Dublin Union we have a special school with a large number of children in it at Croke's Auxiliary—that school is both for boys and girls—side by side with it you have a large school for boys only at Fellestown. One of the advantages of amalgamation would be that one of these schools might be for boys and another for girls exclusively; but what I object to is this, that you have got so many different systems—one set of children are boarded out, another set treated in the schools. Both plans have their merits and demerits. I think something should be done to compel our union to adopt either one or the other in the main. There would be a residue that may not be dealt with, but I would suggest they might be dealt with by arrangement between the different unions. Supposing in the North Dublin Union we adopted the boarding-out system only, we would have a certain number of children we could not board out, and, so far as their education is concerned, I would suggest that our union should make arrangements with another union for the education of these children. But when you have the two systems you have a large staff and big expense. If they are boarded out you have a staff superintending them, and they are not always too well supervised so far as the staff is concerned. If you maintain them in schools you want a large staff of teachers larger than you would require if there had been amalgamation, and large enough to accommodate several unions very often; if you could get the unions to adopt some one plan or the other. Then the difficulty is to discriminate between the children that are to be sent to one or sent to the other; it is done on very arbitrary lines sometimes, and one child may have a great advantage over the other in the system that is adopted. I think every union should have the right of sending to an industrial school a percentage of the children in its charge. I would not give them power to send all but I would give them power to send a percentage; that would create emulation among the children themselves to get out of the union and get to some better place, where they could get a better training, because it is generally conceded that in an industrial school they get some industrial employment

Nov. 23, 1906.

Mr. T. G. Harrington.

that they don't get in the unions. If that were held up to the children in the unions it would lead to better conduct and ambition among the children themselves. There would be some compensation to the Guardians for doing that by getting the Government grant in the industrial schools for these children as if sent in by the local authorities. I will take the case of Dublin children. During the three years I have been Lord Mayor I have taken a great interest in the admission of children to industrial schools. We have quite a large number of children. It costs us about £10,000 a year, the contribution we make to industrial schools from the city rates. We have sometimes thirty or forty children at the fortnightly meeting of the Finance Committee for admission to these schools. We have a special officer paid to inquire whether the facts submitted to us by the applicants are accurate. He has to go round and visit the people and their friends, and find out whether the statement given to us is true. We are very rigid, because a number of the people in Dublin who pay the rates are so poor that we are very particular about giving an advantage to one man—to relieve him of the expense of educating and supporting his children at the expense of men who are perhaps as poor as he is.

16481. Do these children go before a bench of magistrates?—The children go before a bench of magistrates, but the magistrates cannot admit them into any school without our order.

16482. You mean the magistrate makes an order to admit?—They do, but we look into it ourselves.

16483. If a magistrate were to make an order that a certain child found begging, for instance, should be placed in an industrial school, would his order have as much effect?—That is so; it would have no effect if we did not admit the child. He would have the power of sending him to a reformatory, where, as a matter of fact, we would have to pay more for him. Of course I am totally opposed to the system of sending children to reformatories, which is too freely indulged in by magistrates—children, even for asking for a few coppers.

16484. They would not go to a reformatory?—Children begging go to an industrial school, but if children give a little annoyance, are seen throwing a stone, for a very trivial offence magistrates send children to reformatories for five years, and they are lost for ever. If the boarding-out system is adopted by a union the great proportion of its children should be boarded out. If that left a small residue, that ought to be dealt with by some arrangement either with a National school or another union, or some other way by which these children would be dealt with without an expense staff for the case; keeping up a staff for two systems leads to a great amount of expense and no beneficial result, as far as I can see.

16485. What system do you really think the best?—The two of them have advantages. In the boarding-out case the children assimilate with the population, and are more free very often from the bias of the union, and in many cases they settle down in the homes of the people; they are adopted by the families who have them, and we have actually had cases in the North Dublin Union where they supported the family.

16486. Is your opinion in favour of the boarding out if you can get good homes?—Yes; and then I would give the Guardians a discretion to send the other children to schools, wherever they could be sent to schools.

16487. Do you think the industrial schools would be likely to refuse what you might call the remnant?—I don't see that they could.

16488. I am aware of an industrial school that raised a great many difficulties?—I can assure you that must have been sometime ago, because now they are in such a hurry. My complaint is that they are bribing people and offering rewards to them to send children. I have met cases where they offered him, for a hard to get children sent to them because they had not been able to keep up their average and were afraid of losing their certificate. I had to prohibit the sending of children to some of the schools on that account. In addition to that, I should suggest in the case of girls trained in unions, after they come to the period at which they cannot very well be kept there, the Guardians might have the power of sending them to learn the duties of domestic servants in any school that should have been established. I have been trying in the past year in Dublin to establish such a school, and I do hope we have succeeded. When a girl comes to fourteen the Guardians might lawfully get control of her for a year or two while she is learning domestic training; and in the case of a boy, they should have the power of paying a small fee and apprenticing him. The whole difficulty with children arises just at the time they come

out of the unions. In the case of boys, only in very few unions have they got industrial training, and they are only able to take the lowest positions, and that is the very time at which these children ought to get some training and some chance of a start in life. In the case of girls, they see nothing in the union which would fit them for domestic work, and very often they don't get enough of it in the industrial schools. I think when they come to be discharged, if the unions of Ireland and the local authorities would combine to establish a place where servants could be trained, they would do a great service to the country; a great many of our girls pick up domestic duties very rapidly; it would do a great deal to lift the whole tone of the domestic classes if such a school were established. I am sure if the unions had the power to contribute they could do a great deal towards the establishment of such a home, and it would not be a dream upon any particular community.

16489. You, of course, have an intimate knowledge of other parts of Ireland as well, especially Kerry and West Cork, where there are very poor districts. In some parts of Ireland that we visited, where there were also poor districts, evidence was given to us about the great hardship on very poor unions, where perhaps 1d. in the £ produced only 250. Our attention was called to the impossibility of the ratepayers keeping the institutions, especially for the sick, in anything like the condition they ought to be in?—That is so, of course; a good deal of the expense of the union is really swallowed up by the officers. You have to pay a master—you must pay him a fair salary—and an unscrupulous Guardian of Cashmere, a good many years ago, made a calculation, and proved to the satisfaction of his Board that if they had lodged the inmates of the union at a local hotel they could have done it less expensively for the year.

16490. Take unions like Cashmere and Castleown, with small valuations. They get very little help out of the Government grant, whereas unions like Dunshaughlin, or perhaps Balrothery, that have large valuations—valuations of £100,000, and Dunshaughlin, I think, even more—they get a very large grant?—Yes.

16491. And these people were very urgent in their request that some reorganisation of the grant should be made?—Naturally. Take Dunshaughlin and these unions: the proportion of the poor to the population is very small, and the proportion of the poor to the valuation is still smaller, while in these poorer districts the rates are tremendously high, the valuation of the district is very small, and all the people are poor or live in a struggling condition; and really the line of separation between those who have to go into the unions and those who have to maintain them in the union is very slender.

16492. Do you think it would be fair to consider the question of reorganisation?—I think the whole system of union treatment ought to be an amalgamation of all the unions and a national rate, but subject to that the poorer districts should get some relief.

16493. If we could not go quite as far as a national rate, you would at all events go for some assistance towards the very poor unions out of the Government grant, or otherwise, that would enable them to keep their institutions at the minimum pitch of efficiency?—Certainly; our unions, so far as they are workhouses, ought to be abolished altogether, and kept only for the sick and infirm, and they ought to be in the poorer districts kept up as quiet as well as in the richer districts; you cannot do it now. The tramp question is a very difficult question. It varies in different portions of the country, and I don't think anybody could give you any advice on the question, except that you should keep a history of these tramps, and give the power to the unions to refuse a man who has been a persistent tramp and been in a great many institutions.

16494. In the North they go in for taking very sharp measures. They are rather disposed to call in the aid of the police?—It means that if these men are housed in the unions the public are safe, but if you refuse them admission to the unions, there is the danger to public property outside.

16495. The tendency in England seems to be to deprive these undesirable of the right of going about the country; that is a big question?—That is a big question if it came to be made a national question.

16496. You would rather reserve your opinion on that question until it was raised in some other place?—Yes.

16497. Dr. BOGGS.—There is the question in the North Dublin Union of "remand children"?—Yes, it is a very extraordinary question. Children either of

MR. JAMES WALSH, J.R., EXAMINED.

Mar. 23, 1904.

Mr. James
Walsh

16518. CHAIRMAN.—You are the Chairman of the District Council of Colbridge No. 21—Yes, sir.

16519. We would be very glad to know the views of the Council on the question of the amalgamation of the Dublin Unions?—I think I might say the members of our Council, and of the Board of Guardians of Colbridge, are unanimously opposed to the amalgamation. I think you will see from the reports given by the Local Government Board Inspectors from time to time that they have often gone as far as to term Colbridge the model board of Ireland.

16520. I noticed seeing these reported?—There have been reports from time to time, and we have laid out considerable sums of money in improving our hospital and workhouses.

16521. I think you may take it that your workhouse is of a higher type of efficiency than a great many other workhouses in the country?—It is generally acknowledged to be well done.

16522. Partly, in some places, not in the body of the house, it is very bad; but the hospital is very nice?—And all those improvements done to the hospital have been paid for directly by the rates, and we think it would be certainly a great injustice to our ratepayers if other people are to reap the benefit of that by amalgamating us with any of the other unions, whose rates are, in some cases, more than double ours. It has been suggested that we have accommodation for more inmates. We have, and if you thought well of it, and gave us some extra area.

16523. From Kildare or Dublin?—From Dublin, I would suggest, or part of Meath. I have heard that they are thinking of doing away with Dunshaughlin. There is a district in the Co. Meath, about Dunboyne, that is very close to us. Colbridge is in Kildare, but it is just at the extreme edge of Kildare. Kildare is a very large county, and there are only three unions in it. It is very close on forty miles long.

16524. How far are you from Dunboyne?—About six miles from the village. Then there is a big tract of country from Dunboyne along by Maynooth, on towards Kildare; we go right away to Enfield. There is a big tract of Meath country there that if Dunshaughlin were done away with they would have to go to Trim, but it is quite within easy reach of Colbridge.

16525. If your hospital were maintained at Colbridge, would you still object to have the remainder of the workhouse closed?—We would object, very strongly.

16526. On the rating ground?—Primarily on the rating ground; and in addition to that, badly on the rating ground would not strike the Dublin unions. I think they would rather die of starvation. They would not mix with the class of people that are at the Dublin work, and I think they would rather die at the back of the ditch than go into them.

16527. You have about eighty infirm in your house?—Yes. Most of the infirm we have are of a poor class, well farmers.

16528. Labourers?—Labourers, and people of that sort, who have gone in through misfortune, not through any misconduct or anything of that sort.

16529. How far are you from Naas?—We are about twelve miles from Naas.

16530. That would be the natural place if there were amalgamation for the Kildare part of the union?—Yes.

16531. The village of Colbridge would be almost the centre. How much of Kildare goes beyond Colbridge?—It runs into Leixlip; that is about two miles nearer Dublin, along that one strip of District.

16532. Have you considered the question of the location, whether it would be desirable to remove them from your workhouse?—We are very free from them. I am glad to say, but whenever we do have them there they are always a great source of trouble to us. We would be very pleased to be rid of them.

16533. You think it is hardly a suitable place, a workhouse?—I don't think it is. They require too much extra attention, and if they don't get that they are not properly looked after.

16534. Have you many children in the workhouse?—We have no children in the workhouse. We have no difficulty whatever in boarding them out. We board them out extensively well. The children we board out have come back to us. The people that they are boarded with either adopt them or else they get situations for them. We have a ladies' visiting committee, and they take charge of those children if the people don't want to keep them, and they get situations for

them. We have not had, in my recollection, a single case of a child coming back.

16535. You have twenty-five boarded out and only four or five in the workhouse?—They are there because their parents are there, and we cannot get them out of it.

16536. Do you happen to remember anything about these children that are there, what type they are. Are the parents temperately disposed, or are they chronic alcohol-drinkers?—The parents are there, I think, mostly from misbehaviour.

16537. Would you regard them as suitable people for the care of children?—I would not.

16538. Would you be in favour of any change in the law which would enable you to separate the parents and the children and board out the children?—I think it would be a great advantage if the Guardians could do that. There are five children in the place, and three of them are in charge of their mother, who is a very dissipated character.

16539. You have naturally a large number of tramps?—We have.

16540. Have you thought over any method by which the evil could be mitigated?—It occurred to me that a proper system of police supervision should be instituted over this class, and they should only be admitted on a ticket signed by the sergeant or head-constable of police, who should keep a register giving a full description of each such case. Particulars could be furnished to the county inspector each month, and from his office to the Local Government Board, or the police authorities, and by this means the whole number of what may be termed professional tramps could be identified in a short time.

16541. And registered?—Yes; and stringent measures taken that to dispose of them, getting rid of them perhaps by transferring them to some industrial institution, because we suffer principally from these professional tramps.

16542. They bring families round with them in many cases?—Yes, we have the same cases coming back week after week; they go to Naas, come to us, and then to Dunshaughlin and Balrothery, and back again.

16543. Mr. MURPHY.—Are they of both sexes?—Yes, they are.

16544. CHAIRMAN.—And some children?—Not often; there are sometimes children.

16545. We have seen a good many children in going around?—They don't come to our workhouse very much.

16546. I suppose you would have no hesitation in saying that those children ought to be removed from the charge of their parents?—Certainly; they are brought up to thrive from the time they are able to crawl about; they are living by it.

16547. That would relieve the workhouse of a very large number. Then you would have practically only the sick and aged and infirm?—We never do have any children.

16548. Except a few?—Very few.

16549. Do you keep a teacher?—We do.

16550. That you could dispense with if you were not obliged to make any provision for children?—I think it is a mistake having children kept in any workhouse.

16551. There is a difficulty about people who are destitute for short periods, people who are out of work for a short period, and have to get relief from the rates with their children. Have you thought of what you would do with the children in those cases?—In those cases we give them outdoor relief.

16552. They may not be eligible for that?—In any case, where they are eligible, that is the system we always adopt.

16553. For instance, an able-bodied man and his wife, with children depending on them, you could not give them outdoor relief?—No; but then they don't require it unless the man is laid up.

16554. If the man was out of employment?—There is plenty of employment about our district unless they are laid up or unwilling to work.

16555. You rather suffer in the other way, not enough workmen?—I would not say that. We have plenty of available labourers and plenty of employment for them, and most of our Guardians are scattered over the union, and whenever these cases crop up we have always somebody in attendance able to tell us the circumstances of it.

16556. Mr. MURPHY.—On the question of outdoor relief, have you any views to put forward. Would you care to have it extended in any way, or to have the charge brought back to divisional again instead of

Mar. 23, 1904.

Mr. James Walsh.

union rating?—We might be allowed more discretionary power.

16597. Many Guardians say that the wider area encourages extravagance!—I don't think it does in our district, I must say.

16598. Dr. BROOKS.—Regarding the treatment of the sick, you approve of the hospital being separated from the workhouse?—We don't have many people drifting from the hospital into the workhouse. People able to afford it, when they come into the hospital, if there was any means by which they could pay for the treatment they receive, they would be quite willing to do so.

16599. Would you approve of making provision for that class with pay wards?—I would make it more an infirmary than a workhouse hospital if we could.

16600. Is there any means of separating it from the workhouse?—They are fairly distinct as it is.

16601. Separate entrance and separate administration?—I would not be inclined to put them under a different administration.

16602. Keep the administration as it is?—I would.

16603. You state the poor of Colbridge would not care to come into a Dublin workhouse?—I don't think they would come in.

16604. Perhaps there might be a section of the poor who would not care to go into any workhouse?—Few of them care to go into it, till they can't help it.

16605. Even for treatment?—For treatment; with as they are using the Colbridge Hospital and Infirmary much more than they used to.

16606. CHAIRMAN.—It is a most useful hospital?—It is.

16607. Dr. BROOKS.—A nice operating room?—That was all built and paid for out of the rates.

16608. What you would like to see would be some provision for paying patients?—Yes, I would.

16609. You have not any available space that could be used in that way?—I don't think we have, unless we partitioned off portion of it.

CHAIRMAN.—That you could hardly do, having regard to the way it is used.

16610. Dr. BROOKS.—Have you any ideas on the treatment of consumptives?—I think it is a mistake having them mixed up with the ordinary people in the workhouse.

16611. Would the Guardians be willing to pay to a central institution for the treatment of consumptives?—I think a central institution would be a very excellent means of disposing of these cases.

16612. For the Co. Dublin?—I don't know that you want one for the Co. Dublin.

16613. CHAIRMAN.—For whatever area would produce a sufficient number of cases?—Yes; but in Dublin there are a lot of incurable hospital, independent of the workhouses, that these people drift into.

16614. Dr. BROOKS.—We are speaking of the early cases that might possibly be cured?—I think we would be quite willing to contribute to one if there was one for the Co. Dublin, if it was thought necessary. I don't if it would be necessary to have one for each county.

CHAIRMAN.—No, but Dublin County population is so large.

16615. Mr. MURPHY.—You say your Board of Guardians and yourself are opposed to any scheme of amalgamation?—We are.

16616. Do you think it is undesirable or proper to keep forty or fifty old men housed up for the winter in a stuffy room such as we saw at Colbridge?—I don't quite grasp your question.

16617. What place have you for these aged people from October until April except a room for them to remain huddled in all day, confined in a smoky atmosphere, without recreation or employment of any

kind. Do you not think some change is needed in that respect?—I think it rather a mistake to try and make the accommodation for that class of people in workhouses too luxurious; if you do you will find the numbers increase very rapidly.

16618. It would not be luxury to have the people employed at some useful occupation, where their time would not be dragging as it is most in the day-room of a workhouse?—Most of the people we have are not fit for any employment.

16619. You have men there from fifty-five to sixty-five years of age?—Well, these men do all the work about the workhouse; on a fine day they work in the ground and garden.

16620. You have not very much land?—We have a goodish garden and a good bit of land at the back of the place.

16621. Do you not think it would be well if these poor people could be put on a large farm, where they could be occupied during the day?—I think you would have to have a good many labourers to work the farm. Most of the people we have are quite incapable of working.

16622. Men from fifty-five to sixty-five, of average bodily health, are not incapable of doing work?—We have very few of that class in Colbridge.

16623. CHAIRMAN.—You have a large number of the aged and infirm class?—We have, but they are just their labour.

16624. They seem to be able to do something. They would not be men who would be hired out for a day's wage?—Well, they do a good deal about the place there.

16625. Mr. MURPHY.—Don't you think it a dull monotonous existence for these men?—I am quite sure it is.

16626. Do you not think now that we are trying to bring about some reform it would be well to try to improve the condition of the aged and infirm?—I fail to see how you could suggest to improve them.

16627. Suppose we could take away all the children—as you have already properly done—as far as you can, from the Colbridge Workhouse, and board them out; supposing the inmates—you have not many—would be to a proper place for their keeping, you would have nobody then but the aged and infirm and the sick, retaining your good infirmary there. Could not some arrangement be made whereby the Guardians would be empowered to pay for the keep of these aged and infirm in some healthy place—some large colony or another, where they would have occupation and some little of the pleasures of life?

16628. CHAIRMAN.—Constant occupation!—That would be a sort of system of transportation.

16629. Mr. MURPHY.—Not necessarily. Colbridge might be selected as the place itself, if you could get land enough?—Nearly all those people who are in the Colbridge Workhouse are natives, and have their friends and relations in the district, and those people go to see them from time to time, and I think it would be a very great hardship on those infirm aged people to send them away to a different county where no one would know their names.

16630. Do you think the visits of friends, so few and far between, would compensate for the other advantages of health and air?—I don't say their own friends; but somebody from a parish poor over so a Sunday to the workhouse, and everybody knows what goes on about their homes, or late homes.

16631. Inquiries on the subject show that the visits are to the sick, but very rarely to the chronic inmates?—There are a great many visits to the inmates in the Colbridge Union.

16632. CHAIRMAN.—Chiefly to the sick, would you say?—No; I would say about equally.

Mr. WILLIAM ROBERT, R.P., examined.

Mr. William Robert.

16633. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Walsh has just explained that you are all unanimous in thinking that no change ought to be made at Colbridge?—Yes; as far as I know we are all unanimous against amalgamation on several grounds.

16634. The only thing you have to say is that if some of the Co. Meath were thrown into you, you would not object?—We would not object.

16635. But you would object to be thrown into the Neas Union?—You may as well throw us into the Cork Union. Some of our union is twenty Irish miles from Neas.

16636. You yourself at Colbridge are twelve?—When I am in eighteen; the Colbridge Workhouse alone is twelve Irish miles.

16637. Where is your own residence?—Glenalla. It goes to Hollywood Rath, in the Co. Meath, and Keshide twenty-one Irish miles from Neas.

16638. What union does that place that is twenty-one miles from Neas belong to?—Colbridge Union.

16639. How far is the most remote part of the Colbridge Union from the Colbridge Workhouse?—It would be about ten Irish miles.

16606. What is the most distant part of your parish?
—Edridge, I think; that is on my side, the North-
West side.

16607. That is the only change that you would look
forward to if there were amalgamation, that change of
going part of Donoughmore into yours. Is that the
only conceivable change as far as you see?—I don't know
that it is capable of very much more change; we keep
our union very well up-to-date, do it better than many
at least we have got credit for it. Keep our taxes down
and our poor well looked after. Our rates are low.

16608. The hospital is very good, but do you think
yourself that the able-bodied side of the house is all
that might be desired. Do you go round it often?—
Not often; I went several times.

16609. I think if you were giving a close eye to it
you would see a good many things that could be im-
proved?—Indeed you could, and elsewhere as well as
here; but it would not be judicious to improve it too
much or you would have all the laborers of the coun-
ty in it.

16610. Don't you think it would be an improvement
to make them work more than they do, not to be sitting
in large numbers in an overcrowded room?—There are
no large numbers in it to start with.

16611. I beg your pardon?—Of able-bodied men.

16612. Of the class called aged and infirm, there are
eighty?—Nine out of ten of those are not able to do
anything but smile and work in the garden. There
are some of them not able to get out of the cots where
they sit, and others not able to get out of bed; that is
my experience of them.

16613. They are not what you would call an able-
bodied lot of young fellows, but they are men that some
work can be got out of?—It would surprise you how
little they do. There are no able-bodied men there fit
to do anything only dodge about the garden and lead
cabbages.

16614. What we felt in going round these institu-
tions was that it was a very wretched thing to see a
large number of men sitting round a fire and doing no-
thing all the day but that?—It is a wretched thing if
they were able to do anything.

16615. They could do a good deal, and would be all
the better of doing something?—Yes.

16616. Mr. MURPHY.—Many older men outside
are at work?—Those are not able to work; if they are
destitute, what can you do with them?

16617. CHAIRMAN.—Give them something to do?—If
they are not able to do it?

16618. It is very difficult to do anything for them in
the workhouse, but we have heard from a number of
villages that if there were one institution for a county
where the aged and infirm of a county could go, and
they could be kept at such light work as they are able
to do, it would be better for them and for everybody?—
I don't think it would; in fact we have no able-bodied
men practically in our union except a tramp that will
come in and go out again.

16619. Is not speaking of men in the pride of
their youth and strength?—No; but an aged man of
fifty-five or sixty-five, if in good health, would be able
to work, but we have not them.

16620. They get stiffer every year sitting round the
fire doing nothing?—They are not there.

16621. Then we were under a mistaken impression.
We thought we saw them?—They were not there, any
able-bodied men.

16622. Not able-bodied, but able to do some work?—
I don't know what they could do except lead cabbages.

16623. Mr. MURPHY.—Look after cows, feed
cattle, or do something useful?—I would not like to
own the cattle they would be feeding; they would not
feed much cattle, those lads. We have plenty of accom-
modation; we have more accommodation than we have
people in.

16624. That is probably due to the management of
the house?—In fact we never keep children there. We
always board them out, and send them out to workmen
and laborers that have a cow; and then there is a
 ladies' committee, who see the children are all well
cared for, and sent to school, and cleanly dressed; and
they are brought in a couple of times a year and in-
spected. There are plenty of applications for children.

16625. CHAIRMAN.—You board out all you can?—
Yes; we have only two children, and there is a school-
master.

16626. What do you say about boarding out the old
fellows?—Well, unless you had a guarantee, it would
be a case of getting rid of them.

16627. You would not approve of boarding them out
with their relatives?—I am afraid you would have a
good many on the books; every one would be looking
for it.

16628. People who would never think of going on the
poor rate would be desirous to get it?—Indeed they
would, and to get it easy.

16629. Mr. MURPHY.—You did not say anything
about the tramps?—I don't know very much what could
be done with tramps. I heard you asking our vice-
chairman about people suffering from phthisis or con-
sumption, and what you would do with these, and with
leprosy, and all that sort of thing. I would be for
sending them to a central place—Donoughmore—where
there is a beautiful little workhouse, in the Queen's
County. It speaks more than all the evidence I could
give of the effect of amalgamation. Some sixteen or
eighteen years ago the Guardians were mad to get it
dissolved, that it would be a great piece of economy.
They did get it dissolved, and what are the facts. It
happens to be an unfortunate taxpayer in the district,
and the taxes are increased. I pay more taxes because
of the amalgamation with Roscrea Union, and some of
the poor people have to go sixteen miles to hospital,
whereas they could go five or six miles to Donoughmore,
and the little union is lying derelict, a beautiful little
union, one of the soundest in Ireland, that cost £25,000
or £40,000 to build. There is a union that could be
had for a song. If that was taken up and used by
several unions for consumptives, I think it would be
a great benefit. It is in the midst of a fine country,
with fresh air. I would not like to have consumptive
people in a workhouse hospital; but with regard to
amalgamation saving the rates, I think it would be a
step in the wrong direction.

16630. Certainly, as regards the Colbride rate?—I
regard this as a practical proof after eighteen years.

16631. Have you heard what the members of Rath-
downey, and Borris, and other parts of Donoughmore
Union think about amalgamation?—I know their
opinion from what they tell me. They tell me it is a
hard grievance, they are sorry for breaking up the
union.

16632. When we were up in the North there was a
union that had been broken up in the Co. Tyrone—
Gortin—and there the people are very glad that it was
broken up.

Mr. MURPHY.—Quite so; a great saving to the
ratepayers of the late union and no complaint of hard-
ships incurred.

16633. CHAIRMAN.—They took a better course at
Gortin—they sold the building for stores for building
material, and it was knocked down?—They did not
sell in Donoughmore, for they were going to make an
industrial school of it, but the scheme did not come
off.

16634. It is in a most convenient situation?—Yes,
within one and a half miles from Ballyreagh, and
they cannot use it. If you have amalgamation, it
means more staff to the place you amalgamate with,
and it means more officers.

16635. Mr. MURPHY.—Does it not mean lessening
the staff?—What it means in this minute exemplified
where you are. The county surveyor here had £500,
now he has £1,000, and it is the same way with every
other officer in the place. I certainly would board out
the children; I would not have them reared up in the
workhouse; there is an able school workhouse children.
The children in the Colbride Union are all absorbed
into the population, and any farmer can get a chap
here or there. Who would take a workhouse child?

16636. Why not follow the same course with the
old men?—You cannot get old men to thrive on; they
would die.

16637. The infirm that you have got there for three
or four years, and that you never hope to get rid of,
might it not be well to try a plan of boarding them
out, or in a place with a large farm, where they would
get some occupation and fresh air?—They would
not be cared for; they are better cared for in an es-
tablishment like that, where they have a doctor to look
after them, and a master to look after them; and old
men, when they get beyond a certain age, require as
much attention as a child to keep them cleanly.

16638. CHAIRMAN.—We don't see much of this care
bestowed on them in the infirm wards—we see them
too often dirty and neglected?—It is a wonder, and

Apr. 29, 1901.
Mr. William
Robbitt.

Nov. 23, 1894

Mr. William
Roberts.

they having the nuns to care them; some screw loose; it is not that they have so much to do; you have a schoolmistress there for two children.

15653. I suppose the schoolmistress confines all her energies to the children. As regards the old men, I allude to the infirm, not to the sick in charge of nuns?

Mr. John
Field.

Mr. JOHN FIELD, F.R.C.S., EXAMINED.

15655. CHAIRMAN.—I don't know that there is much, Mr. Field, that you can add to what your two colleagues have said; they have enlightened us considerably on the views of your Guardians—they are against amalgamation?—Yes, strenuously against amalgamation. We have only three unions in the county, and I think it would be a hardship on the sick poor to change any of the unions.

15656. To be moved to a distance like Naas?—It would be too far. We certainly would be inclined to take in more of the County Dublin than we have, because we have accommodation.

15657. And Meath?—We had the Brackenstown portion of it before, and we felt it a great inconvenience to lose it after putting up buildings.

15658. How much did you lose?—£2,000 or £10,000.

15659. Did you get any compensation?—No.

15660. No district in any other locality?—No; this runs very convenient to Colbridge; a portion of Dunboyne would be more suitable to come to Colbridge than to Trim or Navan, because it would be nearer.

15661. And good roads?—Good roads; Brackenstown is within three miles of Colbridge, and it is tedious to Trim.

15662. What union is that?—Dunshaughlin.

15663. How far is it from Dunshaughlin?—Ten miles. I would be for putting all the hospitals under the County Councils.

15664. You would make them district hospitals, and put them under the County Councils?—Yes; we are working that way with the infirmary in Kildare, where you have a certain number of County Councillors and a certain number of outside ratepayers on the committee.

15665. You meet at Kildare once a month?—Yes.

15666. And you would meet at Colbridge once a month for the Colbridge Hospital?—Yes.

15667. And in that way out it all, as far as management is concerned, from the workhouse?—Yes, I think it would be advisable. There are a good deal of people coming in who pay a little.

15668. Do you think all the rural workhouses in the country could be dealt with that way?—That would be my view. We spent a lot of money for the last eight or ten years; nearly up to £3,000.

15669. You spent a lot on your hospital?—And the house generally. We have a water supply and every accommodation necessary for a workhouse.

15670. Mr. MURKIN.—Is it not desirable to have the spending of public money in the hands of the representatives of those who contribute it?—Yes.

15671. And yet you would take it away from them?—No; the same people that are managing it at present would be managing it in the future.

15672. I thought you wanted it given to the County Council?—A portion of the County Council and a portion of outside ratepayers—you would have some members of the board on it and some outside members.

15673. You would be giving people a voice in the management of it that did not give anything to the start of it?—Are they not paying rates? I would make it a county charge. In Colbridge we pay for the Kildare Infirmary, and send nobody at all there.

15674. CHAIRMAN.—You think the Kildare and may return the compliment, and pay for Colbridge?—There are thirty beds at Kildare at present, and there is room for twenty more.

15675. And the Colbridge people have a good enough infirmary at home, and don't need to go to Kildare?—They don't need to go to Kildare; it is well equipped in every way.

15676. I suppose it is as good as Kildare Infirmary?—I think I might say it is better, for I attend Kildare. We have adopted the boarding-out system for a number of years. In Mr. Robert Kennedy's time it was commenced, and has continued ever since. We have two children at present. Certainly, the tramp class ought to be dealt with.

—I would send the children out to the National School, and have no schoolmistress.

15677. The board could do that?—I am not on the board now, at least, I am not one of the officers. Mr. Robert Kennedy was the Chairman, there for twenty years, and took a great interest in things.

15657. What would you do with them?—We have an enormous number of them there.

15658. What change would you make in the law?—What I suggest is that there should be a farm taken in some county for two or three counties.

15659. And they should be kept there?—Yes, and made work; and in the summer time, when the people would be busy, hire them out to the farmers; and I would make it an Imperial charge in the way for the greater portion of the tramps are three years, and in years' military men; they have been trained in nothing but smoking and drinking; they are a useless class, a terrible tax on the country, and most of the petitions and burials are caused by these men. We had two cases of burning in our district that tramps did, and we had to pay for them—they lit fires there, and the place took fire, and the newspapers' had to pay to them.

15660. Mr. MURKIN.—Is that statement of yours not an argument in favour of doing away with a great many of these workhouses—are not these workhouses an invitation for these people to come?—They are, more or less; but it is the law.

15661. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose you would change the law, and shut the workhouses against tramps, and, instead of that, send them to a colony?—Yes; I would give magistrates power to contract them for a certain limited time to this place. I would be against taking their children from them, unless you took them up themselves. If you took the children from them, so many would come in.

15662. You would not like to take the children unless you took the parents?—No.

15663. Mr. MURKIN.—You think the unmarried mothers care little for their children?—I don't think they do; they have them for begging purposes.

15664. CHAIRMAN.—And, then, if they do care for them, you think they don't treat them wisely or well?—No, they should not have control of them. I send them in the country about—they are a terrible tax on the people. Where they get a couple of women, they are inclined to levy blackmail on them; they won't take food, but money.

15665. Do you happen to meet many of this class in certain?—Yes.

15666. They don't go much to the workhouses—they camp out, and there is a considerable number of this class?—There are. We are central from Navan to Trim, and Dublin to Mullingar, and a lot come that way.

15667. Mr. MURKIN.—You could hardly do anything with them?—I would empower the magistrates to send them to a colony, for they are not alone a tax on the country, but a bad example to the others.

15668. If they don't go to the workhouse or do any illegal act, what could you do with them?

15669. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose they are vagabonds, without any lawful occupation?—Yes; they sell coal and sawpans, and force people to buy them, they buy them to get rid of them. I would be against any change in the law with regard to representation, but I would reduce the number of Guardians; the less Guardians you have the more business you get through. A small number of Guardians manage the place, but when there is an appointment, others come in, and manage over their heads. I would certainly deal with the tramp class very strongly. We could accommodate a great deal more people than we keep in Colbridge. There are only three unions in Kildare. A large portion of our county goes to Blaney which could be accommodated in Colbridge, because we have a railway from Maynooth on to Cabray, and could take in portion of Johnstown and Enfield, and we could take Trimbour from Naas; it is nearer to Colbridge than to Naas. Portion of the County Kildare in the Ballinglass Union could come into Naas; it is a kind of a scattered county.

15670. Do you think it would be possible to have unions falling in with the county boundaries?—Hardly; I think it would be a hardship.

16671. Colbridge is too near the border, and Ness is too near the border of Wicklow?—Yes, and you have Edenberry on the border again, and Athy runs very close to the Queen's County and Carlow; portion of the town of Athy is in the Queen's County; the Barrow divides the two. We protest very strongly against our union being done away with, because we spent a good deal of money on the union, not anticipating it would be done away with.

Mr. JAMES WALSH, J.P.

16672. I might make a remark I forgot to make before, I have been told that some of the Dublin unions are inclined to advocate that if Colbridge is kept in vogue, sending drafts of people there from other unions. I think it would be a great misfortune to us; they are not the class of people we want in a country district. I don't think they would improve the tone of our

workhouse at all. Mr. Field has just said that a large portion of the County Meath might be amalgamated or joined on to Colbridge. There is also a big district of Clonsilla very much nearer than some of our present districts. If our area was extended, and we were left as we are, we would be extremely happy.

Nov. 22, 1894.

Mr. John Field.

Mr. JOHN FIELD.

We can take Clonsilla, Blanchardstown, Palmerstown, and Clonsilla, and we could take a large portion of the County Meath.

Mr. John Field.

Dr. J. C. McWALTER examined.

16673. CHAIRMAN.—You were kind enough to offer us some further evidence?—I just wish to say a few words about the amalgamation question. It seems to me that there are such a number of difficulties raised about the amalgamation of the two Dublin unions that it might be wise to see if any plan short of absolute amalgamation could be devised. I think, really, what is required is a uniform rate. I happen to be a member of both boards, and visit them both nearly every hour day, therefore, I have a fair idea how it would work if they were amalgamated. I don't think it would make for efficiency at all. My experience is, there is so much work to be done in each union that very much essential work is passed over; and, necessarily, if the two were joined, a large amount of work would be passed over. On the South side we have a weekly meeting of the Dispensary Committee and on the North side a monthly meeting, and although the number of persons is much the same, the drug bill on the South side is much smaller than on the North. There may be other reasons for that, but I think one reason is, it is known when the committee do meet every week, they look into these things more carefully than a committee meeting once a month.

16674. Do you mean to say you keep down the supply of drugs and instruments?—They are very carefully looked after, and a requisition is not made unless the demand is perfectly justified.

16675. Then the committee do reduce occasionally?—Yes; we never strike out a thing, but it is well known these things are looked into very carefully. The chairman is a rigid economist, and if a 1s. 6d. ink-bottle was wanted, he would see if he could not cut it down to 1s., and people who send in requisitions know the thing will be closely scrutinised. Lately, when we have not been looking into it so closely, having changed the day, we found the bill going up rapidly. The same thing must occur with regard to other articles.

16676. You would attribute a good deal of that efficient management to frequent and regular meetings of committees?—Yes.

16677. That would be rather an argument for the appointment of committees?—It would; but still, after all, the revision of committee work must come before the board.

16678. Do they ever interfere with committees?—They do; that is one of the constant grievances. If something unpopular is done at the committee the matter becomes known, the Guardians are whipped up, and the recommendation is defeated.

16679. That would be only a little temporary blessing?—No, it occurs very often. Guardians who attend committees every week, know if they do something unpopular it will be defeated, and, therefore, they are anxious the work should be done by the whole board.

16680. Do you think there would be a better chance then?—They know that once a thing is passed it is not so likely to be over-ruled.

16681. There are no motions to rescind?—There are, but persons are not anxious to go back on a resolution of the whole board. It seems to me in Dublin the demand is for a uniform rate.

Dr. J. C. McWalter.

16682. How would you work it so as to secure a uniform rate and at the same time maintain two unions?—Now, we have no power to strike a rate. We make a demand on the City Council for a certain sum, which, as a matter of fact, represents, it may be, 2s. 6d. in the £ on the North, and, perhaps, 1s. 6d. on the South; there seems to be no reason why that would not be spread uniformly over all; and then, in order to see what guarantee you would have for efficiency and economy, it should be pointed out separately that the sum which the North side received was more or less than 2s. 6d., and that kept constantly before the public and the Guardians and the Corporation would immediately draw their attention to the fact: "Either we have paid up a sum equivalent to 2s. 6d. on your valuation, now you require more than that," and they might have authority to require to get a very good reason before they would increase it. It seems to me, also, that certain departments might under such a scheme be united.

16683. How are you going to carry out the rating?—You have North Dublin with 3,000 people and South Dublin with 4,000 people in the house?—The South Dublin Board of Guardians demand from the Corporation £40,000, and the North Dublin demand £50,000. In making out the city rates they say: "We require £80,000 for poor rate, that means 1s. 11d. all round, you shall pay 1s. 11d. uniformly, everybody." I don't see that there is any insuperable objection to that method.

16684. I think you would find a good many objections raised?—Of course, interested persons; but take the Corporation as a whole.

16685. Take the ratepayers of whatever side might be injured, you find the expenditure of the North Union is so much and of the South Union so much; the people in the South Union find they have to pay very much more than the cost of their own union, and then they have no control nor no right to interfere with the spending of the money in the North?—My view is—you must point out to the persons the sum they are already getting.

16686. Point out to whom?—If the North Union began to get rather expensive, and demanded a sum from the Corporation which represented a higher rate.

16687. About how much a year do you spend in the North Union?—About 2s. 6d.

16688. How much a year altogether?—It is roughly about £50,000.

16689. And in the South how much is the rate and the amount?—The rate runs up to rather over £100,000; there is a charge from the County Council and the City Council and the proportion which the Local Government Board allows to; as a matter of fact the demand from the Corporation of Dublin is less from

Mr. James Wick.

Apr. 22, 1904.

Dr. J. C.
W. Walter.

the South than from the North; that is because they have a richer area.

16690. You would only have uniform rates within the county borough—not for Rathmines and Pembroke?—I think that would meet the case of Dublin only, because the others are bound to be different as it is.

16691. Then union rating goes by the board there?—Well, we make a demand from that Council.

16692. You will have the people of the city of Dublin paying far more rates than the people in Rathmines and Pembroke?—Yes; but they do now.

16693. I am talking about the poor rate; you will have them paying the over-expenditure of the North, and Rathmines and Pembroke not contributing; is that what you propose?—No; I propose that that portion of the poor rate which is payable by the Corporation of Dublin at present shall be made a uniform rate on all the houses properly under the Corporation; you will have then the same rate—North and South—necessarily. Of course, as regards Pembroke and the like, they remain as they are. This is, to a certain extent, only part of the question, but it seems to me a simpler plan, and one more easily passed; if you try to reform everything there will be such a number of objections.

16694. We have not heard the objections you refer to?—The South Dublin Board are strongly against the whole thing.

16695. They are, on the rating question?—Yes; and the North Board are not altogether of the same mind, and the Pembroke people are inclined to object also; but if you confined it to the city of Dublin—

16696. You would reduce the area of objection?—Yes.

16697. Do you know the valuation of Dublin—of the part of the city that is on the North and on the South side?—Roughly, the North is about £460,000 and the South, £300,000.

16698. No; the county borough part?—On the North side it is £450,000, and on the South, £275,000.

16699. Your proposal would not give very much relief to the North?—If we had a uniform rate in Dublin—that is the principal thing outside the city—you are bound to be different; you cannot make it uniform. Mr. Harrington pointed out that it would be a good thing having one workhouse used for males and another for females; that suggests itself as a good thing, and it is the only good reason that can be suggested for amalgamation.

16700. Do you think that is a reason sufficiently strong to make you expect amalgamation?—I don't; I think it is impracticable on account of the number of people I hear objecting.

16701. We have not heard these objections in public, but you seem to be impressed by them yourself; what are they?—They are prejudices; nobody wants the North, and only a portion of the North wants the South.

16702. You are on the two bodies, and ought to give an unprejudiced opinion; what prejudices have the South against the North and the North against the South?—The difference between 2s. 6d. and 1s. 9d.

16703. That is money again?—It seems to me very strong when you have money and prejudice combined.

16704. Mr. MURKIN?—Your proposal does not get rid of the prejudice?—But still, after all, it would be a comparatively easy method. If the Corporation got it, who pay over the money, you can, to a certain extent, overlook these objections.

16705. The change you suggest is one rather from the point of view of a ratepayer than from the standpoint of a reformer. By amalgamation improvements might be effected?—That is so; but to my mind it is very doubtful if there would be any real sound advantage; when you take 4,000 in one workhouse and add them to 3,000 in another it makes an enormous body to deal with, whereas in two halves it is not properly dealt with.

16706. If we got rid of several of the classes—children and inmates—you would not have that overgrown institution?—My view is that it would be possible to combine those; you have only eleven or twelve Protestant children on the North, and on the South eight.

16707. CHAIRMAN.—That was suggested to us this morning by witnesses—I think that would be very desirable; then we have Protestant hospitals on both sides; these might be amalgamated, and by amalgamation you might have a certain amount of room; if we made an arrangement between the North and South that the Protestant male and female hospitals should be amalgamated and the Protestant children amalga-

mated we would have a certain amount of room, and if we got some of those country hospitals and sent our convalescences there I imagine it would be a great reform without much difficulty.

16708. Mr. MURKIN.—If the management could be placed under one body it seems to me it would be more simplified—I look on that as a very desirable question; it is, theoretically, simple; but the difficulty, as regards Dublin Poor Law, is that the Guardians don't take sufficient interest in the thing, and that is more likely to happen when you are dealing with small people than when you are dealing with 4,000; the buildings must remain, and when you have, necessarily, two separate establishments I don't think there is much gain in effectiveness.

16709. You could get rid of a good many of the officers?—That is a point I am very much inclined to doubt; with the exception of the clerk on each side, and assistant clerks, we pay comparatively small wages; we made several valuations attempts to raise the wages of our clerks, but the Local Government Board would not let us; there may be a nominal saving at one or three hundred a year.

16710. You could get rid of a good many of the male employees if you had women in one workhouse?—We would have a number of women employees there.

16711. Less than now, with the advantage of separation?—That is a strong point.

16712. Look at the amount of inspection that is required in such a place as Dublin?—That is a strong argument in favour of it, but whether it would be sufficient to overcome all the difficulties which certainly would be raised; my fear is that attempting to do so much we may not accomplish anything.

16713. There has not been any very strong expression of opinion against the change so far?—Of course if they have not come before you it would not be far a million it.

16714. In fact many witnesses who have expressed views are rather favourable to making the two unions one, having both under one management?—But when you have £20,000 on one side and £60,000 on the other that is a good deal of money to put into the hands of one board. If you do away with one clerk you can increase the salary of the other; you contemplate having two buildings two miles apart.

16715. That thing exists in Belfast; they have 4,000 inmates in the workhouse there, and there is no complication of the kind you fear there?—You propose to have 7,000 inmates.

16716. The proposal is to take away about 1,000 from the institutions—children and inmates?—I am not counting children; they are mostly in China row.

16717. You have 500 in the city workhouse?—But so many children as we could send out under the existing law we have sent out.

16718. But still there are a large number there yet?—There are; but to put all those practically under the one board I cannot but think that any little saving would be lost; I am unconvinced about making the expenditure when such large sums are involved. A workhouse up to 3,000 could be economically managed by a board, but 5,000 probably not.

16719. CHAIRMAN.—In practice it would not work out that one Board of Guardians would deal with 7,000; would it not be committed?—Committees don't seem to work so well.

16720. The admission must always be by a committee?—But we make a board of that; they have the powers of the board; the whole board can attend; it is not a named committee.

16721. Dr. BRUNN.—Could you not have the same thing?—We cannot get men to attend to office; we have sixty members in the North, and Mr. Cogan says about four is the average attendance at the Admission Board.

16722. Would the reduction in the number of Guardians increase the attendance; when there was a greater responsibility on them they might attend better?—Yes; but we cannot deal with an inmate number very well.

16723. But still it would not be in the one institution; in all probability you would have a lesser number to deal with in each institution?—But, after all, take it that a committee did the work, if you are dealing with 7,000 you would have double the number.

16724. If you had two committees?—You would have one committee admitting women and another admitting men?

16725. One committee for the North and another for the South?—Would you propose having different Boards of Guardians?

16726. You would have one Board of Guardians and different members acting, according to the convenience of their residence to the North or South sides?—Then, practically it would remain as at present, except in name.

16727. You would have one Board of Guardians and two committees—one committee for attending the buildings on the North side and the other on the South side—and the report of these committees would come before the Guardians in the same way as you deal with Cabra. A union may have as many buildings as you like; the fact of there being additional buildings does not complicate things, as far as the board is concerned?—My experience is that a committee lends itself to jobbery; a committee meets and makes a certain suggestion, and when that comes before the full board to be considered, if not agreeable to the majority of the board the members are whipped up to out-vote it.

16728. That does not occur with the Admission Board?—That is a board, you see; on the North the dispensary work is done by a committee who have all the powers of the board.

16729. Dr. BROWN.—Could you not do the exact same with other matters?—If you delegate the powers of the board.

16730. CHAIRMAN.—No delegation?—Either it is a board or a committee; if it is a board having the power of a board you practically give into the hands of a few men the power of the great number, and therefore their actions will not be sufficiently under control, and improper things are likely to be done; if, on the contrary, it is a committee the committee's action is over-ruled.

16731. There is only one board meeting day for the North Dublin and one board meeting day for the South Dublin?—There are practically two days if you take the Admission Board.

16732. The Admission Board is not a board?—I may be mistaken, but I understood the board had power to meet on a certain day for a specific purpose.

16733. They may meet as a board, but it is usually as admission committee in all other names I know of?—The board have power to meet on Monday for certain specific business to admit people; they are therefore an Admission Board; they have also power to meet on Monday for dispensary business, and they have full power as regards dispensary business only.

16734. That is under some special order?—Yes; there is a special order.

16735. But without an order they can have their work prepared for them by a committee and deal with the recommendations of their committee?—But the objections to the committee are that its suggestions are over-ruled by the larger board; therefore the work of the whole board is more satisfactory, but, on the other hand, there is too much required to be done on one committee, and people get tired, and it is badly done. We were very anxious on the South board to have probationers trained there who might be eligible for situations as qualified nurses. There are a number of young women in Ireland who are very suitable

for a position like that; the last advertisement we had in the South we wanted five nurses, and there were six applicants only.

16736. That is a matter you need hardly go into with us, as you have absolute power to raise that with the Local Government Board?—There are certain facilities that might be suggested to boards to train nurses.

16737. There is nothing to prevent it being done now; the law is big enough for it?—The only thing is, when we suggest it how do you know the Local Government Board will accept our training.

16738. It is very simple; if you write a resolution and have a conference with the Medical Inspector it can be put into shape at once?—The nursing question depends so much on the supply of nurses. I mentioned before the necessity of temporary relief. I am strongly in favour of that. We find an ordinary case of a man with six children who happens to be thrown out of work; we have nothing to do but take them in; three children cost 2s. 6d. a week each, that is for the food only, and 2s. a week then for their teaching extra; that would be, at least, 18s. a week additional on the rates, and we have not power to give it towards rent, or any relief at all. It was suggested to send certain children to get technical education to industrial schools, but I was not sure whether it would be within the power of this Commission to make any recommendation that Guardians might have power to obtain technical instruction for the children. We have, both on the North and South side, made an application to the Department of Agriculture, and they say they have no funds for that purpose; we find that although there is a great demand for lads at the age of fifteen—we can get rid of any amount of them—once they reach twenty or twenty-five they are useless; they have no handicraft or trade; they come back to the house. My experience is that people in the workhouse are much better off than 30 per cent. of the ratepayers, or 50 per cent. of the Dublin poor. I am rather afraid they will see James's-street too often; they get so fond of it; they are better fed, clothed, and housed.

16739. That struck us strongly in going through the workhouse how very comfortable they were, and they had a good dietary?—We are giving those Irish bacon in the North Union, and 90 per cent. of the ratepayers don't get it, and we give them cream and butter. Are we to build a convalescent hospital and over-feed them and give them nothing to do?

16740. Still you would do that for the sake of stamping out consumption?—Yes; but I suppose it would make a great increase in the rates; twenty people die in Dublin every week from consumption, and there are three times that number sick.

16741. They would only need to go into the sanatorium for a comparatively short time and be taught how to make themselves innocuous for others?—That is the theory; less than three months would be no use; that would be 750 people.

16742. They could not all get it at once?—If it was only 200 that would be a grave matter for the rates, and if you over-fed them they learn such habits that they would not be good citizens afterwards.

Mrs. McDONALD CONGRATE, P.L.C., EXAMINED.

16743. CHAIRMAN.—You are appearing on behalf of the Poor Law Officers' Association; there was a letter from Mr. Denis O'Connell that you were nominated by the Poor Law Officers' Association of Ireland to give evidence?—The first point that they asked me to take up was the appointment of Poor Law officers and the reduction of untrained persons from such positions; what they seemed to wish, I should say on their behalf, is that a master of a workhouse has some very incompetent person forced on him who has probably never seen a workhouse, and is supposed to do work which he is quite incapable of doing. They wanted me to say that they would wish a sort of apprenticeship, that they might be promoted from a small workhouse to a larger one, and so on, with the hope of eventually being made master or matron.

16744. Make it a public service transferable from one workhouse to another?—That is it exactly; and also that trouble is so great in a workhouse if the officials are related to the Guardians; they do nothing but annoy the board if they find that they are in a little difficulty, and they would like to have a record kept of their conduct by the master and matron, and have their salaries raised according to that record.

16745. Or lowered?—They did not ask me to say it was to be lowered; but it should be raised according to their merits.

16746. Mr. MURKIN.—Without regard to the Guardians?—Without regard to the Guardians.

16747. Do you speak on behalf of the Poor Law Officers' Association?—Yes; and not as a Guardian. They find the people are quite unskilled who are sent in; have no technical training. In the prisons service they refuse to take women who have not been trained in something special—either laundry, nursing, or cooking.

16748. CHAIRMAN.—What apprenticeship would the people in small unions undergo?—I suppose you would put them into a kind of probation for a certain number of months.

16749. And none of them should be connected in any way with the Board of Guardians?—I think they feel that very strongly; several workhouse officials have said to me that the workhouses cannot be efficient otherwise.

16750. Would the appointment still remain with the Guardians?—In the Prisons service it remains with the Prisons Board.

Mar. 22, 1906.

Dr. J. C.
McWalter.

Mrs. McDONALD
Congrate

Mar. 28, 1904.

Mrs.
M'Dowell
Coagran.

16754. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—You would like the Local Government Board to make the appointments?—That is my personal opinion.

16755. CHAIRMAN.—I don't think the Local Government Board would like the task?—There are certain rules under which the Guardians advertise, namely, that a man must be under a certain age—under thirty-five—and I have often seen very tatter'd old gentlemen come in who said they were only thirty-five. If they have no friends among the Guardians they feel that their salaries are never raised. One woman made a bitter complaint to me the other day that her salary had never been raised because she knew nobody on the board.

16756. One of your own officials?—Yes.

16757. Then she had, at all events the pleasure, of your acquaintance?—Yes; but I am not fond of raising salaries, and I am not talking now as a Guardian. There is no maximum rate that they come to. I knew one man who was a brother-in-law of a Guardian who was put in at £1 a week, and very shortly afterwards we raised him to 30s. a week; he was put in in June, and in September we raised him to 35s. a week.

16758. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—The Local Government Board would not now sanction that?—It did happen.

16759. Not recently?—It is some time ago—six years ago—it did happen. I know the man, and I want to verify the statement in the books.

16760. I think five years interval is necessary at present unless some exceptional reason is given for the increase?—And then the better protection of officers against dismissal; there is a great feeling among the officers that people have spite against them; it is a great word they use. If they don't please the Guardians in some one particular they are very much in the hands of the Guardians.

16761. Is it not very much the other way; is it not that the Guardians put up with officials through weakness or good nature?—I don't think that is the case; I think they are allowed to do things if they are friends of the Guardians, but I don't think the Guardians trouble a great many of them as to efficiency or inefficiency.

16762. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose these are your own opinions; you are not now speaking with any direct authority to make that statement?—One of the men mentioned it in speaking to me; we both agreed that that was a very serious part of it; that you could not get a workhouse into an efficient state unless the officials saw there was some use in working; that they might hope to be promoted.

16763. Do you think the Poor Law officials now would endorse that evidence of yours?—I do; because I have gone through it, Mr. President, with those who asked me. The next point was the transferring of officers from union to union, both in promotion and as a result of want of harmony amongst the officers; it is still going entirely on the feeling that it should be a Poor Law service for them, and then when the time came for their superannuation that they should get it as a right.

16764. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—That is going a little above the Civil Service even; the Civil Service officials cannot demand their superannuation?—These people are allowed at the end of their work a certain amount of money, which is supposed to be put by for them.

16765. Is it not a practice throughout the country that superannuation is universal in regard to Poor Law officials?—Not always, I think.

16766. Nearly always?—I had an experience of that a good many years ago; there was a woman who was a maternity nurse, she had grown old and delicate; one Guardian in particular wished me to go and speak to her and talk to her and tell her that she would come to grief in some way, as she was getting old; this man, in particular, said "She will get so much superannuation." So I put a notice of motion on the paper that she should get it. To my horror, the man who had asked me to go stood up and opposed it. However he passed; she got it, but still he opposed it.

16767. Does not that show that the Guardians acted fairly in giving the money?—No; because she had had her whip out; she had canvassed the board; and had she not canvassed the board she would not have got it.

16768. I hope you have not that low estimation of your countrymen. I think the general experience of the country is that they deal fairly with their officers. I know an instance myself where the Guardians tried to add years and years to the service?—I know they do often, but the case can be otherwise—that is what the Poor Law officers complain of—that they don't get it by right; they get it by favour. With regard to the

inmates we find it impossible once anybody has been in the workhouse to get places for them, because the tendency in the workhouse is to become degraded, and it is the settled conviction of the public that the workhouse demoralises those who are obliged to enter it.

16769. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose no one likes to take a failure if they can get a person who has not failed?—Exactly; I suppose that is it. A great deal of this is due to improper association and improper classification in the workhouses of the North Dublin Union.

16770. Don't you think it might be due simply to the fact of failure without regard to where the inmates come from?—Sometimes it arises from illness; in the North Dublin Union we have eight acres of ground, and it contained on the night of the 15th of March 2,457 people, at 32s to the acre; the result of the increase of inmates has been that the open spaces have been gradually covered with temporary sheds. In the admission ward sometimes as many as three have to sleep in a single bed at night. Amongst the other portions there are no day rooms.

16771. In what part of the house does that happen?—The admission ward, where there are three in a bed; it is chiefly the women I am speaking of; it is the same on the men's side; I have taken all my figures for the 15th of March.

16772. Was that in some of the out-houses or the main building?—The admission ward.

16773. Those are not the hired houses outside?—No; only the able-bodied sleep there; these are generally the people who come in for hospital treatment.

16774. Would they not be sent at once by the resident doctor to the hospital?—Not if there was no bed; Dr. Kennedy was complaining bitterly to me the other day that during the day the doctor comes down and says "I have left you three beds for to-day," and during the day the three beds are filled, and then there is no place to put them until the doctor comes next day. Among the other evils there are no day rooms; inmates have to spend all their time, living, eating, and sleeping in their wards; this is unhealthy, and prevents proper supervision of the ward and the absence of a dining hall, and the issuing of ration to each person throughout the house leads to great waste.

16775. These seem rather cases affecting the management of a particular workhouse; it is hardly one of the matters which we would go into?—I thought that was what you wanted. Shall I say then that the overcrowding—

16776. That would be a reason for amalgamation, in your opinion?—Yes; but in the first place we should get rid of the lameness and epilepsy; that would give us eight wards and a day room, and make a very great difference. The blind also could be sent—we had ten of those in the house on the 15th of March—and then remove the consumptives.

16777. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Have you many of them?—I don't know how many we have, because I would have to go through the hospital to find out; but we have a fair number, and so strongly did we feel about it that a little while ago one of the Guardians had a notice of motion to take a house in the country to put them into, but then it was decided that he should withdraw it until after this Commission. Then able-bodied men and women absolutely get no work to do, as far as I can find out, in the workhouse.

16778. CHAIRMAN.—Are you familiar with other workhouses besides the North Dublin?—I am very familiar with English workhouses.

16779. Your experience of English workhouses is that they do no work there?—No; they are kept much better at work. In consequence of my visit to English workhouses we started wood-chopping. We had an enormous industry here, and we loaded in £10 a month for money received from wood-chopping, and the old men delighted in it, but it was, unfortunately, stopped. Then the women, I think they should be allowed to have two nights' and one day's work. I wrote to some workhouses where they had their female employed, and in Sheffield they have got entirely rid of their female.

16780. They get them somewhere else?—Exactly; but that would not matter to us. They sent us their stout (produced). That is a history which is laid before the Guardians when anybody applies for admission. The form in Belfast is even better. Most of the witnesses seemed to think that the women who drag about children with them should be treated as criminals. In the North Dublin Union it was my bad at one time—terrible—dragging children about, taking them out in the morning and bringing them in at eleven o'clock at night. The work for ladies' part

Mar. 25, 1884.

Mrs
M Dowd
Chicago.

women in another great trouble; these girls get twelve hours' sleep, and when we get them admitted, when they come back to us we ask what brought them back, and they say the work was too hard.

16778. That is rather as regards the interior management of your own workhouse?—Then will you take the classification of hospitals; in amalgamating the North and South Unions it struck me there could be a training school for nurses, and so we might get rid of pauper help, only allowing the paupers to come in and scrub in the morning and do the cleaning, and the probabilities might do the nursing. I am told in Birmingham it is made a kind of out-door relief; these women get that work to do as a kind of out-door relief.

16779. That is the scrubbing?—Yes; then they are paid so much an hour, but they are never allowed in the house after one o'clock; therefore they never touch the food. If the two Protestant hospitals were amalgamated it seems to me it might get rid of pauper help, which is a very considerable drawback.

16780. Is in your experience that a good deal of nursing duties are discharged by the paupers?—It is, unfortunately, and the serving of food.

16781. Under classification?—In large wards you cannot see all the way down. A civilian complained to me the other day that a relative of his had been ordered an egg, and he never got it; he had come out of the house at the time, so I had no power of looking into the matter, but it was a pauper who had taken it, I said not tell you. That leads to the selling of eggs and other things in the house, and our infirmaries are served almost entirely by these people; one of our paupers has been found with 49 in his pocket in the police station, quite drunk. They go out and stay out for a certain time, and when they have spent all that money they come in again. I know of a trained man in the hospital, and the pauper attendants, five of them, struck; they would not have the trained man. The worst evil connected with the workhouse is the pauper attendant; quite the worst; they do the work and get the officials in their power. My personal experience with reference to the high death rate of infants, having watched it very closely to see what was the matter, is that no nursery should contain more than twenty babies, and even that is too high a number.

16782. That is no ward?—No ward; more than twenty babies should not be near each other. My own opinion is that the terrible death rate we have comes partly from that. I think there should be better classification in the nurseries, and I very often think it would be well to separate the mother from the child.

16783. Mr. MURKIN?—In what respect should the classification be changed?—I think respectable married women and the young girls might be together—girls under twenty-four with their first children—so that widows who are not well behaved should be in a class by themselves, and another set of women who come to us repeatedly should be a class to themselves; there should be, at least, three classes. I think the company of the respectable married women would be good for the young girls.

16784. Chairman?—Are many of that class, unfortunately, obliged to come to the workhouse—what we call the really respectable people—driven by poverty?—Yes; we have in the nursery constantly respectable married people.

16785. Have you found out the reason why that class has to come to the workhouse; is it through drunken habits?—Yes; directly or indirectly, it is always through drink. I would not call a woman respectable who was a drunkard herself, and I don't think she should be with the young girls. I think there is a great tendency to get rid of the babies when they are not wanted.

16786. You mean they are purposely careless of their children?—Yes; about a fortnight ago that was discovered in one of our nurseries—a woman absolutely tried to get rid of her child. Of course she was stopped at once and separated from the child. She shows at once why the small nurseries are necessary; you could not watch twenty or eighty babies or mothers with babies. In my experience and that of several women Guardians the classification of hospitals is an important part of it.

16787. Therefore you would like to classify according to respectability and disease combined?—Yes; I won't touch the disease.

16788. The doctors must have them classified

according to disease; you would classify them according to respectability?—I would, decidedly.

16789. That is not done in general hospitals outside?—But they don't take in the classes the workhouse has.

16790. Don't you think they would take in any interesting diseases?—Yes; but the class they will not.

16791. Don't you think your hospital in the North Dublin Union, so far as orderly conduct on the part of the inmates, is well managed?—I think it is as well managed as it can be.

16792. As well managed as any ordinary hospital?—I don't know, because I don't know many ordinary hospitals; but a little time ago we had a discussion about a question of classification. There were consumptives that I thought should not be put in hospital with respectable women. An officer thought it was a very good thing to have the consumptives all together independent of their characters. We fought very hard at the Board, and the women were beaten, and then the officer, who had taken quite a strong part against us, came to me and told me she found we were perfectly right. There was one woman who had been sent to her ward to be treated, and she became acquainted with two young girls, and they presently left with the woman who I had objected to being put there, and she carried them away.

16793. That might have happened in any hospital?—I feel in making the fight I was justified.

16794. One should do as much as one can to segregate ill-conducted persons, but it would not be possible to have respectability considered in hospital wards where you have only so few wards. You would have to have an enormous institution to sub-classify all the diseases according to the respectability and situation in life. Are not all your wards crammed full, and three in a bed waiting to get in?—Our hospitals, no, but in the almshouse ward.

16795. You have not empty beds?—If you amalgamate you can classify, and I must say I would like them to be classified.

16796. One can always do that in a sensible way. You have been quite right in what you suggest about keeping certain objectionable women from the young girls. Putting them of a different end of the ward might have been sufficient separation, if there was a good nurse to keep an eye on them?—I think much mischief is done in workhouse hospitals.

16797. Mischief will be done anywhere?—I think that is all I have to say. We women are particularly anxious to have a woman inspector. We receive nothing but kindness and goodness from the gentlemen, but we would like a woman inspector in our workhouses. We always find inspectors more than anxious to help us in every way they can—

16798. Where do you feel the want?—I feel it. I chiefly want amongst the infirm, and there I think a woman inspector would be a great help.

16799. Who would go round and pay?—I—Surprise visit.

16800. A few visits in the year. What would she do now?—She would see whether the wards were comfortable enough for an old body, and see to the clothing of the people. She would do what the man does, and does very efficiently, but I would like a woman. I think we women are trained to housekeeping.

16801. Don't you think some of us men know something about it, too?—We are trained to the little things that men are not trained to. I should feel incapable of doing Dr. Rigby's business. We would like a woman inspector. We also feel very strongly, and would like a woman relieving officer appointed, in many places, for a woman to go round and do the duties of a relieving officer sometimes would be very important; for instance, going to a mother with her children.

16802. Then you would not be able to go to the father?—Well, the man could go to the father.

16803. Then you would have a woman inspector for the female side of the house?—I think the old man would be very comfortable with a woman inspector, too.

16804. What I wanted to see was what a woman could do that a man could not do?—When I go round I take down the beds and look after the washing and the linen.

16805. I always did so when I was an inspector!—All your inspectors do everything that is good and kind—I am not saying a word against them—but still we feel we would like a woman inspector; the clothing, and the food, and the babies, and if the women Guardians are driven out, as we probably will be, then there would be a woman to look after the poor.

The Sitting was adjourned.

Mar. 24, 1904

THIRTY-FOURTH PUBLIC SITTING.—THURSDAY, MARCH 24TH, 1904.

At the County Council Office, Dublin.

Present:—Mr. MOCKE (Chairman), Mr. MURNAUGHAN, and Dr. COREY BOGGER.

Mr. JOHN McDONNELL, J.P., P.L.C., CHAIRMAN.

15606. CHAIRMAN.—You are a Guardian of the North Dublin Union for a very long time?—Yes, sir.

15607. The Guardians have been considering the question of whether amalgamation between their union and the South Union would be beneficial—what is your own opinion in the matter?—I think it would be beneficial. In fact, the case has been so clearly demonstrated that I don't think I could add anything to the evidence already given.

15608. Did you hear the evidence that Dr. McWalter gave last evening?—I did.

15609. He had some middle course?—I don't endorse his evidence in that respect.

15610. Would you rather go in for amalgamation pure and simple?—Decidedly.

15611. With a head not larger than the present board?—Yes.

15612. Would you look forward to seeing much practical benefit apart altogether from the question of saving?—The first consideration with me is the interest of the poor. What I would suggest would be that one workhouse be turned into a hospital, pure and simple, and that should be the South Union.

15613. Do you think it is not a little too large?—There are magnificent buildings there, fine grounds, and all the rest, and together with having it as a hospital, I would transfer those who are tottering on the threshold of the hospital, the feeble and infirm, up to the hospital, and then afterwards it might be considered how far you might go with the maternity cases and babies.

15614. You would rather have that plan than the division of sites that the ex-Lord Mayor, Mr. Harrington proposed?—That would not work at all, sir.

15615. What objection would you see to that?—When a man wants to leave and get his wife and children out, how is he to gather them up?

15616. I suppose they would be gathered for him—telephone across?—I don't think it would work. The first thing is to provide for the sick.

15617. You would not be able to effect such a reduction in officials if you kept both sides there?—To my mind the first thing is what are you going to do with the sick? Would it not be far better to have the sick in one hospital?

15618. You have a splendid female hospital in the North?—We have; but when those people are becoming convalescent, where are they to go? The ground is very desecrated; you are bounded by buildings and walls; you have not a mouthful of fresh air for the convalescent to get; and, besides, the place is so congested that the air they are breathing is not pure.

15619. You would not say that of the air in the new hospitals?—No; but I consider where you put so many people on a certain area the air cannot be very pure. You have the smoke coming from the railway across on that bit of ground they have; they cannot get a pure or refreshing breeze.

15620. It is on a high site?—It is, but it takes a lot to drive away the smoke.

15621. You generally get good, sweet, pure air in the hospital?—Oh, yes, that is all right; but you have no place for the people to walk about. Then, besides, on the south side you could have a convalescent ward as well.

15622. If a number of almshouses were got out of the workhouse—leaving and others?—You have 1,372 cases in the North Union.

15623. That is including feeble and infirm?

Mr. O'Neill (Clerk).—Yes.

15624. You may say 800 in the extreme cold weather?

Mr. O'Neill.—Fully that.

WILSON.—Then the South would, at least, have 1,500.

15625. They have 1,300?—That makes 2,800.

15626. If you take the feeble and infirm of both, you won't have much space afterwards in the South Union if it is turned into a hospital?—There are 150 out children.

15627. They are included in that total. What is your view about the girls who come in there with illegitimate children; do you think they ought to continue to be received into any workhouse, or would you be in favour of sending them to penitentiaries or reformatories?—That would be far better if it could be done, if they would be taken, instead of letting them into workhouses at all. I don't know that you would get an institution to take charge of them; there might be some difficulty.

15628. Each religion would have its own institution, and take them in at so much a head from the Guardians?—At that particular time they are very petted, and not so easily managed; it would not be easy to get them to submit to discipline.

15629. There would be more chance of their being disciplined in an institution like that, under religious influence, than in a workhouse, where they come and go and scold all day?—Then, if there should be a maternity ward there, there certainly should be a classification.

15630. If you had no maternity ward at all in a workhouse, if those girls went, as a matter of course, to some religious institution, they generally come out the workhouse two or three months beforehand, and then they remain often for their lives afterwards, going backwards and forwards, and there would be a chance of breaking them off—taking away the consequence of their lapses, and starting them afresh?—That would be a capital arrangement, and they would be more likely to return back home again; but once they get the air of the workhouse we cannot make any improvement; in fact, they go out, and become, in many cases, more depraved.

15631. That would take a very large population out of the workhouse if that class and the children could be taken?—It would. You want a good deal more space than you have in workhouses. Besides, in the North Union, if you take a lot out of it, you want a place to put those that are able to work in, to do something; you will get a man very well able to do a lot of things.

15632. You have a large city population that keeps coming in and out?—Yes. If you gave them employment in the workhouse, you would have that class in the North side, and they would not be in such a hurry to come in.

15633. Do you think they come in from laziness in many cases or is it inability to get work; do your porters come in?—On the North side you have all the markets, and you have a good many coming in from the markets.

15634. That is, men who are porters?—Yes.

15635. And when business is slack, they come in, or when they lose a job from tipping?—Yes, come in to brace up, and go out again.

15636. If they cannot get immediate employment they go in with their families?—You have gaily porters coming in, but they scarcely ever come in unless when they are broken down.

15637. Do you find many of the corner-boy class in the workhouse?—Unfortunately, we have a good many, and they are put in positions they should not be in at all, because they are handy and smart and quick.

They are put as nurses, attendants, and scrubbers, and if they were put to harder work they would not be so ready to come in.

16832. Can you tell me anything about the night shelters there are in Dublin?—We have two on the North side.

16833. One at Bow-street—that is still working?—It is.

Mr. O'NEILL.—It closes in the summer for two months, cleaning up.

16834. What other is there at the North side?—That is the only one.

16835. Then there is one at the Theatre Royal, on the South side?—Yes, and there is Carlostree, Brookfield-lane.

16836. That is Dr. Spratt's?—Yes.

16837. From whom would we be likely to get good evidence about these shelters?—One of the relieving officers at the North side.

CHAIRMAN.—I know pretty well the procedure of Bow-street.

Miss WOLFE.—Clark-street is in the hands of the Sisters of Mercy.

16838. CHAIRMAN.—This one at Poolbeg-street?

Miss FUCHS.—That is managed by a Protestant committee. I think Dr. McVittie could get you information.

16839. Do you know anything of your own knowledge of the Mendicity Institution?—No.

16840. It is still working?—Oh, it is.

16841. They get them to do some light tasks, and give them their food?—And they sleep in the night refuges very much.

Mr. O'NEILL.—They help them to a great extent to get back to their own towns and residences.

16842. The residence of a great many would be Dublin?

Mr. O'NEILL.—Well, no; I know many myself that come up to me from the country, and they get a note from the manager, and have been sent back to their own towns.

Mr. A. CARROLL.—If it is shown that there is a certainty of getting work they will pay their passages.

16843. CHAIRMAN.—The casual poor of Dublin who are not in the workhouses must be between the Mendicity Institution and the night shelters?—The casuals that come to the North Union are principally from Balbrithery direction.

16844. These are tramps; but I mean the men and women that come in when they are out of work?—They are a class of people that take their children out in the daytime, and they are begging about the streets in the day, going from publichouses to publichouses, and they come back at night, and sleep in the workhouse, and they do that night after night.

16845. Regular mendicants, using the shelter of the houses?—Yes; I have told the master that he ought to warn the people that they could not make this a sort of resting-place at night.

16846. Would you be in favour of depriving these people of their liberty for a year or two years, and putting them into a place where they would be obliged to work, as a sort of punishment for their vagrancy and want of good habits in life; it has been suggested by a great number of witnesses?—I don't see how it can be done; the liberty of the subject comes in.

16847. If a man does anything wrong they lock him up; are these people doing sufficient wrong to be locked up?—That is a matter for the law.

16848. Would you be in favour of making a law that would deprive them of their liberty?—Certainly.

16849. And taking their children from them, so that they could be properly brought up?—Certainly; save themselves and save their children.

16850. Do you think that class is increasing, as far as your observation goes?—I do.

16851. Taking a big city, would these people make a considerable amount in a day?—Yes.

16852. Their begging would be successful?—Yes; £s. or 7s. at least.

16853. Then they go in, and get their bed and breakfast?—And supper at night.

16854. Do they go in in time for supper—what time is it now?—There is no particular time fixed. As for the matter of bathing, it is never done at all.

16855. You could not give them a cold bath, of course?—Then, there is the danger of bringing in disease from the city.

16856. It is desirable to have that class kept out of the workhouse proper, and lock them up with a

view of reforming them. I heard mention of the feasibility of sending children of that class to farmers' houses, but I doubt that. The children would be well trained?—What training would they get in farmers' houses? They won't be drilled.

16857. People who advocate boarding out say that what they want is to be put in a position of life where they can make their living easily. If a boy goes to a farmer's house he is taught to do various things about the house and land that enables him to become an agricultural labourer; he is not taught to be a tradesman or anything of that sort; don't you think that is a good, healthy life?—If you take the parents and put them into institutions it may be done. There is a great spirit of independence abroad. If a boy has been wandering about begging, it won't be so easy to bring him into a farmer's house to work.

16858. The older they become, the more unmanageable; then you could put them into an industrial school or a reformatory?—A reformatory is the last place I should send them to; there they meet boys of the most vicious class.

16859. Do you know anything about the after life of the reformatory boys?—No more than what I see in the papers. I see a number of the boys turn out badly. One or two bad boys amongst a lot will do an immense amount of harm; no amount of supervision will take away the taint.

16860. That is one argument against having them in large bodies; would it not be better to have them in small houses?—You must remember on the North side the class of people you have to deal with; in the South side they have a number of small farmers towards the mountains.

16861. They are not tied up to board out in their own union?—I know that; but the South side is particularly well situated in that way.

16862. But they send to Enniskerry and other places in Wicklow?—I don't know what places we could send to on the North side where we have that class of farmers at all.

16863. Send them to Tyrone. From Wales they are sending them to Cumberland and Westmoreland?—If we could select the district.

16864. There would be nothing to prevent you sending them to districts where labour is wanted. Send them to farmers of the same religion?—That would be far better, because they would be cut off from all associations. They would have to make their home where they were, and that would be far better than any institution.

16865. I know your view is very strong about the lunatic accommodation in the North Dublin Workhouse. You know it ought to be better, but you have not room to make it better. You would be glad to say all lunatics removed from the workhouse?—Decidedly.

16866. Have you formed any opinion whether it would be better to send them to the ordinary district or county asylums, or to some institution, such as was recently started at Youghal, not so well equipped, and a cheaper asylum? If they would be taken in the asylum, where there are doctors and nurses, to my mind that would be the best thing to do.

16867. If it could be done without additional expense in building?—If not, I would suggest a disused workhouse. If you take a disused workhouse, suppose you get the building free, a proper staff of doctors and nurses would not cost as more than they are costing us at present; that is, provided we get the building free.

16868. The building will always require some structural alterations?—But I would prefer an asylum by far, because they are continually changing. A man might be pretty right to-day, and to-morrow he may get violent.

16869. You draw a clear line between two classes of infirm—those you call the feeble infirm and the healthy infirm?—There are men with such spirit that they are walking about when they ought to be lying down.

16870. Your view is, that feeble and infirm should be always placed in proximity to the hospital?—Quite so; they may be all right to-day and ill to-morrow.

16871. As regards the healthy infirm?—I would give them some work to do; something to dole at.

16872. Mr. MURPHY.—Do you think it would be worth considering the establishment of a home in the county—the disused workhouse in a suitable locality for the aged and infirm?—Most decidedly.

Mar 24, 1901

Mr. John
McDonnell.

Mar. 24, 1884.

Mr. John
McDonnell.

16979. With sufficient land to afford employment and some occupation—I think that would be a capital idea.

16980. At present large numbers are huddled together in a day-room in an atmosphere heavy with tobacco smoke and other odours. This should be changed.

16981. CHAIRMAN.—Bad air and over-crowding?—But you have no exercise ground in the North Union—the place for them is between two walls—the boundary wall of the railway on one side and the boundary wall of the workhouse on the other.

16982. CHAIRMAN.—A shocking place, like an elongated hall-alley.

16983. Mr. MURKIN.—If there was some workhouse that could be done without in the county where that class could be sent, and could have some occupation and a little exercise, so necessary for health, do you not think it would be worth considering?—Decidedly.

16984. Dr. BROOKS.—Would you be in favour of separating the hospital, if possible, from the workhouse?—I don't see how it could be done.

16985. Is your workhouse it would be very difficult, but generally speaking?—Oh, yes; generally speaking, I would say; but it could not be done in Dublin.

16986. If you had a separate entrance from Broad-street, could you not separate it in that way?—I don't think it is a proper site for a hospital at all. I think all the hospital cases ought to be together, North and South, to that I hold fast—all together, in the one building.

16987. Supposing there was amalgamation, would you think that that building might be obtained in the South Dublin Workhouse?—If you compared the two sites, you would never dream of having hospital patients in the North Union if you could place them in the South Union.

16988. Would you be in favour of making the hospital in the South Dublin Workhouse and keeping the North for the healthy?—Decidedly; I think I suggested that.

16989. That would do away with the pauper inmates attending in the workhouse?—Certainly.

16990. I think you mentioned that the corner-boy class very frequently acted as attendants?—Very often.

16991. And I believe they do nursing duties?—And various other duties, because they are quick and sharp, and know a good deal about city life; handy men, and they levy blackmail wherever they can.

16992. So that it would be better for the unfortunate patients?—To take them out of their hands altogether.

16993. And it would not be an indictment to that class to go into the workhouse?—It would not; there would be a better system of nursing and better care.

16994. Would you suggest any difference in the administration of the hospital if such an arrangement was arrived at?—I don't see what change.

16995. You would not make it a district hospital?—What would that mean?

16996. Separating it from the workhouse, and a separate committee to manage it?—You would not be separating it from the workhouse so long as you keep the feeble and infirm there.

CHAIRMAN.—Unless you looked on them as sick.

16997. Dr. BROOKS.—The buildings in the South lend themselves for separation?—If you make a district hospital you would want to leave it open for the whole county.

16998. No, the present area?—What benefit would that confer?

16999. In several ways—in the first way it would remove the workhouse taint?—Then, by all means, call it a district hospital.

17000. Would you be in favour of the Guardians appointing a committee composed largely of themselves with some outsiders on it?—I don't see how that would work.

17001. There is a section of the Local Government Act that enables that?—Well, as long as the board would not be too large that may work satisfactorily, but I don't believe in a board as large as we have at present.

17002. You could make it as small as you like; I am only speaking of the proportion, say, one-third of outsiders to two-thirds of direct representatives?—Would these be by co-option.

17003. Of course, by co-option?—That would work well.

16994. You would be in favour of it?—I would.

16995. Mr. MURKIN.—That provision already exists, but it has never been taken advantage of. Do you not think the Guardians are very well able to manage their own business?—They are.

16996. Why would you bring outsiders in?—You could pick out here and there a man of great experience among the poor.

16997. I think from what we have seen of the Dublin Guardians that they don't lack experience in any way?—We are on our trial, to a certain extent, perhaps, if we had the power it might be availed of.

Sir, MURKIN.—You have the power.

16998. Dr. BROOKS.—You have not the means at present?—No. About the consumptives, I would like to say something on that point. This country not being very large, I think we should have a national hospital for the whole country; one or two for consumptives; they are growing daily in number, and require immediate attention.

16999. The sick do not care to go far from their own neighbourhood?—No matter what part of the country you go to you cannot get more than sixty miles from the sea.

17000. CHAIRMAN.—The amount of consumption in the country is very great, and the evidence we have got is rather in favour of having one for a large county and, say, one for two or three smaller counties, if combined together, pretty much as in Lancashire system. You have to take into consideration whether you have better air in the north or in the south.

17001. Dr. BROOKS.—Pure air is all you want and a dry soil. You would be in favour of siting a consumptive hospital or hospitals?—It should be looked into at once, to my mind.

17002. CHAIRMAN.—A doctor whom we met at Crag-hill has started a sanatorium in connection with his hospital, and the results are wonderfully good; and, in giving his evidence, was very anxious that there should be a large number of sanatoria, and the only advice he gave was that they should be put up in a very temporary way, for if this disease was grappled with simultaneously all over the country, that temporary buildings would be enough to eradicate the disease, and this is from a man who has a very large experience. Dr. Moorhead?—Don't you see the rapid strides the cattle disease was making in this country; they would not grapple with that for a good while—grazing compensation—but then they went and attacked the mares, and it is now nearly blotted out; and, in like manner, if you take consumption, in a very short time you will nearly eradicate it. I know a case at present where there is a child ten years old sleeping in a room with three other children, and the child has phthisis. We tried to persuade the parent to let the child go somewhere, and he would not, and they have the other children sleeping in the same small room.

17003. At all events you would like sufficient accommodation to be provided for dealing with the disease?—I would. There is another thing that is wanted very badly, and it is a lady inspector for the unions; that is badly wanted.

17004. Mr. MURKIN.—In what way?—Amongst the females particularly, examining the underclothing and backs. Of course you will meet an odd gentleman like the chairman, that is very strong at that point, free time to time.

17005. Guardians in some of the unions complain that lady inspectors were too impetuous?—Another reason is, we have some lady Guardians in the North Union, and they have done good work since they came there.

17006. CHAIRMAN.—Have they done much about the interior of the institution?—They have, but the difficulty is when they bring forward recommendations to the Board of Guardians; we sometimes don't see our way to adopt them, although they are based on sound sense, and not very extravagant.

17007. What kind of recommendations would they make on these special points?—Oh, clothing; for instance, when you send the cheaper article to wash two or three times it is no good, but if you get a better article it will last longer.

17008. You have drapers on the Board who ought to be able to assist you in the choice of a good article?—Gentlemen of a particular trade generally go in for bits of their own trade. If I belong to a certain trade, and a man deals with me for an article, and he is a contractor, perhaps I might be inclined to recommend him. Then if a lady inspector comes round, if she sees the way to make recommendations after an inspection, if

they come with the force and authority of your Board, they never will be questioned, they will be carried out at once, so she could assist the lady Guardians in that particular branch of administration. The lady Guardians have a hard card to play in the North Union.

16028. I was asking one of the ladies what the lady inspector would do that the male inspectors do not or could not do. I found it a little bit difficult to quite understand it. I am only anxious to know. I am not at all saying that it might not be a very good thing, only I wanted to know what is the precise reason in your mind for suggesting it?—That she would make such an inspection as she would make in her own family life—see the women, how they were dressed, what clothes they had on.

16029. Do you think she could go very far in her own home that way?—I presume you would send some person of practical experience, some married woman with experience of her own family; it would not do to send a fee lady.

16030. A married lady would have her own family to look after?—Some of the lady Guardians say that in the hard weather some of these women are out in the snow very badly clad.

16031. That is a thing any of us could see in going through?—If a lady inspector was appointed I would expect her visits would be pretty frequent, at least once every three months; six months is too long a period altogether.

16032. Then one lady inspector would not go round very far?—Six months' inspection would not be worth that, because in the time coming on preparation could be made.

16033. Don't you think the lady Guardians ought to be able to do as much as there is to be done?—Yes; if assisted by the male Guardians, it could be easily carried out.

16034. Or to communicate with the Local Government inspectors?—They will be at the back of the books together if they do that.

16035. I always found plenty of Guardians anxious to consult with me for the benefit of the workhouse and of the union?—Yes, and you gave us every assistance in your power when we were trying to reorganise.

16036. Why should not any Guardian, lady or gentleman, confer with the inspectors?—It would look out amongst the officials.

16037. I don't mean make complaints of particular errors and faults, but anything in the system that would require amendment; something not in the nature of personal complaints so much as something to improve the system?—I am giving you from twenty-five years' experience what I consider would be a man impressed, when I was able to go round the wards myself, but what could I do on the female side? I wish we had more lady Guardians, and they would every assistance, and that can only be given by a lady inspector. You have a lady inspector of boarded-out children.

16038. You think the lady Guardians have done great service for your workhouse?—What is the consequence now? we have a Visiting Committee principally composed of lady Guardians; now we have an opposition Visiting Committee composed of the male Guardians, that are diametrically opposed to the views of the lady Guardians.

16039. Mr. MURKIN.—Is not that a bad spirit to assume?—Very bad; that could be allayed by a lady inspector.

16040. Is it not perhaps the idea of the male Guardians that the ladies are going outside their ordinary duties?—Not at all. The lady Guardians are more particular in inspecting food, such as butter and things of that sort, than the male Guardians are, and they think they are too faddish, and that people in humble dwellings have not those fine things to eat, and when we are paying high prices for the best article, we ought to get it.

16041. And the ladies insist on the article being of the quality contracted for?—Decidedly.

16042. That is very proper?—Until they were thwarted.

16043. CHAIRMAN.—Is that the main question on which the two Visiting Committees differ, the question of supplies?—Supplies, and other details of the place; it keeps up a lot of friction. I think Dr. Biggar knows something about that.

16044. What I was more thinking about was trying to meet in a systematic way any defects, not so much condemning a particular person for what may be the fault of the system?—How can a male inspector do a necessary inspection amongst female's garments, and bedding, and so on.

16045. What inspection would a lady inspector make?

she goes into the female ward, what could she do practically?—She would be as use at all if that is all she would do.

16046. What would she do?—Examine the beds.

16047. That is always done?—I know some inspectors that come to the North Union examine five or six beds at one end and five or six at the other end, but the spaces in the centre would not be touched at all.

16048. There is not much use in turning down every bed, but taking samples, as a practical man would?—If you put a lady inspector there she would not make that slipshod inspection.

16049. Would she do more than examine the beds?—She would strengthen the hands of the lady Guardians to carry out necessary reforms that are cropping up every day.

16050. Such as?—Suppose it came to her knowledge that there were two Visiting Committees, and she brought that under the notice of the Local Government Board, I presume they would point out that that should not be the case.

16051. I don't know; conceivably it may result in good; one often feels a little fractious does some good?—I merely ask you in your experience to think the matter over.

16052. I am very anxious to think it over, and the reason I am asking so many questions is that I would like to find out the reasons?—Some of the lady Guardians will give you better reasons than I can give you.

16053. Mr. CORNELL.—Would you allow me to ask Mr. M'Donnell his views on the extension of out-door relief?—Some years ago we had a winter exceptionally severe, and we went to your Board to see what could be done in the way of employment, and you gave us a sealed order to give out-door relief to the heads of families and establish a stone-breaking yard.

16054. CHAIRMAN.—Because the workhouse was over full?—Yes; we started a stone-breaking yard in Brunswick-street, did not ask the men to work too hard, and we put a man over them, and paid them 8s. and 9s. a week. There was another one at Cabra.

16055. The ground of that relaxation was altogether because the workhouse was full?—I would suggest, if there was a season of exceptional distress, that that might be done.

16056. Would you do it largely to prevent the houses being broken up?—I would, and take away that thing of out-door relief; once people get a taste for out-door relief it is very hard to break them off.

16057. What safeguards would you have for this extension?—I would give the out-door relief, as we do at present; it is very closely watched. We have struck out a road as well as we could. A woman with two children gets so much, and a larger family so much more; of works well—and where there is illness in the family we give meat for beef tea.

16058. Mr. CORNELL.—Would you extend the relief to a woman with one child. Are they not frequently in as much destitution as a woman with two or three children?—They are; they certainly should get it, but a good deal would depend if she had a child twelve or thirteen years old. It might be given until she was able to get into a situation.

16059. CHAIRMAN.—If a girl was at school the mother might be able to do some charring, but you would like them to have the discretion to give out-door relief where there was one child?—Yes, and where the woman is industrious.

16060. Mr. CORNELL.—It has been proposed that there should be amalgamation between the North and South Dublin Unions. Do you think one Board would work?—Certainly.

16061. With the large number of 135 Guardians, would one Board consisting of that number work?—Not at all; you could not have more than sixty at the very outside.

16062. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose the average attendance would not be more than a dozen?—It is larger, 50 per cent. at least.

16063. Mr. MURKIN.—Would you be in favour of the suggestion in case of amalgamation to have the women in one workhouse and the men in the other?

CHAIRMAN.—If the sites were equally healthy, you would agree with that?—I could not get over the idea of having one hospital for hospital patients, and a building, if a suitable one, for feeble and infirm as well; nothing can change me from that.

16064. Your main reason is that you think the south side is so much superior and healthy, you want to get the sick there?—Certainly.

16065. But if the two buildings were equally good, and the sites equally good, would you not see a great

Mar. 24, 1904

Mr. John M'Donnell.

Nov. 24, 1904.

Mr. John
McDonnell.

benefit in having the males in one and the females in the other?—Certainly; but in the South Union would not that be the case?

15997. Mr. MURTAGH.—Still they would be in proximity to each other?—Yes; if it could be done, so much the better.

15998. Mr. Carroll.—Would you not be in favour of one uniform rate for the two unions?—Yes, and amal-

gamation, that follows naturally; there is no reason why, because the river divides the city. I don't think there is such an anomaly in any other part of the kingdom. That was done in the dark ages of the Poor Law.

CHAIRMAN.—It was done when there was electoral division chargeability, and you had all over the county startling differences in rates.

Mr. J. J. GOGGINS, F.R.C., examined.

Goggins.

Mr. Chairman, we thought it advisable at the Board to gather a committee together for the sake of saving your time and our own, and by having the amalgamation of the opinion of the majority of the Board, that we might be able to arrive at a more correct answer to your queries. I believe Mr. O'Neill has already handed to you a copy of these answers, and whether it is necessary for me to read them to you; my impression is that it won't be necessary. I will merely add that where we mention Dunshaughlin Union, of course we might not be able to get that union, but we might get Balrothery for the sick and epileptic, and imbecile poor, or consumptives.

15999. Mr. Carroll.—There might be an objection raised in consequence of Dunshaughlin being in a different county, but Balrothery is in the same county?—I don't know if I would be at liberty to make a few remarks respecting what occurred at yesterday's meeting here. I think it would be wise to correct two or three mis-statements, because sometimes misrepresentations go forward, and it is better to have it out. Now, in the case of the children at Calce, we had the question raised at our last Visiting Committee—we visit monthly—suspecting three five or six children that are Protestant children. I raised the question myself, having seen a reference to it in a paper in the city, because we were not going to lie under the imputation that these children were either unfairly or ungenerously dealt with. We were, on that occasion, inclined to think that everything that was stated in the paper was not quite true; in fact there was never an occasion before on which the religion of any child was raised as being under a certain master. When we had 120 Catholic children under a Protestant master there was never a word about it at all. The Protestant master has been superannuated, and now, for the first time, because these six children are with us the question is raised that perhaps they are in an atmosphere in which they should not be. Mrs. McDonnell Consigns in here and will tell you, as I do, that we did our level best to locate these children in homes of their own religion. As the number was so small we thought we would be doing them a service by transferring them to a good Protestant institution, where they would be well cared for and breathe their own atmosphere, but we were opposed, and although we were quite willing to give extra pay for these and make every provision for safeguarding them, still the opposition came along, so that the idea falls to the ground that we want to retain them or deal unjustly with them. Respecting the home suggested by Lady Meath, the Guardians of our union are quite in favour of doing all we can for Lady Meath if she gets the home. We have already had a flattering memorandum from her, saying she is thankful for the offer we made her at so much per head at any time she will start the home. As far as our boarded-out children go, and as far as the committee of inspection can see, they are regularly visited—well, I should say, perhaps half-a-dozen times yearly—but we know very well the relieving officer visits them every week, and the children we saw within the last fortnight or three weeks were all in splendid condition, and quite at home with the other occupants of the home. We saw them both at their homes and at the schools, and they seemed well kept and well cared for, and it reflects great credit on the people who took them over; and I am happy to say there was an application for half-a-dozen children at the same time from various people to take them under their care.

16000. CHAIRMAN.—You have not found any difficulty in getting homes?—No, the people don't take them exactly to make money out of them; they are all fairly well-to-do people who want children here and there, where there are no children; and also to make up a certain number in their homes for company to school with the other children. I think, as regards amalgamation, if it could be brought about, the children of the two unions could be well disposed of by having the imbecile children at Calce, and if Balrothery were put in order you could have all the boys of the two unions

put there, and that would dispose of the children in a healthy locality.

16001. I think you were here when Mr. McDonnell was speaking about the children. Would you be in favour of taking their children from a number of these respectable or bad parents?—I would, if it could be proved they are not capable of minding them or bringing them up morally or in a decent condition, making them useful members of society.

16002. Would you be in favour of extending the boarding-out system, or would you rather like to maintain institutions?—I think up to a certain period the boarding-out system would be well, and the children could be taken then and put into some industrial schools or training establishments.

16003. At what age?—From fourteen up.

16004. Why would you send them to learn trades? You must always agree with children as to these last. Every child will not take to agricultural pursuits. One boy will take to mechanics.

16005. There is no reason why he should not?—No reason, but that their bent is not that way.

16006. As you bend the twig?—But still it will go back. They have inclinations like our own. A man, as a rule, never follows his father's profession in trade or commerce.

16007. These, of course, are boys who are children of the State. But do you think these children ought to be put forward and put into positions better than the poor class of rascals could put forward their children to?—If they have the intellect it would be a pity to keep them back.

16008. I am not talking of keeping them back; but do you think it is the duty of the rascals, through their Guardians, to educate these children and bring them on to trades, and put them in a better position, although they were waste?—Do you think it would be a proper thing to put them into better positions than the children of labouring people who are able to keep out of the workhouse?—I should imagine if the State would aid they ought to get the chance.

16009. I don't know whether you are so much in the city, but in a very large portion of the country there is a great dearth of agricultural labourers! There is at present, at any rate, until such time probably as the country will be brought back into agricultural business.

16010. I mean as things are at present there is a great want of people to do farm work in the country?—There is, and even in the case of kitchen gardens there is a great want.

16011. Don't you think it is a good thing to bring the workhouse children to it?—Certainly, as many as will take to it. We have sent out several from our auxiliary to various parts of the country, to farmers and others. We don't keep them back; if they are to be taken we give them every opportunity to go.

16012. That is a cheap way of putting them forward in the world?—It is the best way to make them mingle with the people, children at Clontarf and Beldrye. Several of them have got positions on the railway and tramway, and are gradually getting absorbed into the population. They are all well settled and do for. I just answer Mr. Egan, that, as far as the North Dublin Union is concerned, the children are well attended to, and a regular ladies' committee look after them, and sometimes other Guardians go with them. As regards the consumptives, we ought to have a home, and I don't think there ought to be any delay as regards the consumptives getting a home.

16013. That is an institution for curing them?—Yes, a diseased union; and furthermore, if possible, there should be one in each province.

16014. When we have statistics as to the next number, I suppose you have a sufficient number?—Exactly; but as regards the employment of the lady inspectors, I have no objection to all the lady inspectors you can get, but I fail to see what good a lady inspector can do with

a nation of the union, and a heavy staff of ladies like the ones at Cabra, who have the look and lay on every-thing.

15876. Are you a member of the other inspection commission?—I am not an attending member of it. I happen to have gone with the ladies the last time; whether I am wanted on or off their show I cannot tell. I suppose eventually I will be excommunicated.

15875. Mr. MURKIN.—By the ladies or the men?—I am afraid that I have gone between the two and will get landed. As regards clothing, we have a fair assortment of drapers on the board, and they are all capable men and very well able to look after the quality much better than any lady inspector who is not in the business. As regards butcher experts, we have half-a-dozen, at any rate, contractors' brothers and contractors

themselves; we have a fair share. We are a fairly well mixed business board, that know their way about; they don't want to be told much.

15877. And they insist upon the articles being up to the quality?—Oh, yes, as a rule. We insisted on a late occasion, when it was thought to impose upon us, to run an article of sheeting. We were told that it could not be made here, and we insisted on it, and we were fortunate in being able to get it made here, and I am very glad to be able to say, get it made outside Harold's Cross, a vastly superior article to the other one. I don't think the board ever allow anything to go on credit. Several things may be said, and have been said, against them, but I think on the whole they have done their business faithfully and well.

Nov. 28, 1904.

Mr. J. J. Goggin.

Mr. JOHN CAROLAN, F.R.S., Chairman of North Dublin Board of Guardians, examined.

15878. CHAIRMAN.—You have been Chairman for a long time of the North Dublin Union?—I think about sixteen years. I think this is the twenty-eighth year that I am a member of it.

15879. Are you in favour of the amalgamation of the Dublin Unions?—I would be; it would be difficult to amalgamate them, but still when it would be worked out I think it would be beneficial to both unions.

15880. Have you thought at all how you would divide the buildings, what classes you would put in the present North Dublin Union and the present South Dublin Union?—I have not, indeed.

15881. You would leave that to be arranged subsequently. Mr. Harrington suggested yesterday that the males might be put on one side of the river and the females on the other?—At one time there was a proposal to transfer the female children to one union and the male children to another, but it fell through.

15882. Mr. McDonnell suggested to-day that the workhouse of the South Dublin might be used for an hospital for the sick and feeble infants?—They have a good deal more room there and better air space; our air space is all done away with.

15883. These are matters you think might be left open, as far as you are concerned, until a later period?—When amalgamation takes place it can be regulated. On the north we are so congested we have built on every space we could build on.

15884. Two or three people in a bed?—No.

15885. Mrs. McDowell suggested to me yesterday there were three in a bed?—I don't think that is possible; the bed would not hold more than one. They may be so close together that it might seem as if there were more than one in the bed.

15886. Mr. MURKIN.—So that everybody has a separate bed?—Oh, yes.

15887. CHAIRMAN.—If there were any case otherwise it would be an entirely exceptional thing?—I never heard of it. I don't think it could possibly take place.

15888. The lunatics have not very good accommodation in your workhouse?—They have not. We would like to have these lunatics removed out of the house. We treat them as well as we can, but the accommodation and the situation of the poor people is not what it should be at all; it is one of the points I would be most anxious about.

15889. Would you send them to the asylum or some subordinate institution?—The asylum would perhaps bring the charges very heavy, because their working was to be very expensive; if there could be any possibility of an institution where they could be removed to.

15890. You are taking the cost of their food and clothing only in the workhouse?—Their food and clothing.

15891. You would have to add all the establishment charges and other expenses to bring them up to the same level that the asylum inmates are shown to have cost?—Quite so.

15892. Mr. MURKIN.—You think if the cost could be made nearly equal to what it would be in the asylum, it would be better?—Our cost is £18 4s. 6d. a head.

Mr. O'NEILL.—Establishment charges, laundries, and everything; and in Cabra, for the children, £12 17s. 1d.

15893. Mr. MURKIN.—We have been told that it is not very desirable that a very large number of these unhappy people should be placed together. I think the institution has been placed at a thousand by qualified persons. Do you think it would be better, on humanitarian grounds, instead of sending them to the asylum, to send them to an auxiliary, away

from association with the noisy and violent class?—I think that would be a far better arrangement. So far, of course, as the inmates of that department in our union are not of the violent class, with better surroundings, and in a separate institution, they really might become better in their mind and health than when plunged in the midst of a lot of violent lunatics.

15894. I think there is an experiment in that direction in the South of Ireland, and the estimated cost per head was placed at £15. If you could get an institution of that kind for the Co. Dublin?—I think it would be very desirable.

15895. CHAIRMAN.—Is there any other matter in addition to the various matters that have been discussed in the last couple of days that you would wish to mention?—No; I think the various subjects have been very well discussed and very properly got before the Commission. I don't think I have anything to add. Of course the boarding out of children has been discussed. That has always been approved of by the Board. The working of Cabra under the nurse leaves it a very superior institution, and when the children come to the proper age they are provided for, and none have returned, and the reports that have come back have been that they are all doing extremely well. And as regards the boarding out of children, I have always been in favour of it, and the children have been placed with people and have grown up as members of the family, considering the man and the woman as their father and mother; and they become absorbed into positions that really belong to their class.

15896. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you think the boarding-out system, where it can be carried out, is much superior?—I think it is a very good thing, because these children when they grow up become absorbed in the population.

15897. Dr. BRENN.—Do you know how many of the children that have been boarded out returned to the workhouse?—Not in the number of years I have been there. I have known but very few instances where they have returned.

15898. CHAIRMAN.—Do you happen to remember any case in which they did return, anything about the individual cases?—I do not.

15899. You could not recollect whether they were boarded out at a late age or an early age?—On that point I could say it was when they were boarded out at a late age they came back, because the nurse had not proper control of them; they were beyond her control when she got them.

15900. Mr. MURKIN.—That is an argument for sending them out young?—That is the point; when children are sent out at an early age they forget the surroundings of the house and the union, but there is one difficulty in boarding out children, that is sending children out whose parents—perhaps they are not in the house—eventually discover where these children are, and give the nurse a great deal of trouble by following the children, and that spoils the good working.

15901. CHAIRMAN.—That would be a reason rather for sending them not too near the house?—There is a rule that if these people turn up at the house to inquire for them when they are sent out, that they are not to get any information where they are boarded out; but they traffic around the country and find out where they are. There was a good move made some years ago. The children originally that were boarded out were dressed all in a uniform, and they were known, and in fact were objected to at the National schools, and they were known along the road that they were workhouse children by their dress; but that has been changed, and

Mr. John Carolan.

Apr. 24, 1906.

Mr. John
Carroll.

the Board now allow a certain sum yearly to the nurses to dress them in ordinary costume. In fact their clothes used to be branded N. D. U., and it was a great mis-

take. Some farmers, and other people that sent their children to the National schools, objected to their being associated with them.

Dr. Forrester examined.

Dr. Forrester.

17025. Dr. Brogan.—We would like to hear your views upon some of the subjects that have been discussed here?—As to the advisability of making a hospital of the North and South Unions?

17026. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think as a medical man it would be desirable to provide better accommodation for the sick and feeble infirm?—We are in a dreadful condition in the North Union as far as the feeble and infirm are concerned; the women are in a very bad way. A great number are kept out of the department that should be there; there is no room for them.

17027. You have not three in a bed there?—Oh, no. In the healthy infirm I don't know how they stand. I have only charge of the feeble infirm; there are not three in a bed. I don't let them into the department because there is no room, but outside the department I should not wonder if there was something like you say. I know there is a tremendous congestion, and something must be done about it.

17028. What do you think of amalgamation as a remedy?—I think it would be a very fine thing, and we should deal with a number of points by it. An immense deal of classification could be carried out. For instance, one thing I raised a little trouble about lately was the remand children. We have only about a dozen or so in the house usually, and these children should be at school with a schoolmaster over them. It is not fair to have them wandering about; and if there was an amalgamation or arrangement with the South Union, it would be worth while, if there were twenty or thirty of these boys under restraint for a month or so, that they should be put under charge of a schoolmaster.

17029. Do you think a workhouse is a proper place to have remand children in?—It is not, it is a very improper place, but they are sent there by the magistrate, and they are taught every villainy that they don't know already. Some of them come there quite innocent, but don't leave it in that condition. They must get amusement, and their amusement is tripping the sticks from the old men.

17030. Their capacity for innocent enjoyment?—It is immense, and the old men don't appreciate it. Then there is the epileptic question. As far as I know, there is no machinery whatever for the education of the sane epileptics. Take the case of a little child, and as far as I know there is in Ireland no machinery to teach it its religion or the alphabet unless it is taught at home. I think that urgently requires to be seen about.

17031. Have you charge of the sane epileptics at present?—I have.

17032. About how many have you in the workhouse?—From twenty to thirty.

17033. From what age to what age?—The youngest is ten or eleven, a little girl.

17034. At what age did she come in?—She only came in recently, therefore she knew how to read and write when she came in. I believe some of the other inmates are teaching her the catechism.

17035. It would be hardly safe to send her to a school?—They won't take her there.

17036. I mean to your workhouse school at Cahra?—They won't take her. I sent her there, and she was returned the same day.

17037. Does she get many fits?—She gets them fairly often, perhaps two or three times a week.

17038. Do you think it would be safe to have her there at Cahra?—It is not considered right to have an epileptic child amongst other children, and I sympathise with that idea, but there I have this little girl absolutely by herself. It is not right. She is perfectly sane, and a nice child.

17039. Dr. Brogan.—In the course of a year or two what do you think her condition will be?—I don't know, but it will most decidedly not be improved knocking about the house amongst the epileptics.

17040. Is she likely to drift into insanity?—She is more than likely. The Guardians did everything they could. She was sent out to serve people to be boarded out, but as soon as they found she had fits they sent her back.

17041. CHAIRMAN.—Did you ever try to send her to people who would be willing to take an epileptic patient; that would be a good thing to do?—It may be.

17042. Dr. Brogan.—I suppose the person she was boarded out with had the same recommendation as far as ordinary child?—I don't know about that.

Mr. Carroll.—There was extra money paid for the boarding out of that girl, and I think the woman she was nursing with fell ill.

17043. CHAIRMAN.—You did not try anything else?

Mr. Carroll.—I think nobody else was tried.

17044. CHAIRMAN.—Is she the only child you have got?—Yes; the others would be seventeen and eighteen, up to sixty.

17045. Dr. Brogan.—Do you have many at that age?—No. I had two little boys a couple of years ago, and they were taken out by their people afterwards; still if there was a proper institution they would all either be at school or at some employment, helping to support themselves in a proper institution.

17046. CHAIRMAN.—They would not be eligible for the Stewarts?—It is rather an expensive institution, and besides they are not insane.

17047. Dr. Brogan.—About your lunatics generally?—I am strongly of opinion they ought to be removed; the accommodation is not of all what it ought to be in them, and there is no chance of proper exercise or education for those who are able for it. They are in a bad way. They ought certainly to be removed to a lunatic asylum.

17048. What about consumptives?—They should certainly be separated.

17049. CHAIRMAN.—A sanatorium?—A sanatorium, either provincial or—

17050. According to the requirements of the district?—Yes; their views must be met to a certain extent, because if they are asked to go too far they won't go. We have the Catholics and Protestants separated, and they are scattered still more in the present hospital, the four or five acres. I don't know how many are in the Catholic hospital. We have no means of separation in the Protestant hospital.

17051. Is it fair to the other inmates to have them exposed to the contagion?—We separate them as much as we can; they are not isolated, but they are washed as much as they can be. Their clothing is regularly looked after.

17052. It is the religious difficulty which exposes the rest of the Protestants to the infection?—That is the position. I don't know how it is to be got over.

17053. Dr. Brogan.—Do you try to separate them in the ward?—As far as I can I do.

17054. CHAIRMAN.—They are in a small room at the end of the ward?—They are in the same room; on the female side I had a room, but it was taken for idiots. I tried to get the end of one of the other wards, but I could not acquire it.

17055. Dr. Brogan.—The Guardians had that said discussion?—They had, I believe; but I did not get it.

17056. CHAIRMAN.—If you were considering this question apart from any religious difference, I suppose you would put those consumptive patients in with the other consumptive patients of the house?—Perhaps so.

17057. Is it not just on account of the religious question you are exposing all the other Protestants to the risk of infection?—That is so; the Protestants in that one ward—it is a large ward, a fine ward, one of the best wards in the North Union—are very well watched, still the sooner something is done the better.

Dr. Brogan.—If you got a small infirm ward adjoining it would remedy it.

17058. CHAIRMAN.—Or even if you gave up the religious classification the danger of infection would vanish?—Yes.

17059. Owing to your crowded condition it is just a question whether the rest of the Protestants are to be exposed to the infection of phthisis, or whether patients who have phthisis are to be exposed to the danger of having their religious convictions damaged with it?—If I could get the end of any ward, I thought the matter before the board.

17060. Dr. Brogan.—There is nothing to hinder it being carried out?—Nothing, except the immense overcrowding; no department can spare twenty yards of space.

17032. They have an institution outside to which they send patients at night?—It makes no difference; we are always crowded up again.

17033. Mr. MURKIN.—When the good weather comes, won't you get some relief?—Some little relief, but the old people are there. I had them counted the other day, and I think there were nearly old women alone in bed the whole day on a hospital diet. Of course, that won't be so bad in the summer time, but it shows the condition we are in.

17040. If the Guardians were empowered to board out these feeble old people with neighbouring unions, would not that be all right?—It would; that is a deal; but something must be done.

17041. Dr. BROWN.—You are so built round in the North Union you cannot extend the buildings?—You cannot do anything.

17042. Mr. MURKIN.—Unless by elevating the building?—If they built two towers on the top of the main building, holding six or eight beds on each side, that would do for the Protestant phthisis cases.

Dr. BROWN.—But that is only a temporary arrangement, and it would be a pity to go to a large expenditure for a temporary arrangement.

Mr. CORRELL.—They have no room to build. They were obliged to get land from the asylum for some recent buildings.

Witness.—I would approve of Mr. McDonnell's idea of the sick infirm being on the South side, and the North ought to be big enough for the rest. I think

it would be better than the sex separation; I would have all the hospitals together.

17043. Dr. BROWN.—One apothecary would do!—Dr. FETTER.

Yes.

17044. It would be a saving of staff?—I think it should be worked more economically after a time.

17045. And more efficiently, too?—I think so; certainly a better classification.

17046. CHAIRMAN.—The hospital of both Dublin unions is almost altogether a chronic hospital?—Very largely, not altogether. We get in bronchitis and pneumonia and accident cases.

17047. Not many?—Not many accident cases; but sometimes, if the other hospitals get crowded up, they will have to pass the cases on.

17048. The hospitals are mainly, almost altogether, chronic?—They would be, in the main.

17049. Such hospitals are necessary in a large city like Dublin?—We could not do without them. We get people sent up from the country who have got money to pay their fare, sent from other hospitals to us.

17050. You think there are enough general hospitals in Dublin?—It is the hospital for all Ireland; they come there from everywhere.

17051. Except Belfast?—I think I dressed a man's head in Jesus-street Hospital who was hit by a bullet in the riots at Belfast some time ago. He took the first train to Dublin.

Dr. CALES POWELL examined.

17052. CHAIRMAN.—We have had a good many of the Guardians giving evidence to-day on the question of the amalgamation of unions; that affects, of course, the housing and the classifying of the sick a good deal. Have you considered the question of amalgamation from that point of view?—I have, in connection with the Dublin unions; although a great number of improvements have been carried out within the past fourteen or fifteen years, still, every little improvement was practically only a patch on a very bad foundation. In the North Dublin Union, practically every plot in the place is defectively constructed.

17053. Even including your own hospital?—It is very good, but there are a great many defects in it.

17054. Such as the passage being on the wrong side?—In the first place, it is surrounded by large, high walls. There are bad sanitary arrangements.

17055. It was built at a time before sanitary arrangements were attended to?—There were no sanitary arrangements supplied when it was being built. At present, in the North Dublin Union, the area is about eight acres, and there are 2,800 people housed on it, including hospital cases. In connection with the sick people, I would strongly advocate a joint district hospital for the whole city of Dublin, the North and South Unions.

17056. Where would you have that?—There is no chance of it in the North Union.

17057. So you are driven to the South?—And I don't know, except you cleared all the healthy people out of the South, that you would have room there for a hospital.

17058. That is what Mr. McDonnell suggested to-day? If you would separate the hospital altogether from the main, I would advocate pay wards; no matter how little a patient pays, very often it is only a week, yet it is something.

17059. It is up to a good deal?—It is up to a good deal.

17060. The people feel more a privilege they have to pay a little for?—I think so; they don't value it at present in the majority of cases.

17061. We found that at Bonmahon and Linsinn, in the county infirmaries, they get a substantial revenue each year from small sums?—Quite so. Then the nursing of the union hospitals at present is certainly very defective.

17062. You have not enough of nursing hands?—The inmate helpers there should not be in hospital wards under any conditions.

17063. Have they to be employed to do some nursing duties at present?—They have to attend on the nurses, for instance. In the female Catholic hospital, where the nurse are, you have each man on a landing having charge of fifty beds; she is supposed to nurse them

and give them medicine; that would be quite impossible under the present arrangements. Of course, in a large number of cases, they are chronic, but still they are getting medical treatment, and require attention. Then there is not proper classification at present in the union hospitals.

17064. As regards disease or character?—Of acute cases in the female hospital of the North Dublin Union, there are about 200 patients there, there are about forty-five of them acute. I hold it is a needless expense, and you are taking up space which should be allotted to acute cases, in having these old, feeble chronic cases in the hospital at all.

17065. Where else would you have them; you have forty-five acute, could they be on one of the floors?—We have them in the wards in the hospital of which I have control at present. I have the acute surgical in one ward and the medical in another ward, but they are in the one building, and under the same nursing. I have all the chronic cases, but not in the same wards.

17066. Mr. MURKIN.—What would you suggest?—That all the acute cases in each hospital should be separated from the chronic cases.

17067. CHAIRMAN.—That you have done?—Well, I have done it as far as the wards go, but they are under the same nursing; they should not be seen in the same building.

17068. Mr. MURKIN.—You would make them distinct in nursing and building?—I would; it would not entail so much expense; they don't require the same hospital diet or nursing.

17069. CHAIRMAN.—That you would be able to carry out with more economy if they were all transferred to the South Dublin buildings?—I believe so.

17070. You could sub-classify there?—I could.

17071. Dr. BROWN.—You have your consumptive cases separated?—I have, but they are in that building; they are separated by a landing.

17072. How many have you?—In the female Catholic ward there are twenty or twenty-one.

17073. Practically the ward is full?—It is full.

17074. CHAIRMAN.—About the saving of their food; can you not, as a matter of fact, give the acute at present such diet as they require, and the not acute cases such diet as they need?—We have to give the chronic cases hospital diet.

17075. You can diet each patient according to his requirements?—I can, as far as the hospital diet goes.

17076. How many hospital diets have you got?—There must be eight or ten. I use three or four of them, with extras afterwards.

Mr. MURTAGHAN.—And many of these 200 could do with a less expensive diet than the acute—I believe so.

17072. CHAIRMAN.—Then even the cheapest of your diets—I believe it would be cheaper to have them on infirm diets.

17073. And you could put them on infirm diet—I believe so, if there was a proper system of classification.

17074. But even as it stands, you could give direction for such dietary for certain patients—I could, but not in the hospital.

17075. Why could you not do it in the hospitals?—It is against the regulations.

17076. The regulations are elastic enough to meet that?

Dr. BIGGER.—You can make another dietary. The hospital dietary is only a matter for convenience sake, a matter of book-keeping; you are not bound to it; you do change it by adding extras.

17077. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Still, you would see an advantage in having a separation of the acute from the chronic?—Certainly.

17078. Both in the matter of nursing and dietary?—I believe so.

17079. CHAIRMAN.—You have them separated as regards wards—I have; but they are in the one building, with the same nurses.

17080. Dr. BIGGER.—You think if there was amalgamation you could have an acute hospital for the two unions?—I believe so; and I would strongly advocate a school for nursing.

17081. CHAIRMAN.—Would you have a sufficient variety of cases for the instruction of nurses?—We have a larger variety of cases in the North Dublin Union than in any hospital in Dublin.

17082. Of acute cases?—Yes, every kind of acute. Of course, we have not fewer there.

17083. Surgical?—Plenty of surgical cases. There is a good deal of operative work done there.

17084. Many major operations?—I have done obstetrical hernias there.

17085. That is a thing you had to do in a hurry, but if you had a big operation you would send them down to the Richmond?—No; I have sent nothing out since I got the operating room; we have the place fitted up very well. In dealing with consumptives, I consider no consumptives should be admitted to the union hospital.

17086. Or to any general hospital?—Or to any general hospital. And, speaking generally of this disease, the death rate from it is something frightful.

17087. Without any actual precautions at all being taken?—Practically no effort at all being taken. The death rate from tubercular disease is increasing every year in the Dublin registration area. For the year 1902 the death rate was 46.9 per 10,000, while all the infectious diseases put together was only about eight or nine per 10,000; still, there is really no serious effort made to check it, and cases have come under my observation, members of the same family, where they have really one contracted it from the other; no doubt in my mind about it. To deal with that, I would certainly advocate a sanatorium for the whole North and South Dublin Union for all consumptives, and I would advocate that the disease be notifiable compulsorily.

17088. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Don't you think that will arouse opposition?—Everything will arouse opposition.

17089. CHAIRMAN.—You think it necessary in the interests of public health?—Very necessary.

17090. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—But it is such a strong step?—I don't consider that a disease which is accountable for such a death rate as 46.9 per 10,000 of the inhabitants—I don't consider it would be a strong step to make such a disease compulsorily notifiable, when all the other infectious diseases put together are accountable only for eight or nine. I would not say a strong step, but a very justifiable step.

17091. CHAIRMAN.—People used to have a great objection to the notifying of that disease, because it was regarded as an hereditary disease, and they did not wish to have a family trait announced, but now it is recognised not to be hereditary?—Yes.

17092. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Don't you think advocates of notification would have to make a stronger case than they have made up to the present to get Parliament to assent to that change?—Very little attention at all has been paid to tuberculosis: the people have not been educated on it. The public health authorities have taken

no steps to put the matter in a proper form before the people. Imbeciles, epileptics, and harmless lunatics, I would advocate that they would be sent to the district asylums, but in different departments; and in advocating that, I believe it would be about the cheapest way to deal with it, because at present they really get no treatment in unions, they are simply housed and fed; they have no work; and when they go into the unions, instead of its tending to improve them, they get worse and worse from their surroundings. Children in unions is another matter of which I have some practical experience. I consider that all children should be boarded out.

17093. CHAIRMAN.—Have you considered what would be the youngest age at which one might safely board out children?—I have. My experience of women in the North Dublin Union Workhouse tends to show that in the majority of cases it is impossible to make them take any kind of proper care, and, therefore, I would advocate that they should be separated at an earlier age than at present. We wean them at about ten months; then they are separated at two years.

17094. Are many of the children in your workhouse bottle-fed?—A great number.

17095. I suppose you consider it would not be safe to send them out to be bottle-fed in the country?—So right off.

17096. Have you heard of any inquiries that have been held showing the danger of that?—I don't think there would be any danger.

17097. An inquiry held by Dr. Bigger in the South Dublin Union some little time ago?—I did; but they are isolated cases.

17098. Dr. BIGGER.—The death rate was over 50 per cent.—What age were they then?

17099. Children under a year old, mostly under six months?—The death rate from infants at that age amongst the poor people is an enormous death rate in the city.

CHAIRMAN.—This would be outside Dublin.

17100. Dr. BIGGER.—These were boarded out, as boarded in the city at all. Your death rate, I know, is pretty high in the North Dublin Union?—It is very hard to calculate.

17101. But it is not more than 30 per cent.—I would not say so; but children are admitted there practically dying, and you cannot calculate the death rate.

17102. CHAIRMAN.—You would board them out at as early an age as can safely be done?—Quite so; and I would advocate that the Guardians have power, on the advice of their medical officers, that the children should be sent out at whatever age they think fit. In the North Dublin Union at present there are some of girls; they come up from the country with illegitimate children; they are admitted from the Rotunda Hospital; and the Guardians have no power to send them back. There are twenty-eight unmarried women in the nursery, and eighteen or twenty are from the country, mothers of illegitimate children; it is impossible to manage them.

17103. Cannot the lady Guardians manage them?—I don't think anybody can manage them. The men have control of them, but they are very glad to get rid of their children, most of them.

17104. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Have you any suggestion to make in regard to them?—I would suggest that the Guardians have power, in every case getting admission to the union to send them back to their own country, and not alone these women, but all people getting admission to unions from other unions. Guardians should have power to send them back. There must be some hundreds in the North Dublin Union; I believe that is really the source of the overcrowding in the place; they are people outside the union.

17105. Would you admit girl-mothers to workhouses?—Oh, no; I would not have any children at all then or the mothers.

17106. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think they would be better in a separate institution?—They would.

17107. Dr. BIGGER.—You get a larger proportion than you should get of that class on account of your proximity to the Rotunda?—Yes; they come deliberately up.

17108. CHAIRMAN.—I presume from the Coombe they go to the South?—Yes, but I have known cases to come from Kingsbridge direct to the North Union—they come from Cork and Kerry and Limerick. In the Coombe Institution you have up to 600 children, but

that is a place where I would advocate technical instruction for these children; they are really doing nothing at present, practically nothing, and I believe they are kept there until they are fifteen.

17115. Not fitted for domestic service?—Not fitted for anything; and I would strongly advocate technical instruction.

17116. We have had evidence to-day from Mr. Goggin that the after-life of these children is very successful?—Well, numbers of them have come back into the North Union.

17117. You come across big numbers of them?—I have known other institutions in the city that they get admission to afterwards.

17118. Dr. Bosman.—Which class do you refer to?—Females.

17119. To the ones brought up in Calver School or boarded out?—Brought up in Calver School.

17120. Have you found many of the class that have been boarded out coming back?—Some, not very many. I believe the boarding out is the best.

17121. Mr. MURKIN.—You think it is only right and proper that these girls should be instructed in domestic economy and doing household duties?—Certainly.

17122. Is not that being done at present?—The mass have not proper facilities there for training. I would have hospitals separated from the unions; I believe that these hospitals should be managed by the committees, and the medical staff should have representation, and that would tend to economy and better working.

17123. Dr. Bosman.—Why do you suggest that?—At present, in arrangements or re-arrangements in the hospital, the medical staff are not in touch with the board; in general hospitals they are.

17124. CHAIRMAN.—Are there any public hospitals anywhere—county infirmaries, or any of these institutions supported out of the rates—on which the medical staff are members of the governing bodies?—Well, there are institutions partly supported out of the rates that the medical staff are on; we have not at present the privilege of being present; I have experience of that.

17125. Dr. Bosman.—Do you think, after all, it would rather prevent friction than cause it?—Certainly; I believe so.

17126. You would understand each other better?—Quite so; and it would be a great help to the governing body.

17127. CHAIRMAN.—So few doctors could spare time to sit through a long board meeting?—It would be only a matter of sitting for the time the hospital business was on.

17128. Dr. Bosman.—For that reason you think the administration should be somewhat separated from the general administration?—I believe the administration of the hospitals should be separated altogether from the workhouse, even if the present workhouse in Dublin are left as they are; I believe the hospitals should be under separate management.

17129. Mr. Carroll.—With regard to these pauper students, do they sleep in the wards where they are attending to nurses?—There is no one sleeping in the wards but patients.

Mar. 26, 1900
Dr. Caleb Powell

Mr. ROBERT MCGOWAN, F.R.C.S., examined.

17130. CHAIRMAN.—Now we would like to hear your views?—Well, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, there was a committee of our board, the North Union, appointed, and they had a consultation about the queries that came addressed to us, and they came to certain conclusions, which were placed before the board, and the board approved of them, so I am merely reiterating the conclusion they came to.

17131. Mr. Carroll.—The Commissioners have this memorandum as to the proceedings of your board before them?—Quite so; I am entirely in favour of the amalgamation of the two unions; we recommend that for all purposes, except for management. We go in entirely for equalising the rates.

17132. CHAIRMAN.—How could you have any amalgamation if you had separate management?—Well, we could classify the inmates very much better.

17133. Mr. Carroll.—As I understand, your idea was that the County Council would collect the rate of the two unions when you furnished the account?—Quite so.

17134. CHAIRMAN.—You mean to say, contrary to all the evidence given hitherto from the North Dublin, which was in favour of absolute amalgamation and the transfer of all the sick to one side or of the one set to one side of the river, that you would only go in for amalgamation to the extent of having amalgamation of expenses?—The principal object would be to equalise the rates.

17135. And you would have the two Boards of Guardians meet still?—I don't suppose you would.

17136. Then it would be amalgamation, of course?—Amalgamation certainly. We recommend the removal, if possible, of the imbeciles and epileptics and consumptives, and that would give us a good deal of room. We are entirely congested; I need not tell you that on night acres to have 2,500 people we are entirely congested.

17137. Mr. Carroll.—Are you in favour of the answer to No. 4 query as to out-door relief?—We certainly require more powers with regard to the extension of out-door relief. We certainly would be anxious to relieve persons out of employment, with families depending on them, and having no means of subsistence, so that their little homes should not be broken up.

17138. Mr. Carroll.—Mr. McDermott gave evidence to-day that that should be subject to a labour test—that the able-bodied men who are out of employment should have employment given to them, and be paid for it?—Yes.

17139. And they should not go to get out-door relief

unless they were willing to work?—Quite so; the Guardians should have discretionary power to pay the man for a limited time.

17140. CHAIRMAN.—Did your committee make any estimate as to what would be the probable expenditure under such increased powers?—Well, the valuation of the union is £266,000.

17141. Yes, but how much would you be likely to spend on additional out-door relief if such additional powers were given?—I don't know.

Mr. Carroll.—As far as I am instructed, I don't think they have made any estimate.

Mr. O'Neill.—No, they did not.

Witness.—Certainly, I would recommend that the children out in Calver should be taught some technical knowledge, to be of advantage to them when they are taken out to farmers, for instance. I have known cases where boys were brought out from the union, and they were of service to the farmers, and they were assimilated to the population around. They got married, and even reared up families.

17142. Mr. Carroll.—Do you go to the extent of saying they should be taught trades?—Trades; no; but something in the way of the Technical Board; they could be taught the elements, for instance, without actually going into trades.

17143. As regards the girls, I suppose they should be taught?—Domestic economy, certainly; I have known several of these girls taken out to farmers' places, and they were certainly very valuable; they were taught to be helpful, and they cooked fairly well.

17144. CHAIRMAN.—Where were they taught cooking?—In the convent at Calver; I have known cases where they were appreciated very highly. In going over the accounts with the clerk I was struck very much; in 1894 I found the rating was 2s. in the £, and now twenty years after we are less, though we have something like 800 more inmates.

17145. The valuation of the union has increased enormously?—Yes; I suppose that is the explanation.

17146. You have got in Clontarf and Drumcondra?—That is true.

17147. And the valuation of the city property is up a good deal?—Yes.

17148. Did you see whether there was much diminution, if any, or was there an increase in the amount spent by the Guardians under the Poor Law? There was not much difference, I gather from what you say, in the rate, but was the expenditure a good deal higher?—I think it was something like £28,000.

17149. What was it twenty years ago?—£28,000 odd.

Mr. Eugene M. Gough.

Apr. 24, 1894
Mr. Eggar
Mr. Gough

Mr. O'Neill.—About the same thing, and it struck me very forcibly; the valuation has gone up over a third.

Witness.—We are told in certain quarters that we are not economic in our dealings, but this would rather show that we are, and the inmates are better treated, I am sure.

Mr. JAMES CHOLLEN, *x.p.*, *p.l.c.*, examined.

Mr. James
Chollen.

17150. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the Corporation as well as of the union?—I am, sir; the principal thing that I just want to say is I was present when Dr. Powell was giving his evidence, and it is with regard to the women coming from the country districts. When the unions were first organised railways were not in existence, and this thing could not happen to the extent that it has now, because there are facilities given to this class of people, and people interested in these women may promise them anything, and get them on the railway and pay their fare to Dublin.

17151. Mr. Carroll.—You refer to mothers of illegitimate children?—Yes; they promise them anything, and they put them on the railway and tell them to either inquire for the Rotunda Hospital or the North Dublin Union; this I have on their own statements, that they were paid to come here and stop here. I think, sir, that that is a very great hardship upon the people of Dublin.

17152. Would you recommend that the Guardians should have power to send these women back?—That is what I am coming to.

17153. CHAIRMAN.—Or charge the country districts?—I think the legitimate thing to be done would be to send these people back; although it might not be a reasonable thing to do, yet, in justice, I think it should be done, because the men who are guilty of bringing these women to this state would be very likely to be got at in some shape or form, but when they come here they remain a burden on us, and we have to support themselves and their children, and very often they go out and come back in the same condition; it is a horrifying thing; and it is degrading on the men of Dublin to have to support other people's misconduct in other districts.

17154. Mr. MURKIN.—The suggestion has been made in other places that the law should be altered; I think it ought to be altered; the same as in Scotland.

17155. You think the Guardians ought to get the same power?—We ought to get the same power that they have in England or Scotland; they can send them to us from England or Scotland, but we have no power to send them to England or Scotland, or anywhere else. No later than last week we had a case from England. I don't think it is right at all. As I said before, the railways were not in existence when the workhouses were established, and there are facilities given now that were not in existence then, and it is made easy for these people to transgress in this way. It might be well to give us power to charge the country unions from which these people come, but the thing would be to give power to have the law altered.

17156. To enable you to recover the expense of sending back the people?—Yes, sir. I am just as much interested in the one union as the other, and, with regard to amalgamation, I am entirely in favour of amalgamating the two unions; I am a ratepayer in both, and have been a member of both. And I think that it is an unfair thing too, that because the Liffey divides us we should have to pay a larger poor rate on the North side than on the South side, although we are for the poorer district. The error dividing us should not, I think, be the means of assessing us more rates than we would have to pay if the two unions were amalgamated, and, along with that, we would have other advantages if we had amalgamation with the South Union. We cannot, no matter how well disposed we are, or what intentions we have, we cannot do anything more for the benefit of the deserving poor on the North side than we have already done. We are built in, as you are in this room; we are surrounded by the Midland Railway and the Lanesby Asylum and the hospital; we cannot move; we cannot enlarge, and it is impossible to improve the place.

17157. By amalgamation improvements at the South would relieve the North Workhouse?—Yes; because they have a good deal of space in the South Union;

Mr. O'Neill.—We had 2,700 odd inmates in an average for that year; now we have 3,300 in an average; but our contracts are much cheaper than then; our ration is about 6d. per lb.; but, 6d.; stacking pieces, 5d.; they were much dearer then.

but with as every room or place we put up we are making the place more congested and worse. I don't think there is a rod of ground in the place that is not covered with houses, and that is not as it should be; no matter how solid our medical men may be, or what attention they may give, it is impossible to have the place in the state we would wish to have it. With regard to the diet, I think the dietary should be the same in the North and South; there should be a fixed dietary in both unions.

17158. CHAIRMAN.—By amalgamating them you will have that?—It would follow from amalgamation, but if there is no amalgamation I think it is a mistake to have different dietary in one from the other, because the people will go from one to the other, and I would wish to say also that my opinion is that when men come to fifty or sixty or sixty-five there should not be any question about their treatment or food; they should get what was best to prolong their life. I don't think they require medical treatment—that is the infirm people. I think they should be all in a place by themselves, and should be allowed to live as if they were in their own homes; I don't think there should be any restrictions on them when they come to that time of life.

17159. You would give them privileges?—I certainly would; I don't think the laboring man or artisan who has worked to sixty or sixty-five years should be turned into the ordinary workhouse with contents of the city.

17160. You would give him privileges in going about?—I would; and I think there should be a home or house somewhere—a distance from the workhouse—that would not be classed as a workhouse, where the men should be allowed just to live out their lives.

17161. That might make a good deal of expenditure?—I don't think it would. There would be no medical men required or nurses, except one or two to superintend the place; these people are healthy, the same as most of us perhaps when we arrive at that age; we would not require much attendance, but to get food that would suit our age. I don't think it would cost a lot at all; there would not be a nurse or medical man required; it would be only deans that would be coming on these men. With regard to housing on, I certainly think it would be the best system—far better than retaining children in schools or institutions. I think they are far better to mix with the community, and they would be more likely to become useful citizens. I find in my experience that a good many of these children brought up in schools very often turn out very clever vagabonds; some of them, at all events. But when they are sent out amongst the small farmer class they are very likely to be amalgamated with the community and become useful citizens.

17162. Mr. MURKIN.—Owing to the force of example?—Yes; that has a good deal to do with it, and in the North Dublin Union we have no means of teaching them trades or businesses, because we are too much confined and cramped for space, but it is quite different in the South Union; it is a large industry, and they do admirable work there in the way of weaving and shoemaking and tailoring. If we were amalgamated with the South I believe it would be for the general benefit of the community both of the ratepayers and of the poor; that is my firm conviction. There is another statement I would wish to make, that is that the Guardians should have power, if they so desired, where men were industrious and had worked well during their life, to give them a small allowance, not to be called out-door relief, but by some other name, so long as it would not be very much over what it would cost in the union, because I know charitable organizations do a good deal to keep people up by giving them a small sum weekly. And if that could be approved of by law you would keep a good many people out of the union that are in it now—something like a small pension to men when they would come to sixty-five years of age.

Mar. 24, 1894

Mr. James
Coolidge.

17153. CHAIRMAN.—You know the original idea of the Poor Law was that no man should starve or be in danger of starving or be destitute, and that relief should be only given under these circumstances; you would wish to enlarge the law so as to enable the Boards of Guardians to supplement the means of those who had not sufficient for their comfort—I would; that is my idea.

17154. As a ratepayer, would you be afraid of the consequences of that?—I would not if there was proper supervision.

17155. What would you call good supervision?—To get an honest man at the head of the department if you can get him.

17156. As a relieving officer?—Something that way.

17157. The relieving officer would have the power of bringing these cases before the Board of Guardians; I don't know whether in your Board of Guardians the application for relief at all comes the Guardians for their relief?—Sometimes you will meet cases if you are any way active going through the district; you will know of cases.

17158. Apart from that, do poor people, either by themselves or through their friends, ask the Guardians to support applications for relief?—Not that I am aware of; there are rules that the relieving officer cannot deviate from.

17159. I am aware that your relief is very tightly administered in Dublin, and it is all given in kind, but in making your recommendations you have only in view the city of Dublin and relief in kind?—That is it; but what I would be glad to see is where a man has been known to be an honest working man all his

life—say he is up to fifty or sixty years of age—that that man should, as a matter of right, get relief either inside or outside, and if he chooses to be outside he could do with less than inside. You would be surprised what they do with a few shillings—these people—if given at the proper time; he should have, at least, what would keep him from starving and enable him to live outside the house, and that would do away with a good deal of the congestion in the workhouse. With regard to lunatics and epileptics and idiots, they should be treated, I believe, in a different place from the workhouse altogether, and the Guardians, I think, should be empowered to pay a certain amount to any institution which would be different, whatever institution was established. There is one about to be established by Lady Meath; she is writing, I think, to establish a home provided the public will support the people in it, and I think it would be a very wise thing for Boards of Guardians to get rid of these people if it possibly could be done, because they cannot be treated in the North Dublin Union; it is too crowded; they have not a place for them. With regard to the medical officers, I think it is very unfair that a medical officer should, at the end of his life, be dependent upon a Board of Guardians for his retiring allowance. I think a medical officer, if he has served a reasonable time—the same as any other official in most public institutions—should be entitled, as a matter of right, to get his compensation or pension. In some instances if he displaces the Guardians or some of their friends they may come down on the medical officer and try to injure him. I think that should be put beyond their power.

MRS. EGAN, P.L.O., EXAMINED.

17160. CHAIRMAN.—Your views that you wish to give us are chiefly in reference to the boarding out of children?—Yes; I think Mr. O'Neill, the Chairman of the County Council, carried almost all I had to say, except one or two points. There is one thing in connection with the children reared in the barracks schools that I have always deplored very much, and that is they are all right enough as long as they are there, and, if they are very good boys and girls, when they go out I suppose they are right enough, but most of us are a little wayward, and the children may lose their situation, and then they have no place to return to but the workhouse; they see a home where they can stay a week or a month until they get a situation, but I say these children from Cahir, when they lose their situation or become ill, they have nowhere to return to except the workhouse; they look on it as their home.

17171. It is a refuge that they know their way to?—And after one or two visits they lose their whole sense of shame, if they have any; but I don't think they have when they are reared at Cahir; they return there again.

17172. Is it that which makes you rather inclined to prefer the boarding-out system?—That is one reason, but not the sole reason. The boarding-out system I know very intimately; I have been living in Dublin since I was thirty years, and when I lived out at Buncy I knew the children; it was quite easy to know them, because they were glad in a certain way, and I knew them now to be respectable men and women who have got married, and they told good situations, and in some cases I know where little boys that I knew as children are the support of the old people who reared them.

17173. Dr. BROOKS.—Do you find many of the boarded-out children come back to the workhouse?—None; I never knew of one; they get absorbed into the population.

17174. Is it a common thing to see children that have been reared in Cahir coming back?—Frequently; there is scarcely an Admission Board that they don't come, and some of the boys have developed into tramps.

17175. And have these children been for years in Cahir?—Oh, yes; reared there.

17176. What happens to the girls?—The girls return there, and some are inmates of the workhouse now, though they are quite young women.

17177. You really think because they have been brought up in an institution that they look upon the workhouse as the same institution?—Exactly; they have no other idea of home.

17178. Although the institution may be separated by miles it is still an institution?—Yes; they have no home to return to; once they get a situation from Cahir and lose it they must return to the workhouse.

17179. Was it ever suggested that there should be a home in Dublin where boys that are earning only a few shillings a week could go and sleep and be looked after?—Yes; there is such a one here in Abbey-street.

17180. Are they really as well looked after?—I believe so; I have attended the annual meetings and heard the reports, and from some observations I made myself I think they are well looked after; but these boys reared in an institution like Cahir are not in touch with the world outside; they know nothing of these places; they have only one little line of thought—they are in the world and not of it. They are completely isolated from the outside world; I don't think they ever heard of these things.

17181. You really think they feel awkward when they mix with other children of the same age?—Certainly; they are quite new to the world outside. There is one great difficulty with us in the North Dublin Union; the children of these tramps—these in and out children—who come in one week and stay a day or two, and these are others who are even worse, whose parents come in for a night and go out in the morning and take them out begging and street-singing, and come back there again about eleven o'clock at night; poor half-starved children; these we can do nothing for at present. If the law could be amended so that we could take these children and compel them to be sent to an industrial school there might be a chance.

17182. CHAIRMAN.—Or boarded out?—Boarding out won't do for them; if you sent them ten or twenty miles from Dublin these parents would tramp after them.

17183. Or fifty or fifty?—Any distance; they think nothing of walking down to the King's County or even Galway.

17184. Would you be in favour of capturing these people—these tramps?—I am afraid they cannot be reclaimed; I would not attempt to do so.

17185. There was a Bill a few days ago brought into Parliament with a view of enabling the authorities in England to take such children and send them to a labour institution, where they would be detained under a magistrate's warrant for a year or two years?—I am rather sceptical about that; I am afraid habit has grown so strong.

Apr. 24, 1904.

Mrs. Egan.

17185. They could not exercise the habit if they were locked up!—But when they were released they would exercise it again.

17187. Well, lock them up again?—Yes, if you could keep them locked up; but if you capture the children young they could be reclaimed.

17188. If you put them into one of these institutions won't they gravitate back again in the way you have described so graphically?—In an industrial school they are not so closely kept in as in Cebra; in an industrial school they are more in touch with the outside world.

17189. In what way?—They are brought out more into the world; the instruction they get is of a superior class; it is broader.

17190. Would they not be instructed in the same books and hours and time-table?—No; I think not. I have been in Arizona, and find the boys were more intelligent. They teach them agricultural work, and make good assistant gardeners of them. I have known many boys who came from Arizona and went to gentlemen's places under good gardeners, and ultimately became gardeners themselves.

17191. Mr. MURPHY.—I doubt if in an ordinary industrial school there is an opportunity for such teaching—I know in Arizona they do.

17192. Dr. BRONER.—Have you known any of that class to go back to the workhouse?—If they are straight-limbed and strong coming out from an industrial school, if they don't settle down to regular pursuits, they become soldiers or sailors; they don't go back to the workhouse. It must strike anyone who goes to a large workhouse that the main population of both men and women, especially on the men's side, are those half-grown creatures, stunted in mind and body, who are never good for anything, and after a while drift back to the workhouse—people with no spirit or strength, wrecked in body and mind, and poor and stunted. If you look around any day you will see that class around you. I have often observed it myself, and especially on the men's side, but everyone agrees that the industrial school boys, if they are sound and strong, if they don't settle down to regular pursuits, become either sailors or soldiers, and go away.

17193. CHAIRMAN.—You prefer seeing them brought up as agricultural labourers and kept in the country?—Certainly; and when you board out a workhouse boy I think they make very excellent agricultural labourers. Mr. Maurice Butler, who is one of the oldest Guardians in the union, told me that the best agricultural labourers and the best working men's wives around the Blackrockdown district were the boys and girls he had known boarded out from the union in his time, and I heard Mr. John Daly, of Baldoyle, say the same thing, and I have given my own experience that the boarding out is much better; I should not let them ever drift back to town, because there is too much temptation for them; they meet some one or other, that will bring them back into the old habits and vices.

Mr. O'Neill.—We have very few boarded out at present.

Witness.—Some of the older nurses in the North Dublin Union were not desirable; the children were good enough that they reared, but the houses were not what you would wish to place a child in; sometimes they had large families of their own of young children. As a rule all the new nurses are very desirable; they are middle-aged women, whose own daughters have got married, and they take a girl or two as company in the evening time, and send them regularly to school, and keep them neat and clean. Then an unmarried man and his sister will take a couple of boys or girls, and in all these cases they are very well looked after; in fact our nurses have improved very considerably within the last five years. There are very few now in which houses you would not be quite entitled to leave the children; in fact some of them are really ideal homes for children; I am quite pleased with all the new nurses, and Mr. Quigg, the relieving officer of the Baldoyle and Howth district, displays great discrimination in the selection of houses for children; they are almost all well looked after; the new nurses see a vast improvement on the old ones; the houses are more suitable, and a great many of the new labourer cottages are very nice and clean, and there is more accommodation and altogether a better tone about the place than in some of the older houses. But then there is another point—Miss Fitzgerald Kennedy recommends committees; I have discussed this matter with several people who have a local knowledge, and they say that they think the women would rather resent so many ladies coming in and out of their houses, they would regard them as busy-bodies, and very often the women who take up that kind of work are not the most desirable; they are not women who have any sympathy with the people, who are only what Mr. John Daly described as busy-bodies—people who have nothing else to do, and take this up to fill up their time. There is one point that must be borne in mind, that is that there is no one more keen to express sympathy and appreciate good manners than the Irish peasant, but they want to find it out for themselves; they don't want it to be forced on them. They don't want you to force it on them and impress them with your superiority; they will very soon find it out for themselves and express that feeling. You are not to rush in and assume that the whole place is your own; if you come in quietly and say "Good morning," and don't bustle about until they seem to realize the fact that you are there, they are very nice and polite, and give you every information, but if you go against the grain they become sulky; I find that sometimes with the relieving officers. These are things that must be always borne in mind in dealing with the people; they will follow a lead, but won't be driven; of course I am of the people, and have all my sympathies with the people, and know them thoroughly, and know the subject intimately. Now, Miss Fitzgerald Kennedy has complained of the clothing of our children.—

17194. I don't think you need mind going into that?—She says they are the worst clad children in Ireland; that is rather a sweeping statement.

Mr. JOHN O'NEILL, Clerk of the North Dublin Union, examined.

Mr. John O'Neill.

17195. CHAIRMAN.—Now, let us hear all about the agricultural grant?—Well, sir, in the year 1896 and coming on to 1897 I prepared the usual estimate of rates for the Guardians.

17196. And they adopted it, of course?—No, sir, they did not adopt it; the estimate that I thought would bring them through fairly for the year—that is the estimate of what rate we wanted to raise. Of course we had in view about £7,000 or £8,000 that we got from other grants.

17197. Take the lump sum?—£24,000.

17198. Did they reduce that?—The estimate was £24,860, and they reduced that to £24,142; that is a sum of £716 short of the estimate.

17199. Was that the usual procedure on their part; was it usual to cut down your rate a certain amount?—It was customary to take 1d. or 2d. off the clerk's estimate, but this was on the largest scale up to that time; in fact the North city rates never went below 2s. in the £; 2s. 2d. was about the usual sum that would bring the North city through, and an average of about 2s. 5d. or 2s. 6d. would be the average for the rural.

17200. What was the poundage they knocked off?—5d. in the £ was taken off.

17201. Mr. Carroll.—Has not your board suffered from that ever since?—In 1911, in the £ was the rate they struck that year for 1907-08, and they had to strike a rate of 5d. higher in order to meet the deficiency, which amounted at the end of the year to £8,000.

17202. CHAIRMAN.—You calculated on their knocking off a couple of pence, and they knocked off 5d.?—They knocked off 5d.; but it happened, unfortunately, to be the year 1898, which was taken as the standard year; if any other standard year was taken, or even that for expenditure, it would be fair enough. Under these circumstances the agricultural portion has been losing every year ever since £4,000 under the agricultural grant.

17203. Mr. MURPHY.—Did the Guardians place before the Local Government Board these exceptional circumstances?—They did, but they did not bring it forward until it was too late; the Act of Parliament was passed, and then they passed a resolution when they discovered that the standard year was fixed for 1898, and they went back on the figure, and the

resolution was adopted by the board and sent on to the Local Government Board in case any amendment is made in the Act; they are very anxious, if it could be done, in making your recommendation.

17204. You would be anxious that this particular uniformity should be brought forward?—Yes; should be redressed.

Mr. Carroll.—It is a practical loss of \$4,000 a year over stated.

17205. Dr. BRUCE.—That affects the whole union at present?—Yes; the agricultural part of the union.

17206. It is no relief to the city rates?—No; I mean that the rural district lost that year, say \$2,000, consequently they would at present time lose \$1,000 a year.

17207. Your total reduction of the rate was \$7,000?—Yes, \$7,340.

17208. CHAIRMAN.—You put down the loss to the rural district as \$1,000?—I did; the loss every year since to the rural rates.

17209. Dr. BRUCE.—If your estimate had been passed it would have been in excess of the requirements?—No, sir, it would not.

17210. CHAIRMAN.—You always put on a little to be landed off?—I did not happen to put it on that year. I wanted to make it as close as I possibly could, because there were a certain number of members of the Board going out at the time and seeking re-election.

17211. Mr. Carroll.—Was not that the root of the whole thing?—Yes; the election was coming on in March, and they said they would make a trial to make the north city rate 3d. less than ever it was before. Next year they had to pay it up; it was 2d. 4d. The valuations of our union, there were various valuations given to you—

17212. CHAIRMAN.—I have got this year's—\$400,343. The north city has increased very much, by \$39,263 in the course of four years. Our demand was

\$53,567 for the north city, and I see the demand on the south side was \$44,350, which leaves a very small difference.

17213. You heard Dr. M. Walter's suggestion. Do you think that that met the views of your Board of Guardians? He wanted to equalise the rates only on the county borough parts of the union, leaving out the townships and all the portions except the city?—I don't think that would do so well. The demand for the townships of South Dublin was \$33,344; that leaves \$18,000 altogether as their demand for the year, and our demand for the year was \$22,362.

Mr. Carroll.—I don't think that sub-division would work well.

Witness.—I don't think it would.

17214. Mr. MURKIN.—What is the amount of your expenditure under out-door relief?—In 1903 the cost was \$2,530; that is provisions, clothing and the very lowest scale of contract prices, because we bake our own bread, and have our own tea and sugar and meat at one-third less than we could purchase them for in the shops.

17215. CHAIRMAN.—So that they really get value for more than \$2,000. If you give them cash for \$2,000 they could not buy the goods you give them?—You would have to give them \$3,000 to purchase that amount of goods.

17216. Mr. Carroll.—There is an increase in the number receiving out-door relief beyond that of last year?—Yes, there is a very great increase, 1,730 against 1,597. Our average cost with regard to provisions and clothing has gone down very considerably recently. It is only 2s. 7d. in the last abstract. It was 3s. 3d. for the corresponding period last year, and it was up to 4s. and over, but that was owing greatly to the economy with which the Guardians now receive and consider contracts, taking the smallest and lowest price of every tender; the meat and grocery tenders are sub-divided.

Mr. JOHN LONG, B.L.O., examined.

Mr. John Long.

I don't know whether I can add much to the information you have already received about the North Dublin Union.

17217. CHAIRMAN.—Anything you think has not been mentioned before?—The wind has been very well taken out of my sails already. I would like to say something on the question of amalgamation and a few other things. I am quite in agreement with all that has been said with reference to the amalgamation of the North and South Unions for various reasons; not that I believe it will impose any additional cost on the South, because I believe with greater economy and better management the rate will be reduced all round eventually. Our rates are coming down already; on the north side they are down a 1d. this year, and the expenditure has very much decreased. But I cannot know what argument could be used against amalgamation of both unions unless that it is the Liffey that divides us. I don't know any other argument. The people can pass to and fro; they can go to the south side if they choose. One night's residence on the south side will qualify them for the South Union, and one night's residence here will qualify for the North. We are obliged to admit them for being one night in Church-street, which is a great lodging-house street. I know there are many idle people who could be working, men who are more or less in relaxed circumstances, that make it a pleasure to go to the North for a while, and when the Guardians begin to get tired of them at the Admission Board, they go to the South, and vice versa, and I think there is a certain amount of abuse in connection with that system. There is one thing I would like to express on the gentleman present, and that is the great necessity of reducing, by these means or other, the fearful congestion in the North Dublin Union.

17218. Amalgamation is your remedy for that?—It would tend to reduce it, but there are other remedies I would suggest; the principal would be that a sanatorium should be provided for both North and South Unions, and in that institution I would remove the consumptives in the first instance, and it might be made available for convalescents. People are turned out of hospital before they are properly healed, and the result is when they go out they are not able to work. There is no place where the medical officer can send them to restore the body of the man, and the consequence is they leave the institution very weak and delicate and unable to work. If a sanatorium such as Balthorey could be dissolved and turned into an institution such as I

suggest for the accommodation of these people, as convalescents and consumptives as well, and also as a district hospital for Balthorey, I think it would serve the three purposes very well, and it is not so far from the city, half an hour would bring a motor ambulance in and out. It is in a very fine part of the country, altogether isolated from buildings, or villages, or residences of any kind, and there is a fine breezy atmosphere in the district. One of the most difficult problems in connection with the North Dublin Union is the disposal of those women coming from the country.

17219. I think we have a full set of that?—My suggestion—I don't know what value it would be—would be, that there should be a State allowance to provide for them. The children whose mothers come up from the country should be boarded out, we cannot get rid of them; they refuse to go with their children.

17220. I don't think it would be a wise thing to ask for a State grant for illegitimacy in Ireland?—Well, who is to provide for these children? It would be unfair to the Guardians of the North Dublin Union to expect them to board them out.

17221. Mr. MURKIN.—How would it be to ask for further powers for the Guardians to recover from the putative fathers for the support of these children?—I always advocated that. I suggest that the supposed fathers should be made responsible, if possible, for the maintenance of their children; and even if the case should fall against them they should certainly be brought before the court as a warning to others, and I think the evidence of the mother, with the evidence of some others as to their keeping company, ought to be sufficient to establish a case. I mean in the case of a first child.

17222. Would not that be going a little too far?—Is not that the rule in England?

CHAIRMAN.—I should not think so.

17223. Mr. MURKIN.—The subject is so delicate that public opinion finds little expression, and more harm than good might come of intervention?—It is a great evil, and should be grappled with somehow; and it is a great injustice to the ratepayers of Dublin that they should have these people on the rates, and young girls well able to work cannot be got out of the place. As regards tramps, I don't think the evil is so great as some people imagine. There have always been tramps in Ireland, and there will always be poor people going about the country, but there should be a broad distinction drawn. The able-bodied tramps, I believe, are a great

Mar. 24, 1904.

Mr. John
Long.

nuisance in the country and a great danger. I believe that these are people who, to a great extent blackmail and terrify the people as they go through the country.

17224. CHAIRMAN.—What would you do with them?—I would have them photographed, or something like that, at the various unions, and their names ought to be taken and given to the police, and the police should deal with them to a great extent—I mean the abominable criminal classes. They could be dealt with under the Vagrancy Act without further additional powers. I don't think they are very much trouble to the unions here in Dublin.

17225. There are some in the rural districts?—Yes; they cannot beg or blackmail here in Dublin very much. But we have the casual class, who are very frequent visitors to the house; but they cannot be dispensed with, because there will always be a labouring class in Dublin who cannot get employment and must be admitted for a night's shelter. They have to be placed two in a bed very frequently in the casual wards. Some short time ago we found one ward occupied during the night by seventy inmates that was intended for forty; the place was altogether over-congested. At that time we provided a house in the locality to remove some of the people out to—to accommodate forty people—that is a very objectionable practice to be sending 150 or 150 poor wretched women through the streets, morning and evening, to these places outside.

17226. Mr. MURKIN.—If the Guardians had power to board out their inmates, the Guardians in Dublin could arrange with unions in the country to take their inmates?—I think the congestion in the North Union would be very considerably reduced by

amalgamation, and removing the harsher fraction to an auxiliary union in the country. I don't think they should be kept at all anywhere convenient to Dublin, and I think one large district union could accommodate a very large number of them. It makes little difference to these people what part of the country they are in. They have nobody to visit them, and by removing these people and removing the congestive ones, which are rather numerous in the house, and should never be left there at all—there is neither an accommodation for them in the North Union—you will very much relieve the house. There is one smaller place in the North Union which contains at night 150 males, and it is very low and dingy, and there are old wooden beds in it, and it is a miracle to see how it has escaped so long from fire. I feel very nervous, as a member of the Board, at its condition. There are no means of exit at one end, and if a fire broke out it would burn like a match-box; and I don't know that twenty people could be got safely out even through the windows. Then, again, there are several other sheds about the buildings, shutting out the light from the wards, which ought to be removed also. I have always considered that want of amalgamation between the two unions was a considerable loss to the ratepayers. These sheds cost £1,000 to erect, and they will have to be removed. They are not fit for habitation at all. There are a great many things to be said on behalf of amalgamation, but I always considered that one of the Co. Dublin unions—for I think there are too many in the country—could be dispensed with, and make it a nucleus for the people I have spoken of; and Ballyreagh I believe a very suitable place for that purpose, as well as using it as a hospital for the district.

Mr. W. C. CRIMMIN, Chairman of the South Dublin Board of Guardians, examined.

Mr. W. C.
Crimmin.

17227. CHAIRMAN.—You are the CHAIRMAN of the South Dublin Union?—Yes.

17228. You have had to listen to a great many arguments that you did not perhaps quite agree with?—Well, yes, sir; but still I did agree with a good deal of what I heard.

17229. What is your own view on the question of the amalgamation of the two unions?—I think it would be unfair to the ratepayers of South Dublin.

17230. If it meant an increased rate, but if it did not mean an increased rate, would you see any objection to that?—I would answer that by the deliberate answer of the Board of Guardians of the North Union in answer to Query 3: "We recommend the amalgamation of the North with the South Union for all purposes except management." My Board thoroughly agree that it would be impossible without amalgamation.

17231. I did not understand that answer, and asked several Guardians, who explained that by saying it did not mean anything but amalgamation, pure and simple?—You must take what they wrote. It seemed to me a thing that could not be done, and I voted against it, and we had a discussion with a good many Guardians, and it came to this, that they said what they were in favour of was amalgamation, pure and simple.

17232. Would you see any objection to amalgamation if there was no additional expense to the South?—Yes. It is not the expense I look into so much, it is the management of both institutions. How are you going to manage them, might I ask. You should have two masters, one clerk might do, but the amount of extra work you place upon him would certainly entitle him to 50 per cent. of an increase of wages; the same with the medical staff, and the same with the nursing staff.

17233. You mean to say amalgamation would not mean any saving in establishment charges?—No; none whatever.

17234. Assuming that, do you think there would be saving under any other head, people who go backwards and forwards from one union to another?—They are doing that at present.

17235. Do you think that would stop if you put it under one Board?—I don't think so.

17236. They could not go backwards and forwards; they would only have one place to go to?—At the same time, according to the evidence which I have heard here to-day, given by the Guardians of the North Dublin Union, what they call the roving population find no difficulty whatever in getting in there at any hour; we are altogether different.

17237. What is your latest hour for admission?—We don't let them in at all hours unless they have a ticket

from the relieving officer, or give a good proof that they are destitute.

17238. I suppose very likely these people have tickets?—It does not appear, because no relieving officer would give a ticket to a man who had left that morning.

17239. The way they get it is they get it only in the morning and present it late in the evening?—Then the relieving officer is not doing his duty. He should ask the question where they slept last night.

17240. But they don't always give the right answer?—He ought to know if they are coming to him every day.

17241. Then you think there is more casual admission in the South Union than in the North?—I do believe that.

17242. And for that reason you would be unwilling to see the affairs of the South Union managed by a Board partly composed of the men of the North?—That is my chief reason. Our predecessors, Guardians who occupied the position we do, about forty years ago, devoted a great deal of capital expenditure to improve the buildings, and the ratepayers since have paid off those capital sums, and I think it would be unfair to call upon the ratepayers of the South Union now to contribute and pay a share of the capital expense of buildings of the North Union, which were erected in or twenty years ago.

17243. You think if any amalgamation did take place there ought to be a valuation of the property of both unions and due consideration given to that?—I would not go as far as that.

17244. You are aware that when there is amalgamation between unions at present, under the existing law, that these matters are all gone into?—Yes, I am sure they are; but we have been working for some years past for the purpose of improving all our departments, and especially our hospital department and infirmary department, and I say that if we were stopped now, by the introduction of a new body, from providing for the wants of our own people, it would be a great pity. Nor in mind that between all unions there is only an imaginary dividing line. I heard a good deal made of the river Liffey. There is only an imaginary line dividing the North Union from Dunsheaghlin and Ballyreagh Unions, and I say it would be just as much unfair to us, as it would be unfair to them, that the North Union should amalgamate with them. It would be unfair to the Guardians of Rathdown if we wanted to amalgamate with them.

17245. Mr. MURKIN.—Is not the interest of the citizens common in everything as regards the Poor Law?—Yes.

Mar. 24, 1904.

Mr. W. C. Coleman.

17294. Then why should it be unfair?—You must take into account that the municipal rate is confined to the borough; poor rate is a union rate.

17297. CHAIRMAN.—Would you be willing to have an equalisation of rates on the north and south sides of the city?—If it went that far I would, but I don't suppose it would.

17298. The proposal was made by Dr. McWalter, who is a member of both Boards. Your opponent would be making an argument against any amalgamation in any sense, anything that would disturb the existing state of affairs.—Unless you could close the workhouse. I would like to see every workhouse in Ireland done away with.

17299. Do you think you could go a long way towards closing the Dublin workhouse?—I could by substituting a small hospital in their place. I mean the Co. Dublin workhouse.

17300. I mean the city of Dublin?—You could not close them, there are too many inmates.

17301. There are almost all debilitated?—A good deal of them are sick; we have 1,300 supposed to be sick.

17302. Between the two unions you would have over 2,000 sick?—I am sure we would; that is disgusting.

17303. Really sick, I mean?—I think we are represented to have 2,000 sick; we have only about 250 who demand active medical treatment. The city hospitals treat as very well. We find from experience that they are only anxious and willing to take in all cases of serious illness, especially where medical aid would be of any avail. It is only where medical aid would be of no avail that they discharge them, and these are the cases we generally get.

17304. You look on your hospital as mainly a chronic hospital, and the acute cases are in the general hospital?—Yes, that is my experience. I would like to classify, to see three classes, but two in particular—the epileptics and the lunatics—taken out of our workhouse; and I would say that there is no department in our workhouse I have studied so closely as our lunatic department. We have done everything under the circumstances to relieve the lot of these afflicted creatures. We have them located in the most favoured, healthy, and cheerful positions available; they have allotted to them fairly large and spacious recreation grounds; they have heating pipes in the dormitories, so that the warmth can be received by each and all alike. On the female side there is a laundry, where a number of healthy patients are employed; another portion are engaged knitting and repairing clothes. On the male side there is land attached to the department, where a number of the healthy patients are employed, and we have sent out these a great number of the best-educated and selected inmates of the house, in order to show them how to do their work, and to show them good habits. We grow all the vegetables of the department in this ground. I consider this a great boon to these debilitated creatures, as it keeps their minds otherwise than dwelling on their sad state. I would venture to say our lunatic department is the best cared for of any of that kind in Ireland, and a reference to the reports of the Commissioners in Lunacy will prove my assertion; yet I consider this or any other workhouse a most unsuitable place for lunatics, so proper classification cannot be carried out, which is admitted by all authorities as most essential for the successful treatment of the insane. I think it is most improper to have imbecile children, able-bodied lunatics, however harmless, and those suffering from acute disturbances of the mind, sleeping together in the same dormitories, and using the same utensils and recreation ground. I am told that some of these healthy lunatics have very vicious and almost unspeakable habits, which must be very demoralising to the young, and I think equally so to the old, whose minds are weakened by disease. This state of affairs I think must continue as long as they are left in the workhouse, no matter how anxious the Guardians may be to remedy it, as there is not a sufficient number of each class in any one workhouse to have separate divisions and a separate staff of attendants in charge to each to look after their various wants, as existing in all asylums. Then we have also a few cases of phthisis streated amongst them, and we have no special arrangement whereby those could be isolated.

17305. Dr. Broome.—They have none in the Richmond?—However, taking it all round, I think the best thing I could do, and I think our Board is fairly unwise, is that these three classes should be removed. I have not exactly made up my mind where we should put them, but the conclusion to which I have come is that we should place them in some sort of an institution—call it a distinct asylum, if you like—but that institution should be built on a less expensive scale to those erected within recent years—plain buildings.

17306. CHAIRMAN.—Or you would take an empty workhouse if you got it?—Yes, it would suit admirably with a smaller staff, professional and otherwise; when I say otherwise I mean a staff of a workhouse who, for instance, would take a known lunatic or lunatics into a garden, and work with them and show them how to work. I don't believe in a staff of officials who are paid to keep their hands in their pockets, and look about and supervise, and do nothing for them, as they have in some of the institutions I know.

17307. Mr. McWalter.—You would have working officials?—Working officials, by all means, to show good example to the inmates; many well spent. The applicants are a class I would also like to see out, too; they are the only class that have not proper accommodation in our workhouse. I believe every Guardian in the union would like to see them out. We have about seventy altogether.

17308. What do you think should be done about them?—The Committee of Month some time ago was in communication with our Board, and we did agree, under certain conditions, to offer a fixed sum per week per individual.—As we offered.

17309. CHAIRMAN.—The North want 2s. better?—I am sure our Board, when they see the arrangements that will be made, will not for the sake of 1s. or 2s. oppose it, but I am only telling you what they did do. I certainly agree with Mr. McHenry also, that the sick is all hospital should be treated by themselves, no matter whether there is a distinct entrance to that hospital or not. In our union the hospital is the great center for the house—they go to the hospital, they are transferred then to the infirmary and the healthy wards, and stay there.

17310. Mr. McHenry.—What do you do with them when they get out of the hospital and get to the healthy place?—They go into the hospital as sick. I would discharge them from the hospital to their own homes, the same way as from the city hospitals, and if they want to get into the body of the house, let them make a new application.

17311. CHAIRMAN.—Did you ever do that in your union at all?—We have made order after order: "To be discharged when well," but the doctors say they are not well, and when they are discharged from the hospital he sends them to the infirm wards, and the result is that is evaded, and although some people may come in there with the best intentions of getting medical treatment and cure—

17312. Under what power does the doctor transfer them to the able-bodied portion of the house?—He must make room for others coming in sick.

17313. Under what power does he transfer them to another part of the house?—I am not aware; the matter is here.

Mr. Fraser, Master.—He can class them where he likes. He may consider them convalescent, and send them to the infirmary as not sufficiently fit to be discharged.

Witness.—We would certainly have room if the lunatics and epileptics were taken out. We would have one of the finest hospitals in Dublin, even compared with one of our city hospitals. We spent a lot of money on it, and that money has been paid over. I would have no lunatic attendants whatever attending on them. They may go there to wash the place or scrub, but they should have nothing whatever to do with the distribution of food or the giving out of medicines.

17314. Dr. Broome.—You would not allow them to sleep in the place?—No; we find that our healthy wards at the present time are occupied by a number of those who are doing nursing duties, and those nurses bring food to the wards at night to their friends and comrades.

17315. Which is the patients' food?—Well, they may not be denied of their food, but perhaps some of them cannot partake of it; they get it whether they eat it or not. I would have those properly nursed.

17316. Do you really believe that would be a saving to the union?—Yes. And about our nursing staff, we are making an attempt to get all our nurses to live in the house, especially the night nurses, and I think it should be a general rule, many of them are married women attending to their families by day, and the result is there is a great temptation to sleep at night.

17317. You are making an attempt to try and isolate all cases of consumption?—Yes, we have all the female cases isolated as well as we can under the circumstances.

After 24, 1904,
Mr. W. C.
Graham.

17258. They are not well situated at present?—They are not, but we are making an attempt to remedy that.

17259. Would it be possible to put them in the same building as you are putting the females?—It would be possible with a little expenditure.

17260. It has been done before?—I would recommend a general hospital for the treatment of consumptive people outside.

17261. Would that be for your union or both unions?—The county and city at large.

17262. You would recommend a sanatorium, and in the meantime those others might be very useful?—We are going on slowly.

17263. In the meantime these cases are very infectious?—We are doing our very best; as soon as we have the women transferred there we will try to see what space is available to transfer the men; we must do the one first.

17264. I think you are making wonderfully good work?—Now, as regards out-door relief, the official answer to the question was that our Board of Guardians are of opinion that greater facilities should be afforded, which would enable them to exceed the present limits for the distribution of out-door relief. I am a dissembler from that reply. I am not able to agree with them there, consequently I give their answer first in order to explain. I believe when you are dealing with the question of out-door relief you are treading on very slippery and dangerous ground. We must not forget that there is a great difference between being needy and being destitute, and so augment the income of the needy at the cost of a class similarly circumstanced, would be discouraging thrift, and would be demoralizing and injurious to the community at large. I am in favour of granting old and infirm people out-door relief, or some similar assistance, but I would on no account give out-door relief to people who say they cannot get work, or to families who may be deserted by their father, or to families whose father is in prison; if you do so you will destroy the obligations of the fathers to support their children, in fact you would take away all responsibility from them. Even the present system of granting out-door relief to widows with more than one child is not in favour with me, although I would be slow to recommend its abolition, because at present the very fact of being a widow with children confers on them the right to out-door relief, whereas I believe if the workhouse test was applied to them, not one in ten would avail of it.

17265. Mr. MURKIN.—Would not your views, if carried into effect, cause the entrance into the workhouse of many children?—I don't think so.

17266. Wouldn't the children starve if the father was in jail and the mother unable to provide means for their livelihood?—You must bear in mind at the present day when they go into the workhouse, the very fact of going into the workhouse deters the father from leading such a life and being taken to prison; it would also deter the father from going away, because the father would be brought back and prosecuted for deserting his wife and family.

17267. Surely if the father is in jail he is away already. Are the children to starve in the meantime?—Let them go into the workhouse.

17268. Then don't they get accustomed to the workhouse, and lose that spirit of honest pride that we all would like to see more widespread than it is?—That may be, but you must protect society. It is unfair to call upon the general community to support a lot of people like that.

17269. But by giving opportune aid, might you not be saving the ratepayers of the future a good deal of money?—You may save the ratepayers, but you must look to society at large.

17270. Would you not be saving innocent children from the taint of the workhouse, and the dangers of evil associations?—You may, to a certain extent.

17271. Is not that a matter for deep consideration?—It is, but I am only giving you my views.

17272. CHAIRMAN.—Your view is that destitution ought to be a condition before you give out-door relief, not merely poverty?—Yes, destitution; not merely poverty or being needy.

17273. That is the present law, and you think it wise?—I think it is wise. There is another question I am very much interested in, and that is a system of providing for an old-age pension.

CHAIRMAN.—I am afraid we could hardly go into that.

17274. Mr. MURKIN.—Is not that an extension of the out-door relief to which you are so much opposed?

—It is; but I would put it in such a way that I would make each individual member of the community subscribe to it.

17285. Where would you get the money?—If you make every Post Office in the country—

17286. CHAIRMAN.—There has been a special inquiry on this subject, and it would be a very wide field for us to take up, and we have no power or qualification for taking it up?—We are also interested in the question of the law of settlement. I am informed by some of our most experienced relieving officers that at least 30 per cent. of our inmates should not be properly charged to the South Union. Then taking it again that, that there are some of our inmates in other unions who should be charged to us, say 5 per cent., I believe if we had a law of settlement, properly organized, we would have at least 25 per cent. less inmates in the house.

17287. Dr. BROOK.—How do you arrive at your 5 per cent?—That is from the other unions.

17288. How do you arrive at that?—It is only an approximation.

17289. CHAIRMAN.—There is greater poverty on the side of the water, and therefore you think there are fewer?—I don't mean exactly North and South Unions, but I mean the country unions.

17290. Dr. BROOK.—You have calculated 30 per cent. by your relieving officers. How have you calculated your 5 per cent?—It is only imaginary. In my workhouse I have ever been in I always find there are some people from Dublin.

17291. Remember there are 250 unions?—If I allow 5 per cent. for what is there which should be chargeable to the South, of course it is only an approximation.

17292. It is not even an approximation, it is altogether imaginary?—I would not agree with Mr. Cross when he said we should charge those to the district to which they come from. I think that would lead to a very complicated business and a lot of law expenses. I think that as soon as people would find out that such a law was in existence the whole thing would cease, or very nearly cease. There is one class I would like to make a settlement for: young women from the country, who come up to be here for their confinement; I would make those an exception. I would not be a party by any means to send back those with their children to the places they came from, because if you do so the temptation is so great I honestly believe they would rather do away with the child than take it back. I would be very slow to send back such a class as that.

17293. Would it not mean a great deal of expenditure and a large cost for transport?—It would at first; you must bear in mind that for the last ten or twelve years we had in Dublin a great number of public works, where a lot of money was expended, and coming on district times we saw the different condition showing what an interest they took in these things, and the result was it all got published in the press, and you had a regular influx of country people coming here to get employment, and, to their grief, when they came here they had no employment, had nothing to do but go to the workhouse. That class is still with us, unfortunately.

17294. Mr. MURKIN.—You think some change to the law should be brought about which would enable you to send them back to the places from which they came?—Yes, some change. There is another question also that we are very much interested in, the question of the able-bodied in the workhouse. We find we can get no return whatever, not even the cost of their maintenance, out of them. And I had a scheme. I was reading about the House of Industry in Townsend-street, which was established many years before the Poor Law Act, and had the same intention as the Poor Law Act. I believe if you could pay them a certain amount of money for their labour, and deduct the cost of their maintenance, it would be the means of encouraging them to work, and also making them better fit to earn a living outside. They would be more inclined to do it, and I am of opinion that there is no individual so destitute as a man or woman who spends three months in the workhouse when they take their discharge; they have no money in their pocket, and no friends or associates to call upon, consequently there is no individual so destitute. I was glad to hear from you on Tuesday that there was about to be introduced into the House of Parliament a Bill to deal with that class. If that Bill was extended to Ireland it would meet all my views in reference to that matter. To form a labour colony and make them work would be an admirable thing.

17295. The experiment is on its trial in England, but not on a very extensive scale?—So I understand.

17296. Do you think that would be a relief to the rate and a blessing to the poor?—Leaving out the question altogether of the relief to the rate, it would be altogether better for the community at large that these people should be made to work.

17297. And better for themselves, too?—I think so. The next question I would like to raise is the payment for relief. I am of opinion that there should be greater facilities for enforcing the existing law of making children pay for the maintenance of their parents, and parents for the maintenance of their children, in hospital, no matter how little they might pay; and that should go further, as we find that a great number of patients in our hospitals who die are assured for very large amounts in burial societies.

17298. CHAIRMAN.—About how much would the average be?—Some of them are insured in different societies. Some draw £20, some £30, and nearly less than £5.

17299. Mr. MURKIN.—Is that practice any way extensive?—Merely every case.

17300. CHAIRMAN.—How much a year premium do they pay?—Generally by the week, from 1d. to 1s. a week, and I think we should be concerned to obtain from these societies payment for their maintenance while they are with us. We have not that power at present, I understand.

17301. Dr. BROOKS.—Would that not very soon check the insurance altogether. Would it really benefit you very much after a few years?—The way I would deal with it is this—

17302. CHAIRMAN.—They would put the insurance in evidence, so that you would not be able to get hold of it?—They might do that, but the class of people who have their parents insured are people who are very well-to-do generally, and whom, for some difference or other, the parent refuses to live with. If such a law existed these children would not let their parents go in at all; they would keep their parents with them. The next question is the question of tramps. In reality we are not much concerned with tramps; we do have some. I would divide that community into two classes—one, the tramp by force of circumstance looking for work, whom I believe to be an honest man. I should facilitate him in every possible way, but before he would start from any given point to readi another, I think he should receive a passport from the officer of Constabulary from the place he starts from, stating on the face of the pass the destination he was going to. I think that pass should admit him into any of the workhouses along his way, where he would receive his supper, bed, and breakfast in the morning, and be allowed to depart early. The other class I would deal with harshly in this way, that I would register them, and I would make them give forty-eight hours' notice before they would take their departure. I believe if that scheme be adopted it will break down that nuisance very soon.

17303. Practically none would give forty-eight hours' notice. What do you think would happen to them. Would that be the end of your legislation on the matter. Would you simply give the Guardians power to require forty-eight hours' notice?—That would be a preventive of the tramp nuisance altogether.

17304. What would they do?—They would turn their attention to something else.

17305. Sleeping out?—No.

17306. Would you not be afraid that they would sleep out. There are a great many towns they go through, where they have not a workhouse to sleep in, and they get a low lodging?—They have always plenty of money.

17307. You would merely oblige them to go to the low lodging in the place where the workhouse was?—My idea is that after a few years it would do away with the

class altogether. If you form a labour colony then by all means send that class there. I would also take the children of tramps away from them. I believe that a tramp is not a suitable individual to have charge of a child. I would take them away altogether. In reference to the boarding out of children, we board out all orphan children.

17308. A good many of them in the Co. Wicklow?—Yes, Wicklow, some in Kildare, and in the Co. Dublin. We would recommend additional power being given to our Board to board out children whose parents are in the house, and who for some reason of mental or bodily infirmity are likely to remain in the house.

17309. You think they ought to forfeit the privilege of having charge of the children?—Yes; and also the children of the infirmal pauper.

17310. While the children are in charge of the State through a Board of Guardians or otherwise, do you think it desirable that the parents should be at large. Supposing that the father and mother, or father or mother, had children, and they were deemed not fit persons to have charge of their children, and the Guardians took charge of the children, do you think at the same time that the parents should be allowed to go out freed of their burden?—Would it not be better to leave the parents out without the child rather than with the child?

17311. Or would you be in favour of saying persons who have so misconducted themselves should go to the labour colony?—Yes, if necessary. I believe it is the only right thing to do with children, much better than to rear them in any institution, no matter how good.

17312. I suppose your idea of a labour colony is that it should be conducted on kind principles; nothing in the nature of a penal settlement?—No.

17313. A place where people should be made comfortable, and work, and confinement would be the only disagreeable thing?—That is all.

17314. Mr. MURKIN.—Work, and restraint, and discipline?—In my opinion that would very soon change the social life altogether.

17315. CHAIRMAN.—There is a great difficulty for a large number of the poor class of work people from want of strength, or other cause, of getting employment?—There is, but that would be a case where medical relief would come in.

17316. I did not mean so bad a case as that, but a man comes to you for a job; you look at him, and if you see him a poor class of man, you say: "That man will never give me a day's work," he would not be snapped up?—There is a danger there.

17317. A large percentage of the population is not really fit?—No.

17318. Mr. MURKIN.—But these people, if they have been well-conducted and industrious, and have children, the children generally give respectable fathers and mothers help when they can?—Yes, always; I heard Mrs. McDowell Congreve speaking about lady inspectors. I don't quite agree with Mrs. McDowell Congreve; no doubt a lady inspector might do some good, but she could do no more than our present inspector, Mr. Bourke, because the last inspection that he made of our hospital and house, not only did he examine to see was the clothing clean, but he examined the bed-clothes to know was there any vermin of any description; not a single thing but he examined, and did everything that a lady could possibly do.

17319. That is my experience of the way in which inspections are done and ought to be done?—And these outside we spoke of a while ago, I think before they should be discharged from the workhouse they should also give twelve hours' notice. The way to deal with that class is either to keep them in or to keep them out.

Miss WELBY, P.L.C., EXAMINED.

There has been such a multitude of questions put, and such a reiteration of the same arguments, so if you would allow me I will just say shortly my views. As a woman, I do believe a lady inspector would be of great use, because I lay down as a principle, and I am satisfied I could prove it, that all women Guardians go for thoroughness, efficiency, and economy, and when they had a woman to work with them, as their more direct representative with the Local Government Board, a great many improvements would be the result. Now if one or other of us write any complaint to the Local Government Board, we are at once put in a hostile attitude towards the others. When I first became a Guardian and went through the South Dublin Union I

noticed everywhere the trace of the man's hand and over so many inequalities.

17320. CHAIRMAN.—The trace of the master hand?—Oh, no, not the master, but the man. I said everything here has been derived by man as if women were not under consideration at all; yet the larger number in every given union, generally speaking, are women. Again, I must say it was with women that in a drawing-room meeting the idea was first started of having a lady inspector for our boarded-out children. The Board deemed very much to it on certain grounds, and our lady inspector has met with a good deal of rather sharp treatment as far as words go, but all the same her report had the effect of stimulating the relieving officers

Mar. 24, 1904.

Mr W. G. Connolly

Mar. 24, 1904.

Mrs. W. G. P.

and causing the children to be removed from very undesirable nurseries, and has proved good. But the part of workhouse administration that interests me most is everything regarding the children, and personally I would be very glad if the children formed a kind of department by themselves outside the workhouse; outside almost, in a certain sense, the Poor Law administration, and that they were brought more in touch with female helpers. Now the question of these poor girls, that class is largely recruited from domestic; they come from all parts of Ireland, and fall into rags in Dublin because they have no helping hand, and I think we want very much for our boarded-out children for their after-life, and our institutions children, if we are to have them, we want committees to look after them. Look at these Poor Law questions, it is all done from a very narrow standpoint; each union looks upon it from its own little circumstance, and we don't deal with it as a great national subject. I have been reading quite lately what is carried out abroad—the Elberfeld and Leipzig system.

17321. You have not got the people here who are bound by the Kaiser's authority?—This springs from individual benevolence.

17322. The duty is imposed on citizens and they cannot refuse to undertake it. They have to become relieving officers and take charge of a certain area?—They do it voluntarily.

17323. They are invited, but the office, although unpaid, is compulsory?—There is no question of compulsion, it is all a voluntary matter; it all arises out of the feeling that we should rather help one another, and not allow anybody to starve, and the consequence is that without any Poor Law application or administration, there is an assistance for the poor which seems to me most effectual.

17324. You know that has only spread to a couple of towns?—It is spreading.

17325. It has been in operation for fifty years or more, and still it has only got to a small number of places?—Even so, does not that lessen the country very much.

17326. But whatever you think of the plan, you would find it very difficult to get in Dublin, or Belfast, or Cork, or Limerick men who would give up their time to home-to-home inquiries, and pursue these inquisitorial inquiries which would be resented in this country in a stirring way?—We dwell too much on what would be resented in the way of interference, because our people are not different from others, as we are rather apt to believe ourselves.

17327. They are accustomed to very stern discipline in Germany?—We are not as amenable to discipline as they are, but the result seems a general relief of the poor in a very effectual and economical manner.

17328. You have, of course, read at the same time that it has been considered by the Poor Law authorities in England that the system could not be put into operation there?—Public bodies, like Poor Law authorities, move very slowly.

17329. I am speaking of Royal Commissions and committees?—What does not seem valuable today will to-morrow or later on; here we are in a big city like Dublin.

17330. Your idea is that the Elberfeld system ought to be applied in Dublin?—I would be very glad if it could be applied, even in the district, hints from it. About children, I have found lately in our union that we have groups of children whose parents are undergoing imprisonment. Yesterday I was asking the master. I thought they were cases brought in by the relieving officer, and I wondered why it was they were not dealt with through the police court, and children, as not vicious themselves, but of vicious surroundings, were not passed on into industrial schools, but the master told me it was generally through the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children they came there. Could they not be dealt with concurrently with the prosecution of the parents and passed on to an industrial school?

17331. We felt that ourselves a good deal lately?—I think that with regard to Poor Law matters we may say broadly there is a great deal of ignorance; they know that there is a huge establishment, that relief is

given, and they believe there is a great deal of extravagance and waste, but individually they don't take a very keen interest in the matter. Another thing is this, that there are some who cannot, and what must be done with them? I don't agree with people who say that the children of the ordinary tramp class should be boarded out; that is to say if children aged from seven to the baby in arms are found with a tramp, a provision was passed that those children should be taken from them.

17332. What would you do with them?—Could we not have a short period industrial school in which children could be sent.

17333. Why would you prefer that to boarding out?—I would hope that temporary dealing with the children may help them, and I don't believe boarding out would effectually sever their connection with their parents, and unless the parents were hopelessly vicious it would be a pity to take them away. I have a great belief in the power of redeeming poor human nature. I think a great many people drift on into a state of hopeless despair.

17334. But still there are a tremendous number of people with insufficient means of supporting life. Are we to go on supporting these people and letting them increase their class, or try to take some steps to put an end to them?—Yes, and at the start we must be severe; some must suffer. I got a little girl belonging to the tramp class into a situation, but she was not twenty-four hours in it when her mother and father followed and took her away; frightened the people. We have inn-and-outs coming very much; if there was some kind of outside relieving house.

17335. Would you not meet that by saying no children should go to the workhouse?—Yes; and at once send them to a school and not let them idle their time there for a fortnight. Then there is the other big question. I don't think you like us to enter into many things in the way of detail, of internal administration.

17336. Complaints as to details in a particular workhouse need not, we think, be gone into?—I believe myself there could be a great deal of economy in the internal administration of workhouse, if you had not the rigid rule of following uniformity of years and years ago; there is a waste of food.

17337. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Would there not be the danger of peculation?—No; what I mean is that there should not be the uniform distribution of food to each inmate. I mentioned that to you last June.

17338. CHAIRMAN.—Would there not be the danger of peculation?—I judge, not from personal experience so much, as from what has been done with very good results in other workhouses, saving time and ton of bread in England, and I always think that what has been done elsewhere we could do here.

17339. I think there is no doubt about it that under bread there might be a saving, and I would agree as to the desirableness of having joints carved in the hospital wards, if one can make general rules.

Dr. KEMP.—That is the very thing that is done in the North Dublin Union.

17340. CHAIRMAN.—That hard-and-fast line of relief always struck me as most wasteful, but the other can only be carried out where you have responsible officers to take charge of it, and take the food as they see fit and do it out?—I would quite agree with what the Lord Mayor said yesterday about the need of training our children, but I think they can only be trained outside in homes, and also boarded-out children should get facilities; throughout the country there is an appreciable number of deformed children. I don't know if the Poor Law in any way empowers a Board, for instance, to apprentice such, or give them the means of getting a trade. We should, as far as possible, work so as to make every boy or girl of the community self-reliant and self-supporting. I would be very pleased if there was a kind of general co-operation and thoroughness in the administration of the Poor Law, and one branch did not overlap another. We need something like the Charity Organisation. And show all things, of course, improve the housing of the poor. When you speak of a sanatorium for consumptives, a great deal of that arises from the wretched tenements, and the prevalence of drinking habits among the people.

Mr. WILLIAM STREETER, F.R.C.S., examined.

Apr 24, 1904

Mr. William
Stretcher.

17341. CHAIRMAN.—You represent the rural portion of South Dublin?—Yes; I am also a Guardian.

17342. For what part of the district?—Rathfarnham, Whitechurch.

17343. Have you been here much to day. Is there anything particular you wish to say yourself?—My ambition is to reduce the number in the home.

17344. Is there much labour wanted in your part of the country?—There is a fair amount of labour.

17345. You can get a man whenever you want him. You are not short of men working?—Occasionally.

17346. What wages will a man get in your part of the country?—The average wages would be about 12s., the weekly wages would be about 8s.

17347. Does he get any diet?—No. Lord Masey's weekly wages is 10s.; the small farmers give 12s. to 14s.

17348. Not constant employment?—It is principally constant; wet and dry it would average 8s., but that is not the point I want to draw at here at all. What I want to put before the public is that the Legislature that passed that Poor Law for this country did us a great evil.

17349. That is what Daniel O'Connell said?—Did he? I don't agree with Daniel O'Connell's views on other points, but on that head I do. It is a cancer eating the life out of the country. On one side we have a lot of paupers, we have the able-bodied, and a good sprinkling of officials, and these poor classes are living well. They neither sow nor spin, but they have the best portion of the rates.

17350. The officials tell a good deal?—They say they do; well, the majority of ourselves do. I think if the evil could be got under.

17351. How would you go about doing it?—The first thing I would do would be to give an old-age pension. It is a ridiculous thing to say that people after spending their years keeping up this establishment here—I hold the working man creates everything—he is keeping up that establishment, and then at the end of his days, if he is unfortunate, he has to break up his home, and as he goes there, and his wife is put in one portion of it and he is put in another. I am told it costs 4s. 5d. or 5s. to keep these people, and if they got 6s. outside they would live in the lap of luxury; but I believe it costs 15s. or 21s. a week, taking everything into consideration.

17352. They cost a great deal more than 4s. 5d.—They cost from 15s. to 21s. a week.

17353. Supposing you say 12s. 7.—The actual food they consume is 4s. 5d. Now the attendance, the buildings, and the interest on the money, make a good deal. If that money was capitalised for industrial purposes a good deal could be done with it. I think it is a very foolish idea of the present Government to tolerate the present system so long, that they would not allow half the money that costs for poor rates to create some industry. I believe if we had a native Parliament the present system would not stand five years. Why not follow the system in America. I have some friends in America, and they laugh at what I tell them. There are able-bodied men must either rook hog or die. Here in the South Dublin Union they are marched and marched out in the morning for fresh air. They come in for their breakfast; then they are marched out, and at the dinner hour they come in again, and still all this power and energy is locked up, it is no practical use. I suggested when I went there last to take a farm in the neighbourhood of Crumlin; I was bounded down. I believe these able-bodied men ought to be made support the sick and the children, get some value out of them. The Guardians said they could not have them going to and fro to the farm, but I would expose them as much as possible. I would put these men to work the streets.

17354. Then the poor fellows who would lose their job as scavengers would be applying to you?—That difficulty would be easily got over. I know people in my district who are worse off than inmates in the home.

17355. I am sure you do. Plenty of them never get such dietary, I am sure?—They will get no dietary; the dietary here is 50 per cent. better. There is another point: there is a premium on death. I heard the late chairman say that the workhouse is full from the hospitals, and that has to be kept supplied, and now this is a thing that ought to be done away with. I believe any money derived from dead bodies should go to the rates. No official in the institution should receive any fee or reward on account of any individual dying. They get 51s. or 27s. for a dead body, but when that amounts to hundreds a year—I am speaking of the supply to the School of Anatomy—the officials that are in receipt of

that at the present time, I would go to any extent to compensate them, but I would have no official receiving money for that purpose.

17356. Do you mean to say the money is received by individuals?—It is received by officials. I believe the doctors claim it by Act of Parliament. I believe that ought to be wiped away; it is a scandal in any civilised country.

17357. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you mean to say the officials sell the dead bodies?—I say they receive a reward for a certain number of dead bodies. There is a general horror among the people outside.

17358. CHAIRMAN.—Have you anything at the back of all this. Have you any knowledge?—There is no knowledge required.

17359. What do you know about it?—I know these bodies go down there, and they get 51s. 7s. or 30s. each for them.

17360. Who gets the 27s. 7s.—It is divided. Dr. Keene—I think they is 7s. 5d. paid for a body—5s. goes to the porter, and 2s. to some one else.

Witness.—Who is this gentleman speaking now? The dead-house man gets that.

17361. Dr. BROWN.—What is the next point?—The next point would be the children. I would board out all the children. But as regards the tramp question, I think you might go a little too far with it; it reminds me of a little touch of South Africa to interfere with the children. I believe there is no child but would wish to be reared with his own parents. It would be a great cruelty to deprive a man of his children because of having to change his residence from time to time, and ask for relief in the North or South Dublin Unions.

17362. Mr. MURKIN.—If he leads a life of habitual vagrancy and does not do work, do you think he ought to have charge of any children?—Philosophy says that there is a reason for everything, and everything has its reason; and you must bear in mind that the laws of this country decree that man to want. The farmers were made hard up they could not afford to pay him; the landlords must get their rent regularly. I don't believe this tramp question is so prevalent in any other country. There is what you call a pauper in England among the trades classes, but the farmer in this country is so wretchedly poor. There was a time he could only employ a certain number. The agent came round and said: "This man is doing so much work. I must get so much more rent from him."

17363. CHAIRMAN.—You are a farmer yourself?—I am not, sir; I belong to the industrial classes.

17364. Mr. MURKIN.—Would you not wish to see these men back again to the ways of ordinary occupation and industry?—Certainly.

17365. How could you do it?—By reward—not compulsion—you will never coax an Irishman back by compulsion. I heard this gentleman speak about a colony. I hope it will not be run by officials on the same lines as other institutions.

17366. What do you propose?—I want the Guardians to have power to buy a farm and to make them reared their own maintenance. If a colony gets into the hands of officials it will eventually get into the hands of the wrong officials; but put it under the direct control of the people and then it would work.

17367. Would you favour the colony if it was under a local governing body?—Yes, directly from the people. Another thing I might mention. There ought to be popular representation on the Local Government Board also. There are going to pass a new Bill through, and the best thing you can do is open up the circle.

17368. CHAIRMAN.—Yes, I understand you?—It would be for the benefit of the whole system, and I think if there was more attention paid to the industrial question in this country, we would not have half the paupers. For the last five years, practically speaking, we were under the control of the doctors above. The doctors bore the show in all these institutions. Here, some time ago, two patients from our district came in; one was about seventeen or eighteen days in the South Dublin Union. He saw a doctor going in and never saw a doctor until he came out. Some time after a man went in suffering from temporary insanity. He was placed up two or three stairs. I went to see him and complained of where he was, but the doctor would not attend on account of professional etiquette. I am like Lord Brougham. I don't believe in etiquette, and I asked could I bring in an outside doctor, and I was told I could not. I think we should have power to bring in an outside doctor.

17369. Did you bring that proposal before the Board

Mar. 26, 1904.
—
Mr. William
Steedman.

of Guardians?—I intend to bring it forward. As regards these houses that come up from the country, in my own parish we had a parish priest who was very sturdy on this question. If these people were sent back from whence they came, I don't think they would go to the extreme of destroying their child. I don't see why the ratepayers of North and South Dublin should bear the expense of all the acres of Ireland.

17370. CHAIRMAN.—You think a law enabling you to send them back would be a proper law?—Certainly.

17371. Mr. MURPHY.—Would not these poor people be exposed to the publicity they seek to avoid?—We are over that age of sympathy in this country; this sympathy is keeping us back. And I believe in the housing question. Since I went there we built 450 cottages in the Co. Dublin, and I believe that elevated the people. I have been in places and seen as many as nine sleeping in one bed, and the bed was never cold. Some were working by day and some by night at Inchicore.

17372. CHAIRMAN.—Inchicore means good wages. Why had they not better houses?—These latter-day philanthropists never went near them. I think there could be a good deal done for a certain class of people if the clergy of all denominations were roused among the people and tried to educate them. But the whole cry in my district, and has been for years, is, "Go to the workhouse," if your finger only aches. We have a lot of people on out-door relief, and if the thing was capitalised it would nearly support an industry. It is all for want of industry that the tendency is to pauperise in this country.

17373. You think the proper provision to make for the relief of the poor would be to get these employments?—Get them employment; let them be self-supporting and self-reliant.

17374. That is the point which was at issue when the Poor Law was started?—They went the wrong way about it. The late chairman is very anxious to raise the qualification of Guardians. I go in the totally opposite direction. There are four or five or so up there whose valuations does not exceed £20—I am not speaking of myself—and I think we are as good workers as any other men on the Board. I don't know what class of legislature we had when the Poor Law Act was passed. We have people that relieve their sons and their cousins. I think when a person gets into a relative situation, and he is a Guardian of the poor, he ought to retire; he ought to clear out.

17375. And make room for some other man?—Undoubtedly. I don't know whether that sanitary department of ours is wrong or right.

17376. Dr. BROWN.—Is there plenty of labour for these people in your district?—Whether there is employment or not they manage to live outside the workhouses. There is plenty of sick laid at Dollymount; why not march the penniless down there to that and make good ground. There is another place at Sandymount. It is said they would break away and not go back to the union. That is the very thing we want them to do. I believe it would have a great tendency to

relieve the congestion. They are locked up there, and once they are locked up they have no desire to go outside. In the districts I came from there is plenty of mountain land. What is the reason we could not get them up there. Suppose we started in April and engaged them up there.

17377. CHAIRMAN.—Did you never think what an additional cost to the unions their boots would be if they were taking these fenced marches?—Is that the view you take of it. I don't believe in that question. Supposing they did wear out an extra pair of boots, so could have them make the roads, or something practical.

17378. Mr. MURPHY.—You would make them useful—you want to encourage them to work?—But I would not like to force them by coercion.

17379. Still you would like them to be kept employed?—Reasonable employment.

17380. CHAIRMAN.—That would be a difficult job walking from James's Street to Kilmashogue Mountain?—Not at all. Supposing they worked until 4 o'clock and returned, what great difficulty would there be. There are plenty of buildings lying idle there, and we could camp them out there.

17381. Dr. BROWN.—That would be a labour colony?—It would not be the labour colony he speaks of. I think this gentleman has a labour colony in his eye the same as Spike Island.

17382. CHAIRMAN.—Oh, no; some place where it would be a pleasant place to stay?—There are other men that some practical value could be taken out of them, and we could put them to some industry, but the Local Government Board has tried us up to sight. We cannot give money for out-door relief. If the children were taught some industry it would be a very good thing—knitting and cap-making—but the only device is to strip the ratepayers all along the line.

17383. If it is considered that it is time to change, Parliament can make the change?—I think it is time to change the whole system. The old-age pensions should go along with them. I would give it to deserving people.

17384. How much a head would you give?—Nothing less than 7s. 6d. or 10s. a head. It would all depend on their previous circumstances.

17385. Mr. MURPHY.—Would the ratepayers be willing to give that?—There are other funds outside the ratepayers. Look at the money being spent in foreign countries, in Egyptian expeditions, or the Transvaal. I don't think there is much profit out of the Transvaal. We could make the lawrence and discontinue pay it. Those are the people I would like to make pay; it is the feeder of the whole thing.

17386. Making them pay all the poor said?—No; they should pay towards the support of the institution; 80 per cent. are in the workhouse from the effect of the mosh liquor. I think they ought to subscribe something to it. Mr. Guinness gave £50,000 to the hospital and ignored as altogether, and there are a part of his victims in here. We want to get money at a very cheap rate of interest from the Treasury, if we want to do anything for these poor people.

Dr. DELANEY EXAMINED.

Dr. Delaney, I am one of the medical officers of the North Union. I merely came with regard to the question of amalgamation of the two unions. There has been an inequality for many years between the North and South Dublin Unions as regards the ratings. I don't think a geographical division can be said to be an economical one, and I think on both sides the rate ought to be equalised, even if amalgamation were not to take place. I maintain that the care of the poor, and sick, and destitute is the case of the whole community in which they happen to be, and I would regard the city of Dublin as being one whole community, and equally chargeable for the maintenance of the destitute poor in it. That would be one reason why I would urge the equalisation of the rate—the general relief it would give would be a great benefit. The difference in maintenance in the North and South is considerable, 4d. or 6d. per pauper per week. There is no other city in the kingdom, with the exception of London, that has two ratings on different sides. Glasgow may be taken as similar to Dublin as regards the river, but the rating is uniform.

17387. CHAIRMAN.—You are aware, of course, the reason why there are the two divisions in this city; it

happened by accident. There were two buildings, the House of Industry on this side, and the Freezing Hospital on the other, and these buildings were taken over for workhouses. Glasgow has two workhouses?—Yes, but it has an equal rating.

17388. Are you sure of that?—I was told by a gentleman that that was so. In passing the Act of 1860 and regulating the standard rate as a scheme of payment from the Equivalent Grant, the Government fixed in Dublin 1s. 9d. for the whole city. They forgot there were two ratings in the city. Then they made it on the average of the whole city. If they have made a standard rate for the whole city they have given legislative sanction to the principle of a uniform poor rate. The north side of Dublin is very much crowded; has a population of 10,000 over the south side. We have a fair number of registered tenement dwellings, consequently our population is very much congested, and it is a poorer population. The causes of it are very many, but the chief causes are due to the fact that on the northern side of the city all the produce gardens are. The people then crowd into the markets and get employment there. They are temporarily out of employ-

ment and temporarily employed again, and in that way become chargeable on the North Union. I don't think these people who crowd into the cities ought to be sent back again to the country districts. I do think that a small rate is aid for the rural districts, for the aid of

the urban district, to be distributed by the Local Government Board, would meet the difficulty, and save the urban district from the expense caused to them by the influx of the country population to the towns and cities.

JUNE 24, 1904

Dr. Debbeyde.

Dr. R. D. KENNY EXAMINED.

Dr. R.D.

Kenny

I saw in yesterday's evidence some of the gentlemen seemed to be in favour of having a separation of the hospitals. I would be very much in favour of it. I would have to each thing as a poorhouse. I would have simply the poorhouse hospital or public infirmary, and take in all the sick there.

17308. CHAIRMAN.—What would you think of moving all the sick to one workhouse and lodging all the healthy in the other—sick, feeble, and infirm in one workhouse?—I would keep the feeble and infirm by themselves.

17309. Are they not a class that become sick very soon?—Yes; but the weakness and debility of old age would only clog that hospital.

17310. Supposing you took the South Union for sick, you could have some of the buildings assigned for feeble infirm?—That would do; but I would have the able-bodied people kept out altogether, and I think if there was a greater extension of out-door relief it would cure a lot of people running in and out. You have made a lot of paupers yourselves by forcing people to come in. For instance, there is a law that if a woman has one child and she is destitute, she is not able to get any relief, but if she has two you will give her something; you will feed these but not two, and the stopping of out-door relief very often brings a whole family into the hospital, and then they become poorhouse birds for the future. I think about 10 per cent. in out-door relief of what is sent would keep every single one of these people out of the union, except drunken tramps that have to be dealt with.

17311. Dr. BROWN.—It was stated the workhouse was largely recruited from the hospital?—All rubbish from the Dublin hospitals is sorted into my side of the house; unsuitable operations. People that are sick and cannot be nursed too long. I don't mind that, because it is the business of the public hospitals to do temporary immediate work. We don't have fever but all the medical diseases. You cannot have a public hospital

such as the Richmond or Mater nursing them all through convalescence except they have plenty of rooms, which they have not most of them, and then they come in to us; but they do more than that, they send in their cases of accident, broken thighs, broken arms, and hips.

17312. Old fractures?—No, new fractures. They sent in a man with a broken skull who died in twenty minutes. I would not be for the amalgamation of these two unions under one building and administrative; you would be concentrating too much. We would like to have a poorhouse hospital in the best air we could. For the poor probably the north is better situated than the south, because it is more in the middle of its own district; but both of them are more suitable than if stuck out in the country. In the north we had great fighting about the boarding out of the children, and the Cabra institution was started because they were not satisfied with the boarding out. The children came in dirty, and there were all sorts of complaints which might have been obviated; if the clergymen, and the Guardians, and the relieving officers were to visit them there would be none of these complaints. But we built Cabra as a children's hospital, and now I think they are doing work far and away better than any out-door relief, and they are not getting a pauper taint on them, that people are so talking about. The children at Cabra look like children of an ordinary National school.

17313. Dr. BROWN.—As to the after-life of these children?—We had some industries in the union and were getting up others, but a workman's deputation came down and made the Guardians sweep it away because it was interfering with work outside. The Guardians were idiotic enough to listen to them. We had shoemakers' shops in Arana, and the boots were brought in into a room not as big as this. A Commission like this ought to do a good deal in the direction of making such labour useful.

The Sitting terminated.

May 3, 1904.

THIRTY-FIFTH PUBLIC SITTING—TUESDAY, MAY 3RD, 1904.

At the Courthouse, Naas.

Present:—Mr. MICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURKAGHAN, and Dr. COEY BUCKER.

Mr. Stephen J. Brown.

Mr. STEPHEN J. BROWN, *c.s.*, examined.

17395. CHAIRMAN.—You are familiar with the scope of our inquiry, so it is unnecessary for me to make any statement. Are you representing the Council?—I was one of those who was nominated by the Council, being Chairman of the Council, to give evidence on this subject.

17396. You have in your hand a list of queries that we have put to the various bodies?—I have.

17397. Perhaps the briefest way would be for you to make a statement?—I may mention, in the first instance, that our Council did answer the questions, but owing to an unfortunate accident the replies to these questions are not forthcoming. If they should turn up I presume they may be sent in to the Commission.

17398. Certainly?—With reference to No. 1, the Council were of opinion that it would not be expedient to dissolve any of the unions which are contained in the county.

17399. That is Colbride, Naas, and Athy?—Those are the only unions the buildings of which are situated in the county, but there are two other unions partly within the county—these are Edenderry No. 2 and Ballyinglass No. 3. And the Council were of opinion that if the idea were to prevail that the county should be as far as possible self-contained, that it would be desirable, if the portions of those other unions, which have not their buildings in the county, were added to some of the other unions.

17400. You considered the question of its being a self-contained county for Poor Law purposes?—We did.

17401. And your opinion is rather in favour of it, if possible?—It is rather in favour of it, but we were not able to take a large enough view of it—how it would affect the other counties—but as far as our own county is concerned, we considered it would be a great advantage.

17402. Were any of the representatives of the Colbride neighbourhood present at that discussion at the County Council?—I think not.

17403. At the inquiry which we held in Dublin they expressed themselves hostile?—I should say it was not at the County Council, but by committees to which it was specially referred, these questions were considered. It was intended that they should come up again before the County Council, but owing to the unfortunate accident to which I have referred, they never got further than the committee; but I just remember there was no representative of Colbride present at the meeting at which these things were considered. We thought a considerable portion of the Edenderry Union might be joined to the Colbride Union, which, if the Dublin portion of the Colbride Union were taken away, would be compensation.

17404. That is the Kildare portion of the Edenderry Union?—Not the entire of it; portion of it would go naturally to Athy, as also Ballyinglass No. 3. We had all the areas and out, and population, and everything in our replies to these questions; they have all disappeared, and I am not able to reproduce them. I could show you on a map how it would work out.

17405. You were not in favour of closing any of the three workhouses?—We were not; they are all, I think, very well-managed institutions.

17406. You don't propose to close Ballyinglass Workhouse, but to take the Kildare part away from that union?—Ballyinglass is in Wicklow—we have nothing to say to that—but the committee who examined the matter were of opinion that it would be desirable that Ballyinglass No. 3, which is a very small area, should be added to Athy No. 1. I may mention that the representatives of Ballyinglass No. 3 itself are opposed to that. They would rather remain as they are, for a very good reason, that their rates are lower than in Athy No. 1.

17407. Are they closer to their hospital?—I don't see; portion would be nearer Athy and portion near Ballyinglass.

17408. Then Edenderry, if you take away the Kildare part, would that virtually mean having to break up the union?—I think not. I think the King's Co. portion is very much the larger portion. We don't know how that would affect the remainder of it. Edenderry is a very small portion of it. Both Ballyinglass No. 3 and Edenderry No. 2 are very small portions of these unions. Our suggestion is that hospitals should be separated altogether from unions; that comes in later on.

17409. Now you are taking up the answer to No. 11.—We did not think that even in the event of the union being dissolved that the workhouse could with advantage be utilized for an auxiliary asylum. Our Council almost immediately after its formation took up the question of auxiliary asylums, and we suggested that the dissolved prison buildings at Naas should be utilized for that purpose. There was an elaborate report prepared by our county surveyor, in conjunction with Dr. Smyth, perhaps I might hand that in—showing what the possibilities of making it an auxiliary asylum were, and that building, if an auxiliary asylum was thought of at all, is still available.

17410. Not used?—And not used; but having regard to what has taken place since then, I do not think, and the Council does not think, that an auxiliary asylum for those joint districts is now necessary at all. There was at that time about 100 inmates in the various workhouses, and most of those have since then been provided for in the district asylum at Carlow.

17411. You have the top number of these inmates and lunatics inmates here—about thirty-four?—The numbers are given in that table. There were then thirty-eight in Naas.

17412. Have you reduced?—That has been considerably reduced. Colbride and Athy have been almost cleared out; and Carlow, thirty-six. I don't know how Carlow stands. I think a number in Carlow have also been transferred to the asylum.

17413. There are a good many there still?—But there are still, I believe, a considerable number—a fair number—in Naas, and what we think now is that: by means of some internal alterations in the asylum, not entailing any very great expense, that sufficient accommodation can be provided for those who still remain.

17414. And a further institution is unnecessary any way?—Is unnecessary; and we think that if the increase in lunacy continues, and if the asylum should become overcrowded, the question might be dealt with by the application of the Scotch system of boarding out pauper lunatics. It would not be a very large application, but it certainly could be found we have a sufficient number of suitable cases for boarding out to relieve any congestion.

17415. With their own relatives?—We think they would be better with strangers; there might be certain cases in which they could be left with their own relatives, but as a general principle we prefer strangers. One of the great objections to the auxiliary asylum is the capitation grant—the fact that the full capitation grant would not be available in an auxiliary asylum—has having regard to the fact that we have now disposed of almost all our lunatics in this county at all events, there seems to be no occasion for it.

17416. We have received statements that if an auxiliary institution were established, the full capitation grant ought to be given to them about?—We are also strongly of that opinion, and made representations to that effect at the time we were suggesting this project as an auxiliary asylum; we urged upon the Government that it would be desirable to change the law in

that subject. I will pass to No. 3 now, dealing first with (c). We thought it would be desirable that the children should be, if possible, all boarded out.

17417. At present you have a considerable number of children in the workhouse?—Yes, there are a considerable number.

17418. On the 1st of January—27 in Naas, 27 in Ards, and 5 in Colbridge?—The Council were unanimous in thinking that if possible all children in the workhouse should be boarded out.

17419. That would require, as you know, an amendment of the law. Have you followed out that, and joined to the objections to that as well as the arguments in favour of it?—I don't think we did. I think we considered the arguments in favour of it. The fact that these children would be so much better brought up in the country with something like home-life surroundings than in the workhouse. It is a well-known fact that workhouse children seldom turn out worth anything. To the end of their days they seem to carry the stamp of the workhouse.

17420. And to reproduce their kind?—And reproduce their kind; and where the boarding-out system has been tried it has been found very satisfactory. We think, if possible, it should be extended; then of course it would give a great deal more space for classification and other purposes.

17421. The position is at present that an unmarried woman or a married person goes into a workhouse with her child or children. By law now you cannot separate them; therefore you would want to pass a law giving the Guardians power to separate children from their parents, and to board the child out?—Oh, yes.

17422. Your Council were in favour of that?—Our Council were in favour of making such changes in the law as would enable all children to be boarded out.

17423. That is to say all children who were in the hands of thieflike or non-productive parents—parents who could not support their children, or put them decently on as citizens in the world?—Quite so.

17424. But if you come to a case where a labouring man and his family would have to take temporary shelter, owing to great stress, what would you do with the children in such a case?—In the application of any such principle, there would be a discretion in the Board, and I apprehend no Board in such a case would permanently separate the children from the parents.

17425. Your idea was that no child should be retained in the workhouse?—Except for a temporary period.

17426. If you make a provision for a temporary period, it will be very hard to know where to terminate that period. The reason I am asking you is this, that a suggestion has been made by previous witnesses that in such cases, if boarding out were not considered possible, owing to the shortness of the period, that such cases might be committed to an industrial school instead of to a workhouse temporarily until the parents were allowed to have them again?—I think that would be a very good idea.

17427. So as to keep the workhouse clear of children always?—That is the main point we dealt with. We did not go very deeply into details, because we thought those were matters perhaps which would be better dealt with by the representatives of the Poor Law Boards themselves. The point upon which we insisted was that the retention permanently of children in the workhouse necessitated staffs of schoolmasters and schoolmistresses, and so on; that that should end, and by a combination of boarding out, and what you now suggest—though I don't know that it occurred to us at the time—sending them to industrial schools, that the workhouse might be kept clear of children.

17428. At present there is a habit of remanding children, or sending children to the workhouse temporarily while their parents are in prison, or while some Cruelty to Children Act prosecution is going on, or even when a child is remanded on a charge itself?—I am aware of that.

17429. Would you be in favour of having children in that case remanded to an industrial school, so as to class workhouses altogether to children?—I would—personally I would—it would be very much better than sending them to the workhouse.

17430. But for ordinary children who come in periodically on the rates, your Council are strongly in favour of boarding them out?—Yes. The question of combining unions and classification of different classes of paupers in the different workhouses, of course that really means the question of union rating.

17431. Possibly county rating?—County rating, I mean to say. The Council were in favour of that principle.

17432. They were in favour of a self-contained county for Poor Law purposes?—A self-contained county for Poor Law purposes, and if possible utilising the workhouses for different classes.

17433. In the way you are speaking now you get rid of the leprosy and children. Come now to the Suggest class of all, the aged and infirm. Would you be in favour of making one institution, what you might call almost an almshouse arrangement, for the aged and infirm, where they could be classified according to respectability?—Yes, that was one of the ideas.

17434. You would not be in favour of diminishing the number of hospitals for the treatment of the sick in the county; you would have your three hospitals still. Supposing Colbridge were broken up, you would still leave at Colbridge a hospital for treating the sick?—Certainly; if the building could be utilised as a hospital; there is some doubt on that, whether it would be satisfactory without almost rebuilding.

17435. I am only taking Colbridge as an instance. Assuming you could have a suitable hospital there, and you could take out of that institution all the other classes except the sick and infirm, would you be in favour of sending the infirm to a central institution, say Colbridge itself?—Yes, that was the idea we had; that the county should be self-contained, that the workhouses should be for the use of the whole county, and a certain classification should be made, one class in one, and another class in another, and so on, but we did not go into the question as to in which.

17436. No, but as a general principle?—As a general principle we were in favour of that.

17437. There is another class we have not touched upon, that is the girls who come into the workhouse to have illegitimate children?—We did not go into that question. Those are questions which perhaps would be better dealt with by the representatives of the Poor Law Boards.

17438. But you have had such wide experience of local government in the Poor Law and other matters, that I am sure we would be glad to hear your own personal opinion. If you felt at liberty to give it. We have had suggestions that in future workhouses and workhouse infirmaries should be closed to the admission of girls who come in to have children; that instead of their going to the workhouse they should be sent to a refuge, or penitentiary, or whatever you like to call it, under religious management, according to the religion of the girls, and that if there were not a lying-in ward available in the institution, they could be sent to the nearest available lying-in hospital. The girl who comes into the workhouse now a few months before her confinement, that she should go to one of these refuges and be under good influences for that period, instead of being herded with women who had two or three or more illegitimate children in workhouses, as they are now; that she should be in that penitentiary, that her baby should be taken charge of there, that an effort should be made to put her in a situation as soon as she was fit for it, where she could pay for the cost of keeping her child, and possibly herself, while she was there?—That system might be worked very well in large cities, where there are institutions either already existing or which could be easily established for the purpose.

17439. There are a very large number in Ireland?—There are, but in counties such as this it would mean the establishment of a new institution.

17440. Why, could you not board them out in Dublin, so very near Dublin. Do you see any possible objection to sending from a county like Kildare these girls to a Dublin institution, and paying so much a head, as you would for extern hospitals?—There are some parts of the county very distant from Dublin.

17441. I mean even if you had to go to a place like Kilsberry, would you see any objection to sending them to Kilsberry. These people being able to travel, they generally expiate themselves some two or three months at all events before the event comes off?—If we had these institutions existing, I have no doubt that girls would be better taken care of perhaps in them than they are or can be in the workhouse.

17442. They are very rarely reclaimed in a workhouse?—Yes, that is what I say—once they go into the workhouse it is practically all over with them, and it might not be so in such institutions as you describe; but the difficulty I see in the establishment of such institutions.

May 3, 1894,
Mr. Stephen J.
Baron.

May 3, 1904,
Mr. Stephen J.
Brown.

17443. Of course there are a very large number in Ireland?—I should say not sufficient at all for the requirements.

17444. I am not sure of that, and what keeps this number so very large is the fact that the girl who falls once goes into the workhouse and keeps on having children there; the number of first lapses is not so large. The number of illegitimate children is many times more than the number of fallen girls?—Well, I have no doubt that if such a system could be arranged it would be better than the present.

17445. Would you as a newspaper—I am not putting it higher—think it a prudent and wise use of the public rates to pay for a woman there with a chance of re-employment rather than pay for her permanently in a workhouse, and for the stock of children that she generally raises there?—You would have no absolute immunity that she would not fall again having entered those institutions, but I have no doubt she would be more likely to be reformed. I am not able to form any idea of the relative cost in such institutions.

17446. Assuming the cost would not be higher than the cost of a patient at the hospital?—Assuming it would not be higher, I certainly would be in favour of some change of the kind.

17447. If a girl falls and has an illegitimate child, does she in many cases have to go back to her family?—As I told you originally, I have not much experience of the internal management. I have never been on a Board of Guardians, and have very little experience of the internal management of a union, and I would prefer not to hazard opinions or statements.

17448. You don't remember any case yourself in your ordinary experience of life in the country of girls with illegitimate children going home?—I do not.

17449. Or whether a girl with a baby at her heels would be likely to get employment as a farm labourer, would she be taken into a farmer's house, for instance, with a baby, as a labourer?—I should say not.

17450. I find that it is to be some custom; so great is the dearth of labour that they will take them?—I don't think that would be the case here, but there are a number of gentlemen here representing different unions who will be able to answer you and give their views on that question.

17451. Is there anything else under Query 3 you would wish to say?—I think not.

17452. You have not alluded to sub-heading (a)?—I thought that was included in the general question of classification.

17453. You meant it to cover that?—I meant (a) and (b) to be covered by that.

17454. Now Query 4?—We have to some extent discussed the changes which would be necessary—county rating, and then the various buildings used to the best advantage for the whole county.

17455. Would you make it county rating for the sick of each locality. You would keep up Celbridge, and Athy, and Naas hospitals, and the Co. Kildare Infirmary. Would you make all these distinct charges local charges or a county charge?—Our suggestion was that the hospitals should be separated altogether from the workhouse—if possible, different buildings altogether, and that they should be all under the same system.

17456. That would make a very heavy cost if you went into new buildings?—I fancy it would mean some cost at all events, unless in the event of the dissolution of any of the unions that any of the buildings would be available. At any rate if the inmates and children were removed from the workhouse there would be very much more space available, perhaps to have the hospital in the workhouse ground itself, although there are many objections to that.

17457. Old associations?—The associations. The expense of establishing separate hospitals might be too great. But with reference to the county infirmaries, they are in a very anomalous position at present. Take the case of Kildare Infirmary, which really only serves a district with a radius of five or six miles around it.

17458. We were there this morning, and it is full of patients? I don't say for one moment that the infirmary could be dispensed with, but this institution is maintained by the entire county, and people who are outside the radius which the Co. Kildare Infirmary serves naturally feel it a grievance that they should be maintaining that institution whilst they are also maintaining their own district hospitals. What we say is that all the hospitals in the county should be under the same system and maintained out of county funds, and be under a common system of management. The Kildare institution is a most useful institution, and could

hardly be dispensed with in the locality it serves, for that locality is at such a considerable distance from the other union hospitals.

17459. Instead of making it a local area charge, you think it would be better to have the whole of the cost on the county?—I do thank it would.

17460. Any other question of chargeability or rating that you would like to refer to?—Question 6 we did not go into; we thought that was largely a question for the representatives of the unions.

17461. No. 5, you don't want any more hospitals than there are in the county. The re-establishment of the Kildare Infirmary practically gives you four hospitals in a line from top to bottom?—I think the number is sufficient and the distribution is fairly good. In addition to those that have been mentioned, there is a private hospital called the Cottages Hospital, at the Curragh, maintained out of private funds.

17462. What class of people are removed in that?—I believe they are mainly people about the Curragh.

17463. Not soldiers?—No; it is not a military hospital in any sense. I don't think soldiers on active service would ever be received there, but persons connected with the camp—camp followers—and persons from Newbridge, I believe largely.

17464. The inmates at the Curragh are received into Naas Workhouse?—I believe so.

17465. So that it would be people of good character that would be received into this cottage hospital?—I should say more but people of good character. The tickets are in the hands of subscribers, and I suppose they make some inquiry before giving tickets for admission. I don't know the number of beds; it is not very large, but I believe it is always full.

17466. Whereabouts is it exactly?—It is on the Newbridge side of the Curragh.

17467. It is altogether a voluntary hospital?—It is a voluntary hospital, maintained by contributions.

17468. Under what management?—A committee of subscribers.

17469. You don't happen to have a report of that institution?—We have never seen a report. They don't publish any report except perhaps a statement of the sums subscribed. They may send a balance-sheet to subscribers, but it is not published.

17470. Then as regards Query 5?—That is the one I say the Council did not go into fully. We thought it better to leave it, as it was concerned mainly with the internal management of unions, to leave it in the hands of the representatives of the unions. No. 7: we thought it would be most desirable that there should be a system of payments in aid of the hospital treatment of the sick.

17471. Both in county infirmaries and unions?—Both in county infirmaries and unions, we considered they should be all under a common system, the county infirmary and the workhouse infirmary.

17472. What governing body would you have it under?—The County Council was suggested as a governing body acting through committees.

17473. Did you go into the question of the extent to which you would look for payments in aid?—We did discuss that question.

17474. In three or four instances that we have met they had the rule of leaving the amount to the discretion of the committee and medical officer in consultation. They would get to know the circumstances of the people. For instance, a workman's child might come in, a man who might pay a little. The absence of the child, it was argued, from the family would mean a saving at all events of 6d a week, if nothing more, and they would charge the lowest possible amount, sometimes just the absolute amount that would be saved to the family where the family was in low circumstances, and from that on up to the full amount expended. Would you be in favour of giving a discretion to the governing bodies of county hospitals under the County Council or Board of Guardians, that they should be empowered by law to charge such sums between those limits as in their discretion they thought fit?—That was the general idea. It would be impossible that in every case the full cost should be charged, and in some cases we came to the conclusion that where the hospitals were availed of by people really well-to-do, in addition to paying for their actual cost of maintenance, they should pay a sum towards the cost of their medical treatment.

17475. Up to perhaps two guineas a week?—Yes, it would be a graduated scale.

17476. In some county infirmaries we found that practically the cost of the medical salaries was met by

the receipts from these paying patients. At Licham and Bannahall they were very large!—That has not been done in the county infirmary, but the medical officer is allowed to charge, I think, fees to patients.

17477. That he can send his private patients in, you mean?—I think people who are able to pay and become inmates of these hospitals, I think the doctor in certain cases charges fees.

17478. You are not sure of that?—We have not yet devised a regular system for the management of the Kildare Infirmary. We have been told that there are general regulations about to be prepared, and we are waiting for those rather than start on an isolated system; but some of my friends who attend the Kildare Infirmary more often than I do will be able to tell you whether that is so or not; my opinion is that it is so.

17479. Then they virtually would be his private patients?—Yes; pay to the committee only the cost of maintenance, and pay the medical fees to him. I may tell you we have had in contemplation for some considerable time that question of making a set of regulations for the Kildare Infirmary, but for the reason I tell you it has not been carried out.

17480. The only thing we have not touched on is, I think, the tramps!—With reference to that, the suggestions made by the Council were that there should be some system of registration for tramps.

17481. Every tramp should have what virtually would be a passport?—Yes; and these habitual tramps would be known persons, to whom certain special powers could be applied by the Guardians, such as the power of detaining them for a certain period when they did enter the workhouse, and obliging them to work.

17482. One Guardian who gave evidence suggested this passport system, too, with the further detail that a photograph of the tramp should be on it!—That might be a useful means of identification.

17483. If he were not a bona fide traveller in search of work he would not be eligible for support from the poor rate, then he would become a person to be dealt with by the police, is that your view?—Our view was—

17484. He has a passport, we will say; that passport in ordinary tramp cannot get, and if a man is wandering without a passport he is liable to arrest by the police!—That was not the idea we had. The idea was that by means of this registry the habitual tramp should be a known person, and when a habitual tramp presented himself at the workhouse, the Guardians would have power to detain him for some certain period and put him to work.

17485. As in England, they have power to keep him a certain number of days, increasing according to the number of times he goes there!—And compel him to work; that would prevent many from applying at all, and those who did apply and entered the workhouse, it would be the means of getting them back to work again.

17486. You would not go as far as this witness to whom I alluded, who said that if they had not their papers they would be about without lawful reason, and should be dealt with by the police, and either put into prison or a labour colony?—That was a different idea to the one which any Council had, but it there was labour colonies established that would be working out the same idea in another way—that there would be power not merely to detain him in the workhouse and compel him to work, but to send him to some place—a labour colony, such as you suggest—where he would be compelled to work.

17487. The idea that seems to preempt the foundation of these labour colonies seems to be that no people should be allowed to go strolling at large, loitering, committing, but if they say they cannot get work they should be put where they can get work, and be made to work, and these institutions made, as far as can be, self-supporting!—I would be thoroughly in favour of that. It would be producing the same thing by even a better means, because the casual work they would be put to in the workhouse might not be as good as the organized work in the labour colony. I don't know where you propose to establish these labour colonies.

17488. The thing is quite in the air; there are two or three Bills on the subject before Parliament at present!—But in the meantime the power to detain and make them work in the workhouse might be effectual while you were waiting for the establishment of labour colonies.

17489. Are you in a position to speak on any of the medical questions—the internal management of hospitals, and the separation of consumptive patients?—

No, sir; of course every one has agreed that consumptive patients ought to be separated, but I don't think it would be practicable to establish consumptive hospitals in each county; they should be central ones for certain districts.

17490. According to the number of people who would be likely to go?—I am not very much in favour of joint boards from my experience of them, but still in that case I think it would be hardly practicable to establish consumptive hospitals for each county, at least at all events.

17491. Was this meeting at which those questions were discussed summoned on due notice that this particular question was to come up?—It was, and copies of the queries were sent to each member of it.

17492. Amongst the members of the Council were there any members of the Boards of Guardians?—There were.

17493. Were there many of that type on the Council, men of experience in the work?—There were some representatives of the Boards of Guardians.

17494. Anyhow the result you came to was that you could not do without any workhouse in the county?—That was the opinion of the committee.

17495. And you think at the same time that the hospital and workhouse should be separate?—Yes.

17496. To carry out that view, would it mean the establishment of more institutions instead of getting rid of some that exist?—It would, that is if the hospitals are absolutely separate; but although we were in favour, if possible, of having these separate buildings, that was not made a *sine qua non*—that the management of them should be separate is what we considered essential, the management of the hospitals and of the unions, with, if possible, the buildings separate.

17497. But anyhow you did think it would be well to separate the sick from the ordinary pauper?—Yes, certainly.

17498. In this county I see by the latest return that the number classified as aged and infirm was something under 300. Do you think it would be wise to keep up three institutions in a county for such a number as that?—If a system of classification was carried out by which the aged and infirm would be put into one place, and another class kept in other institutions, 300 would apparently be a sufficient number to keep up one institution.

17499. You are quite of opinion that the children should be boarded out where it could possibly be done?—Yes.

17500. And in regard to those who would be temporarily taken from their parents, it was suggested that they could be sent to an industrial home. Do you not think it would be better to give the Guardians power to have certified homes in the neighbourhood, where these children could be retained temporarily?—You mean private dwellings.

17501. Private dwellings kept by people of good character, who would be certified as proper persons to keep these children until a fixed residence was obtained for them?—The suggestion about sending them to industrial schools was not made by our Council. It was suggested by the chairman and accepted by me, the plan of sending them to separate homes would be more in accordance with the views of the Council. I am not in favour of institutional life wherever it is possible to avoid it.

17502. Your Council seem to have decided that they preferred to enlarge the area of union rating to county rating in regard to all Poor Law purposes?—That was one of our suggestions.

17503. Any reasons given for that?—I don't think there were any reasons set out in the memorandum.

17504. Our experience so far is that when you widen the area you lessen inspection and increase the cost. We found that amongst our inquiries, especially in the North of Ireland, that the larger the area the less careful the management, and consequently the greater the cost. Did that idea occur to the Council at all when considering this matter?—No, sir; the idea was involved in the question of classifying the inmates in the different institutions. If different institutions were used for the purpose of classification it almost necessarily involved the question of county rating as opposed to union rating.

17505. Could not the Guardians of the different unions have power to pay for the keep of their inmates in this central institution without infringing at all upon the present management?—It might be done in that way, but I don't see how that would work very well. If the three workhouses that exist in the county

May 3, 1904.

Mr. Stephen J. Brown.

May 3, 1904.
Mr. Stephen J.
Brown.

were used for the classification of inmates for the needs of the entire county, it would appear to us to involve the question of county charges.

17506. In what way?—In the first place these workhouses should be under common management, if they are to be used interchangeably, as to speak. If all the paupers of one class from the entire county are to be sent to one place and all of another class to another place, I don't see how you could work it out except under common management.

17507. Could not the accounts of the institutions be kept and the cost per capita of the inmates found out, and then the Guardians of the different unions be asked to contribute their share?—It could be done that way, but you would lose the benefit of amalgamation. If they were all under one Board there would be a great saving of the cost in getting supplies.

17508. The central institution would be all under one management. The only other institutions you would have would be the infirmaries, where they are at present?—I don't think it would quite work out that way.

17509. It seems to me that according to the number of aged and infirm, these people who are entitled to support out of the public funds, only amounting to 300, one house ought to fully supply the wants of those 300 people?—But there are other inmates of the workhouse besides the aged and infirm; would they not remain in in other institutions?

17510. I thought the idea was that the children should be boarded out and not allowed into the workhouse at all, and I thought the lunatics should be sent either to an auxiliary asylum or to an asylum?—But there would remain other classes besides the aged and infirm, I think.

17511. What other classes would you have?—There are able-bodied paupers, and I suppose those women that come in temporarily, and other temporary inmates.

17512. The headings are sick, aged and infirm, mothers having infants, children, lunatics, idiots, convales or tramps, and all other classes, and the all other classes are practically the able-bodied, and they would come largely under the heading of men-and-children—people who are eligible subjects for labour colonies or such institutions?—There are a number of able-bodied inmates in the workhouse.

17513. There are not 4,000 in all Ireland out of 40,000—not one-tenth—and a great many of those are poor girls who have gone wrong and remain in their old age in the workhouse?—I have no notion as to the number that would remain after you took away what are classed as aged and infirm.

17514. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—The number, according to the last Census before us, was—sick 337, aged and infirm 294, mothers 59, children 51, lunatics 51, total in the county, 792 of all classes?—I did not hear those who are able-bodied.

CHAIRMAN.—Twenty-two at Athy, six at Colbridge, and three at Neas.

17515. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—They are included in the total of 792?—Certainly, if you take away the sick, and aged and infirm, there is very little left.

17516. In regard to the area of management, that seems to be a subject to which the Council has given considerable consideration. Have they any reason for suggesting that the management should be taken from the Board of Guardians?—No, they did not suggest that.

17517. Your recommendation was that it should be by a county committee?—No, that is with regard to hospitals only. Our idea was that the hospitals should be placed under a common system. The present system is altogether anomalous; the idea of the whole county paying for one institution, which only serves a limited area, as well as its also paying for its own institutions.

17518. That only applies to the county infirmary?—It applies only to the county infirmary.

17519. Just for the sake of doing that, would you take the whole thing out of the management of the present men who have been doing the work. Is there no other way of balancing the matter?—I don't think the present system has been altogether satisfactory. There is a provision for converting these into district hospitals; that has not been availed of.

17520. How has the management not been satisfactory?—I am not prepared to go into details.

17521. When a suggestion of that kind is made by a public man it ought to be backed up by some strong evidence. Your recommendation is that the work of the management of the Poor Law system should be taken out of the hands of the Guardians, and given to a committee appointed by the County Council?—Yes, that is the recommendation of the Council.

17522. Was anything said at the meeting as a reason for such a recommendation?—I have already stated that I have myself no intimate knowledge of the management either of unions or union infirmaries, but personally speaking from myself, and without referring upon any particular institution, I have been given to understand that the management of the union hospitals under the Guardians has been in many cases not satisfactory.

17523. Could you give particulars in any way, because so far as I know I have visited every hospital and infirmary in this county?—I did not make any selection upon this county at all. I am speaking of the management of hospitals by Boards of Guardians.

17524. I naturally thought you were speaking about the hospitals of the county you live in. I have visited the workhouse infirmaries of twenty-one counties in Ireland, and I must say they seem to me fairly well conducted, and some extremely well?—I have read some reports by medical authorities from which the opposite conclusion might be drawn.

17525. Then you have nothing to support your suggestion upon that the management should be transferred from the Guardians to a committee appointed by the County Council?—It is not based upon the management of any of the union hospitals in this county. Any charge that is advocated is not confined to this county alone, but is for the whole of Ireland.

17526. Had that the general support of your Council?—It had; not of the Council, but of the committee specially appointed.

17527. Of how many members did the committee consist?—Some seven or eight.

17528. Have you many tramps in this county?—I have already stated I have little or no knowledge of the internal workings of unions. I have never been a member of the Poor Law Board, and those questions will be fully answered for you by gentlemen who have more intimate knowledge than I have. But I may say that at times there is a very considerable influx of tramps.

17529. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose last week you had a few?—Last week, and on occasions of that kind, we are very freely visited by them.

17530. Dr. BROGAN.—Was the committee that considered all these questions a representative committee of the County Council?—It was; it was the Finance Committee, a standing committee; it was referred to them.

17531. Was it a full meeting of the committee?—It was not a very large committee, only four or five members present.

17532. Was it a unanimous decision they arrived at with regard to putting the hospitals on a county basis?—It was.

17533. CHAIRMAN.—Did their report come before the Council afterwards?—It did not come before the Council for the reasons already mentioned.

17534. Dr. BROGAN.—Will it come before the Council?—It can be found. If the Commissioners thought it desirable we might go into the whole question again, but we have gone into it very fully and carefully.

17535. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Was Mr. Minch present?—He was.

17536. Dr. BROGAN.—Regarding the cottage hospital, is it supported entirely by the subscribers?—It is.

17537. Has it anything to do with the members of the Hunt?—I think not. It was established originally as a memorial to the late Lord Drogheda. There was a subscription, which supplied the capital funds, and then it is maintained by annual subscriptions since then.

17538. I thought perhaps it was maintained largely for the treatment of servants of the household?—I think not. It is called the Drogheda Memorial Hospital, and was established by public subscriptions in memory of Lord Drogheda.

17539. Is it a small hospital?—I think there are only about eight or ten beds in it altogether.

Mr. ROBERT KENNEDY, M.C., A.P., examined.

May 5, 1904.

Mr. Robert Kennedy.

17542. CHAIRMAN.—Are you a member of the County Council?—No, I am not. I was formerly Chairman of the Colbridge Union, and I was an elected Guardian there for about forty years.

17543. And you are Lord Lieutenant of the county?—Yes.

17544. You have seen these queries?—Yes.
17545. Is there any subject in particular that you would like to express your views on?—Well, I came here chiefly to say how very desirable it would be to have Colbridge Workhouse and all workhouses more or less as district hospitals. We worked for years at Colbridge, and our whole object was to make it into a district hospital—to get people of all classes and ranks into it—and with great success. I may just give an instance that when we found that the vehicle for taking people into the workhouse was a sort of coffin on wheels, we got a cab and did not put "Colbridge Workhouse" on it, but "Colbridge Infirmary." That was our policy, and when the Local Government Act passed I wrote to the late chairman asking him to induce the Board to come under the Act, and make the workhouse into a district hospital.

17546. They did take some steps?—He promised to do it, but I never heard what they did.

17547. Some steps were taken, but some difficulties arose?—And my object in coming here to the Commission was this, that living in the country and in that union for years, I look upon it that it would be disastrous to do away with Colbridge Workhouse, because it really is at present a district hospital, and read by a great number of the better class people, and they have confidence in it.

17548. You speak from the point of view of the sick?—Mainly for the sick.

17549. Not as regards what you might call able-bodied?—There were no able-bodied people at all in the workhouse; in fact we had a difficulty in getting women. We had to pay for women to do the work. We improved the hospital, and I speak, I am certain, for all the steps of the district from one end of the union to the other, that they would look on it almost as a disaster if the workhouse was done away with, because it would be practically doing away with the hospital. What I would point out to the Commissioners is this, that the County Council, and I think the County Council in Kildare, so far as I know, are a very economic body, they certainly don't wish to increase rates, that they elected as soon as they were appointed that there was not sufficient hospital accommodation in the county, in Naas, Athy, and Colbridge, although the hospitals there had been greatly improved, and they made a fourth hospital at Kildare; they re-opened the infirmary there. In doing away with Colbridge Workhouse it would be doing away with a district hospital.

17550. It never has been suggested that there should not be a hospital at Colbridge. It has been suggested that the able-bodied could be removed to other centres, so that the entire of the building could be used for the sick?—That would be all; in my day there were no able-bodied at all.

17551. What would you do about the aged and infirm?—I would leave them there.

17552. You have in the hospital about seventy patients?—Yes.

Mr. JAMES STUNDERLAND examined.

17553. CHAIRMAN.—You are also a member of the County Council?—Yes.

17554. And you are, as we know, a member of the Committee of the County Kildare Infirmary?—Yes.

17555. You have heard the evidence of Mr. Brown and Mr. Kennedy this morning. I don't know whether you would care to go in detail through the various questions, or whether there is anything you would like to take up specially out of what has been said?—Well, I had not the privilege of being a member of the Finance Committee, so therefore I was not at their meetings; we did I see the questions agreed.

17556. Are you a member of the Board of Guardians?—Yes, Athy.

17557. You remember the evidence of Mr. Brown on the question of the hospitals. How far would you agree that they should be under county management or union management?—I think I would prefer these under the Guardians, that is in the different divisions.

17558. And then you have among the aged and infirm people who are able to be up and to be about—you have about eighty of these?—Yes.

17559. You would leave these there, too?—I would. I am looking to the future. I don't look for the present. I am of opinion that in years to come our population may increase. I hope it won't go on decreasing. The country is more or less going back now because people cannot get work. I believe that applies to a great many parts of Ireland, but I look for the time when men may not remain as it is now. When it gets a better price there will be more tillage, and the population may increase when the people are better housed, and therefore the Commissioners ought not to act on the belief that our population will go on decreasing. I look forward to better times, particularly when the people become peasant proprietors, that the population, I hope, will perhaps increase. Our policy at Colbridge, during the forty years I was there was to do all we possibly could to make the workhouse into a district hospital solely, and to do all we could for the poor, and in doing that I am satisfied we were doing good to the extent, because when the hospital was going the shorter time the patients were in and on the rates.

17560. The aged and infirm are there practically for the rest of their lives. They are not in any cases hospital patients?—Yes; I would leave them there.

17561. But they are not sick?—No, certainly not.

17562. Why would you leave them there?—There would be a staff there.

17563. A different staff altogether?—Of course, I did not care so much if they were removed as long as the hospital remained.

17564. Mr. MURPHY.—You would see no objection, if the hospital remained, to have the able-bodied removed to some other place?—No, except this, that a great many relations go and see them. I was always myself personally a great advocate of outdoor relief, and the Board in my days were of the same view, but then we looked very carefully after the people outside.

17565. Do you not think it rather a gloomy existence for these old people to be kept in the house during the day passed up without any exercise or fresh air, or occupation, nothing to shorten the day. Would they not be better removed to some place where they could be classified and occupied?—Certainly, if you could do that.

17566. If that could be done you think it would be an improvement?—Yes, except that their relations could not go and see them.

17567. Have the old and infirm any visitors?—Oh, they certainly go and see the sick in hospital.

17568. They go and see the sick very frequently, but as regards the chronic cases, they have very few visitors?—I think the old people have not. I will just give the Commissioners an instance of the use of the hospital. The wife of a man in my employment, with four or five children, went there, and I thought it was a hard thing that the poor thing should die in hospital away from her children and family, and I went to see her, and told her I would try and get her a nurse, but she preferred, although greatly attached to her children, to remain and die in the Colbridge Infirmary Hospital. I don't think a greater compliment could be paid to the management of the Guardians than that; she died there.

17569. At Athy, for instance?—Under the Athy Board of Guardians.

17570. And Naas?—Under the Naas Board of Guardians.

17571. And Colbridge the same way. Then the county infirmary. What would you do as regards that?—I would have it under the same management as it is, appointed by the County Council; but as regards the Kildare Infirmary, it serves a larger area than five miles.

17572. From what distance do your patients come?—The principal come from five miles, but they come from all parts of the county.

17573. Do you ever get them from Colbridge?—The north part of the county don't send so much; they are nearer Dublin, and send their patients there.

17574. And they have a good operating-room in Colbridge, and good facilities for operations there, so there

Mr. James Stunderland

May 3, 1904.

Mr. James
Wendland.

is no reason why they should come south; but do you get patients from the south of the county?—Yes, from Athy and Monasterevan.

17573. Castledermot?—Yes; they take a good deal of patients from the Athy Union, from Monasterevan.

17574. Would you get them from Castledermot off the railway line?—Very seldom.

17575. Did you ever get a patient there?—Not to my knowledge. I quite agree with Mr. Brown that Bellinglass No. 3 should be added to the Athy Union, because it is more convenient for the patients there. It is very hard for patients to have to go five or six miles for a dispensary doctor when there is one in the town where they live. One side of the town of Castledermot is in Bellinglass and the other side of the street is Athy; and I also agree with him that Eldersley should be added to Colbride.

17576. Would you like the whole county to be self-contained for Poor Law purposes?—Yes.

17577. As regards the conversation this morning about girls who go into the workhouse to have illegitimate children, what would you think about that?—I think there should be a home for these people to go into.

17578. Would you retain the workhouse for them still, or would you rather send them to a refuge under religious management?—Yes, under religious management somewhere, and then board out the child and let her go back to service and pay for the boarding out of the child. I think that would be better.

17579. As regards the children in workhouses, are you in favour of having them boarded out altogether?—I would have them boarded out altogether, with or without the consent of their parents.

17580. And you would have legislation to enable that to be done with lunatics, and idiots, and epileptics?—I would have them removed to an asylum.

17581. Then the other main class that you have in workhouses would be the aged and infirm—what would you do as regards them?—I would board them out as far as possible.

17582. That would be outdoor relief practically?—Yes, or a place for them separately.

17583. One workhouse set apart for them, you don't see any objection to that?—I don't see any objection to that.

17584. Casuals and tramps, what would you do with them?—I think the Guardians should be empowered to retain them for a certain period, say three days, or longer.

17585. As in England; there is power given recently to Guardians in England to retain them. You would approve of that power?—I would approve of that, and that they be empowered to prosecute them, and that they have to do certain work, and if they did not do that I would prosecute them.

17586. Have you heard at all of this new idea of labour colonies. It has been suggested that a big farm should be taken—two or three for the county, or something of that sort, and that these tramps, and people who are hopping in and out of the workhouse, unprofitable labourers, raising families and propagating pauper children after them, it has been suggested that they should be sent to these institutions under the name of labour colonies, and detained there under a magistrate's warrant as long as was thought necessary?—I certainly would approve of that.

17587. Do you see many of that class strolling through the country?—Yes; there is a regular stream of them coming along the roads from one union to another.

17588. Are there many, as far as your observations go, that are going through the country with carts and things that don't go near workhouses, and manage to camp out?—Very few.

17589. Up at Eldersley we got evidence that there were great numbers of them going through that part of the country in their carts with their carts and never going into workhouses?—They are not in our part of the county.

17590. And they consider them a most objectionable class?—I think the tramps are the most objectionable.

17591. If all these classes were dealt with in the way you now express your approval of, practically no one would remain in the workhouse but the sick, if they would become district hospitals, and that you approve of?—I approve of that.

17592. Mr. MURPHY.—Do you think it would be better to take out the aged and infirm from these institutions they are in at present and put them in some

place where they would have some recreation and occupation?—I think it would. I think it would be wise, too.

17593. It would lighten the monetary and give them an interest in life if they had exercise and occupation?—I would approve of that.

17594. Seeing that there are only about 320 aged and infirm in the county, would you not think one institution in Kildare for that particular class alone would be enough?—I would.

17595. Supposing there is another way of providing for them, and that infirmaries are kept where they are at present and improved, do you think that would be an improvement?—I think it would.

17596. Dr. BROWN.—Did you consider the question of the tramps and consumptive patients?—I did, at least in my own mind, and I believe there is a great want of as hospital in this county for consumptive patients.

17597. Do you know if there are many consumptive patients?—I believe there are a good many.

17598. Have you thought out how the hospital might be provided, and under what management it should be placed?—I think it should be helped by the State, and I think it should be under the management of a committee appointed by the County Council—a representative body.

17599. Whose would the rate be raised, would it be a county rate?—It should be a county rate, but I believe the State should help in the matter.

17600. As far as being a county rate, it would be on the same basis as the county infirmary?—Yes.

17601. Would it not be well to have all the hospitals on the same footing?—I think it would be better to have the county infirmary and the consumptives on the county, because it would be the only one for the county, and would serve the whole county.

17602. How is the county infirmary managed?—By a county committee appointed by the County Council.

17603. Are there many local members upon it?—There are a good many.

17604. And they take a keen interest in it?—They do.

17605. Supposing the other hospitals were on the same basis, with local committees for supervision, and looking after details?—I would imagine they are under local committees when they are under the Board of Guardians.

17606. But for the purpose of getting the rate on a more equitable basis?—But you see the hospital at Athy serves only for Athy, whereas the county infirmary serves for the whole county.

17607. Are there not operations performed in the Athy hospital, and in Naas, and in Colbride?—There are some slight operations.

17608. I think there are large numbers; for instance, in Colbride there is a very good operating room, just as good as you have in the county infirmary.

Chairman.—Is it that they have spent some money on the Colbride operating room.

17609. Dr. BROWN.—And all the cases requiring operations from the neighbourhood are treated there and borne by the local rate?—In other hospitals it is borne by the local rate.

17610. Kildare Infirmary is kept up at the expense of Colbride and Naas—is that correct?—Oh, yes; but then Naas and Colbride have the privilege of sending their patients there.

17611. If they don't avail themselves of the privilege?—They can do it; perhaps they prefer sending them to Dublin.

17612. You think because they have the privilege, although they don't use it, it is all right?—They have the privilege.

17613. Would it not be economical to have all the hospitals on one basis so that nurses could be changed from one institution to another. You did not think of that?—I did not consider that.

17614. Would that alter your opinion in any way if you saw there was some economy in it?—If there was economy in it.

17615. And also putting the hospitals on one uniform basis. Would not that be an advantage, and making it a county rate with local committees, the county hospital out of the rate, and the county sanatorium out of the rate, and these district hospitals out of the rate?—I believe myself it would be more economical to have it a district.

17616. Why?—I think the people would try and keep down their rates in their own district.

17617. Why not then have the county on the district rating?—That is the county infirmary?

17513. No, the county rate. You have a county rate for other purposes. The same thing ought to apply in one case as in another?—I think it would be more economical to have it on the whole district rating.

17519. Not always; it is not always an advantage to have a hospital worked on too narrow lines?—No.

Mr. N. J. STENNETT, M.A., J.P., examined.

Well, in answer to these queries, I prepared a short statement. I did not follow exactly the order of the queries, but I prepared a short answer, I think, dealing with all the points, and submitted it to our board, and they agreed with them and suggested some alterations.

17521. CHAIRMAN.—Is that the Naas Board?—The Naas Board of Guardians (No. 4), which includes part of the County Wicklow. Of course, this is only a summary. The first question is the question of amalgamation. I don't think, really, that question arises at all. I don't think there is any demand for it or that it has ever been suggested in this county until this Commission was appointed. I don't think it arises unless it is deemed advisable in some way to join some portion of the Coleridge Union with the neighbouring Unions of Dublin and Meath. That I am not in a position to go into at all; but as for amalgamation, what seems to be forgotten is that to make a sick person or aged and infirm persons travel a greater distance than they now have to travel to get relief is a virtual denial of relief, and if they must get relief that most infallibly increases the outdoor relief, in which our board have the strongest objection on account of its abuse, and therefore to speak of amalgamation as if dealing merely with figures and not to think of distances is not to deal with realities. In parts of our union, in the County Wicklow, they have to come from five miles the other side of Blessington. To tell a person, who is aged or infirm or sick that he will have to go to Coleridge to get cured is a denial of relief to the very persons who ought to have it at their hands, and that, I think, settles the question of amalgamation.

17522. It never has been suggested to us that the number of hospitals should be reduced in Ireland?—No; but I have heard the suggestion since I have been in the room, and I have followed the questions and the answers given to this Commission in other places, and in every union the question of amalgamation or abolition of workhouses has been suggested.

17523. Of workhouses as workhouses?—Very well, but that involves the suggestion that the aged and infirm in each district should have a further distance to go.

17524. Yes, it does?—Very well, I shall wait until some witness here comes and proves that in this county my union is so small that it would not be a very great inconvenience, and, in fact, a denial of relief, to make the aged and infirm and sick travel a longer distance.

17525. Not the sick?—Well, either one or the other. From the very nature of the case you must give relief to the infirm near at hand or you must increase the outdoor relief.

17526. Suppose Naas, for instance, were made the central union of the county—were made the headquarters for the aged and infirm of the county?—Do you mean that no aged and infirm should be received into the others?

17527. Into no other workhouse?—What then is the aged and infirm person living near Athy to do?

17528. They would come by train to Naas?—What about the expense of that?

17529. The question is, would the expense counterbalance the saving of abolishing the salaries of all the side-bodied part of the house at present?—I, personally, should be most strongly against that, and not only that, but it would be impossible to test it. After all, the test is supposed to be destruction. How can we, living in Naas, test or know whether persons living a few miles from Athy would be destitute or not?

17530. It would be the relieving officer of the district that you would have to rely upon, as at present?—Not at all; you might as well abolish Boards of Guardians.

17531. How would you test the destination of a person living at Kilbride, County Wicklow?—Because we take care that either the local Guardian or somebody locally is consulted as far as possible.

17532. Surely you don't mean to say that the people from Kilbride or Blessington are never admitted into the local Guardian has been consulted?—Not at all;

17533. However, as far as the County Infirmary is concerned and the County Sanatorium you would have them county charged?—On the county rates; and as Mr. Jones regards a place for the sanatorium, I would suggest the Sandwell Crag—fine fresh air and a good dry soil.

May 5, 1904.
Mr. Jones
Sandwell Crag.

but you suggest that the statement of the relieving officer should be accepted.

17533. On what else do you ever go?—Upon local information and inquiries made.

17534. Are not the people from those places, as a matter of fact, admitted into the Naas Workhouse without the Guardians having any knowledge of the fact until it comes up before them on the register for approval?—We don't admit a person permanently.

17535. But do you ever turn them out; is it not a fact that the relieving officer admits a person and he remains permanently; can you give me an instance where he has not?—You better ask our clerk.

17536. I am asking you, because you have such a strong opinion on it?—No; but I point out this that if you make aged and infirm persons come a long distance to be relieved they may not come, and they may ask for outdoor relief.

17537. It does tend to increase that?—Then if we rely on outdoor relief it is almost impossible to exercise local supervision. It is a matter rather outside my memorandum, and it is therefore rather difficult to give an answer straightway; but you asked me how we tested a person in the aged and infirm ward apart from the statement of the relieving officer. The case of destitution or not comes up on the report of the Master or on the examination of the list as to whether he is able to pay or not.

17538. The Master, of course, is living in Naas, and knows nothing about these remote districts?—I think I am right in saying a list is sent round by the clerk, and the local Guardians do inquire.

17539. There would be no difficulty in sending such a list round to the Guardians of the county?—I think, if you ask me, our districts are, if anything, too large for the purpose of supervision, and unless you have supervision of the Poor Law there will be an enormous increase in the rates. With regard to the suggestion of classification I think that, if possible, the aged and infirm and permanently incapacitated who are not sick, and therefore don't require the daily attendance or constant attendance of a doctor, should be under separate treatment with a separate regime, and in separate wards, as far as possible.

17540. Again, you would not agree that a central institution for the county would meet that?—No; I would be absolutely against that.

17541. Such central institution would admit of such classification as you recommend?—It seems to me to alter the whole basis of the Poor Law, and, with all respect, I don't think such a suggestion is involved either in the warrant appointing the Commission, or indeed was ever intended by Parliament that altering the whole basis of the Poor Law should be conducted by an inquiry of this kind—a Local Government's Commission. If you do that you must alter the whole system of election of Boards of Guardians.

17542. That may be faced?—That was never intended under this Commission.

17543. You have your opinion of what was intended; you must permit us to have our opinion?—At any rate I can say that I don't think it is the proper way to alter, radically, the whole basis of the Poor Law.

17544. You recommend this improved classification. How would you carry that out in the Naas Workhouse?—To be candid, I should like, if possible, theoretically.

17545. Practically?—I had better take it in steps, because there is a question whether the money is forthcoming, and there is no use speculating about district hospitals if we have not the funds to build them.

17546. I am not speaking about district hospitals, but this question of aged and infirm and those who don't require hospital treatment; how you are going to give them a better regime?—A more liberal scale of diet than side-bodied paupers; but what I wish to avoid is this, I wish to avoid persons being treated as sick and getting a better treatment as sick who are only aged and infirm. I think there ought to be a uniform scale of diet for aged and infirm, and they

May 5, 1894.

Mr. N. J.
Synge.

should be kept in a separate ward, and that the curable sick should be under the doctor's hands, and to them should be permitted to order special food and, shall I add, special drink.

17647. He has that power at present?—It may be rather liberally applied to the whole body of aged sick and infirm. Mr. O'Grady, who is here, has taken a special interest in the very large increase in the consumption of spirits in our workhouse, amongst others, by the aged and infirm, and certainly, I think, there is great room for economy in that regard. When you have persons, as we have found, who have been constantly getting almost daily allowances of spirits and porter, who have been years in the workhouse, who certainly would never have got it outside in their own homes, I think that special treatment should be confined to the sick. And there are other matters. I think there should be uniformity of treatment and diet in the aged and infirm wards, subject, of course, to the discretion of the doctor.

17648. That is what does exist you are aware?—I think there ought to be some stringent rules; there are a great many workhouses where I think the sick and infirm are not kept separate; sick is a very wide word—I mean by it a curable person.

17649. Do you think these aged and infirm should come into workhouses; would you approve of leaving them altogether in the same wards as they are at present—I mean people who come in who are rather respectable old people—and respectable people, would you leave them together, as at present?—I was just going to answer that question. I fail to see, and I am confirmed in my opinion by the report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons, how in the case of the past lives of persons you can distinguish between the deserving and undeserving, and the respectable or non-respectable; you cannot do it; you can only judge of their behavior in the workhouse. I am confirmed by the report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on what was called "The Outrage Houses Bill." They reported there, and the "Committee of the Royal Commission on the Aged Poor" reported the same things, "that to judge the character of applicants for relief and to prepare a system of classification by past character would present the greatest difficulties."

17650. You would not attempt to classify them?—I think it would be extremely difficult; you can distinguish the tramp class, of course, and the vagrant, and the in-and-out class, but how are you to define the deserving and the respectable?

17651. The reason I asked you is that you use the phrase in your memorandum, "the deserving infirm." I wanted to get at your definition of that?—If they have a long distance to travel there would be many deserving amongst them.

17652. You would not be able to sort them?—No; I don't think it is possible. As regards the treatment of the aged and infirm, I say it is against the principles of the Poor Law that the treatment of the aged and infirm should be much better than that of the same class outside the workhouse. It is right that they should be properly treated and with due regard to their age and infirmity, but if you establish a system of treatment which is higher than they receive in their own homes you are virtually encouraging people to come to the workhouse.

17653. That we may take as an axiom?—Yes; but I should like to see that carried out in practice. With regard to the sick, I say theoretically it would be most desirable to have all the sick treated in separate hospitals, but the question is whether that can be done; the workhouses are there, as has been pointed out; some of them are not full, and if the lunatics and epileptics and the children are taken away there will be more room left for the sick, and the question is how we could possibly get from the Government, or from anybody, money to build separate hospitals outside. I agree it would be very desirable there should be separate hospitals, and I think these separate hospitals would probably be largely subsidised as the hospitals in Dublin are by private charity, but unless the Government give us money I confess I don't see how these separate hospitals would be built, and therefore I am driven to think you must keep the sick, if possible, in separate wards or perhaps in separate buildings in the existing workhouses, and be under district management. There is no doubt that that is the more economical method of management with a smaller area, and I heard the suggestion from one of the members of

the Commission that you should have county management and county rates, and local bodies managing them.

17654. Dr. BOONER.—A hospital committee composed of members of the County Council and other members?—If the rate was a county rate.

17655. CHAIRMAN.—You must not assume we are expressing our own opinions when we put questions?—I have no doubt some one else suggested it. No; but a local committee which was powerless over the rates would not have much stimulus to exercise any great supervision.

17656. With regard to the Kildare Infirmary, does it get much from voluntary contributions?—I think there was a capital sum subscribed to put it in order, but I don't think there are large annual contributions.

17657. You seem to anticipate that if there were separate hospitals they might receive voluntary contributions?—If there were I should largely hope to see paying patients. I should be very glad to be sent there. If there were separate wards we should have banners started to support them and we should have separate buildings where people would go and pay and be taken away from infection, but now the only people interested in the sick in the county are practically the Boards of Guardians.

17658. MR. MURTAGHAN.—Might you not carry the question of hospitals too far; is not the natural place if one can afford it when he gets sick, his own home?—The doctors are inclined to think that with trained nurses and scientific appliances and daily and nightly attendance, having regard to the danger of infection, the best place is the hospital.

17659. Where the case is not infectious?—If it is a surgical case it is often better treated in rooms attached to a hospital, as is universally done in Dublin.

17660. Is an institution like that a good place in which to place a child?—There is often no room for a nurse in a small house, and country doctors' attendance must necessarily not always be daily. But I don't see the possibility of getting funds for these separate hospitals.

17661. CHAIRMAN.—Therefore you would let the present buildings be used as they are?—Unless the Government are prepared to come down with the money.

17662. Assuming that was not done, would you leave it with the Board of Guardians or with a district committee similar to that suggested in one of the sections of the Local Government Act?—You must always remember that the Board of Guardians are responsible for the money and have to fix the rate, and the majority of people after all will be the destitute pauper, and I think, in the interests of the community, the Board of Guardians should have the controlling power.

17663. Under the Local Government Act they should be two-thirds of that number?—The doctor, I think, and two or three competent persons would be very desirable; of course, the remainder I make don't apply to comprehensive hospitals, which I hope will be a county affair.

17664. Or even larger perhaps?—The only question is if the disease is infectious; probably if there were such hospitals established it might be derived out altogether, or largely diminished. The question is whether such hospitals should not be rather temporary structures than permanent stone buildings. However, I leave that for the experts to decide on. With regard to non-dangerous lunatics and epileptics, they should certainly be removed from the workhouse; it is the law now, and I understand the Boards of Guardians can call upon the County Lunacy Committee to take them into the lunatic asylums, but we have had the greatest difficulty in getting the County Asylums authority to accept our lunatics, who are not dangerous lunatics, although they get 4s. a week per head for their maintenance. They say they have not space for them. At the same time, although a temporary measure may be taken for their support, it is a question whether they should not be really properly cared for in some place apart from dangerous lunatics, where the expense of keeping some epileptics and non-dangerous lunatics ought to be much less and require much less medical supervision than dangerous lunatics. With regard to tramps, I find a difficulty, which I think any gentleman must feel, in answering the question as to tramps unless the cause of the matter is gone into. I have followed with some care the evidence given before this Commission in many places, and it seems to me that the habit, objects, and modes of life and mode of dress should be gone into, otherwise we won't get an effectual remedy. That was gone into very

condemned by local inquiries all over Ireland in the case of the Poor Law Commission, and it is evident from that that the nature of the tramp has entirely varied.

17605. Or would you say it is their story has varied?—I imagine it really is different. As I read that evidence they really were in most cases people who did work work and food.

17606. That was when we had a large population—over eight millions—in the country?—Yes. In the present case the tramp is a person who will not work or will not work continuously, and therefore you are dealing with quite a different class of person from those who were dealt with by the Poor Law Commission of 1834.

17607. We have got a good deal of interesting evidence about that—I am afraid it has not been published yet—the evidence as to why people are tramps or what makes them tramps.

17608. Have you any evidence on that?—No, I have not. From the very nature of the case that should be the evidence of the police or persons who have studied their habits.

17609. We have been in communication with the police on the subject?—With regard to the remedy to be applied, first of all with regard to the detection in the workhouse, I understand that the Local Government Board can make an order to-morrow and allow us to detain, and, secondly, even if that were allowed it is a question whether it would be effectual, as I understand it has not been effectual in England.

17610. There has been a labour colony agitation?—Yes; and there has been the strongest pressure brought to bear on the Government to appoint a Commission to inquire into the tramp question in England. If you drive him out of these institutions altogether you will only perhaps drive him to sleep in the huts, which may not be altogether pleasant. I suggest, really, that there should be a careful inquiry into the cause of vagrancy before any remedy is applied.

17611. Have you observed in your own experience of the country anything that you would be inclined to attribute as one of the causes of vagrancy?—I really cannot. I have often asked questions of those tramps who come up to one's hall-door, why they were carrying on this trade, if I may call it, and I never could get a clear answer. I often found that they would tell you they were going in one direction, and following their movements, you would find they were going in an opposite direction.

17612. Did it ever occur to you that they were largely hereditary tramps?—I am not sure.

17613. Have you seen with a great many of these tramps their children going about with them?—No, the men with children are what they call gypsies, who travel about in vans. They did seem to carry on a certain kind of trade, selling pines or making baskets. The tramp I refer to is in the ill-bodied gentleman who won't work.

17614. You have not observed women going about with children?—I have not seen many. It has been suggested that whereas begging, I believe, now is unlawful in a public place, it is not unlawful I believe in a private place, so that a man may come up and beg at your hall-door, and in your house, or trade premises, and cannot be punished I believe, whereas if he begs on the public road he can be arrested and punished. Whether that would prevent a man coming up to one's hall-door and begging, I am not sure, but there seems no reason why it should not be as unlawful to come into a shop and beg as to beg outside the shop.

17615. Mr. MURKIN.—But there are beggars and beggars?—No doubt.

17616. Some people perhaps are deserving beggars?—But it is none the less unlawful, because it is impossible to distinguish between the deserving and the undeserving. With regard to children, it certainly seems desirable that all children, except infants of course, should be removed and boarded out, either at or present in houses or sent to industrial schools. These again, who is to establish and pay for these industrial schools? That seems to be a crucial question, how these are to be paid for and supported. I don't attach much importance to that remedy unless funds are provided.

17617. What about using one of the disused workhouses?—I thought I had given a satisfactory reason that you could not possibly use many of these workhouses. If you will allow me to say, I cannot help remarking that there have been other suggestions made from time to time before this Commission which I am absolutely opposed to, and I know that our Board are

also absolutely opposed to. I have drawn their attention more than once to them, and that is the suggestion that adult inmates, and aged and infirm, should be boarded out, either in houses or elsewhere, and also that idiots and epileptics should be boarded out, as I believe takes place in Scotland now. I think one witness went so far in Mullingar as to suggest that workhouses should be abolished altogether, and to substitute outdoor for indoor relief. It seems to me that that, with all respect, goes to the very basis of the Poor Law, and I could give reasons if necessary for showing that it is certainly not included in the queries sent to us and in the terms of reference, because I understand here from that that the governing words in these terms of reference were the amalgamation or abolition of workhouses, and the consequent alteration in the treatment or classification of the inmates.

17618. CHAIRMAN.—I don't think you will find "consequent" anywhere?—The concluding paragraph, which is the general paragraph, authorises the Commission "generally to inquire and report whether any, and what, administrative and financial changes are desirable in order to secure a more economical system for the relief of the sick, the insane, and all classes of destitute poor in Ireland." These are administrative and financial changes in order to secure a more economical system. These words, I submit with all respect—the reason I do so is because this suggestion as to outdoor and indoor relief has been made—those words do not cover the abolition of workhouses and the substitution of outdoor relief.

17619. I suppose they did in the mind of the witness who made that suggestion?—The question was raised more than once, and I would ask you either not to consider it or to report against it. I have the strongest opinion on that matter, that unless outdoor relief is diminished as much as possible, the expenditure of the Guardians cannot be controlled at all. The grave reason in the absence of evidence of destitution except the statement of the relieving officer. It would lead to extravagance, and dry up the springs of charity. Many aged and infirm persons are now voluntarily supported by relatives who would be put upon the rates as soon as the workhouse and is received.

17620. Mr. MURKIN.—Is it not possible that outdoor relief, properly safeguarded, is a very economical system?—For the reasons which are given in the report of the Poor Law Commission, and every Commission, it cannot be properly safeguarded.

Mr. MURKIN.—I don't look upon that as an infallible decision of all.

17621. CHAIRMAN.—That was a most representative Commission?—Yes; some of the ablest men in Ireland were on it—two Archbishops, Dr. Murray, Archbishop of Dublin, and I think Dr. Trench. There was an inquiry in England just before, and there have been Parliamentary inquiries since.

17622. Do you know what action was taken on that report?—The Irish Poor Law was the result.

17623. The Irish Poor Law did not follow that report. It was the result of a report made by one gentleman, a Mr. Nicholls, an official with no previous knowledge of this country.

Witness.—He had their report before him.

CHAIRMAN.—And he went in direct opposition to it.

Witness.—Is what point?

CHAIRMAN.—The report of this most representative Commission was criticised by him in every way.

Witness.—I don't agree in that; he was against outdoor relief.

CHAIRMAN.—Oh, yes, on that point they agreed. I had not in view the disapproval of outdoor relief, but the recommendations of the Commission. I was referring to the last paragraph in your observations here, in which you say, "the only representative Commission which inquired into a thing of this sort." Well, that was a most representative Commission, but yet the Poor Law which we are inquiring into was founded and framed on the report of one man—an Englishman or Scotchman.

Witness.—I don't see that that is relevant to the question I am dealing with, when we find both this Commission and Mr. Nicholls opposed to outdoor relief.

CHAIRMAN.—This observation of yours, that the Poor Relief Act was the result of that Commission, is general, and is not restricted to outdoor relief at all.

Witness.—I have said I don't think that your terms of reference cover a complete reform of the basis of the Poor Law, which would involve also an alteration in the local government. I say that that was never intended to be carried out by a Commission of this kind.

CHAIRMAN.—Well, your assertions are very forcible.

Aug 3, 1904.

Mr. N. J. Symonds.

May 3, 1884.

Mr. S. J.
Byrne.

Witness.—I would be very much obliged if the Commission will show me under what head of inquiry—
CHAIRMAN.—We are not here to answer any questions put in this way by you as to our warrant.

Witness.—No, no; but under what head of inquiry is the substitution in any manner of outdoor relief for indoor relief warranted?

CHAIRMAN.—We have not asked you any questions on the subject. You are speaking of a report you read of evidence at Mullingar.

Witness.—I have a right to consider the evidence given by other persons, which, presumably, will be taken into account by the Commission.

17684. CHAIRMAN.—I don't remember that evidence?—That evidence having been given, I suppose I have a right to deal with it. You certainly received evidence with which our Board dealt more than once, that idiots and epileptics should be boarded out. We were most strongly against that, because there would not be the proper supervision at all of them by the farmers and

people who had control of them. They would be taken from the immediate and direct care of the doctor. A new terror will be added to life by the prospect of meeting these idiots and epileptics in country roads; and another thing is, the border line between dangerous and non-dangerous lunatics being not always easy to draw, you might have cases of dangerous or semi-dangerous lunatics, or people of a doubtful kind of insanity being put around care in country districts; and I don't like the idea of epileptic persons being sent to homes round the country where they may be wandering about the roads and frightening women and children.

17685. I don't know what class of person you suppose an epileptic is?—I have seen them.

17686. You mean getting that?—I do. I think it would be most objectionable. That was brought seriously forward by more than one person before this Inquiry; that is though I say I don't think the boarding out of idiots and epileptics was ever intended by the Warrant of the Commission.

Mr. John Steel
Of Counsel.

Mr. JOHN STEEL (OF COUNSEL).

I represent Naas No. 1 Rural District, and the area is the same as the area of the Union, except a small portion that runs into the Co. Wicklow. This subject came up before the District Council and was placed on the agenda, and the whole matter was considered by the full Council, and the Council were entirely opposed to the amalgamation. Some of the members of the Council were of opinion that there might be some change made in Coleridge Union, but they considered the gentlemen from Coleridge would be able to look after their own affairs, and they thought it better to confine their entire attention to their own district. They were of opinion that amalgamation was not necessary, as the Naas Union was a large union, and the workhouse was situated in the centre of it, and the transit of the sick poor was facilitated by that fact, and they considered that if it was enlarged it would be a great hardship on the sick poor to have to be brought a greater distance, and also that it would hamper the performance of the duties of members of the Board of Guardians. Some of them have to come a great distance at present, and if the area was extended they would not be able to attend as well as heretofore.

17687. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Brown told us of some of your economies in the Naas Union?—I attend fairly regularly, and take a great interest in looking after things.

17688. I understand the expenditure has been considerably reduced lately?—Yes, a new scale of dietary has been adopted, and as far as that has gone at present, we have been able to save £5 a week.

17689. That is on the whole; on the inside I believe something has been saved?—Yes, I was continually bringing before the Board the expenditure on stimulants. I thought it was extravagant. Of course it is all in the hands of the doctor, and the doctor in this union met us very fairly by trying to economise in every way he could.

17690. Is the result a considerable economy?—Yes, £5 a week. With regard to the harmless lunatics, we are very badly situated in Naas Union. We have no accommodation whatsoever for them; in fact the hall they live in in the day-time is the sleeping apartment at night.

17691. The same room for both?—Yes. Not very long ago I was appointed on a committee to inspect this place. I went into this hall-way, and I assure you I got out of it as quickly as I could. It was something terrible the stench of it.

17692. I suppose some of these poor people are not able to take care of themselves?—Yes. The Council are of opinion it would be a good thing to establish an asylum for harmless lunatics, provided the area of charge was made over two or three counties.

17693. The same as the asylums are at present?—Yes; the great drawback would be the question of the building. We could improve the present premises at a small outlay, but if we did that we should get the competition grant.

17694. You have not room even without considerable building; you could not accommodate more than thirty?—Oh, no, we could not now. At present, properly speaking, we should not be able to accommodate more than five or six in the premises we have; and the rector the assistant has his bed in he has also to keep his provisions in.

17695. Dr. BOGGS.—Cooks there too?—Cooks in it; that is a very bad system.

17696. CHAIRMAN.—The ordinary food is cooked in the men's kitchen?—But then he cooks for himself.

17697. You would rather, I suppose, have the lunatics removed from the workhouse?—We would prefer to remove the lunatics, provided the expense of establishing a separate asylum would not come too heavy. With regard to lunatics, we have a right to have them taken into the lunatic asylum, but unfortunately we delayed about that, and then when we discovered that fact we sent on too many—five or six—and there was no accommodation for them, and they were all sent back again. Of course if from time to time they were sent in that would reduce the number very considerably, and then we would not want much accommodation for the epileptics.

17698. We would rather have all the lunatics removed?—Deadly.

17699. Have you made any estimate of the relative cost to the ratepayers between having the lunatics in the workhouse and having them in the district asylum. Are you under the impression that it is much more costly to have them in the asylum than in the workhouse?—I was under the impression that it was more costly to have them in the workhouse; we have no competition grant.

17700. Did you ever make out the expense at each place?—No, I am not on the Civil Asylum Committee. I don't know much about the working, but I would be of opinion that it would not be greater.

17701. Have you any idea of what a lunatic costs you in your workhouse at present?—That would be merely the food and clothing—the average cost is 4s. 6d.

17702. But if you take, as the asylum people do, all the expenditure and divide that by the number of lunatics for the average cost per head, you would find that there is comparatively little difference between the cost in the workhouse and in a lunatic asylum. Then the asylum people get a competition grant of 4s. a week, which may possibly bring it below the cost in your workhouse?—I think it would be very desirable, if possible, if some scheme could be devised, or some Government assistance given, to have them taken out of that altogether, but I would be entirely against boarding out the epileptics. I think it would be objectionable, and I think they would be subject to a lot of annoyance too; you often see half-frenzied men. They would not be properly looked after. The best place would be where the medical officer would be, and there would be a trained nurse to keep them clean and healthy.

17703. As regards the children?—I think the stigma of the workhouse should be removed from the children altogether. I think they should be boarded out with respectable people.

17704. Do you find any difficulty in getting homes in which to board the children out?—Some whatever; sometimes two or three applications for a child.

17705. As regards girls going into the workhouse to be confined when they are going to have illegitimate children, you have heard the conversation we had this morning?—I have; it is a very difficult question. As far as my Council or Board of Guardians are concerned, they would prefer not to have them in at all if possible, but it is a very difficult question.

17706. When they do come in, is it within your knowledge that they stay in for the greater part of their lives afterwards?—Some stay in, and some go out.

17707. Do many go out?—They do.

17708. When they do go out, what is their subsequent life?—That depends on circumstances—it depends on where they come from. If a girl falls in a rural district and comes up, and perhaps her people are respectable, she may, when she goes out to go away to service, be ashamed to come back, and lead a fairly good life afterwards, and her people would support her child. But in this union you have the military stations—you have Newbridge and the Curragh Camp—and that is a different thing—some of those people who come on here with illegitimate children, it has been the same with their mother before them, and they go back again, and fall away, and probably if the illegitimate child of a person from a military district comes in here, if that child grows up and goes away to a rural district, she may live a good life, but if she goes back to the same surroundings she will fall again.

17709. For that reason don't you think it would be a good thing to remove these women from their surroundings and temptation and put them under religious instruction?—I think they should be removed from the workhouse altogether, and take the names of those away from it with a view to make it more popular.

17710. There is no doubt that the presence of these poor girls in the workhouse does tend to—do you use a common word—for people coming in?—There is a prejudice amongst respectable poor people going to the workhouse, and one of the reasons is they say they would be associated with those parties. I think there should be some separate institutions; institutions for that purpose should be subsidised by Boards of Guardians.

17711. You should pay so much per head for girls that go there?—Yes.

17712. As regards the aged and infirm, there has been a good deal of evidence here to-day about them. What is your opinion?—Do you mean the aged people that go into the workhouse?

17713. Under (c) of No. 51—I think they should be destitute in the workhouse.

17714. Or would you prefer having a distanced workhouse given to them?—Unless there was no reason why the workhouse should be kept open. In the case of the Naas Union, I would prefer to have those people in the workhouse.

17715. Take the Naas Union as the central union of the County Kildare. Would you see any objection to make it, in addition to its sick hospital, which would mean, would you see any objection to make that an ambulance or central institution for the aged and infirm of the county, the same way as you have a central institution at Carlow for the lunatics of the county?—If you adopt that system, would you bring the aged and infirm from all parts of the county?

17716. That is what I am throwing out for your opinion—I think there would be a good deal of use in connection with that.

17717. At present bringing them to the workhouse at all is as much of a cost?—There is very little cost now.

17718. Take from Blessington. Do they reach the workhouse as a rule themselves, or are they brought in as an ambulance?—In some cases they are brought in by friends; in more cases they are sent in by farmers loading a cart and horse, and in other cases by the ambulance.

17719. Don't you think that would be the same if the work area was enlarged?—No; I think it would be too far.

17720. Take Castledermot?—It would be a long journey from there to Naas. My idea would be to keep them in the unions in which they were born, and classify them, and in the case of old men and women who lived honestly and respectably all their lives, I would not separate them in the union.

17721. I quite understand that point of view—that is a natural and humane point of view—but if you come to look at the number of workhouses in Ireland, taking a big view of it, you have 160 workhouses in Ireland, and some people consider that the number is greatly in excess, that the number before the Famine times was a good deal less, and that certainly numbers might be brought down to what they were before the Famine times. If you have to bring down the number of workhouses at all you have to close some for the purpose of the able-bodied healthy?—Against that some unions are very large; more unions are small. Take the case of Naas Union, the valuation is £154,000, and population 34,000; in Edenderry Union the valuation is only £68,000, and population 16,000.

17722. What Mr. Brown seemed to think was that if you made such a central institution it would mean a county rate, but it need not necessarily mean a county

rate—I am entirely opposed to what he advocated with regard to placing the control of the union hospitals under a county committee; certainly I would have the local administration as laid down at present, and I would have the local people in charge of their own areas, and I think it would do a great deal to teach them how to govern themselves, and they will have more interest in it. If you had to bring a committee together from several parts of the county you would have to pay those men; they could not give their time for nothing.

17723. The committee would still be local?—They would have to go to the one centre.

17724. There would be a committee for Naas, according to the plan Mr. Brown was discussing, and a committee for Coleraine, and a committee for Athy of local people?—What would you have in Athy?

17725. In each place you would have a hospital at least?—What would that hospital in Athy serve?

17726. The same district that Athy has at present?—Then why change it?

17727. With a view of reducing the large establishment charges?—Then would the area served in Naas be Naas?

17728. Yes?—Then why change the present system of Guardians if the area is the same.

17729. He did not explain that; you might have a talk with him about that afterwards?—I am only putting the view of my Council before you. My opinion, and the opinion of the Council, is that the aged and infirm should remain in Naas, as at present.

17730. It would be hardly possible to remove the Naas people elsewhere?—Some of the people are very respectable old people; others are not. I think they should be in a ward when they come in first for a certain time under supervision.

17731. You would not have room in Naas to make such sub-classification?—I think you would. These workhouses were built on a very bad system, most of them—all halls and passages.

17732. They were built very well for the purposes of classification of the day. Things have changed a good deal since then, and now we are disposed to do far more for the sick and poor than people would have dreamt of doing in those days?—It is very easy to carry out these new ideas, but the unfortunate thing is that the people have no money.

17733. I don't think you need be afraid of this Commission recommending anything that would involve increased expense?—I hope the Commission will recommend the Government to give some money.

17734. Then as regards the infirm, you really don't see yourself any way of improving the present arrangements?—I do not. I certainly say the union as it stands should remain and be under the control of the Board of Guardians.

17735. As regards tramps, have you any special views on that subject?—The number of tramps that are entertained weekly in Naas Workhouse would be something between sixty-six and seventy. There are several classes of tramps. If you go out on the high road now you will meet the bone file tramp going along looking for work. He may look for work but he does not want it. Then you will meet the man with his hands in his pocket. He is not out of employment, he is a professional tramp.

17736. He never did work?—No. In some cases it seems to be hereditary. There are a number of these tramps going about at present, and they are discharged soldiers and militiamen; and what increased the number of tramps was the abolition of the twenty-one years' service—short service has increased them. I think a tramp should have a licence, and he should report himself to the police barracks if he wants to get relief at the union, and if he is found a second time applying for that relief in a union in Ireland, I think he should be dealt with very severely. I would give him six months or twelve months, and I would have a State farm, or tramp farm with a lot of land attached.

17737. That would be virtually a labour colony?—I would give him twelve months without the option, except if he was well-conducted there and worked well, he could be let out on a licence in six months.

17738. You are assuming a tramp a single man. What would you say to the tramps that have children with them?—You mean with the father and mother with them.

17739. Sometimes the mother only?—Or the father and no mother. I think it is the duty of the local administration to take that man and deal with him as

May 3, 1904.
Mr. John Stiel
O'Grady.

May 3, 1904.
Mr. John Stiel
O'Drudy

a tramp and board his children out, because unless you do that you will have a race of tramps springing up.

17740. I suppose as long as that man's children are being put forward in life, and taken care of by the State, you would consider it fair of the State to deprive that man of his liberty and prevent him going to get a further family?—Yes; and to subsidise the State farm. The State farm is worked in the State of Massachusetts in America, except with this difference, that tramps who require lodgings have to go to the police barracks for it.

17741. I am not aware of that institution. Could you give us a reference?—A gentleman in Newbridge wrote to a friend in America, and that is the substance of his reply. I would not persecute every one. There are some deserving old people who get local relief. They just roam around the immediate locality among people who know them.

17742. And it is really not an unending charity. You would not care to lock up the poor blind man?—No. There are a lot of these malicious burnings done by these people that go about. There was one reference made to-day about the way relief was granted in the Naas Union. It arose in Mr. Synnott's evidence. I must say for the Guardians of the Naas Union that they are very particular in giving it, and I have known gentlemen to bring cases there and try and get them on relief, and it was not allowed if there was any chance of the person being able to work at all.

17743. I was merely alluding to the practical impossibility of dealing with cases of indoor relief in remote parts of the union except on the faith of the recommendations of your relieving officer?—We never go exclusively on the relieving officer's opinion, and often you will find that we adjourn for the attendance of the local Guardians.

17744. But the man remains in the house all the time?—Yes, you don't know what to do with him.

17745. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—You have given us some interesting information. You say your Council is opposed to amalgamation entirely, as it would not be suitable to Kildare. What method of information is there unless we take this one of separating the different classes in the workhouses of the country. When we take the children out of the workhouses and board them out, when we take the lunatics out of the workhouses and send them to an asylum or auxiliary asylum, and deal with the mothers also, you have hardly anybody left in the institution except two classes, that is the sick and the aged and infirm?—And the tramps, of course.

17746. They can be dealt with too. In regard to those other two classes they don't amount to a very great number altogether?—Oh, they do.

17747. Not in Naas?—The number in the hospital now—

17748. According to the last report the number in hospital was 166?—That is a good deal, and the hospital as it stands at present—of course I cannot give an opinion of a hospital, but from what the average man would observe, it is very congested and requires classification. For instance, if you walked into a ward until lately you might see a man dying in one bed, a man with a broken arm in the bed next to him, and a consumptive in a third bed; the room that would be gained by the others going out a lot of it would be required.

17749. Is the whole of that big institution required for 150 or 160 cases?—You would have more cases than that if you removed the taint of pauperism from the place. You would have small farmers and people glad to go in there for treatment. That suggestion was put forward by Mr. Kennedy to-day. He did not elaborate it, but he said he wanted Celbridge turned into a district hospital. I think what he wanted was to have the taint of pauperism removed, and I think that that is a very good suggestion.

17750. You agree children ought not to be kept in a workhouse?—I do.

17751. For the rearing of them in a workhouse is condemned on all sides. You agree that the lunatics ought to be taken out also, and the mothers of children ought to be away. Having taken out those three different classes you have only two classes to deal with, the sick and the infirm. Would it not be possible to provide for the sick, say, for instance, in the place where they are at present—make the infirmaries more up-to-date than at present, and take that other class, the aged and infirm, and put them in some place where they could have some occupation, some little employment to relieve the monotony of the hours they have to pass in the day-room. Do

you not think that some such change is desirable?—That is what I suggest, that these infirm people be separated—that there should be separate wards for old men and their wives.

17752. The wards would not be enough. It could not be done as matters are at present. Why not provide an institution for themselves with a good deal of land?—You would buy the land on the building.

17753. The building is there. You have fine buildings in the county already beside the county jail?—The jail is a jail, and until you knock it down and build it again you will never make anything of it. I will ask you to visit the jail. Is it only a jail, and that is all it will ever be.

17754. Don't you see a great deal of useless waste in keeping up these staffs in the county where one staff would do for one particular class?—You won't increase the staff by doing what I advocate.

17755. So, you will keep them as they are, but you might reduce them by doing what has been suggested to us?—I don't see how you will reduce them.

17756. You would only require the infirm staff, that will be necessary in all existing institutions—no one has suggested that there should be any curtailment of the provision for the sick, but a good many witnesses have said that the one particular class known as the aged and infirm, who need very little care now than food and proper attention, could be provided in at a good deal less expense, and a considerable amount of money could be saved by the curtailment of staffs at present employed in looking after them—that is to say, instead of having three staffs here, in regard to the particular class, one staff in the county would do?—I think the staff employed in looking after these people would not be very large. You see they require very little more than food and to be looked after; one or two attendants could look after them.

17757. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. MURTAGHAN means the staffs under the present arrangements are very costly?—I don't say that part of the present staff could be cut down.

17758. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—You can only cut it down by some reform, not by sitting and saying that the present system is all right. We want to find out how we will improve it without costing the ratepayers any more?—If you send the lunatics away and the children away, certainly you will be able to carry on the Naas Union with a less staff of officials.

17759. No, you require the same staff, even if there were only three inmates. You have to have a master, and matron, and porter?—There are a lot of other parties connected with this establishment that could be done away with.

CHAIRMAN.—You see the economy would be still greater if you could dispense with the higher paid officials as well.

17760. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—You keep up buildings that are next to useless. They are not used, you have to keep a roof on them, and you have to keep them in a state of repair. They are not satisfactory in any respect. Would it not be better to try and put the institutions put into a thoroughly proper condition, and have those particular ones for infirmaries, or hospitals, or district hospitals, or whatever you like to call them, for the sick, and have one institution for a county like Kildare for the aged and infirm?—No; I would not be in favour of moving them out of the unions they are housed in.

17761. What is the objection, the cost of transport would be very small?—Unless I was shown figures and shown that there was a saving.

17762. CHAIRMAN.—If you did see that there is a very great saving?—Then I would be in favour of it, if I saw there was a considerable saving, and that it would be a benefit to the ratepayers. I think a Council would be very slow to agree to break up their union unless that was shown.

17763. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—If it was shown to you, you would see no objection?—No objection if it was a source of considerable saving.

17764. And that the classes would be benefited individually?—Yes.

17765. Dr. BARNES.—Would you like to see the hospital separated from the workhouse?—I would like to see the taint of pauperism removed as much as possible. The poor don't like to go to the workhouse.

17766. If they were managed by a separate committee, would not that largely go to take away the taint of the workhouse from them?—I don't know; it would be there in the workhouse still, in the same place.

17767. But if they were administered separately—the mode of admission and mode of discharge entirely separate from the workhouse?—Yes. In the Kildare Infirmary we have it separate, and it takes in these infirm who have an objection to go to the poorhouse. We are always very full in the hospital here.

17768. Do they come to go from here to the Kildare Infirmary?—They are beginning to go from the dispensary at Naas now. There are a good number of nurses in the work from the Naas district. The area that the Kildare Infirmary serves chiefly is the Athy Union, and within a radius of five miles of the town of Kildare.

17769. But you pay the same rate to the support of the Kildare Infirmary as they do in Kildare?—Certainly.

17770. Is there any way you could suggest by which that might be altered?—I opposed opening Kildare Infirmary myself at the time, but of course I would not give any evidence now on behalf of the Council; it is doing good service now. A number of patients go in there—pay patients—who are well able to pay, and they think very bad of paying. The revenue from pay patients last year was only £5; there is £27 due now, and there was an order at the last meeting to have those parties proceeded against.

17771. Are you a member of the Kildare Infirmary?—I am.

17772. Could you explain the system whereby patients are admitted and the medical officer charges private fees for attendance on them?—That question was never gone into properly, but there was a man called Payne in it at one time, and he was killed for his maintenance. He had his leg amputated, and his reply was that he was already under much expense, and that it was as much as he could afford. There was no evidence that a fee was charged.

17773. He paid a fee to the medical officer before he paid for his maintenance?—This statement about expense was made by him.

17774. Was that statement true?—I cannot tell you; the question was not properly gone into.

Mr. E. Fidd.—That was not true.

Witness.—That was the statement the man made.

17775. Dr. BOGGER.—You say there were only £5 last year received from pay patients?—That is all.

17776. The medical officer could not receive very much if the hospital only received £6?—And I can say to say among the names down are the names of people who could very well afford to pay.

17777. Have you no system of collecting money from the patients before they leave the institution rather than wait until afterwards. You are much more likely to get payment at the time?

Chairman.—In the County Fermanagh Infirmary a document is signed by the patient coming in, or father, or person responsible for the patient coming in agreeing to pay so much?—But if a man was responsible for himself, if you were going in you would not want any one to sign for you, and if you would not pay we could not hold you for the damage; you might say you had no money. There was a committee appointed to go into all these matters, and Mr. Brown was chairman, and he was to call the committee together, but he never called the committee yet and the reason is, I think, the Local Government Board have books, or some system, in contemplation, and he was waiting for that; but I hear that at the second last meeting of the Kildare Infirmary we took on ourselves to order the secretary to go and look and enter in it the names of the pay patients

when they came in, when they were discharged, and the amount. On the last day there was £27 due from those parties whose names are on this book, and there was an order made to have them proceeded against.

17778. Mr. MURKIN.—Have you any fixed charge?—I think 30s. a week, and that is in under maintenance.

17779. Dr. BOGGER.—Why not have different scales even lower than 10s., for people not able to pay very much, and higher for people who are able to pay more than 10s.?—I think if any of these parties approached the committee they would accept it.

17780. Why limit yourself for 10s., because that is not sufficient for a patient fairly well off going in for an operation?—I opposed it myself, but the majority were against me. The committee should have discretionary powers. I know many men in this county with twenty acres of land who are worse off than some men with five acres of land.

17781. Regarding a consumptive hospital or sanatorium, would you be in favour of that?—I would on the same system as the auxiliary asylum, that it would be a State hospital for a province or a certain number of counties.

17782. Would you not propose that the county should pay something?—Yes, but it should be largely subsidised by the Government, for it is on the increase in this country.

17783. CHAIRMAN.—You think it would be the duty of the Government from a public health point of view?—I do; the only thing you can do is isolate them in workhouses, because I really think the ratepayers cannot bear the burden of building or supporting the new institutions.

17784. Dr. BOGGER.—Workhouses only isolate them as far as the infection is concerned, they cannot cure them?—I think it is due to us from the Government to do something like that; we are overtaxed and we should get it back. There is another question—the deprivation of paupers. I think if a man spends his life in Scotland and gives the best years of his life working there, he should not be shipped back here. We have not the same advantages; we cannot ship them back. I would be perfectly satisfied if they gave us the same advantages of sending their men back.

17785. Would you be satisfied?—Yes.

17786. Do you think that would be fair?—It would.

17787. You would have very few to send back?—We might have some to send back.

17788. Mr. MURKIN.—There was an effort made a few years ago to dress that grievance, but it was not altogether successful. The law at present is that any person who has resided for one year in any particular union without having become a charge on the rates, is eligible for support from the local authorities in Scotland, provided also the applicant has a full residence in the country of five years?—It is not in England; it is a great grievance to have to support long-expired soldiers. If a man went out in the late South African War and fought there for his country, and he was wounded, that man gets a small pension for a short time. He is left here in this country, and becomes an inmate of a workhouse. That is not a proper system.

17789. Dr. BOGGER.—If the State paid him at a higher rate, would not the general ratepayer have to bear his share of that?—If he went into the workhouse it should be refunded out of his pension, as in the case of the ordinary pensioners.

Mr. EDWARD FINN examined.

You had any evidence in Dublin. We have had a map drawn to show you the portions of Dunsheughlin Union that we could take in. (Exhibits as map.) I disagree altogether with Mr. Symonds about outdoor relief. That ought to be encouraged as much as possible; not to break up people's homes.

17790. CHAIRMAN.—You think you would be able to know whether a man was a decent man or not?—I would. Generally the local Guardians recommend that these people should get a little relief rather than break up their homes; when 2s. or 3s. would keep them outside they would cost a great deal more inside.

17791. You still would keep a workhouse?—Yes, certainly.

17792. So that if you thought a person really was deserving you would offer the house?—Yes; we very often offer them the house in Colbridge, but they won't come near us.

17793. Then you would be just as much in favour as Mr. Symonds of keeping a workhouse?—Yes; sick people with no one to look after them have a great objection to come into the union. We have no power to force them in, and then we are obliged to employ a nurse to mind these people outside.

17794. Would you like to have power to appoint district nurses to act under the directions of the doctors?—No; I would like to have power to compel these people to come in.

17795. If you had a district nurse she would be able to take charge of the whole dispensary district, or perhaps half a dispensary district?—It would come cheaper then.

17796. Mr. MURKIN.—Would a nurse be able to attend to the district?—She might not.

17797. CHAIRMAN.—They have introduced that system in the Derry Union. They get a midwife with

May 8, 1901.

Mr. John Steel O'Grady.

Mr. Edward Finn

May 3, 1904.

Mr. Edward
Field.

nurse's qualifications to act as nurse, and she attends to a number of people, who need not come into the house, and that saves a good deal of expense. That is the view of hard-headed people up there?—Would she stay in the night with that patient for a week?

17704. No, she could not, that would be a case for hospital; but then there are a good many cases that could be attended to in their own homes that are not serious cases; and then there are other cases that are serious and cannot be removed—the district nurse is of advantage in both these cases!—Certainly.

17705. It has made but a small way in the country yet. The district nurse does a good deal that way!—

Mr. THOMAS CONNELLEY examined.

Mr. Thomas
Connellley.

I have not much to add to what our chairman has said.

17706. CHAIRMAN.—But you agree with him thoroughly?—Yes.

17707. I find there is not much division in Colbride; all the Guardians are solid for keeping it on?—Yes, it serves two counties. What would you do with the County Dublin paupers that come there for relief if we send some to Naas?

17708. Unless they went to the South Dublin or North Dublin?—They are very congested.

17709. If they lost the lunatics and children there they would have lots of room?—If Naas was turned into a workhouse for all the county there would have to be a separate staff kept up. We would have to keep the staff on at Colbride to work the hospital. I don't see where the rates could be saved.

17710. You may take it for granted there will not be any proposal made of that kind unless there is a very decided gain in it?—I don't see where the gain would come in; we could not reduce the staff much. There are not many employed to look after the paupers in Colbride, but the lunatics, and imbeciles, and all, should be sent to some institution. They should not be turned out or boarded out; and the children we all recommend to be boarded out.

17711. And the girls that come in and have children, what would you say about those?—I don't see what great change can be made with regard to them.

17712. Does it ever strike you as rather a sad thing that these girls who come in and practically spend the whole of their lives, and have more of these illegitimate children, as a rule, in workhouses?—I don't think any place to which you could send them would benefit them much; those badly inclined will be always bad.

17713. Do you think that a girl after her first fall is bad?—She may not; very often they never fall again.

17714. If they were put under a good religious influence?—Yes, we have that in Colbride.

17715. If a girl comes in to-day expecting to have a baby in two or three months' time, would you put her in the same ward—in the same room with a woman who has had two or three babies before?—Yes, she has to go in with them.

17716. Do you think that has a good religious influence?—Could not that be remedied even in the institutions at present. Could there not be more wards?

17717. You have power to do it if you can, but it would be very difficult for you to do it as the workhouses are constructed and arranged?—If there should not be some little things attached to such as that; if we made them too comfortable it might increase it.

17718. I have heard that argument used, but would you run a girl to utter ruin for the sake of having her as an awful example to others. If you could take her and save her, body and soul, from further degradation, would you not do it?—Yes, if I could see my way to do it.

17719. Don't you think putting her in the hands of a religious body and excluding her from people who

Yes; we would be able to accommodate a good deal of the Edenburg Union in Colbride, and as far as Carbury; we have the railway there. Letting in within three miles. I am afraid you won't be able to reduce the number of unions in Kildare. You have only three, with Athy in the extreme south, and Colbride in the extreme north. Unless you took the Bellinglame portion into Naas and the Edenburg portion into Colbride, we would be very much in Colbride again having our union dissolved, because we serve the County Dublin very well, and the Dublin people are anxious to keep Colbride as a union and hospital. I mentioned to you the amount of money we spent on our hospital.

would be likely to fill her mind with impurity, would be a hospital step to take!—How can they isolate her in these institutions.

17724. They take wonderful care in these institutions, and have a rule of silence when they meet together?—You think the Guardians should have the power to send such cases to institutions and pay for them?

17725. That is what has been suggested to us, and the question is whether the Guardians generally would approve of that. What would be your own opinion?—I think it would be a very good thing to do, and I don't think it would cost much more on the ratings.

17726. It may cost a great deal less, because you might not have the same girl coming in again and spending her life-time there?—At present we have no power to do so; there are no institutions.

17727. There are some such institutions?—There I heard since I came here a lot about the Kildare Infirmary, and I did not hear it suggested at all to make those that go there and see that, from whatever district they come, to make them chargeable to that district. We in Colbride have to pay our share of the upkeep of that, and there never has been a patient sent from Colbride. Why not make those that go to it chargeable to the district they come from instead of a county charge?

17728. Mr. MURKIN.—And that would get out of the difficulty?—Yes.

17729. CHAIRMAN.—That is one method; the other method was, make the Kildare people pay their share of the sick all over the county?—I would not agree to that. I think they should be chargeable to the district they come from.

17730. Mr. MURKIN.—Are you a Poor Law Guardian?—Yes.

17731. Suppose Colbride had a nice infirmary let there to look after the sick, don't you think you could get on very well with that and let some other portion of the county get the other classes—children and lunatics?—The children are all boarded out, and all the Guardians know the names who take them out.

17732. No trouble boarding them out?—Not at all; there are more applicants than there are children.

17733. Are all the eligible boarded?—Yes, all except very few—any child that is fit to go out—it is the proper system; there is no taint of pauperism about the child then.

17734. CHAIRMAN.—You don't think they come back to the workhouse again?—No.

17735. Mr. MURKIN.—Could you not extend that spirit to other classes, the aged and infirm—take them away and let them out to some healthy place in the country?—If it was possible to do it; but I cannot see how it could be.

17736. If it was shown it would not cost any more, and that such a system could be worked, would you be any objection to it?—Not a bit, that would be bringing a system of old-age pensions like.

Mr. EDWARD P. O'KEEFE, J.P., examined.

Mr. Edward P.
O'Keefe.

17737. CHAIRMAN.—You have heard these interesting suggestions about Bellinglame?—That thing has been thrashed out before; nothing new has been said.

17738. What is the view of the Guardians of the Bellinglame Union about the change of the boundaries of the union?—With regard to bringing people to Athy, the Kildare portion of our union comes within half a mile of Bellinglame, and that is twelve miles

from Athy; a good deal of it runs within a mile and a mile and a half, and even half a mile.

17739. That is not a populated part, it is hilly, is it not?—No, it is mostly poplars. I think with regard to the facilities of bringing people to the workhouse, it is much more convenient than it would be in Athy.

17740. You are in favour of the present boundaries

of Ballyglass?—Yes. Of course portion of it goes to Castlebar, where Dr. Brennan resides, but then there is a dispensary at Grange, 14 miles from Castlebar, that Dr. Cruise attends every week, and there is a telegraphic communication with Castlebar, and a telegraphic doctor always attends on telegrams without the formality of real visits.

17621. At Ballyglass you look on yourself as quite cut off from all East Wicklow?—Yes.

17622. You have to attend Assizes and the County Council at Wicklow, but it is a tremendous journey for you?—I had to attend the County Council at Wicklow yesterday, and had to go through Dublin.

17623. So that for Poor Law purposes and any county purposes you really are most inconveniently situated from your county town and the rest of the county?—We are.

17624. It would be impossible for us to look upon Wicklow as a self-contained county for Poor Law purposes?—It would be utterly impossible. We are much more disconnected in our side of the county from it than we are from either Carlow or Kildare. With regard to the unions, though there is one union in the County Wicklow, that might, if it were closed and joined on to Rathfriland, be used as an auxiliary asylum, but it is Shillelagh; it is a small union.

17625. Could you take in any of the Shillelagh Union?—I fear not; it could be added on to Rathfriland, and they have train accommodation there.

17626. But so far as Ballyglass goes, you think it would be quite impossible to incorporate it with any other union?—It could not possibly be done on account of the difficulty of transport.

17627. You have been here most of the day and have heard the discussion that has gone on on a large number of subjects. Without wearying you by putting the same questions to you, did any of them strike you?—The principal one that I would be interested in would be the caring for the imbeciles; that is very badly exposed, and in every institution that I have gone into

I think very great improvements could be made by taking them and having them treated by themselves.

17628. Would you be in favour of sending them to an asylum?—I don't think I would like to have them sent to a lunatic asylum, but to an auxiliary asylum. I would be very much in favour of it.

17629. This is a class that could be dealt with at a central institution. They need not necessarily be in the neighbourhood of their own homes?—No, they need not.

17630. And if there was a workhouse, or a greater portion of a workhouse, that was available for such a purpose, you would be in favour of having it set apart as an auxiliary workhouse?—I would. For example, if there was a place at Shillelagh, it would do for an auxiliary asylum for the whole county because it is centrally situated.

17631. Not from a railway point of view?—Not exactly.

17632. But it is not very bad, Ballyglass would be most inconvenient?—Yes. Of course the other portion of Ballyglass is attached to the Nass Union. It would be much more difficult to get from Ballyglass to Shillelagh than to Ballyglass.

17633. Have you any good direct road to the east from Ballyglass?—It is a very difficult road and a bad road. I have cycled it, and it is a very bad road by Aughavannagh and Greennane into Rathfriland.

17634. Is there any other special question?—I don't think there is. We are pretty well provided with hospitals and infirmaries in the neighbourhood. Of course, just like other counties, we are paying for a fever hospital in Wicklow and a county infirmary that no person from East Wicklow ever uses or could possibly use.

17635. What would your view be. Would you like each patient charged to the district he came from, or the sick made a county charge all over the county?—I think it is working fairly well at it; of course it is a bit of an injustice to us.

17636. But you think it is not a sufficient grievance to make a fuss about?—No.

Dr. O'NEILL examined.

Dr. O'NEILL

17637. CHAIRMAN.—Is there anything that you wish to say personally?—There are only three matters that I wish to bring before the Commission. The first is the overcrowding in the Athy Union at the present time, especially amongst the infirm cases and in the hospital.

17638. What are your present numbers?—On the 31st of March of this year there were 107 men in the workhouse proper.

17639. What is your total in the workhouse?—239; in 1891 it was 248. There is a great increase among the infirm cases and hospital patients.

17640. I think you told me that there was some special reason. Is there not some special work going on?—They were going to have an additional ward put on in the infirmary, but that would not meet it.

17641. But as well as I remember, when I happened to be at the workhouse you attributed the increase to some special cause?—I don't remember that.

17642. There was no special work in the neighbourhood that brought people?—No.

17643. Are you aware of any increase, or how this increase arose?—I am not.

17644. If some of the classes were taken out of the workhouse, say the lunatics, and the women with children, would you then have sufficient room?—No.

17645. You have forty-five children?—Yes.

17646. If the children went?—That would give more room, certainly.

17647. And certainly give you more room among the infirm class, and that would set free four rooms?—It would. The principal congestion is on the male side of the house, not on the female side. The male side is always congested, even in summer time.

17648. Mr. MURKIN.—What is that due to. Do you know any reason for it?—I have no reason to give.

17649. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think it is very likely because the old women can always get some employment in looking after children, and light work in the house?—There don't seem to be as many old women as old men.

17650. But according to the Census there are more old women in the country than old men—in many places there are more men in the workhouse than

women—and the explanation I have heard is that in many places old women can get light work, whereas old men can do nothing?—Old women have a better knack of looking after themselves than old men, and they have relations, and they are more useful in the house than old men. Then there is the overcrowding in the hospital, which I think is due to overcrowding in the workhouse, that is a certain number of infirm cases.

17651. That are not really sick people, but frail old people?—Owing to the number of infirm cases we have in the hospital, necessarily they will get sick as well as any other kind of patients, and naturally they come into the hospital. The hospital wards are badly situated in Athy. You have to go from one building to another, forty or fifty yards between; it is inconvenient for the nurses and everybody.

17652. And it causes a larger number of nurses to be necessary?—It does; more attendants certainly.

17653. Building would be a saving in a way?—I think sooner or later in Athy Union we will have to build, probably, a separate hospital.

17654. If that were done, do you think it would be a desirable thing to build from the workhouse altogether?—I think if there was a small hospital built, containing twenty or thirty beds, it would relieve it.

17655. What would you say to using your existing fever hospital for such a purpose, and building a small fever hospital?—That was my own idea, that it would suit admirably.

17656. The fever hospital is a detached building, entirely unconnected by architecture or any other way with the workhouse?—Yes; and it would hold about thirty beds. That would make a hospital for acute cases. The other cases would have rooms to be treated in the institution as it is at present.

17657. Mr. MURKIN.—That would supply the need for all acute cases?—It would; thirty beds would supply it. As far as I can judge, a union hospital is entirely unsuitable for the treatment of infectious cases; curable cases have absolutely no chance of doing any good there.

17658. CHAIRMAN.—You, of course, would be in favour of a sanatorium?—A sanatorium for consumptives. I think it is much more necessary than a separate institution for imbeciles—more urgent.

May 3, 1904.

De O'Neill

17856. Dr. BROOKS.—How many consumptives have you in the workhouse at present?—Eleven.

17857. I suppose there are large numbers in the district that would go into a suitable sanatorium?—Yes; I have constant applications from people outside to go into the National Hospital at Newcastle. It is very difficult to get a patient in there, and he may have to wait for months.

17871. CHAIRMAN.—And he would be likely too far gone for admission. They won't admit a case in the later stages?—No; unless they find they can do some good they won't admit cases. The third thing I wish to mention is the question of supplies. I think it is a bad system to have the supplies of the hospital coming through the other part of the institution. The hospital ought to be separated altogether from the workhouse, or there ought to be a storekeeper in every workhouse. There is a good deal of trouble always; at least in my experience of the last seven years.

17872. I think you examine yourself all the most supplies?—As a general rule I see all the supplies; usually the master or matron draw my attention to them before they come into stock.

17873. I think there was a case about meat when I was there?—Yes. The supplies pass from one to another; there are constantly little annoyances. It gives rise certainly to friction amongst the officials, and of course the doctor is always brought into these matters.

17874. You do take the matter into your own hands there and reject things?—But that is not the point.

17875. What is your point?—Both the master and matron are very busy officials. They give out supplies in the morning. The supplies may go across to the hospital, and there may be something missing. There is a good deal of difficulty in getting what is missing into the hospital again, because they will have other

business to attend to in the house, and it will be very hard to get them back to the stores. The supplies ought to come direct.

17876. You mean for all kinds of food?—Yes. 17877. This is all an argument in favour of having the hospitals detached and self-contained?—Yes. Take meat, for instance, it may come in and pass the doctor and master, but when it comes to the hospital it may not be up to the mark. Of course the master of the hospital will have something to say to it then, and it is possible she may want it returned, or get other meat; or perhaps meat may come over too fat, and it would be difficult to return it then, whereas if she had the supply in her own hands she would know what would be wanted for hospital patients.

17878. That is really part of the general question of detached hospitals?—Yes. That question you asked some of the gentlemen who gave evidence about women with illegitimate children—certainly in Athy Union it seems to me that the women seem to stop there; when they come in once they stay there, except that they may go out and come back with more children. I have known as many as seven illegitimate children with one woman. There is a woman in the institution at the present time that has been thirty years there and has never left it.

17879. Dr. BROOKS.—She has only had one child. One child, and she has stopped there altogether.

17880. CHAIRMAN.—She most likely, if she had gone into a religious institution, might have gone out and become a happy woman outside?—As it is she is a very good woman, and might perhaps have been an ornament to society. I know she has conducted herself admirably as long as I have known her.

17881. And I suppose you think she deserves a better fate?—Yes; she has been an attendant twenty-five years in the infirmary. She is not an attendant now at the present time; she is in the infirm ward.

Mr. J. RAUER DAGE, Clerk of the Ballyglass Union, examined.

Mr. J. Raue
Dage

17882. CHAIRMAN.—You have a very wide and great knowledge of Poor Law matters, and I am glad to see you here to give us any information which would be useful to us?—I sent in a memorandum. With regard to the sick, I endorse the views that have been given before you. I think they should be treated in separate institutions, but I think the existing workhouse can easily be made separate institutions with very little expense. It means simply in most institutions building a gate-lodge and dividing wall, and your hospital would be just as separate as this courthouse is from the adjoining houses.

17883. You would have an entrance going up right or left—a separate entrance?—Yes.

17884. You would have the male healthy and female healthy yards going up to the windows of the infirmary?—You would.

17885. You would go for closing the doors that lead into these yards?—Yes, I think it would meet the wishes of the persons who are anxious to have the taint of the workhouse removed.

17886. The only place they would meet at all would be at their church, just half-way between both institutions?—Yes. I think the children should be boarded out.

17887. Have you many boarded out at present?—We have six. There is only one child I think in the house who might be boarded out, that is under the existing law. The orphan and deserted children have always been boarded out in Ballyglass Union, and not one returned to the workhouse.

17888. You have a number of children in the house who are not eligible for boarding out. Do you think the Guardians would be in favour of having powers to assume the position of parents towards certain children in the house and board them out?—I would rather Mr. O'Kelly would answer that. I think myself many of the Board would.

17889. If they had the discretion they could neither use it or not—I think we might get a better class of people to take children if the position were somewhat larger than it is. It was fixed at 2s. 6d. a week twenty-five years ago.

17890. And how much for clothing?—2s. a year.

17891. What is done now, you give them a trowsers when they are going out, and 2s. a year after. It is not a very liberal allowance; you think it ought to be more?—I do.

17892. I think Miss Fitzgerald Kennedy recommended it to be raised a little?—I don't know. I mentioned it to Miss Fitzgerald Kennedy, but she did not approve of the idea when I mentioned it, because she said very few labourers could afford 2s. a year for each child. I think that the aged and infirm, as far as possible, should be granted outdoor relief where they could be suitably housed. There is an objection at present amongst many Guardians to give an old man who is practically beyond his labour outdoor relief, if he has a son, say married; but I think a married labourer with a wife and family has sufficient demands upon his earnings. You cannot expect him to support his parent; the result is that these old people come into the workhouse.

17893. What is the average wage with you?—About 8s. a week. In very few cases it goes to 10s.

17894. What food would they get with that?—In some cases I know the wage is only 7s. 6d. without food.

17895. Would that be all the year round?—All the year round; it is with a gentleman farmer, a neighbour in my neighbourhood.

17896. Would that be doing real farming work, or a man who was past his work, and was merely taking gravel?—No, he is a man who acts as hard.

17897. Has he privileges besides that?—He has a rod of ground for his manure.

17898. Has he the grass of a cow?—No, the grass of a goat. I know a man having only 6s. a week, with a large dairy man half a mile from me, and the grass of a goat, and if the goat were not in milk he had to buy milk. I think it would be very well to have almshouses established for the aged and infirm who had no friends, where they could be suitably housed. I think the aged and infirm are capable at certain seasons of the year of doing some light work, for which they would not get ordinary wages. An old man could sit in the corner of a field during mowing time, and sharpen the knives of the machine, and I don't think he should be deprived of outdoor relief for so working.

17899. Would not the building of an almshouse mean further tremendous expenditure?—From the question put by Mr. Murnaghan, I think some of the workhouses could be set apart for that purpose.

17900. You did not mean fresh buildings?—I did not. And I don't think the question of the disowning people—a maternal one, or that they would have much sentimental objection to it. People of the

lower class are very glad to get to institutions of the kind about Dublin. I think in Harepoint Court some of our Irish noblemen are accommodated as State prisoners.

17903. That is not a very close precedent?—No, sir; but I don't know where the sentiment comes in. I think lunatics would be better treated, and, for many reasons, should be treated in auxiliary asylums. With regard to unmarried mothers, I have made a suggestion that the same should be separated altogether. I think illegitimate male prisoners should be in one institution and illegitimate females in another, and one of my reasons for doing that is a moral one, and the second is an economic one. In rural unions I find that widows who enter the workhouse very often marry one of those unmarried mothers, and with a man who is nearly beyond his labour at the time of his second marriage, he does it because it is the cheapest way of getting a servant. She is very anxious to get married that she may get her title of "Mrs." She values it as much as an American heiress does a title of nobility; and after having two or three children, the old man becomes broken down, and we have the whole of them in the workhouse.

17904. You are speaking of a man who is in the workhouse and won a spinster to whom he takes a fancy in the workhouse also; the two of them take their discharge and get married?—Yes, I know a case of a labourer who lost his wife. He got a slight cold and came into the workhouse and married one of the inmates there. Then with regard to the question of children, I believe they should be boarded out as far as possible, and those that you cannot board out should be treated in a separate institution. There was a statement made to-day that the children reared in workhouses of illegitimate mothers continued in the houses of their parents for generation after generation. My experience extends through five or six rural unions. There was one witness made that statement. Then it was questioned by Mr. O'Grady, who stated that in rural districts the rule was different from where there were military stations.

17905. We have met cases of three generations?—You will meet them, but they are isolated cases. You

can get a list of births in workhouses for the last thirty years up to fifteen years ago, and see how many of those children are there now, and whether they have children or not.

17906. It is not quite so easy as that, because you would be astonished how frequently those people change their names. The woman who has an illegitimate child frequently calls herself somebody else?—Is a large union it would be.

17907. But even in a country union where masters change?—We have two young girls we reared in the workhouse, and a boy who suffers from an eye affection. Of these young girls one is of a good character, and the other has an illegitimate child. My experience is that it is women from outside who come in with illegitimate children; these women were not reared in the workhouse. With regard to tramps, we are not very much concerned with tramps, because we are not on the road for them. We have only about six per week, and we try to discriminate between the deserving and the undeserving.

17908. How do you treat them?—If you come to the conclusion that a man is a habitual tramp, how do you treat him differently from the person whom you know is a labourer really in search of work. Do they go to the same ward?—Yes.

17909. The same food?—The same food.

17910. And take their discharge at the same hour?—With the habitual tramp the relieving officer puts a stern face on him and frequently refuses him a ticket.

We get *Pratt's Directory*, which gives the names of every person of any importance in every parish in Ireland. If he says he comes from Mayo, we ask him who is the doctor and the clergyman of the parish, and if we find his answer true, we believe he has some knowledge of the place. With regard to the suggestion of transferring to Athy Union the three divisions of Ballymore, Corrigan, and Grassy, I don't want, as an officer concerned, to give you any evidence on the point other than to say that the matter was raised at the time the Local Government Act came into operation, and at that time the Council appointed a deputation to wait on the Local Government Board, and possibly you will remember the arguments put before them.

May 3, 1904.

Mr. J. Ralph Day.

The Sittings terminated.

May 4, 1904.

THIRTY-SIXTH PUBLIC SITTING.—WEDNESDAY, MAY 4TH, 1904

At the Courthouse, Maryborough.

Present:—Mr. MICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURTAGHAN, and Dr. CORY BAKER.

Mr. JAMES McMAHON, J.P., examined.

Mr. James
McMahon.

17909. CHAIRMAN.—You are the Chairman of the Abbeyleix Board of Guardians?—Yes.

17910. And an ex-officio member of the County Council?—No; I am an elected member of the County Council.

17911. Your County Council considered the queries that were issued by this Commission?—Yes, sir; but, if you would please, I would sooner deal with the Board of Guardians first, because Mr. Meahan, the Chairman of the County Council, will be here later on.

17912. Take it in your own way. Tell how the Board of Guardians of Abbeyleix regard the queries that were sent to them?—As regards the first query, the Board of Guardians are entirely against the dislocation of either of the existing unions in the Queen's County at the present time—either Abbeyleix or Mountmellick. They believe if either of those unions was dissolved the poor and the sick would be exposed to great inconvenience and great injustice, by having to come such long distances, either for hospital treatment or treatment in the workhouse.

17913. The Union of Donaghmore, when it was broken up, was given partly to Abbeyleix?—Yes; the workhouse is situated in our union.

17914. And the village of Rathdowney is in your union?—Yes.

17915. Was there much inconvenience caused, have you heard, by the breaking up of the Donaghmore Union?—I have not heard any specific complaint.

17916. How far is Donaghmore Workhouse from Abbeyleix?—I think it is about fourteen miles.

17917. And Rathdowney would be about one and a-half or two miles less, perhaps?—Yes; I am not very accurate as to the number of miles.

17918. You don't think that either of the workhouses could be closed?—I don't think it would be to the advantage of the ratepayers, and, certainly, not to the advantage of the sick or destitute.

17919. If a hospital were kept on, so that the sick could always be treated there, in their own union, what would you say about transferring what you may call the able-bodied, or non-sick, inmates elsewhere?—I don't think I would be inclined to agree with that either, because there are a great deal of very old, destitute people that would rather be at home in their own locality or as near their native place as possible, and I don't think they would like to be sent off from one end of the county to the other.

17920. As a matter of fact, they are now sent very great distances?—Not very great distances. I think, perhaps, ten or twelve miles is the greatest distance.

17921. The people at Rathdowney have no connection with Abbeyleix, and the people of Maryborough, I suppose, have not much connection with Mountmellick?—Oh, the people of Maryborough have a very great connection with Mountmellick.

17922. By railway they have, but the poor don't go from one place to another on business?—As a rule, they are acquainted with the people of the locality for five or six miles round their native place.

17923. The people of Maryborough have to go to Mountmellick Workhouse; dare they go to a place where they don't know the people?—That is quite true.

17924. So already this does exist very largely—that people have to go to workhouses where they have no knowledge of the immediate surroundings?—That is quite true, to a certain extent; but I think it would be very inconvenient for all parties to abolish either of the workhouses at present in the county. If either of them was situated in a more central position one might be capable of doing the work of the two.

17925. If there was a workhouse at Maryborough that might serve the entire county?—It might, or even in a more central position.

17926. Maryborough is tolerably central?—It is a railway centre?—Of course, it would have greater facilities for locomotion than any other place in the county.

17927. It would be the most convenient place for Guardians if there were only one workhouse for them to attend to?—It would, I believe.

17928. Did you ever consider in this county the idea that we had yesterday put forward by some of the Guardians and witnesses at Naas—that it would be desirable, as you have one government for county purposes, so that you would have all the unions contained within the county and not go outside the county, the poor law would be dealt with by the county; did you consider that idea at all here?—In other words, to make the poor law area co-extensive with the county boundary. That would be a very good plan if it could be feasible; but there may be some difficulties that would crop up.

17929. I suppose it would be very difficult with the bannery of Slieve Donagh to get up to Carlow?—The existing arrangements would be still more convenient for Slieve Donagh.

17930. These people have to come up here to attend?—They have. I believe they have to go up to Kildare and come back here again. I know there is a great hardship inflicted on them by having to come here to attend County Council meetings or sessions.

17931. They never think of driving across by Timahoe?—They do sometimes; but in the winter time it would be a very inconvenient journey to drive across a mountain district.

17932. You know that in a workhouse there are a great number of different classes, all grouped together in the same building. First, you have the sick, then you have the aged and infirm, then you have the mothers of children, single girls with children, and then you have the children at school; you have the lunatics and idiots, you have the tramps, and you have the able-bodied class, of which there are very few in your county. There is only one of the ordinary able-bodied class in the whole county between the two unions?—A very small number.

17933. The others all belong to those other classes that I have mentioned to you. We have received a great deal of evidence suggesting the removal of the workhouses of the different classes. First, we will take the lunatics. There is a general idea that it would be far better to have no lunatic asylums—so to put them all under lunatic asylum management, and if the lunatic asylum was not big enough to hold them, you would take some workhouse, like the old Donaghmore Workhouse, and make it into an auxiliary asylum?—I entirely agree with those terms.

17934. Whether would you put them into a lunatic asylum or an auxiliary?—An auxiliary would be a lunatic asylum.

17935. If the lunatic asylum was capable of holding them, would you prefer putting them there to send the expense of a second institution?—Certainly. Then there are a class of harmless lunatics, what they call fools, and I believe they would be probably just as well treated in a workhouse.

17936. You have very few in your own workhouse?—I doubt if we have any at the present time. A few years ago we had a few cases of that sort; they were in for years, and were no inconvenience to the inmates—they were harmless creatures.

17937. At the last return you had eight women and two men; that would be comparatively few; but having

May 4, 1904.

Mr. James
McMahon.

these few necessitate a separate department being kept up—I don't think it did, in this particular case, because they were all very simple in their habits.

17953. You would want someone to look after them?—The ordinary attendant. I don't think there was any extra attendant. We have no dangerous cases, or any with suicidal tendencies.

17953. Still, a great many of these poor creatures have not the sense to be cleanly in their habits?—They require special treatment in that respect.

17954. And the general opinion of witnesses is that it would be better to have that class in a place where they would be properly attended to by people specially trained to look after them?—Perhaps it might be the best.

17954. Take the children. You have twenty-eight at Abbeylara and thirty-one at Mountinlick; are you in favour of boarding those children out?—Yes, sir, I am entirely in favour of having the children boarded out. I think the shorter time they spend in the workhouse the better for themselves in future life. They are more likely to succeed.

17955. And not to come back as paupers?—Precisely. If suitable persons could be got to take charge of them, I think there is nothing like the boarding-out system for children.

17955. At present you have only power to board out orphans or deserted children; most of the Guardians who have given evidence before us have recommended—?—Compulsory powers to the board.

17956. Yes, or power to the board to enable them to board out the children of thriftless or useless people—people who cannot make their way in the world?—I would entirely assent to that.

17957. Then, as regards the people who own these children, would you think it necessary in some way to put those people under restraint to prevent them thinking that they had only to get children to have them taken off their hands by the Guardians; would you think it well to put them under some restraint?—I would make them contribute, if possible, to their maintenance.

17958. You see, they are paupers?—They might not always be paupers.

17959. Do you think it would be a wise thing if you had a woman with three or four children, or a man and his wife with three or four children, who never did anything practically but a few weeks' begging in the year, and then came back again, do you think it would be a prudent thing to keep these persons' children or let them go free about the country to have more children?—It would be a very serious thing to divert them of their parental responsibilities in the first place.

17960. It would; but still, would you be in favour of doing it?—On the whole, would it not be as well to do it as have the children associating with vicious parents.

17961. Yes; and it is represented to us that if these children are not taken and an effort made to turn them into good citizens they will become paupers, and rear paupers?—Yes; they would be tramps all their lifetime. I think it would be better to grapple with the question at first.

17962. If you did take those children from the parents, do you think it would be a wise thing to let the parents go with a free leg over the country?—I don't know how to answer that question. I would like to have some control over the parents.

17963. Some members of Parliament are introducing a Bill, in which the proposal is to establish labour colonies, where people of that class would be committed on a magistrate's warrant, and detained for such period as was thought fit, and made to work there at remunerative compulsion, that would be supporting them while they are there?—I intended to say something regarding that on the tramp question. That was one of the remedies I was going to suggest. Either empower the workhouse authorities, boards of Guardians or their officers, to detain the tramps for a longer period than they have power to detain under the present law. I believe under the present law they have only power to detain them for three hours after asking for their discharge. I think they should have power to detain them for three days or longer, and, if possible, inflict some punishment on them in the shape of hard labour, and make them pay for their maintenance. And it would interfere with the programme they had mapped out for themselves, and it would give a barrier to their progress through the country.

17964. It would be very inconvenient to their present arrangements?—That is what I want to say; and they would be very careful about coming into such places for the future; but, failing that, a labour colony would be a very good alternative—an excellent idea.

17965. Then, another class we had evidence about was the poor girls who come in, having made a baby, and come into the workhouse to be confined of a baby. They would come into the workhouse two or three months before the baby is born, and they stay in a workhouse until after the baby is born, and, as a common rule, never leave the workhouse again except to go out for a bit with the child to beg, and they come back, and have another child. The suggestion came back, and have another child. The suggestion has been made to us that the workhouse should not be open at all to such girls. If a girl met with a misfortune like that, what should be done would be to send her, according to her religion, to a religious institution—a sort of refuge or penitentiary—where she would be kept until the baby was born, and as soon as she could be separated from the baby, that effort should be made, as soon as it was thought that she was fit to go out, that efforts should be made to put her into a situation, and that the child should be boarded out, and arrangements made that the mother should pay for the child's keep and pay for her own keep while she was in the penitentiary, so that they would not be a charge any more on the rates. It was represented to us that the result of that might be that girls who fell once would not fall again. Now, we had evidence yesterday of a case in the Athy Union, where one of these girls had as many as seven children. We very often meet cases in a workhouse where they have three, four, and five. They go from bad to worse, and these suggestions we are putting to Guardians where we go, because there seems to be some element of hope in them. I would be glad to know your opinion on it?—I think, as an experiment, it would be very well worth trying. I certainly would be against having these girls admitted to the workhouse and mixing with the general body of the inmates. Whether the idea that you mentioned is carried out or not, I certainly think there should be some change. Supposing they are kept in the workhouse at present, there should be some means of classification, that they would not be mixing with other girls or females in the house, particularly the younger children.

17966. A girl of eighteen or twenty who comes in, expecting to have a baby in a couple of months' time, is put at present amongst those hardened women who have had two or three or more children, that you disapprove of?—I do.

17967. You know the way in which a workhouse is built and the arrangement of it, by which you can see almost that if it is not an impossibility it is next door to it, that there can be any classification that will keep these people subject to good influences only?—I know there are very many and serious difficulties in the way of doing it.

17968. Take Abbeylara, you would find it very difficult to arrange that any poor girl when she came in would be kept altogether by herself?—She would not be by herself; she would have others of her own class to associate with.

17969. You would find, I think, very few who would be just in the same position as herself?—There are always a few in the houses of that class.

17970. When a girl comes in fresh from her fall she is in an impressionable condition; she is sorry for what has happened, and would be glad of a fresh start, and if she is put with a girl who has had a baby you would find it would not be a suitable companionship?—It would not.

17971. If she goes to one of these orphanages they take the greatest care by imposing silence when they are working together, and all that, and if it is in a Good Shepherd Convent there always would be a nun in immediate supervision, not paying visits now and again, but in immediate supervision, that would prevent any harmful conversation going on?—It would be far better; and that is what I would be most anxious would be done; but I only suggest the other thing as an alternative, in case the existing arrangements of the workhouse are to go on, then I suggest a different mode of classification.

17972. We have dealt with the tramps, the inmates, the children, and these girls having children, the only two classes that now remain for us to consider are the sick and the aged and infirm; now, these are the bulk

May 4, 1894.

Mr James
McMahon.

of the inmates of the workhouse; you have very few inmates of a workhouse who are not either sick or aged or infirm?—Oh, very few.

17961. We have not received evidence in any quarter suggesting the closing up of the hospital or infirmary where the sick are treated. You would not be in favour of obliging the sick to go further from their homes than they do?—Certainly not.

17962. Now, we come to the most difficult question of all, and that is, the question how to treat the aged and infirm. In the early part of your evidence you indicated an unwillingness to send the aged and infirm at any great distance from where they were. You would rather keep them in their present unions, that is the view of your Board of Guardians?—Yes.

17963. But if you keep all the aged and infirm in Ireland in each workhouse, as they are at present, it would practically make it impossible for us to make any suggestions or report that would involve any large economy; unless we can gather together the aged and infirm, and in that way make one staff of officers do for a county, as even some larger divisions, we would find it very difficult to make any recommendations?—Well, if it could be shown that such a system as that would affect any great economy, I don't think there would be any opposition to it from the local bodies.

17964. We would not dream of putting the extra inconvenience on the aged and infirm unless there was a really substantial saving of rates, but if there were such a saving of rates, speaking for yourself alone, at all events, you would be in favour of such a thing?—Decidedly; and I believe the bulk of the public bodies of the county would be the same way.

17965. I don't know whether you have much out-door relief in your union?—I am not able to tell you the figures.

17966. Is your Board of Guardians rather disposed to give out-door relief to deserving cases to prevent the breaking up of the home?—Yes, sir.

17967. You have no suggestion to make about out-door relief?—Well, no. As regards union rating, I generally approve of that principle, although in some cases the tendency of Boards of Guardians, at least of the Board of Guardians that I have to deal with, in some cases the tendency is, perhaps, to be a little generous in out-door relief; and I imagine in some rare cases, there may be some doubtful cases where you could scarcely say that people are really destitute; and I would suggest if there could be some little check put upon the administration of out-door relief.

17968. Did any practical check occur to you?—Unless there could be a standard sum fixed.

17969. That varies so much. You could not put a standard sum into an Act of Parliament, because the wages and means of the people vary so much in every county, or almost every district?—Suppose the number of persons in receipt of out-door relief was taken, and the average sum granted to each of those was taken, and then, if the amount given to those henceforward was seriously in excess of that amount, the excess should be a divisional charge.

17970. Something like the limit for road expenditure?—Yes.

17971. Mr. MURKIN.—You think the divisional charge works in the direction of economy?—I think so. I was a member of the old Board of Guardians, and it was a divisional charge then; and it was far more difficult to get out-door relief then than at the present time.

17972. Owing to closer inspection and greater care by individual Guardians?—I must say the Board of Guardians at the present time exercise the greatest care and discretion in investigating every case, but they may, perhaps, be a little more inclined to be generous on account of the full amount expended not coming on their own division.

17973. How would it do to have one particular day in the month for the consideration of applications for out-door relief, and then to require that two-thirds of those present would have to vote in favour of the application before it would be granted; would that be a check?—It might.

17974. You understand my point. For instance, if there was one particular day in the month set apart for the consideration of applications for out-door relief, and it would be necessary to have two-thirds of those present vote in favour of the application before it was given?—It might not be a check; but two-thirds might be just as likely to make a mistake, because they are more or less influenced by the local Guardians that represent the district where those persons reside.

17975. Still, if there was one stated day in the month, and the Guardians knew this particular question would come forward, and that it would be also necessary for two-thirds of those present to vote in favour of the application, would it not be some kind of a check?—I don't think it would. I seldom see a division on an out-door relief case. They are generally guided by the report of the relieving officer and the opinion of the medical officer. It is very seldom that there is a division taken on it at all.

17976. CHAIRMAN.—It has been mentioned to us in some places that Guardians who have comparatively little poverty of a serious nature in their division, when they had their part of the country becoming equally responsible for the out-door relief, go in for getting their share?—Presently.

17977. You find that, too?—I do.

17978. So that applications come forward which would not come forward if it was on the division?—I really believe at the present time there are people getting out-door relief that would not get it if it was a divisional charge, and would not be supported or recommended by the local Guardians; and I think the suggestion I made, if it could be practically carried out, would be the best deterrent that could be made use of.

17979. To take the amount that existed against each locality on a certain day, and say that anything in excess of that amount in future would have to be borne by the division?—No, sir. I would take the maximum in normal receipt of out-door relief at the time, the average per head, and then anything in excess of that should go on the local rates.

17980. Would you apportion these over each electoral division or take it for the whole union?—For each electoral division; but, of course, this would not apply to sick persons at all, only chronic cases of out-door relief.

17981. It would not affect sick persons who had a medical certificate that they could not be removed?—Certainly not.

17982. Mr. MURKIN.—Then it would necessitate keeping an account for out-door relief in each electoral division?—That would be very little trouble. The clerk could do that, and the relieving officer has a return in his books.

17983. Not as regards an electoral division?—We often move for returns, and get them next heard day.

CHAIRMAN.—They keep the residence of the persons getting the relief, and that shows the electoral divisions.

17984. Mr. MURKIN.—But there is no question of obsolescence at present; it would necessitate an entirely new change in that respect?—Information will be obtained from the relieving officer's books. And, as regards the amalgamation of unions, if there were any of the surrounding unions that wished to be dissolved, we have accommodation in Abbeyfield Workhouse for a good number of inmates. We don't ask for the dissolution of any surrounding union, but I am instructed to say that if a union is dissolved—

17985. CHAIRMAN.—You are not speaking of Castlecor?—I am not making a suggestion as regards any particular union. Our workhouse was intended for 418 inmates, and at present we have only about 150 in it altogether.

17986. Mr. MURKIN.—Have you not a fever hospital there?—Yes.

17987. How many could it accommodate?—A vast number.

17988. Don't you think if it were used as a hospital for the district for the acute sick it would meet all the requirements?—Then we should get a fever hospital somewhere else.

17989. Could you not have a smaller building with four little wards?—That idea was suggested some years ago.

17990. Does it not seem an extravagant thing that you have an institution to accommodate forty or fifty people which is only used for two or three people?—Could not some economy be practised in that respect?—We would have to build a fever hospital somewhere else.

17991. The fever hospital is a fairly modern up-to-date building, and very suitable for a district hospital?—This question was under consideration by the Guardians before, and the very suggestion you mention was recommended by the Local Government Inspector.

17992. How did the Guardians view that recommendation?—I think they believed there was no necessity for making any change. It would involve a lot of expense.

17993. CHAIRMAN.—If there were a general change all over the country, you have a very good hospital at our fever hospital that would make a good hospital for several cases?—No doubt it would make an excellent institution for that purpose, only we would have to build a fever hospital then. That was the whole case that arose.

17994. Mr. MURKIN.—Still, the cost of a little hospital for fever would be small?—Yes; there were several suggestions made. One was that part of this should be set aside for consumption.

Mr. PATRICK A. MURKIN, J.P., Chairman of the County Council, examined.

18001. CHAIRMAN.—We will be very glad to hear from you the views of the County Council on the various questions?—Our Council did not formally consider the matter, except to appoint Mr. McInnes and agree to attend before you to answer any questions.

18002. What was your view about the number of workhouses in the county, and whether any change could be made of a far-reaching nature?—In the interests of economy, I think that an amalgamation of workhouses is necessary in Ireland. With reference to the Queen's County, in my opinion, if the population continues to decrease, the amalgamation of the two workhouses in the county must, of necessity, come about.

18003. Have you any vacant building in Maryborough?—We have not; and I don't think from the present aspect of the case that amalgamation could be carried out without inflicting some hardship on the poor; and, of course, that is to be avoided. It would be very difficult, and a very great hardship on the poor, to send them from the furthest part of Mountmellick Union to Abbeyfeix, or vice versa. Probably an amalgamation might, with advantage, take place of the two portions of the Queen's County—one that is attached to Athy and the other to Carlow. Very likely an amalgamation of them with Abbeyfeix or Mountmellick might be advantageously carried out.

18004. Did you consider the question involved in that, that is—the question of making the poor law area coextensive with your county?—Yes, sir, if it could be done.

18005. What is your opinion about the feasibility of it?—I think the only obstacle would be the question of the convenience of the poor. There is no railway accommodation in that part of the country.

18006. Supposing we accepted from consideration the sick, and start with the supposition that the sick would be dealt with where they are dealt with at present, and that no change could be made anywhere as regards the sick, would you see any difficulty as regards those people dependent on the rates who are not sick, about moving them to other institutions in the interests of economy?—I think that could be done. At the same time I should not like to give a very emphatic opinion on the matter, because that would be more a matter for the representatives of the district; but viewing things from an outside point of view, I think it could be done without any hardship on the poor when the sick would be treated near their own homes.

18007. Have you acted recently as a Guardian in any of the unions?—I am a Guardian at present at Mountmellick and Abbeyfeix; but I regret to say I am not so attentive to my duties there as I ought to be.

18008. You are at a considerable distance from each?—Seven miles from Abbeyfeix and five from Mountmellick. Then, Mountmellick is in charge of a very excellent body of men, and it is not necessary for outside Guardians to be going there so much.

18009. I suppose they are men that administer their business economically as well as they can?—I think it is as well managed a workhouse as any in Ireland. The treatment of the sick poor in unions is much better than it was ten years ago. In Abbeyfeix and Mountmellick there is a much better dietary and for the poor generally, and the nurses have been recently appointed there; and, altogether, the management of both the institutions is as excellent as it is possible to have it.

18010. Have you ever considered the question of the aged who are not sick—have you ever considered

17995. CHAIRMAN.—Was it ever suggested that the Donaghmore Workhouse should be set apart for consumption?—There were several suggestions.

17996. Is it kept up in good order?—It is in good order. At the present time we have a caretaker there, and a clerk of works looks after the road. We will be very glad to get rid of it.

17997. Mr. MURKIN.—Is it not an expensive thing to have that building doing nothing?—It is.

17998. Would you not like to get rid of it?—Yes; I consider it a white elephant on our hands.

17999. The same might apply to other large buildings?—We have no other large buildings in our union.

18000. In other places there are, and wouldn't you approve of making use of them?—Certainly; they are no use if they are lying idle.

what a very cheerless and unprofitable life they live, herded in large numbers in their day rooms or dormitories, with very little occupation, and nothing to do? Would you be in favour of anything that would centralise that class, so that they could be suitably occupied—some, we will say, on a farm, some otherwise, so as to get some light, suitable labour out of them, which would both make them happier and, perhaps, diminish their cost?—As a matter of fact, when I used to be attending twice as a Guardian, much more constantly than I do now, whenever I went in through the house I was struck by just what you mention; and I don't think that in any part of the world was there a more cheerless existence than those poor people had to endure.

18011. I am afraid it still remains?—It still remains; and the suggestions you made struck me often as the only solution of the question—that is, for the workhouse people to provide more land, and extend the gardens, and give these poor people light, suitable labour, and say with a taste for a trade could work, if they were provided with some little tools, to occupy their time. It may not result in a monetary gain, but it would give them a pleasant occupation; but I think the acquisition of land would be much better for them, because they would have a happier existence.

18012. If those people could be moved to a central institution where there would be land it would be also possible to subdivide them or classify them in such a way as might be deemed expedient. Some people are very much in favour of letting old married couples remain together, other people say that men who have always had a sober and respectable life should get a little better treatment and more privileges than those who come to destitution through their own neglect or vice, and it has been represented to me that if a central institution were entirely devoted to that class, without any other class being treated there, it would be possible to sub-classify them in that way?—It would be a very good thing; because these poor people, such as you describe, who come to the workhouse through misfortune, not of their own making, are entitled to better treatment and different classification to those who lead a lazy, dissolute life, whose profligacy is the result of their own neglect. At the same time there would be an objection to sending these people a long distance from their homes, so to speak, because they have some friends and relatives living about the place, and to remove them to a long distance, where they would never see a friend's face or get a friendly visit, would not result in their happiness. The better solution would be for the Guardians to be empowered to take more land, and employ the people as you have described.

18013. We have been struck, of course, with that view of the question that you have put forward—that is, the cutting them off from their acquaintances and friends; and, having that in view, we have made inquiries as we have gone along at workhouses how far these people, aged and infirm, were visited. We have found, as a result of our inquiries as far, that the sick receive a good many visits, but we were rather sorry to find out that the aged and infirm who come in there to end their days—in a great many cases they are the last of the family, in a great many cases their friends outside are not sorry to say good-bye to them—and we find visits to that class are very few, indeed, and so that it would be more a question of cutting them off from their locality than from their friends. I am afraid—in view of that fact I dare say what you say—

May 4, 1901.

Mr. James
M. Mahon.

Mr. Patrick A.
Mahon.

May 6, 1904.
M. Patrick A.
McMahon.

gest might be the better solution of the question—to have the cases you mention sent to some central place, where they would have occupation.

18014. Are you in favour of having the lunatics removed from the workhouse?—I think all lunatics should be sent to a lunatic asylum, as more suitable for their care and maintenance.

18015. As regards children, now, are you in favour of boarding out?—I am entirely in favour of boarding out. I have advocated it for twenty-five years or so that I am a Guardian. There is no worse school for a child, in my experience, than the workhouse. That question was raised at the time the Trist School was established, and we had a movement in Mountmellick at that time to establish a school in Donaghmore on the same lines; and many of the unions around have considered the question, and decided to amalgamate their interests for the purpose of establishing a school, but the matter, unfortunately, fell through.

18016. That, of course, would not be boarding out—it would be an institution, but it would take them out of the workhouse?—The object was to remove them from the influence of the workhouse.

18017. Would you prefer the boarding out of a child in a small farmer's family to sending them to any institution, no matter how well-regulated or managed?—I would; they become infused in the population, and whatever brand of pauperism there may have been on them disappears, and they become members of the family; and every case of boarding out that could be traced, they had become self-respecting, good members of society; and in nearly every case where a child was brought up in the workhouse he returned a criminal or a pauper—generally both. One of the difficulties of the question that had to be considered was the power of removing the children from the custody of father and mother in cases where the father and mother were not fulfilling their duties.

18018. At present your powers for boarding out are limited to orphans or deserted children?—They are.

18019. Would you be in favour of giving Boards of Guardians the power to board out all children that are in their charge?—Yes; but in the case of children who had a father and mother, who could claim them—

18020. Supposing the fathers and mothers claimed them, but that the Guardians are thoroughly persuaded and know well that the children will never do any good with themselves, that the father and mother, or father or mother, are worthless, idle, perhaps vicious, people, who will bring up their children in the same wretched way that they have been living themselves; if the Guardians are of that opinion, would you be in favour of giving Guardians power by law, subject, perhaps, to an appeal at petty sessions against their decision, to remove the children from the custody of their parents?—I would, sir, though it is a very delicate question, deserving very great consideration, because, if that became law, we don't know how far it may be an encouragement to people to utilise that law by deserting their children, and throwing the responsibility of rearing their children upon the rate.

18021. What would you think of this as a counter-move to that—that men and women who are incapable, or considered and held to be incapable, of having charge of their children, should also be held incapable of having their liberty for the purpose of rearing still further children, and that they should be sent—as is suggested by a great many people now—to what is known as a Labour Colony, and that they should be detained there while their children are supported at the public cost?—I would entirely approve of that suggestion.

18022. That would deter people, would it not, from having children and thinking they would get rid of them easily?—Exactly.

18023. It would mean they themselves would lose their liberty if they misused their parental powers?—Even that it might result in adding something to the misery that it might induce some people to avail of that law for the purpose of getting rid of their duties and responsibilities as parents, but still the greater good to their offspring and the greater good to the community would, in my opinion, counterbalance any risk. There is no day that there is not ample proof of that, especially in towns like this. Women, with three or four children, tramping about the country, and teaching the children to beg and steal, with the result that these children prey on society and become thieves, rogues and drunkards.

18024. Unless members?—Not only unless, but they assume what the poor should get, and they are a tax

on the community. They go to the farmer's home, if they are known there by the good woman of the house, whether they are deserving of charity or not, they will get it through fear, if not through charity. These are the people who set fire to haystacks and do injury to property. The law should empower the Guardians, where deliberate neglect is proved against people, to take their children and place them as you say.

18025. The same observation you have just made apply to that class known as the casuals or tramps?—Yes; that question of the tramps is a very serious one. It just strikes me that it often happens where a strike has taken place in a great city, respectable tradesmen have to go on tramp. I know a case. A self-respecting tradesman was travelling from Limerick to Dublin and he had only his money bag to carry him a certain distance. He got off either at Mountmellick or Maryborough, and enquired here. There was no workhouse. He went to Mountmellick, and probably was treated as a tramp, and had to do some very objectionable work in the morning before he went out. I came across that man afterwards, and he certainly excited my sympathy. The leave ran down his cheeks when he was telling the circumstances under which he had to seek the hospitality of the workhouse. That is a case that ought to be guarded against; and it struck me, in all such cases as that, if a respectable tradesman going on tramp got a certificate from the constable of the district where he was, that should give him relief in the workhouse and be a guarantee of his respectability to the officials. But for the professional tramp, I think no punishment too severe for them.

18026. Even deprivation of their liberty by being sent to a labour colony?—Certainly. I heard your suggestions about women with illegitimate children. Unfortunately, the experience is that once a poor girl falls and goes into the associations of the workhouse there is hardly a case in which she does not fall again, and the suggestion made is an admirable one and the only one calculated to meet the case; that is, whether it is the Government or the rates of the country should provide the maintenance of such an institution to which such girls could be sent.

18027. There are a great many of these institutions existing already. For instance, in Cork and Dublin there are Convents of the Good Shepherd, and there are some Protestant penitentiaries also, so the country has a good many to start with?—They could not take them, of course, except by the Guardians paying for them.

18028. In the same way that they pay now; to send a person to an extern hospital for treatment?—I think that would be an excellent arrangement, and the only one calculated to deal with the case effectually. Of course, I know the general tendency of human nature is to condemn their poor mistakes when they fall. So blame falls on any one else, and sometimes they are the victims of people who should protect them. I think the suggestion is an excellent one, and the only means of dealing with the difficulty.

18029. Mr. MURPHY—Do you think the law in regards the parents ought to be altered so as to enable the girl herself to seek for some assistance; to proceed against the father for the support of the child?—I think so. Whatever attention in the law that is necessary should be made in order to compel the wrong-doer to do the girl justice.

18030. At present it is very difficult to bring home to the parent the offence, and therefore the Guardians are almost powerless?—That is so.

18031. Do you think there ought to be some amendment of the law?—I do.

18032. In England it is much wider in its application than here, and if it were extended to Ireland payment could be obtained more easily?—I don't know what the law may be in England, but I certainly think the law should be improved in Ireland to allow the girl herself to be the prosecutor.

18033. CHAIRMAN—Do you think the present rating area is all right for all purposes; do you think union rating the best?—I think union rating for the relief of the poor is proper.

18034. Mr. MURPHY—Now, with regard to outdoor relief, some witnesses think that it has increased very much since the union has been made the area instead of the electoral division?—I believe there has been an increase, but I don't think that is brought about by any indifference of the Board to investigate fully the applications as they come before them and the necessities of the case. I know there are some people under the impression that divisional rating would be better, because it is said if there was divisional rating the Guardians would be

May 4, 1904.

Mr. Patrick
A. Meehan

cases caused in investigating cases. In my experience since the Local Government Act passed I don't think there has been any case that was not bona fide or there has not been a just and fair investigation, nor I don't know of any case where relief was given when it was not required. Although some Guardians do favour the Liberal ruling at the same time, in my experience since the Local Government Act passed, when the case was investigated and a case was made clear and made to be a just case, there was never any objection presented by any opposition to giving a bona fide case out-door relief. There are some cases of very large out-door relief, in a particular district; it might not be fair to ask a whole district to pay for what might be a limited case, but as far as the relief of the poor is concerned I think it is a very proper thing to have it a case charge.

18035. As a rule, rural Guardians are against union relief while town Guardians are in favour of it?—I investigated that matter with the relieving officer here, who is a very able man, and has the law and everything pertaining to his duties on his finger's ends; there were a large number of people on relief in Maryboro', and when I investigated their cases, supporting them were thirty, only seven were born in the district (union of Maryboro'); others came into Maryboro', got destitute, and became chargeable on the rates of the town.

18036. We have heard that printed out before, and I don't think is a great deal of truth in what you say?—I really think union relief is good. I know Boards of Guardians who were passing resolutions in the old times asking for union relief, and now when they have got a case of them even dissatisfied with what a few years ago they were asking for.

18037. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose you are one of the Guardians of the County Infirmary?—I am.

18038. You don't happen to have a report about you?—I am not in for you in five minutes. I know the institution is managed in an admirable manner.

18039. It is an old building, is it not?—It is an old building. At the same time since the Local Government Act came into force and the change on the committee they have made many alterations there and provided all the necessary medical appliances—up-to-date appliances—and the institution, I think, is among the best of its class in Ireland.

18040. Then you are satisfied with its condition?—Thoroughly satisfied, and I am quite sure that the management will be pleased if you, gentlemen, have time to go down and see the place. The County Council give £1,500, and the balance of the funds that are available for the maintenance come from private sources.

18041. Do you happen to remember how many nurses there are there?—There is a matron and three nurses. I will be very glad to send you the last report.

18042. Mr. MURPHY.—Some witnesses seem to think that the county infirmaries confer benefits on a small area whilst the whole county has to pay for their upkeep?—There may be something in it; it is only very seldom to think that there will be more applicants for medical relief from the immediate neighbourhood of the hospital, but at the same time I think when I submit the returns to you you will see that the patients coming to the Queen's County Infirmary come from all the districts of the Queen's County, and we have ample accommodation for them.

18043. Do you think that in addition to district hospitals county infirmaries are also needed?—Doubtless, I think it is a great boon to the people, not only of the district of Maryboro', but of the Queen's County generally.

18044. Dr. BROWN.—There are not many operations performed at Abbeyfeix or Mountmellick?—I did not see of any operations in the hospitals you mentioned. I know there are numerous operations performed in the Queen's County Infirmary, and many successful ones. At the same time the medical officers at Abbeyfeix and Mountmellick are very excellent men, and well able to deal with any case, but they may not have the appliances in these places, but at the same time when any serious cases occur in these unions I think they are sent by the doctors to the county infirmary.

18045. Regarding the hospitals at Mountmellick and Abbeyfeix, would you suggest that they should be separated more from the workhouses than they are at present?—I really don't consider that question. I know that people in general have a dislike to go to a workhouse, and I dare say there are very many people who would go to the hospital if it was separated. I have now the return furnished to the County Council of

the number of intern patients treated at the county infirmary for the half-year ending 30th June, and they amount to 245; the extern patients amount to 366.

18046. These extern patients were all from Maryboro', I suppose?—I would not think so. I have a good many tickets, and I think about fifteen out of twenty would be from the districts outside Maryboro'.

18047. Just immediately around it?—No; some would be from Mountmellick, some from Abbeyfeix, and some from Durrow.

18048. CHAIRMAN.—Do you know anything about the hospital at Mountmellick?—It is a fever hospital; I don't know about it; it is subject to the Mountmellick District Council.

18049. Would you suggest that the hospitals should be separated as far as they possibly can from the workhouses?—If possible I would.

18050. Would you suggest that the management should be in any way separate from the workhouse?—I don't think so. I think the District Councils manage the hospitals very well.

18051. Mr. MURPHY.—The Guardians?—Yes.

18052. Dr. BROWN.—Would it be any advantage if there was a hospital committee with confidence upon it, such as they have in the county infirmary or in general hospitals?—I should not like to answer that question definitely.

18053. It would bring people into touch with the hospital; they would take more interest in it and visit it, and in that way you might get over the prejudice against the workhouses?—I have not considered that matter, but I dare say it would be a good thing, provided that none of the responsibility was removed from the Board of Guardians. If the Board of Guardians remained the appointing authority of the committee and the committee were responsible to them and could not undertake any expenditure without their sanction, if their duties were merely to superintend and assist the management, so to speak, I think it might be a good thing.

18054. Unless they had some real voice in it you could not expect a committee to go to a hospital and look through it and see things that should be altered unless they had some voice in getting them altered?—Yes; but I am quite sure that the recommendations of the committee would be received favourably by the appointing authority. I dare say it would be an improvement and remove the objection just mentioned if a committee similar to the committee of the county infirmary was appointed.

18055. You would not go further and suggest that the county infirmary committee should have the management of the other hospitals?—Judging from the attendance, I really think if any additional duty was placed on them they would be hardly equal to it.

18056. CHAIRMAN.—You think it would be better to have a local committee?—I think it would.

18057. Dr. BROWN.—And perhaps the same rate too for the whole county. It is rather unfair that Abbeyfeix and Mountmellick should support hospitals of their own and at the same time pay the same rate to the county infirmary hospital?—Yes; but the whole district. We in Maryboro' pay our portion to Mountmellick hospital.

18058. CHAIRMAN.—But not to Abbeyfeix?—The whole district pays for Abbeyfeix; it is not the town supports the hospital, but the whole district.

18059. What Dr. Bigger says is that all the distant parts of the county contribute to two hospitals—their own hospital and the county hospital—and they get very little, if any, advantage from the county infirmary?—That is so.

18060. Would you be in favour of making the maintenance of the sick in whatever hospital a county charge?

Dr. BROWN.—Only the very acute sick?—I would not like to answer the question straight off.

18061. You have not considered it?—I have not.

18062. With regard to consumption, have you thought of anything that might be done for the consumptive in the county—the establishment of a sanatorium or joining with any other county?—I think it would be an excellent thing, and there is a very suitable building available and in a good situation—Donaghmore.

18063. You think it could be made suitable?—There is land attached to it that would be useful for out-door exercise and work.

18064. CHAIRMAN.—Dry situation; it is not low-lying land; it is a well-forested part?—I am afraid it is not well drained; I would not be very positive on that.

18065. Then that would be a fatal objection?—I think the land about appeared to me to be damp;

May 4, 1904.
Mr. Patrick
A. Henson.

There was water about the house, but I daresay it could be removed easily. But, considering the number of people in the country that are victims of consumption, I think it is time that something should be done in the line you state; some effort ought to be made for those poor people; and, except for one thing—the situation—Dungannon would appear to me to be an admirable place for some such institution.

18065. Dr. BROWN.—Queen's County being small, you might join with some of the neighbouring counties.

CHAIRMAN.—You have a good healthy site at The Heath?—It is about one of the highest in the county, and there is a splendid house that used to be used for the races in the old times. It is not used at present, and perhaps with very little expenditure it could be altered for the accommodation of perhaps thirty people.

18067. Dr. BROWN.—Those windows are often wooden shutters put up temporarily?—There is a very good house there, except the sanitary authorities might object; they treat infirm residents there in the summer months, but the building is lying idle, except, I think, the Board of Guardians meet part of a day there, but The Heath, or that locality, would be an excellent place for it; it is a dry, healthy station. Now this (proposed) is a return of the receipts and expenditure of the infirmary for the year commencing 6th of January, 1903, and ending 5th of February, 1904, and you have the return here that you wished for. Number of intern patients within a distance of five miles round the infirmary, 302; number of intern patients beyond five and under ten miles, 134; number of intern patients from ten miles to the bounds of the county, 138.

18068. Dr. BROWN.—But when you enlarge your circumference you have three times the extent of ground?—That is so. But if a hospital was to be discontinued simply because it was of more benefit to the immediate locality than to the more distant parts it would fall against any institution.

18069. CHAIRMAN.—And it is a most valuable institution, of great use to the neighbourhood?—It is only

last night I gave a ticket to a man from near Monaghan who had his eye nearly knocked out; he was admitted there and treated; it would have been very convenient if he had had to travel to Abbeylex or some other place.

18070. Mr. MURPHY.—Is there any feeling in other parts of the county against the county infirmary?—I don't think there is. I know there was an expression of opinion once or twice, but it was not unfriendly, and I think it is quite recognised in every part of the county that the infirmary is an admirable institution, and should be maintained, although people perhaps from near Clonow or Almy may never come there; at the same time they quite recognise that such an institution is necessary, and should be continued.

18071. Dr. BROWN.—You have some trust funds which help to support it?—Yes; there is the income from the Grattan Street fund.

18072. CHAIRMAN.—Have the subscriptions fallen off since the new management, since the system of government was changed?—Well, I regret to say they have.

18073. Before a person becomes one of the governing body by paying a subscription, now that privilege is gone, so, naturally, the same amount of subscriptions don't come in?—It does not; then there were circumstances which I would prefer not to mention now, and a number of subscriptions ceased in consequence.

18074. Mr. MURPHY.—I suppose under the new management the benefits are much more general than formerly?—Yes.

18075. That is to say a class of the population now gets benefits that formerly were excluded?—I would not say excluded, but undoubtedly the poorer class of people are more frequent applicants than before.

18076. So that the benefits to the poor are greater than formerly?—Much more; and since the new management they have supplied up-to-date instruments which enable the medical staff to perform difficult operations that have been performed, and successfully performed.

Mr. Henson J.
Hurlers.

Mr. HURSTON J. HARRISON examined.

18077. CHAIRMAN.—What are the views of your Board as regards continuing the workhouse?—In favour of continuing Abbeylex.

18078. Would you be willing that some classes in the workhouse should go elsewhere, say lunatics?—We always remove any dangerous lunatics.

18079. You have about ten there; they are harmless?—Quite so.

18080. Bad people of dirty habits?—I am not aware that they are.

18081. You would not be in favour of leaving those classes?—I am not expert enough to say; they are doing no harm, and I think they are very much happier among their associates; they like the place, and are very much at home, and probably have an easier life than amongst dangerous lunatics in the asylum.

18082. Do you think they would have as pleasant a life as if they went to an institution where so much is done for their pleasure?—I think they are very happy in Abbeylex.

18083. They are in a little separate ward for themselves?—We have no separate ward; they are with the other aged and infirm. They are always sweeping or kept usefully employed.

18084. Then the children, do you approve of children being kept in a workhouse?—I would like to see them boarded out.

18085. At as early an age as they could be sent out safely?—Quite so.

18086. Would you be in favour of extending the power of Boards of Guardians to board out children that come under their charge, even when they are not epileptic or demented?—I would not probably go as far as that—taking them away; a great deal would depend on who the parents were and a good deal on the surroundings, and the question would be whether you would make it a hard and fast line; it entails a great deal of consideration before you deprive parents of their children—where one parent might be silly or weak, or goodness knows what, to deprive the other parent of the child. I was a Guardian forty years ago, and I have been a Guardian under the new Act, and I know the Guardians are most assiduous in their duty and most careful in the selection of the people they send the children to, and we are blamed with a first-class schoolmaster, and the house is carried on in splendid style,

and the children have earned the highest praise from the inspectors, and I think they are very happily placed in Abbeylex Workhouse.

18087. So you would not care to move them on either?—We constantly have applications for the boys or girls as soon as they come to ten or twelve.

18088. That is for living out?—Yes; and we have put out some children, but it is very difficult to get foster-parents; there is the trouble; they don't trust them too well at all as compared with a place or institution like Abbeylex, where they are so very well managed.

18089. Have you a ladies' committee there?—Yes; but we have a very good house committee.

18090. You did not appoint a committee of ladies to look after those children?—No; we have no ladies connected with our Board.

18091. But even ladies who are not connected you have power to appoint on a committee?—I think that would not work well.

18092. The experience is rather the other way when it has been tried?—It may be in other places, but we are working very well and harmoniously, and it would be some trouble to get ladies into Abbeylex.

18093. As regards the girls who come in to live illegitimate children, would you be in favour of any change there?—Certainly; I think your suggestion of sending them to a penitentiary is the real solution. No matter what is the punishment of a girl, the chance is she will get some instruction and some healthy lessons that will give her a chance of betterment.

18094. What about tramps?—I think it is perfectly impossible to give a satisfactory answer. Mr. Murphy suggested keeping them in the workhouse a little longer. It is very hard to know what to do.

18095. That would discourage their movements a bit?—The custom in our union is that the Master is instructed—of course we cannot refuse them when they come first, but if they come a second time they are brought before the magistrates and sent to Killybegs for forty-eight hours. We had a talk on the subject some time ago, and I think the number of returned tramps was very small in the year; they would see you go and treat tramps too badly you will drive them out into the country, and the chances are they will be

about the farmers' places and burn them, and there will be malicious injuries. I would nearly sooner run the risk of housing them.

1809. Would you take the other step that some people suggest—that is of sending them to a place where they would be under restraint for a long period, to a labour colony?—I don't believe in that sort of work. I think the class of tramps that I have noticed in Abbeylex are idlers; a lot of those unfortunate fellows who only want a night's rest and lodging; they are not able to work; they are idle.

1807. Mr. MURKIN.—Don't you see that the present system continues the same class from time to time and generation to generation?—I think as long as you are in Ireland you will have those tramps going about; you will not stop them; no legislation will ever keep tramps down. I think if you looked to the Government and let them give proper encouragement to their soldiers and give them a way of living, for the tramps at present are the disbanded soldiers—the greatest nuisance that ever befell the country since the South African War—these are the people we have to dread; they go on lone some roads and follow people.

1808. CHAIRMAN.—Those men have no pensions?—I don't know whether they have or not, but they are the real danger; not the poor broken down tailor that is not able to amuse himself to his cost.

1809. These disbanded veterans, what would you do with them?—I would send them back to South Africa instead of the Channel.

1810. Mr. MURKIN.—But failing that, what would you do at home?—I would prosecute them in every sense of the word. I would call upon the police to be more vigilant and watch them.

1811. When they come to the workhouse what would you do with them?—We are bound, I believe, to relieve them at once.

1812. CHAIRMAN.—You have a discretion?—I think our master is very careful about it. He proceeds against them as tramps and vagrants, and gets them into or three days in Kilmainham jail.

1813. Don't you think that something ought to be done to stop the occupation of tramping?—Decidedly.

1814. You won't do that by writing and looking on?—There is no means that can be devised but, I think, should be adopted.

1815. Then you would favour a colony for such people; some place where they could be sent for a term of years and made work there?—Yes; in one way these tramps—but it is very hard on poor artisans knocked out of a job and having to tramp to Dublin or Limerick; these men are driven to destitution on the road; they are good men, and if they got employment they would work; I would not call these tramps.

1816. The Guardians would not deal harshly with an honest working man out of employment?—We don't consider whether they are honest or dishonest; we take them—the rough and smooth—together. The master manages them very well at Abbeylex. Tramps don't trouble us very often—the same bunch.

Mr. JOHN WILLIAMS examined.

1817. CHAIRMAN.—Are you Chairman of the Mountmellick Board of Guardians?—Yes.

1818. You are not in favour of breaking up Mountmellick Union?—Certainly not.

1819. You heard the conversation we had with the different witnesses?—I did. I coincide with everything nearly that Mr. McMahon said.

1820. Did they say anything that you would be inclined to disagree with?—There is a thing I would bring forward that is in connection with these people coming in and bringing children with them; there ought to be a separate institution for them altogether away from that.

1821. They were in favour of sending these girls to a penitentiary or refuge under religious management?—That entirely agrees with my views so as to take them away.

1822. Would you take away the inmates?—That depends to a certain extent; the inmates are very well used for over in our part. I don't know would it be much advantage to take them or not.

1823. You don't see any great occasion for a move there?—No; but there is one thing I could tell you that I think very much about, and that is not to be changing down the convicts from Maryboro' over on Mountmellick.

1807. You see strongly of opinion that many of those tramps are ex-soldiers?—I am; I have seen them. There is an undesirable mark on the old soldier.

1808. Do you happen to know or did it ever occur to you to find out whether these men are still on the Reserve, liable for service again?—I don't know anything about them; we could not tell; there is no classification, and you cannot believe them.

1809. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you keep any record of their occupation?—Well, what they say they are, I suppose, that is.

1810. CHAIRMAN.—Do they ever say they are Reserve men or soldiers, or do they all say they are labourers?—Goodness knows what they say; you cannot believe them.

1811. I think the general reply is labourers?—Just whatever suits themselves for the time being.

1812. Would you be in favour of sending the aged and infirm from the different workhouses to one central institution, where they could be employed on a farm or otherwise?—That would all depend where that institution would be.

1813. Supposing it was at Abbeylex, would you approve of it?—I think any aged or infirm we have are not able to work on the farm.

1814. They are able to do little things?—And our master finds he has quite enough for them to do.

1815. Have you ever gone into the aged and infirm wards in Abbeylex and seen the large number of men sitting and looking about there, doing nothing?—They are not able to do anything, and they are labelled labourers; when the day is fine they are employed to go out and dig and sow, and make themselves generally useful according to their strength; we have not an able-bodied man in Abbeylex. Colonel Peel took a good deal of trouble some time ago to see would there be any among the women to do cottage industries—knitting and wood-carving. They had no idea of it; they could not do it. Now and then if we get a carpenter in who is temporarily laid up he is employed to do jobs about the house. I don't think there is a man idle in Abbeylex Union except when the day is bad.

1816. There is no other competition except these little jobs?—They are fit for nothing else; if there is a tailor there he is worn out, and he won't mend clothes for you.

1817. Mr. MURKIN.—Supposing you had an institution properly arranged and you had a workmaster for the different departments, would it not be different; could not these people be classed according to their various occupations; it would keep them employed and therefore happier?—I am not aware that there is any man that is a skilled artisan that could work at anything. They are all agricultural labourers in the house.

1818. If you had a considerable quantity of land?—They are not able for it; you will have to get hired labour; there may be an acre that might be available, or perhaps two, but that would be the most; we have no men in it; they are all aged and infirm cripples.

May 4, 1904.

Mr. Justice J. Harrison.

Mr. John Williams.

1820. As soon as a gentleman takes his discharge from prison does he go to you?—Yes; I wish you would take a note of it; we have one gentleman over there that does not wish to go away from us, and we cannot send him away.

1821. What did he come to Maryboro' for?—Committing an indecent assault on a young child; the people around him do not make very fine use of him. I think he is not a man we ought to have there.

1822. Why don't you discharge him?—I don't know why we did not do it at all; he had a right not to be let into it.

1823. Why don't you put him out?—Because it is not in our power.

1824. If he was an able-bodied man why don't you send him out?—He is an old man; at any rate we cannot remove him.

1825. Mr. MURKIN.—Did you try to remove him?—We wrote about him, and we could not do it.

1826. Why don't you order his discharge?—Because when a man is destitute and of a certain age we must keep him in the workhouse.

1827. CHAIRMAN.—Is he able to walk about?—He is.

1828. He may go out and do some light work?—What I want to impress upon your minds is this—this man finds there is a sort of grievance in connection

May 4, 1904.

Mr. John Williams.

with what he has already done; he is not satisfied; what can we do with him. We cannot shift him. It is a case for your consideration, and it is the only case I have heard mentioned that is worth your while considering. We don't want the Mayboro convicts dumped down in Mountmellick whatever dumping is in question.

18133. That is a sort of home industry you don't want to encourage?—Certainly.

18134. Is there any other matter you would like to see straightened a bit?—The only matter is a separate place for these young women that have children. I think it is very, very necessary, and here is another matter too—I think we might turn over the tramps to the Government altogether.

Mr. Lewis Cullen examined.

Mr. Lewis Cullen.

18135. CHAIRMAN.—Do you agree or disagree with the witnesses that have gone before you?—In many things I agree, but in the principle I don't agree. I know there are many Guardians in the workhouse that will favour the opinion I give; that is the abolition of workhouses generally, but I would not wish to see Mountmellick abolished and Abbeyfeix adopted in its place.

18140. But a general abolition of workhouses for the sake of economy. You saw that what I was asking Mr. Meahan and Mr. McMahon did go largely for the abolition of workhouses; that every class was to be taken out and leave it nothing but a hospital—I fully agreed with that. I have pretty strong opinions myself, and have studied a great deal. I believe we have an average number of 200 people in the workhouse at Mountmellick, and our rates in the workhouse is something like £8,000 a year, or probably less a week for each individual. I think that if instead of having a workhouse at all—

18141. Before you say that, while you are on the question of expense, I expect you have taken into the £2.—Everything.

18142. Expenditure outside the Poor Law, such as dispensaries?—Certainly.

18143. That would not come before us?—You are not inquiring anything about dispensaries.

18144. No; we are merely on the Poor Law?—I don't look on dispensaries with favour at all.

18145. You would not close the dispensaries?—Yes; and give the money to the poor, and I would have the money handed direct to the person for whom it was intended.

18146. Do you mean to say you would turn off all dispensary doctors and have no one to care the sick?—The doctors would remain there still.

18147. Who would pay them?—The poor themselves when they get the money. We collect the rate; it is called the poor rate, and for every 6d. collected for the poor they get about 3d.; that is my private opinion.

18148. Mr. MURTAGH.—Where does the 9d. go?—For the upkeep of the workhouse; there is more spent in keeping up the workhouse, for sanitary improvements—there was a boiler got in Mountmellick the other day, something about £150, and it was all condemned. Now there is another sanitary arrangement again, £200 or £300 more; the upkeep of the workhouse, painting the windows, the furniture, the half-yearly supplies—they are continually recurring—and for others not poor at all.

18149. CHAIRMAN.—But the poor eat the food—the half-yearly supplies?—If a person went and asked the poor outside out of thirty poor twenty-nine would vote for a little out-door relief.

18150. I am sure a great number would prefer out-door relief, but what you say about the cost of administration that out of every shilling 6d. goes in administration, I would not like you to suppose I agree with you in that?—No; and probably few would.

18151. If you had figures and worked out the calculation I could then show you where I think the error in such calculation would come?—In the half-yearly returns issued for every workhouse in Ireland there are three or four items that come first—the support of the poor. I would separate those items from all the others, and say all the others were acting as a kind of transit for the support, and it cost 6d. to carry the 3d. worth to the poor.

18152. Dr. BRENNAN.—Did you go into the figures at all?—Yes.

18137. What would you think would be a good thing for the Government to do with them?—Take them into consideration the same as if you or I committed any crime.

18138. You would look on their going about as a crime or offence, and get them locked up in Mayboro?—Let the Government look after them; they have plenty of policemen riding about on their bicycles from Mayboro to Tullamore and Mountmellick to Athy; turn them over to the Government. How would you expect a relieving officer to be looking after those sort of fellows. Did they not lose £40,000,000 on the Boer War, and what the devil is the reason they cannot do that much.

18153. CHAIRMAN.—You took the first two or three columns in the abstract?—Yes. The cost of Mountmellick is about £8,000 a year.

18154. Including dispensaries?—Including dispensaries and out-door relief and all.

18155. In-maintenance and clothing, what would you call that?—I say that would not be necessary if I gave sufficient out-door relief.

18156. No; but I am coming to the 1s. and the 3d. 1s. It would be hard for me to give anything like an explanation without taking the whole thing.

18157. You must take it item by item; the first item in this is £1,353 for in-maintenance and clothing; would you put that in the 3d. or the 6d. 1s.—Certainly I would say the poor get that.

18158. That is part of the 3d. Out-door relief £1,026, that goes to the 3d. 1s.—Certainly; but if I were paying out-door relief and handed the money to the poor person.

18159. And that is over 6d. already without going further?—That will not meet it.

18160. Those two sums that I have read out to you are more than half of the half-yearly expenditure?—But everything is put down as going to the poor, but my theory is that it does not go.

18161. You said that yourself. I asked you was in-maintenance and clothing part of the 3d. or 6d., of you said of the 3d. 1s.—I say it would not be fair to charge that entirely to the 3d.

18162. If the food goes into the inmate's interior arrangements and if the clothing goes on his back—Maintenance, to my mind, means maintaining in his big house.

18163. No; it only means food and clothing?—No; I think not. I did not make it out that way at all.

18164. Then there is a sum now for medical charges—a large sum—£750 a year?—That comes under the dispensary.

18165. That would go out of it altogether; and the undoubtedly the salary of the medical officers, the salary of the schoolmaster, and the salaries of the officers, that would go to what you call the 9d. 1s.—Yes.

18166. I think you will find really that you have reversed the thing unconsciously?—No. Probably we will agree with me in my ideas. Those ideas are that there is no poor person in the workhouse who gets a food more than 4s. a week, and I say if that person were given 4s. a week outside or by some other means that it would be a saving on the rates, whereas it is far more than that by the present system.

18167. Dr. BRENNAN.—Did you calculate what the 10s. would cost at 4s. a week?—That would be £40 a week for food and clothing only.

18168. And you have £1,500 and £500 of it for dispensaries?—If I could maintain them at 4s. a week it would come to £4,000 a year.

18169. 4s. a week would house them?—My theory is to abolish the workhouse in rate.

18170. Would you abolish the doctors too?—No; but I would abolish the dispensaries.

18171. How would you carry out the curing of people; suppose you get ill, or any man you know get sick, does he not get the doctor to see him?—At present a person must qualify to a certain extent to get any assistance from the doctor, and yet there are people in a worse position to pay the doctor and still not qualify to get him—in the case of small farmers.

18172. Take the case of the very poor who get the doctor for nothing; would you make any change in that?—I would; I would wish the poor should have the accommodation of the doctor, but still I think the dispensaries are not good; there are a good

deal of expense in the transit of medicine and medical appliances, and they are put on the rates without any regard to economy. The doctor's fees could be reduced; he would reduce his fees in order to suit these ideas of people, but I would give the money called the poor rate according to its name; I would give it to the poor, and then let them pay the doctor themselves.

18173. If the poor person was sick would you pay the bill?

CHAIRMAN.—No; he would give the money to the poor man to pay the doctor?—I would.

18174. I am afraid it is not a practical suggestion; you might have a family of ten in one house and three in another?—There are not so many. I think in the Queen's County there are small families. You can give out-door relief on the certificate of the doctor, only under certain circumstances when a man seems so much wickerly pay the doctor does not care to aid him without a small fee.

Mr. Williams.—I must say, sir, that he is an inspector; he is getting a salary from the Government; do you understand me.

Mr. CONNELLEY PERMAN EXAMINED.

18175. CHAIRMAN.—Are you a member of the Mountmellick District Council?—Yes.

18176. You heard your chairman's evidence; do you support his views?—I came here to support my own opinion and the opinion of the men that I represent.

18177. Do you agree pretty much with what the chairman said?—In some instances I do. My opinion would be all for doing away with workhouses altogether so far as a workhouse for keeping up an idle lot, but not to do away with hospitals or infirmaries. I would wish to see workhouses amalgamated as much as possible to keep down expenses and do away with a body of bad persons, illegitimate children and their mothers, and I would board out all children.

18178. Get all classes out of the workhouse but the sick?—I would; but the aged and infirm.

18179. Would you leave in the aged and infirm?—I would; in a central institution.

18180. You would not go with the last witness to the extent of saying that there ought to be no institution or public building for the aged and infirm; that they ought all to get out-door relief?—Oh, not at all. I would give the aged and infirm and sick all that was necessary, but then there is a body of people reared from time to time in the workhouse; they go out and come back with a family, and I would not let them in at all if I could. It came under my own observation not a fortnight ago—a woman in the town of Mountmellick, one of the worst characters ever reared in it; I think she has six at the present time; and I say one of them, a boy of fourteen years of age, brought before the Board this day fortnight, and two or three masters applied for him and he told the Board he would not

leave the house. But I was selected to come here.

18175. CHAIRMAN.—Does he mean to say that you see an official under the Poor Law?—No; but I am a retired member of the Royal Irish Constabulary, and I take a pride out of it. It is the brightest feather in my cap, and I am not dependent on anything; I have plenty myself. I am honestly saying what I think, and what the people who sent me to the workhouse, against all opposition, meant, and they knew I would say it.

18176. Dr. BROWN.—Did you ever consider that if you were to put the number in the workhouse on out-door relief that the number could not be curtailed in any way; would not all their friends—people in the same position or even a little better position—want the same privilege if you gave it in money?—I come to electoral division rating, and I would have committees in each division.

18177. How would you safeguard it?—Local committees; towns do suffer on account of people coming in there, but the rural districts are in favour of union rating.

leave the house. When those people leave the house they are not worth a pin, and they return back again to the workhouse. Children that are boarded outside and reared outside with farmers or even tradesmen they generally merge in the community and come to be profitable citizens, and they are a credit to the community. I have one little boy at the present time that was boarded out; I have him hired out, and he is a chap good enough to be my own son, but others are at the other extreme, and, unfortunately, the Board have not the power to board out or hire out ones where their mother was there.

18178. You would be in favour of giving that power to the Guardians?

Mr. Williams.—Did I not, as Chairman of the Board, give every facility to have every one out?—But the law won't allow it. There have been applications made to myself several times for children, but I could not get them out because the mothers would not let them go, and I knew the mothers to be the worst of characters. There is another thing I wish to go into—the girls that did happen to fall. It is a very bad thing to classify them; I know decent girls enough to be there for years with street walkers or prostitutes, and in the end they were as bad as the worst.

18179. CHAIRMAN.—About tramps?—There are a class of tramps that make it a profession, and I would do away with them if I could, but with respectable tramps I agree with Mr. Moohan. There are some not inclined to do anything but to go about from place to place, living on the public. I would like to suggest that the girls who come in to have a child should be removed, and not left in contamination with the other people.

Mr. THOMAS THOMSON EXAMINED.

18181. CHAIRMAN.—In the Athy Union you have many more monies than either of the Queen's County unions; you have about 300 in the present time of the year?—Yes, sir. Mr. Doyle, the clerk, is here, and will give you all the figures.

18182. What is the idea of the Athy people about closing it?—I don't think it would work well to close Athy; there is a large radius around; a good deal of it is in the Queen's County and a large portion in Kildare.

18183. How far is the workhouse from the Queen's County border?—Something about three English miles; it is six Irish miles from Scrinallilly to the workhouse.

18184. The Athy Board is not in favour of closing the workhouse?—I don't think it would be convenient.

18185. Did they ever think of any other change, getting some of the inmates out of the workhouse?—The only change we thought of making was taking in portion of Ballinglass into Athy; it comes pretty convenient.

18186. In what county would that be?—In Wicklow. Wicklow, Carlow, and Kildare all join together near there.

18187. You have a good fever hospital there?—Yes.

18188. Much bigger than is necessary for fever?—Sometimes.

May 4, 1904.

Mr. LEVI
Cuthbert.

Mr. CONNELLEY
Plehan.

Mr. THOMAS
Thomson.

May 4, 1904.
Mr. Thomas
Timmons.

18209. What do you think ought to be done with the children?—I would agree with the other gentlemen who gave evidence about the children and tramps.

18210. And the girls who come in to have children?—I think your suggestion is a very good one.

18211. Tramps, have you much experience of them yourself?—Occasionally there are tramps; there is a difficulty about that question.

18212. Do you think it is a very pressing trouble?—I think the great bulk of them should be dealt with.

18213. How would you deal with them?—I think your suggestion was very good about the colony.

18214. Mr. MURKIN.—Is the number increasing or diminishing?—I rather think it increased for the last few years.

18215. CHAIRMAN.—Would you be in favour of putting the aged and infirm into one central workhouse?—I think it would be a good thing, if there was classification, and I don't think they would have any objection themselves.

18216. You think the aged and infirm might be moved?—I do.

18217. And the girls that go in to have children?—Yes.

18218. And the children you think ought to be boarded out?—I do.

18219. And the cessals and tramps dealt with in a labour colony, or some such method?—Yes.

18220. Very few lancers in your workhouse, so that really you would only have the sick and the lunatic; it would not be worth keeping the lancers?—No.

18221. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you think the women and men should be separated and put in different institutions?—I think it would be best.

18222. Dr. BUCHAN.—You mentioned about making the hospital separate from the workhouse?—It is a separate building.

18223. What was your idea in that?—The poor people would not be supposed to be going into the workhouse.

18224. You think that they would not have the same repugnance to go into it?—The less connection it has

with the workhouse the less repugnance they would have to go into it.

18225. Have you heard many of the poor complaining that they did not like to go into the hospital on account of its associations with the workhouse?—A good deal of the objection to going into the hospital is removed since the institution came under the name of the union.

18226. But you have also heard that they did not like it on account of its association with the workhouse?—Some old people would say they would do sooner than go there.

18227. If the hospital were separated from the workhouse in the way suggested—that is making the fever hospital the acute hospital for the district—do you think more respectable people would go into it?—It is quite possible.

18228. And perhaps pay is the ordinary ward?—Yes; there are pay-wards at the present time in the workhouse hospital.

18229. That would increase the usefulness of the hospital and it would relieve the workhouse of a certain amount of stigma on everybody going into such places. You have not considered the question of consumption?—No; but I think the suggestion of Mr. McLean about having a sanatorium at the Meath, or some very dry place, would be very good.

18230. You think the ratepayers would not object?—I think not; but, of course, the look-out of the ratepayers would be rather to have the rates decreased than increased.

18231. CHAIRMAN.—You, as a ratepayer, would be such a feeling?—Yes.

18232. Dr. BUCHAN.—But, notwithstanding that, you would like to see a consumptive sanatorium established in the county?—I think it would be a very useful institution.

18233. There are a good many consumptive patients in the Adhy Workhouse?—Yes; from time to time.

18234. And a good many in the district too?—It is a low-lying district, along by the Barrow; very wet and damp.

Mr. Martin E.
Doyle.

18235. CHAIRMAN.—The view of the Guardians of the Adhy Union was against breaking up the workhouse?—Yes.

18236. Mr. Minch was not able to come?—No; he was sorry he could not get away yesterday.

18237. You have heard the evidence of your colleagues?—I think Mr. Timmons was not present recently when it was discussed with reference to the acute cases for the fever hospital; it was the general wish of the Guardians that the fever hospital would be made a general hospital, and other portions of the workhouse would be utilized for the infirm and sick; at present we have a difficulty with regard to overcrowding.

18238. That is for the infirm and feeble?—Yes; chronic cases.

18239. And as regards lunatics, they would be willing to send them to the asylum?—Yes.

18240. Are they in favour of boarding out all the children?—Yes; the law to be amended to give them a certain right or power.

18241. And girls who go in to have illegitimate children?—It would be a great blessing if there was some place they could be sent to. There are several girls we could get situations for but cannot send them out because the children are there.

18242. And tramps?—We are in favour of giving them some test in order to distinguish between the malcontented tramps and others.

18243. Mr. MURKIN.—That power has been in the hands of the Guardians in England for some years, and it has not had much of a deterrent effect?—Last year there was smallpox in Dublin and our Guardians decided to vaccinate all the tramps and it had a very deterrent effect, and they remained away. I was suggesting to the medical officer to keep it up.

18244. How much a head did you give the medical officer?—2s.

18245. Dr. BUCHAN.—He did not make many two shillings?—About forty. Mr. Timmons referred to Bellinglass; what he meant was the County Kilmore portion of Bellinglass. Adhy is the only union in South Kildare, with the exception of three divisions in Bellinglass Union. These were transferred to Adhy under

Mr. MARTIN E. DOYLE EXAMINED.

the Local Government Act of 1896, but owing to the opposition from Bellinglass the Local Government Board did not pursue it, and left those with Bellinglass. Since then there has been an appeal to the Adhy Guardians by the residents of those divisions asking them to apply to the Local Government Board again, which they did.

18246. CHAIRMAN.—Are they anxious to get to you?—Yes; the new hall of Castleknock is in Adhy and the remainder in Bellinglass. We have a medical officer and midwife there, and the Bellinglass people cannot have them; they have to go six miles away, and the same thing occurs in Ballinacorney.

18247. Mr. MURKIN.—And the medical officer of another union is across the street?—Our office is there, and cannot be avoided of. Of course he does go, I believe, more for charity than anything else.

18248. But he cannot be called upon officially?—He cannot.

18249. Dr. BUCHAN.—Have you heard any expression of opinion from those frequenting the hospital that they did not like to go into it on account of its association with the workhouse?—I think it would be better if different entrances were arranged, but I heard no expressions of opinion. Of late years our hospital has been very much availed of by parties who were willing to pay.

18250. But do you think even a larger class of small ratepayers would go into the district hospital if there was a district hospital?—I think so.

18251. You think in that way there would be a number of smaller ratepayers who had not very good arrangements at home would go there and be treated and pay for their treatment?—I am certain they would.

18252. That class of people don't go into the workhouse at present?—No; it is mostly people about the towns—shop-assistants and others—have availed of the hospital as it at present stands. If the fever hospital was changed to here it a general hospital, and the workhouse done away with, there is no doubt it would be availed of.

18253. And therefore it would be more useful and more up-to-date?—Yes.

Mr. GEORGE VASSTON examined.

May 4, 1904.

—
Mr. George
Vasston.

18284. CHAIRMAN.—You are one of the Town Commissioners of Maryboro' ?—I am. What I wish to say is I agree with a good deal of what Mr. Meahan has said with reference to the workhouse, but there is just one observation I want to make in reference to the Queen's County Infirmary. From what I heard Mr. Meahan saying he would lead you to believe that the present management of the infirmary would be superior to what it was in the past. That is a matter I would wish to contradict, for I am an old governor of that for over forty years. I have nothing to say against the present management, but to say it is better than the past I would contradict that.

18285. CHAIRMAN.—You think, as far as the enlightenment of the times went and medical treatment?—The medical treatment was all.

18286. It was up-to-date?—It could not be better; under Dr. Jacob.

18287. As time goes on they are continually introducing new improvements?—Up to the present time and up to 1896 there was no improvement, I believe, in a hospital except X-rays or something like that that was not in this hospital before.

18288. Operating rooms?—Yes; an operating room too.

18289. You had that there in 1896?—Yes, and at the present moment. I don't believe there is another in the province equal to the Queen's County Infirmary at that time or even at the present moment. I think if you go down there you will say so. And as for the amalgamation of unions, I believe people around here would be in favour of amalgamating the unions.

18290. With a view of lowering the rates, if it could be done without hardship to the sick?—Without hardship. I believe too there are some unions could be done away with with greater ease to the poor and without any loss or detriment to them, and I take, for instance, Mountmellick Union. There is no union that I know of in this district that could be better done away with than Mountmellick; portion of it could go to Athy; that would leave a residue to the suffering unions of something like eight to ten miles. Then again we are here in Maryboro' and we are only seven miles from Abbeyleix and we are only five from Mountmellick; therefore it does not matter which town we go to. In Mountmellick you are ten miles from Mountmellick and only six from Abbeyleix. The Mountmellick Union runs within three miles from Roscrea. What I would do, I would give the King's County portion to Tullamore, Newfstown and Sallypore here to Athy. I give Maryboro' to Abbeyleix, Marymount and Celanino to Roscrea. I would rather have Mountmellick used for Innacree and Donaghmore could be used for a sanatorium. I don't want to have the hospital done away with in Mountmellick. I would be very sorry to see that, but make it a district hospital.

18291. How are the rates in Mountmellick and Abbeyleix?—Nearly the same, except where the sanitary rate comes in, but the rate for the poor is about the same. Those are the only matters I wish to go into. I might, like one of the witnesses here to-day, get bogged if I got into figures.

18292. It is the thing to look at, thought?—Yes; but we look at them from a cursory point of view.

The sitting terminated.

May 5, 1904.

THIRTY-SEVENTH PUBLIC SITTING.—THURSDAY, MAY 5TH, 1904.

At the Courthouse, Kilkenny.

Present:—Mr. MILES (Chairman); Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. COET BEEGER.

Mr. R. H. PATER WATKINSON, D.L., examined.

Mr. R. H. Pater
Watkinson.

18253. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the County Council and also of the Castlecomer Board of Guardians?—I am not a member of the Castlecomer Board of Guardians, but they asked me to come.

18254. As a large proprietor in part of the union?—Yes.

18255. The first query that we put to the County Council was as to whether they approved of amalgamating any of the unions in the county, and their answer was rather short; it was extended amalgamation or total abolition—that, I suppose, means that they would like as many of the workhouses closed as could be closed?—Exactly; we think there are too many workhouses in the county for the needs; perhaps half the number would be sufficient.

18256. It was not intended, was it, that the number of places where the sick are treated should be diminished?—No.

18257. Whenever a workhouse is closed you still would leave a local hospital, call it what you wish, for the treatment of the sick of the locality?—Exactly.

18258. In every workhouse there are the same classes of inmates. First, you have the sick, then you have the aged and infirm, then you have the girls who come in to have illegitimate children, then you have the children over 2 or 3 years of age, then you have lunatics, idiots and epileptics, and criminals or tramps, and then you have very few of the ordinary able-bodied classes, which all over Ireland don't amount to 4,000, so it is a very small class. I take it that the view of the County Council was that provision for the sick should remain, and that amalgamation should be carried out with regard to all the other classes?—Presumably.

18259. In the County Kilkenny?—There are some members of the County Council in favour, I believe, of the total abolition of all the workhouses and boarding-out of all the inmates, but that was not unanimous by any means.

18260. That was the reason that there was an answer with an alternative?—Yes.

18261. Speaking roughly, there are about 300 aged and infirm in the County Kilkenny workhouses. Do you think there would be any prohibitive hardship in removing them to a central institution in the county? Suppose, for instance, Kilkenny Workhouse was set apart for the aged and infirm in addition to the sick for the Union of Kilkenny, would you see any great hardship in that?—I think it would entail hardship on a great many of the old people being taken away from their vicinity and friends who come to visit them. They probably would not be able to see any of their friends if removed to a central institution like Kilkenny.

18262. If one were to take that as a valid objection, nothing could be done in the way of amalgamation at all?—I think many of these aged and infirm people might be boarded out.

18263. Would you be afraid of a very great extension of outdoor relief in consequence of that?—No, I don't think so.

18264. You would not be afraid that nearly every family in humble circumstances would try to get a weekly payment for an aged member of the family? You would not be afraid that the claims would be very large?—That would be the danger, of course.

18265. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—But that objection would not apply to the inmates at present in the house because their presence in the house proves their destitution?—No, it would not.

18266. It would only apply to future applicants?—Yes.

18267. CHAIRMAN.—You said just now that you would be rather afraid of cutting them off from the visits of their friends?—Yes, it would be entailed a hardship by a good many.

18268. In going round as much of Ireland as we have gone hitherto we have made, wherever we have had opportunities, inquiries as to the number of visits paid to inmates in workhouses, and we found that the number of visits to the sick was considerable, but that hardly any, in a good many workhouses practically no, visits were paid to the aged and infirm class who come in to spend the rest of their lives there?—Of course, that is a very strong point.

18269. If you found that those people in a great many cases were single old people who were without friends, practically, outside, would that modify your view?—I think it would considerably. Of course, I have no practical experience. My impression was that people were visited largely.

18270. We thought so too until we began making these inquiries on the subject. Then take the most class that would come up. Naturally that is the girl who comes into the workhouse to have an illegitimate child. That is a class of which there are a considerable number in the County Kilkenny. Have you ever reflected on the position of those women, and can you offer any suggestion as to any different way of dealing with them? You have girls who come in to have children, and they practically stay for the greater part if not all of their lives afterwards?—They come in and out.

18271. They go out as a rule with their children to beg or something of that sort, and come back again with perhaps an additional child?—I would like to see a change in the law that the children would be taken from them and brought up properly.

18272. What would you do as regards the girls themselves? It has been suggested to us by some witnesses that a good plan would be to class the workhouses for such a class, and not to make the workhouse a place where such women could be admitted at all, but as soon as a girl had a lapse which resulted in her being about to become a mother, that she should be sent to a penitentiary or refuge under religious management according to the religion professed by the girl, and that she should be there brought under good influences with a view to giving her a fresh start in life; that she should be retained, we will say, six months or a year, or whatever time would be thought necessary, and that her child should be kept until a couple of years old until it could be boarded out safely?—I think the present system is a very pernicious one.

18273. And causes a great increase in the illegitimate population?—Exactly.

18274. And makes those people perpetually fall. They fall and keep on falling afterwards. The suggestion given to us was that they should be put into these orphanages with a view to restoring them to an honest life again?—I think that suggestion is a most excellent one.

18275. And that the Guardians should pay for them there, and then as soon as they went out to a situation that arrangements should be made by which they would pay for the support of their child and repay the Guardians or the community that might take charge of them, repay for their cost, with a view to saving expense. It was thought by those who made the suggestion that this would be a great benefit and a salvation for the girls, and that it would also reduce the number of illegitimate children, and that it would prevent the tendency of this class to become hereditary?—I quite

agree with that; even on the ground of economy alone I think it would be a great improvement on the present workhouse system.

18276. There are a number of parishes and parishes of that sort in Ireland already, so that it would not be a case of having to establish institutions. In fact you would have a great many to begin with, if they would consent to receive them, as we direct they would. The next class in the workhouse that we need are lunatics, idiots, and epileptics. Would you be in favour of removing these from the workhouse?—Most certainly.

18277. Would you place them in a district asylum?—There is a difficulty. I am a member of the Board of Governors of the asylum, and the difficulty is that the asylum is almost quite full. It would mean an extension of building and a large extra expense.

18278. Would you prefer extending the asylum?—No. By the amalgamation of workhouses it would lay aside the workhouse for these people. I think there are considerably over 100 in the county scattered among the different workhouses.

18279. There are not very many in the County Kildare in workhouses now. Recently a great number have been drafted into the asylum, at least within the last few years; they are now comparatively few?—I was looking at the report of 1901 yesterday.

18280. As far as we see, there are not more than about 50 in the county, so that would not be a very great strain; but if the asylum could not take them in without more building, you would be in favour of having an institution for what might be called lunatics, one of the disused workhouses?—Owing to the large increase of lunatics the asylum will be overcrowded very soon.

18281. As regards tramps or casuals, have you any view on that point?—I would like to see the tramps detained for a couple of days and let them work for what they get.

18282. That is the English system. They have power to detain them for periods increasing in proportion to the number of visits they pay the workhouse?—Detain them longer each time.

18283. If a tramp comes in twice they can keep him a number of days. If he comes in three times they increase the number of days, but it is said that system is not having the deterrent effect in England. A number of suggestions have recently been brought forward, some in the shape of bills in the House of Commons, that labour colonies should be established?—Are there a sufficient number of these colonies in Ireland to justify that?

18284. I should be afraid there would be too many for use as colonies. There are a considerable number. You get at the number by taking all that were in the workhouses on one night. That practically will give you a very fair idea of the number in all Ireland.

18285. Mr. MURPHY.—126 in Kildare according to that return?—A very large number of those would not go to a labour colony.

18286. CHAIRMAN.—Unless they were made in. Some would be bona-fide tradesmen looking for work, a certain proportion of them, and in those cases, of course, nothing would be done; but people who were proved to be idle vagrants, who walked about to avoid work, instead of looking for it?—I think they are very troublesome in workhouses. I would like to see the police given a little supervision over them.

18287. It was suggested by Mr. Butler, who, I am sorry to say, is not able to come in to-day, that tramps whose workhouses at present exist should be put in charge of the Royal Irish Constabulary, to whom they should apply for a night's shelter with an allowance of one pound of bread, the constabulary to enter the particulars of such applicants and prosecute on a second application of any such person within 12 months, or on proof that such person had applied for and received relief in any other place?—I agree with that, or that police should be quartered at the workhouse and exercise control over these people.

18288. Would not that tend to perpetuate the present system, although it would keep them more in order? If under a magistrate's warrant they were sent to a labour colony you would virtually put under restraint the whole of that class?—It would have the effect of reducing the numbers of that class.

18289. It would practically abolish the class?—In that way it would be an advantage if there were no disadvantage on the other side.

18290. Turning about the country, but when he cannot show any occupation or means of earning a livelihood, a great many witnesses have thought it would

be a very proper interference with his liberty. They are merely prying on farmers and others into whose houses they go, and really support themselves in that way?—I know they have these labour colonies in some Continental countries.

18291. In Belgium they have them, and there they are self-supporting. That is more than one could hope for, perhaps, and there are a couple of bills now before the House of Commons to enable such colonies to be started in England?—I would like to see other methods tried first, making the work a little harder when they go to the workhouse.

18292. Supposing we could get rid of the tramp from the workhouse, you would have the awkward class of keeping the workhouse open practically for the casual and tramp, if you got the aged and infirm to a central institution, and get the mothers of illegitimate children to go to refuges. I omitted to speak about the children. Would you be in favour of boarding out all children?—Most certainly. I am interested in that subject, and have studied it a little.

18293. Have you many boarded out in your own union?—Not very many.

18294. You have about 30 children in your workhouse. I suppose a good many of these are eligible for boarding out. You have only two boarded out?

Mr. O'Connell.—Four children at present in Castle-comer.

18295. CHAIRMAN.—What is your view about the boarding out of children?—I would like to see no children in the workhouse at all. I would exclude every child from the workhouse. It brings them up in an unnatural atmosphere, and it is against the law of nature. If we bring them up in institutions, we don't train children as they should be trained. They are brought up as machines, and turn out very bad machines. They know nothing of the ways of the world. It is not the fault of the officials, but the fault of the system.

18296. You would apply that practically to all institution-reared children?—I would; I don't approve of institution life for children at all.

18297. It is the institution life, not merely the workhouse life, that you object to?—Yes; it is the institution life.

18298. The only classes, then, you would have in the workhouse would be the sick and the casuals and the tramps, and the reason I was asking you so closely about the tramps was to see whether you considered that any other plan could be adopted than leaving those shelters for tramps in workhouses?—Put them in charge of the police.

18299. If the tramps were removed, you would have nobody there but the sick, and it would become wholly a hospital and nothing else?—That is what I should like to see, and put the casuals and tramps under the charge of the police.

18300. Would you put them in the lock-up?—I would not make it too comfortable for them.

18301. I suppose on a fair night or the night before a fair or noon, or whenever tramps congregate about a place?—I think it would be all the better if they had not much accommodation on those occasions they would not come then.

18302. Or they might comfortably board themselves out in barns and hay-ricks, where they would not be detectable?—The police could deal with that.

18303. You don't disapprove of the labour colony idea altogether?—Not altogether. I would rather see the other method tried first. It goes rather against our ideas of freedom a little bit.

18304. It does rather. Another suggestion made to us at Kildare and other places was that each man who is writing the road should have a police passport, and one man suggested his photograph should be on it as a means of identification?—Too like Germany.

18305. It is quite German, but the class is a troublesome class. Would you be in favour of the passport system?—For professional tramps.

18306. Absolutely for professional tramps?—If the police photographed them and kept their photographs it would do; they could be passed on.

18307. Mr. MURPHY.—You say that you would prefer to put the tramps under the control of the police instead of putting them in a labour colony?—I would like to see that method tried first in Ireland.

18308. Don't you think that heading them over to the police would interfere with their liberty, just as much as sending them to a colony?—It would interfere with them for the day they wanted to get the lodging, they would be forced to work for their lodging for

May 5, 1906.

Mr. J. H. Povey, Warden, Galis.

May 5, 1904.

Mr. R. H.
Pike Warden-
Cork.

that day. Sending them to a labour colony, I take it they would be sent there for a lengthened term, and that might work out a hardship.

18308. Then again, on the other hand, there would be the danger that these men looking for employment would be taken by the police, put into a lock-up, and perhaps subjected to an indignity?—I would not call it a lock-up; some accommodation adjoining the police barracks might be provided.

18310. Would you give the police the power to pay for the boarding?—I am speaking now of professional tramps, but if there was no place of refuge for them except the police barracks—

18311. If the present casual wards were closed to tramps, what provision would you suggest should be made in future for that class? You would not care to send them to the lock-up?—I would not call it the lock-up.

18312. If a man had a testimonial as to his benevolence, that he was really in search of work, would you give that power to the police to pay for his lodging for the night?—I think I would. I would give them that discretion.

18313. You see, the object of the labour colony is to try and deter the class altogether, and it might be tried on a limited scale for the country, because perhaps in the course of a few years there would be no need of any such place?—No; if you stop the supply for the manufacture of tramps by keeping children away from the workhouse.

18314. The sending of them to a jail for a week or 14 days has not the deterrent effect that reformers would like to see, so it has been suggested that if they could be sent to some place where they would be kept for a considerable time it might bring about a reformation, and once that happened they would try and get work and lead the lives of the ordinary labourer?—I would like to see the children removed from them.

18315. CHAIRMAN.—You would take their children from them?—I would most decidedly until they reformed.

18316. If you take the children from a man or a woman, do you think it would be right that the parents should be deprived of their liberty as long as the State was supporting the children? Would it not be dangerous to take the children from them to lessen their income and give them an opportunity to raise a fresh family. Whenever you go to the extreme step of separating the parents from the children, and where you think it would be really most injurious to the children that they should remain in the custody of their parents, would you be prepared then to go to the extent of saying that people who are so bad should be put into a labour colony?—If they would not give anything in the support of their children, I think they should be; that class could not, they are wandering about the country, you would have no means of collecting their money from them.

18317. Do you think it would be a prudent and proper thing to deprive such a parent of his liberty?—Is it not dealt with in Germany, that they take the children from these people altogether?

18318. In Germany they would not have the freedom of moving about that they have here?—Do you think they would be quite willing to give up the children here to get over the trouble of providing for them, but they would like to get them back at a certain age to beg for them?

18319. But if you did not give them that choice, that they left the children with you and went away and gave nothing towards their support, and you took away the right of getting back those children at a certain age, perhaps they would not be willing to give them up?—I was not thinking of the case in which they would be willing to give them up but a case in which a Board of Guardians or local body, after hearing all that had to be said on the subject, came to the conclusion that it would be against the public interest that such people should be allowed to have charge of the children; if they came to such a decision and took away the child the question arises what will they do with the parent; do you think a parent of such a kind should be allowed to go at large and perhaps start another family, or do you think it would be a fair consequence of his bad parentage that he should be secluded and kept to work at a labour colony until it was thought fit to let him out again?—I have not given the subject much consideration. The labour colony case I rather put out of my head, thinking that the other method might be

tried first, making it a little harder for them to travel about, and also take away their children from them as long as they did travel about.

18320. You did come to the conclusion that it might be prudent to take away their children from them?—Yes.

18321. Then the question arises at once, what are you to do with the parents if you did take the children from them; did you think they might be allowed to go about as before without their children, and subject to the police discipline you recommended?—That was my idea.

18322. Do you not think that would be rather an encouragement to the reproduction of the class?—Well, you would stop the supply in any case in the way of children; you would stop the children being trained up as tramps.

18323. And you would only have to deal with the ensuing generation?—And it would cure itself in a few years.

18324. You would stop the hereditary tramp and only have the existing generation; it would disappear perhaps in twenty years?—Yes.

18325. Mr. MURPHY.—Still the supply that you get at present will be continued if the young inherit the tendencies of their parents?—I think these tendencies can be eradicated by training and environment.

18326. Now, in regard to the removal of the class known as aged and infirm from their own location, you see some objection on sentimental grounds; this is to say you think they will be deprived of the view of their friends and relatives; would you be in favour of giving the Guardians the option of boarding on those people or sending them to a country almshouse; would you give that power to the Guardians to decide as to which they should do as regards the present inmates of the house?—I would.

18327. There could hardly be any question as to their eligibility for assistance when they have spent several years in the house up to the present time?—Exactly; I would give the Guardians the option.

18328. That would get rid of the present aged and infirm class, anyhow?—Yes.

18329. Dr. BROOKS.—Regarding the treatment of the sick, do you think it would be desirable to separate the hospitals as far as possible from the workhouse, calling them by a separate name?—I think that would be very desirable.

18330. Have you known patients having a certain amount of reluctance to go to a workhouse hospital?—Yes, I have known several; I might say many.

18331. Your hospital at Castlecor is a very good one, but still the sentiment is there?—Indeed it is.

18332. Do you think that it also acts to some extent as a feeder for the workhouse; that is that persons going into the hospital for treatment and thence coming in contact with the inmates of the workhouse lose that repugnance, and perhaps afterwards stay as in the workhouse?—I don't know of any to my knowledge.

18333. Would it strike you as being quite possible?—I think it might be possible.

18334. CHAIRMAN.—When the hospital is full does not the doctor say frequently we cannot keep this man, he is nearly well; we will put him in the aged and infirm ward?—Yes, to a certain extent.

18335. Dr. BROOKS.—Would you suggest that the hospital should be separated as far as management is concerned, or only as far as building, or both?—I would have it under separate management, and the buildings separated altogether from all ideas of penitence, and have free wards and paying wards.

18336. So that the poorer ratepayers could go there for treatment, especially in operative cases, and as they could not get at home?—Yes.

18337. You are a long distance away from Kilkenny; do the people about Castlecor and neighbourhood avail themselves of the county infirmary at Kilkenny to any extent?—I don't find they do very largely.

18338. CHAIRMAN.—You happen to have a good hospital at Castlecor?—Yes; and most cases are dealt with there.

18339. Dr. BROOKS.—And also the distance and inconvenience of getting to Kilkenny prevents people going?—Yes.

18340. Very severe operations may go, I suppose?—Yes.

18341. Have you any idea regarding the treatment of consumptives; we have heard a good deal about the establishment of sanatoria?—These sanatoria are not as successful as they were expected to be at first.

18342. Not perhaps to the exaggerated idea held at

ent; it was thought every case going into the sanatorium would be cured—I would not like to see very much expenditure on them.

18343. But still they have done a great amount of good, beyond all question; suitable cases can be selected, and the disease arrested, but not to the extent that it was thought at first, especially in the early stage. You would not like to see a large expenditure on them?—No; they seem to be very experimental as to them; it means expensive buildings erected.

18344. CHAIRMAN.—Could you not adapt a workhouse as a healthy abode, such as Castlemeor or Thomas, and afford to start with?—Would you get sufficient people in the country to fill up a place like that?

18345. I am afraid there are no exact numbers, but among the hospitals you see what is known as consumption—a very large number of surgical tubercular cases—it would mean a large expense maintaining all these people; they would have to be mainly maintained there free; there would be very few paying patients.

18346. We have had evidence from a doctor who has started a sanatorium in his own workhouse, with the help of the Guardians; he has turned the fever hospital into a sanatorium, and he is one of the very hopeful ones we had, for the number of cases in the early stages with him was very large—I did not see the subject touch thought, I must say.

18347. Dr. ROBERT.—The establishment of such an institution would stop the spread of this disease, and in a short time you would have the death-rate of consumption reduced; consumption is, beyond all question, a very infectious disease, and it is impossible for these people to be isolated sufficiently at home; it is a common experience to see one member of a family dying of consumption and next year or the year after another member, and so on, whereas if the first case had been treated in a sanatorium and isolated it might have saved all the others.

CHAIRMAN.—Is there used to be looked on as a hereditary disease?—I have no doubt it would be a most desirable thing.

18348. Mr. MURKIN.—Might not some of the work of the present houses be used in conjunction with the hospital?—I don't see why they should not, without having a special institution for it. I think that might be done.

Dr. ROBERT.—That might do for isolation purposes; it won't cure patients.

18349. CHAIRMAN.—If you get a block of buildings apart from the others, with facilities for open-air treatment adjoining, as Dr. Moorhead has?—A number of these workhouses have different buildings.

18350. It has been mentioned to us that the death-rate from consumption is eight times as much as from all the four put together—I am sure it is.

18351. So that it really is the most pressing and urgent question of public health in the country?—I would like to suggest, with regard to the boarding out of children, I think it is very essential that there should be a ladies' committee everywhere to look after these children. I regard the boarding out, if not properly supervised afterwards, as worse even than in the workhouse, because there is a danger of their being made slaves of.

18352. In isolated cases. Is not the general tendency of the human heart to attach to those little children who come to them at an early age and who really become incorporated with members of the family?—If they are looked after.

18353. I often even if they are never looked after?—No; I think it would be extremely dangerous.

18354. It would be dangerous for the exception, but for the rule you would not be in favour of attention to inspection or continual overhauling of the little child?—I should be in favour of close inspection.

18355. Would you not be afraid that that would keep up the idea that the child was the child of the State and not the child of the family?—I think it would be absolutely essential.

18356. Don't you think a wise and watchful eye looking at the child with a little tact would very easily see; if you or I were to walk into a National school where such children were and it was pointed out to us which was the child, don't you think we could satisfy ourselves by such inspection whether the child was happy or well cared for, and so would be unnecessary in almost all cases to pursue that course and take the child off and examine it for cleanliness?—No; my impression is I would rather have them looked after a good deal more carefully.

18357. If you had ten children boarded out at the same National school, would you be in favour of the inspector strictly and closely overhauling each one of the ten children?—Yes, I would.

18358. Mr. MURKIN.—Don't you think that would defeat the object we all have of getting that child incorporated with the public?—I think not.

Would you not still mark it out as a child of the State and one over whom the public authorities had a certain control. At present the relieving officer looks after the child monthly, and in many cases ladies' committees also go round and see how they are cared for.

CHAIRMAN.—And lady inspectors of the Local Government Board once a year.

18359. Mr. MURKIN.—There are three different inspections—one from the relieving officer, one from the ladies' committee, and one from the lady inspector. If you carry that thing too far you might prevent people in the country taking children at all who would not want to have their homes visited so frequently by these inspecting bodies?—If there was a difficulty in finding people to take these children I would have a system of scattered homes, like they are trying in Germany.

18360. CHAIRMAN.—That would be a smaller institution, but it would be still an institution?—It would be a home institution.

18361. Mr. MURKIN.—There would be no home in it; you would not have the father and mother over the children; you would have the mother pointing them up in a way that they might not be at home. The child would not have the opportunity of knowing how to do domestic work such as it would have if it were in the home of a farmer?—But these children in the scattered homes in England and Scotland are to all intents and purposes part of the family.

18362. There is not a farm attached to each place as far as I know; the houses are built by the Board of Guardians, and a mistress or housewife put in charge with a certain number of children; that is merely an institution on a very small scale?—But it is an institution on a natural scale.

18363. Not so natural as a home provided over by a husband and wife?—I would only be in favour of that in case there were no people fit to take them.

18364. CHAIRMAN.—I think you were just about to say that that very close inspection you are aware of is being tried somewhere?—In Germany.

18365. And in England?—I am really not quite sure; I think it is in England. I don't think it is compulsory, as in Germany; it is compulsory that there shall be a ladies' committee to take charge of these children.

18366. I was rather thinking of the official inspection; there it is carried out very minutely; the children are taken off the children and they are examined for cleanliness. I, as an inspector going around, would merely look at the child, and if I saw the child looking merely happy and healthy, and apparently, as far as the face and pick and hands, clean, I would not pursue my inquiries further. I would not go further with my own children?—I think a man might not be able to do so, but a woman can do what a man cannot do.

18367. I often did in in the workhouses; I had a few suspicious-looking children stripped in as whether they were washed and clean, but I would not like to do more than that outside if I saw the children looking apparently clean?—I would rather entrust that kind of work to ladies; there might be a few men here and there very quick at seeing what is wrong.

CHAIRMAN.—I should also prefer a lady inspector. I am merely on the question of a very close inspection, or what I may call a tactful general inspection, which would only turn to a close inspection where one saw the child puny and sick and neglected-looking, and if my eye was satisfied with the general appearance, I should not like to pursue the thing further.

18368. Mr. MURKIN.—A certain amount of inspection is not only good, but absolutely necessary; still, it should not be overdone, and the visits should be rather a friendly call than an official inspection. If the child looks healthy and content, and has the appearance of being fairly well treated, there is no use in prying further or making a fuss because of some trifling matter?—Little difficulties like that are more than outweighed by the advantages and the prevention of abuse.

May 5, 1904.

Mr. R. H. Price
Wandsworth.

18368. CHAIRMAN.—My idea is that you should see a case at a glance?—Then you would leave it to one man—the relieving officer.

18370. No; I would have the lady inspector also. But I do not approve of a very close inspection by a lady inspector, to the extent of the undressing of children and overhauling of them in that class way, unless there are grave grounds from the appearance of the child for looking into the case very closely. Of course I would look into the house and see they were properly heated, and that there was a cow for giving milk whenever it could be managed, but I would not like to have the child impressed with the idea of State inspection?—

You could get over that by not having the ladies' committee inspect too often.

18371. I think the ladies' committee is very good. I don't think a lady of the locality would make the mistake; I was rather thinking of the official inspection. I think a voluntary ladies' committee would have been enough. As a rule they know whether Mrs. Murphy keeps her child well or not, and won't pry, and they will know that Mrs. So-and-so is keeping the child badly, and they will make it hot for her and get the child removed. I think it is useful for the children too. I think the ladies take an interest in them in after-life and help them on.

Mr. WILLIAM DOWES examined.

Mr. William
Dowes

18372. CHAIRMAN.—I need not ask you. I know you are connected with Poor Law administration in Castlecomer for a very long time. What is your own view about amalgamation?—I am strongly in favour of it, and the Guardians have passed a resolution in favour of it, and one of the reasons that induces me in this, the house was built originally for 400, and at present there are only 117, or thereabouts, in it, and the population in 1861 was about 20,000; now it is reduced by about 90 per cent.—that is of the inmates—and I believe at no time were there more than 300 inmates in the house, so that these facts, I think, would justify me in saying that amalgamation would be desirable.

18373. But you would keep, of course, the sick in hospital still?—Certainly.

18374. I don't know whether you have referred at all to what would be done in the event of amalgamation, of some of the union officers leaving their situations; would you be in favour of their being dealt with as liberally as possible and get abolition of office terms?—Oh, certainly.

18375. You think that would be the general view?—I think it would.

18376. And the representatives of the ratepayers would not be at all willing to do a harsh thing towards their officers?—I am quite sure they would not do a harsh thing, and I think it would be only just to deal with them liberally.

18377. And if you were going to effect a perfect economy you would only have the life interest of the officers as a charge on it?—Exactly.

18378. If portion of your premises at Castlecomer were retained for the sick, can you suggest any other object for which the remainder of the premises might be applied?—It occurred to me that you can have a portion for an auxiliary asylum for the imbeciles and insane, or it could be applied for a school for technical instruction in connection with the Agricultural and Technical Instruction Department. I don't know whether that would be very practicable, but the former would.

18379. You think the suggestion about the lunatics would be practicable and the suggestion about the Agricultural Department would not be?—It might be difficult; retaining portion for other purposes—an infirmary and hospital.

18380. Or there was another matter mentioned—that was the question of possibly using part of it for consumption?—Yes; portion could be set apart away from the other buildings.

18381. It is a good healthy site?—It is a healthy site.

18382. You are in favour of boarding out children?—Certainly.

18383. And you would go a step further and board out the aged?—I would.

18384. What safeguard have you thought of in your own mind for preventing an undue number of claims for such out-door relief from old people?—That is the difficulty.

18385. I suppose a body finds it hard to refuse applications?—That is the difficulty I see.

18386. Can you see any practical method?—I do not. I am opposed to indiscriminate out-door relief, but my friends on the Board are more generous.

18387. You do see that there would be a danger?—There would, I am afraid.

18388. We received a suggestion yesterday in the Queen's County that some such provision should be introduced into a new Act as exists in the Local Government Act with reference to the maintenance of

roads, namely, that there should be a fixed amount payable, and anything above that, a witness recently suggested, should be made an electoral division charge, so as to bring it home to the very man that proposed it?—That would meet my view.

18389. We will say the limit of expenditure is so much each year, as soon as that was exceeded it should become an electoral division charge?—That might work; you want some safeguard; it would be a deterrent.

18390. You think the tendency of out-door relief is to go up as soon as it has been made a union charge?—I should be afraid it would.

18391. Has it gone up, as a matter of fact?—I think it has come up a little.

Mr. McEvoy.—It has not gone up.

CHAIRMAN.—You are in favour of a union charge for all purposes?—Yes; the Guardians passed a resolution in that effect in case of amalgamation.

18392. What did they consider would be a union charge now in the case of the amalgamation of Castlecomer; did they consider that Castlecomer Rural District should in future pay the expense of the Rural District hospital, or would it be put on the new one, which the present Castlecomer Union would be a part?—That is what the intention was, I think.

18393. That it should be a district charge for the sick. Then as regards the inmates in other workhouses from the present Castlecomer Union, say a Kilkenny Workhouse, what would be their chargeability; would the Castlecomer ratepayers have to pay part of the Kilkenny expenditure?—I think they should.

18394. That might work out that you had to pay a higher rate?—I think it would.

18395. Have you at all considered the question of a county rate for all purposes, on any, for the sick; do you consider the question of county rating at all?—No; but it would not more evenly.

18396. The only county rate you have at present is for the county infirmary?—I mean for the in-door support of people?—Yes; it is a county rate and partly by subscription.

18397. I suppose people down at the other side of the bridge, in Waterford and in distant parts of the county don't derive much benefit from the county infirmary here?—No; but they would be entitled to it if there was a vacancy.

18398. They might be entitled to beds in a London hospital, but they would not like to have to pay for that privilege if they did not use it; but did you consider at all the question, when the county infirmary is a county rate, whether it would be popular with local bodies that the sick all over the county should be a county rate?—I have not considered it.

18399. You see that there is a certain element of fairness in it, and if the sick in the county infirmary are a county rate it might even things if the sick all over the county were made a union rate?—I think they devoted their mind altogether to having the hospital and infirmary at Castlecomer for their division.

18400. And they would be willing to pay for that by a rural district rate?—Yes. I don't think they would be in favour of sending patients to the county infirmary or any long distance.

18401. That is not proposed, that is not suggested; the suggestion was that as the county infirmary is a county rate do you think the Castlecomer sick ought to be a county rate instead of a rural district rate?—I don't think I would have it a district rate; I would have it a union.

18402. The new union, the enlarged union?—The enlarged union. Of course it should be clearly understood that the infirmaries there should not go by the abolition of the workhouse.

18403. You would have it the district hospital, and the management of it would be in the hands of what body, the Rural District Council?—Certainly.

18404. Under a committee, such as the county infirmary?—No; it would not be popular.

18405. Mr. MURKHAM.—Not would it be desirable?—Quite right. I think a great many paying patients would go in that don't go now.

18406. CHAIRMAN.—Have you considered what income you might expect to get from paying patients?—No; but I believe there would be an income that could be applied in other ways afterwards.

18407. I suppose, even at present, you have a large number of people in Castlecomer hospital from time to time who could pay something?—Yes; the clerk will be able to give you the returns.

Mr. Mahony.—The average cost and part of the establishment.

18408. CHAIRMAN.—That is, comparatively, a heavy thing, and they would be on what is called a separate register; but apart from that, say, a mother in just fairly comfortable circumstances has to send in his wife or child to be cured, and that member of his family would remain in for, say, three weeks and go home cured, now the absence of that member of the family from home would mean the saving of that member of the family's maintenance for three weeks, say in a week even, from that up; have you ever considered whether it would not be a very prudent thing (something that would tend towards putting the hospital on a basis of independence) to give to the governing body, the District Council, the power of assessing how much each person should pay; if they could pay anything at all, say in a week up to the full actual cost, a comfortable man's expenses might go up to two guineas a week. Would you propose that the District Council should have power to charge and recover the amount of the cost from any patient they considered able to pay?—Yes, if they are able to pay, but if you say a soldier, I don't think they could be made pay, or people of their class.

18409. You could not get at those underground; what would be their average earnings?—They might earn 8s. a week.

18410. Surely a person earning that could at least pay in a week for a member of his family?—If it was himself he would not be earning.

18411. Then it would be a question of giving him outdoor relief?—And they do get outdoor relief.

18412. Take the case of a little girl or boy who meets with an accident or has to go into hospital to be cured?—In that case, taking the soldier, he is a very improvident man, and it will take all his wages still to support the remainder of the family, say seven or eight in family.

18413. If the little child remained at home it would cost nearly a week to keep it or say 6d. a week; don't you think it would be proper, and eventually it would be popular with the improvident father to find out he was paying for his child where it was?—But I see the difficulty of enforcing it.

18414. Summary proceedings at Petty Sessions or a garnishee order on his employer to pay it out of his wages?—If you could tax his wages, but his assets won't produce it.

18415. Only for that little difficulty of procuring you think the principle would be fair?—I think the principle is good if you can enforce it, but it should be a garnishee order against his wages.

18416. You do anticipate a considerable revenue, and I think do rightly; they have tried it in a couple of county infirmaries by getting people who send their relatives in to sign on a printed form agreeing to pay so much. I think they begin there really with 6d. or 1s., but the result is that the amount they recover practically pays the doctor's salary?—A great many now are treated at home by the doctors; they won't go to the workhouse, but if you had a hospital or infirmary apart from the workhouse they would go in, and you would have a revenue.

18417. You have seen a good deal of tramps all these years?—Yes; and we have cured it to a certain extent in Castlecomer.

18418. I hope not with any inhumanity?—Our sets might have been a few more.

18419. I am afraid they were?—But it saved the union a considerable sum. I think we did more than our duty, but we saved the ratepayers and prevented able-bodied men coming.

18420. Is there any other matter I have not asked you about?—Well, except as to vagrancy; my idea is that these vagrants should be detained for two or three days and made work.

18421. That would be virtually bringing the English law into operation here?—On a second visit prosecute them. Of course we have the power at present in that case.

18422. Dr. BROOKER.—You mentioned that you knew people who would not go into the workhouse hospital, and you think they would go in if it were a district hospital?—I think they would.

18423. That would enlarge the scope of the hospital; would you suggest that the hospital should be separated from the workhouse?—That is my idea.

18424. And in management?—I don't know about the management, but it should be a separate institution altogether.

18425. Administered separately?—The same building.

18426. Where it would be possible to use a separate hospital, say a fever hospital, at a general acute hospital, would you approve of that?—Yes; at present I think there are only about fifty patients altogether.

Mr. Mahony.—Thirty-five.

Witness.—There is ample accommodation for more than that.

18427. Dr. BROOKER.—Have you thought of the question of construction?—No.

18428. Mr. MURKHAM.—You think the present system of management should be continued, that is to say that the Guardians should administer as at present and hitherto?—I think so; it would not be popular otherwise.

18429. They take all care to provide for the sick poor and show no disregard of their claims?—No.

Mr. THOS. MANSUR, Clerk, Castlecomer Union, examined.

18430. CHAIRMAN.—I have not any proof of what you intended to say?—I am totally opposed to amalgamation, but in case of such I would retain the workhouse as it is at present for an infirmary and a school. I would apportion what is the present infirmary for a male hospital, and I think the patients require more accommodation in this way. I think the convalescent patients ought to have a day room.

18431. Separate wards?—A day room independently of their dormitory. And then I would apportion the other part as a female hospital in the same way. I would have the two front buildings at two schools.

18432. You don't approve of boarding out?—Well, the boarding out question sounds very well in theory if you could get proper persons to take charge of the children. Perhaps the class of persons you would wish to put the children with would not take them, but the house as it is situated is in a very healthy situation. I would have the children of Castlecomer, Kilkenny, Abbeyleix, and Carlow brought there and remove the whole class to the other adjoining workhouses.

18433. You would have Castlecomer a hospital and

a children's institution?—Yes. Then with regard to the paying patients, I have the figures here for the last three years. In the year ending March, 1905, 49 pay patients were treated in the hospital, and the amount of money received was £74 4s. 6d. The following year there were 35 patients, and the money was £64 15s. 6d.

18434. What is your full average cost—what are they charged per head per week?—Between 8s. and 6s. 18435. I suppose we might say 6s. 1?—It very seldom runs to 6s.

18436. Dr. BROOKER.—Was every individual charged the same amount?—The average cost would vary according to the treatment. One week there may be a good deal of stimulants, and another week not so much.

18437. That was only for food and clothing and stimulants; that was not really covering the cost of treatment?—It did not cover the actual cost.

18438. CHAIRMAN.—You did not put the two doctors' salaries into the amount?

Dr. BROOKER.—Or the nursing either?—No. For the five years there were 127 patients, and the amount of

May 8, 1906.
Mr. WILLIAM
BOLTON.

Mr. THOMAS
MANSUR.

May 2, 1904.

Mr. Thomas
Mabey.

money received was £287 15s. 11d. Respectable people have not an objection to come in, but I think if it were a district hospital more would come and would be very glad to avail themselves of the superior nursing.

18439. CHAIRMAN.—That is to say, people who are not respectable would come in if it were a district hospital?—No, sir; I say more respectable persons would come in.

18440. Dr. ROOGER.—You believe the usefulness of the hospital would be increased?—It would be increased.

18441. Mr. MURRAGHAN.—Do you think the ratepayers of the county should be compelled to furnish extra inducements to people to come into this public hospital?—I think it would be good for public health. I think if people meet with a visitation of Providence it is no complaint at all for the whole community to relieve them.

18442. If they have means of their own, why should the ratepayers be called upon to provide medical assistance for them?

CHAIRMAN.—You would make them pay?—I would make them pay a certain proportion.

18443. Make them pay the whole thing if they were able?—Yes. Now with regard to tramps, who are the admissions to the workhouse last year. The total admissions were 928. There were admitted 229, 5 were born, the tramps consisted of 360 men, 70 women, and 72 children; total, 522, and 41 other persons.

18444. Do you know anything about the kind of people these male tramps are?—A good many of them are militiamen and discharged soldiers.

18445. Any reserve men?—A sprinkling of them.

18446. Would you say there was a considerable portion of them belonging to some branch of the army?—Discharged members, a considerable proportion.

18447. Have you any idea about what proportion?—I could not tell; these persons won't tell the truth.

18448. You judge them by their evil carriage and military bearing?—I don't come in contact with them; the master can tell you. At the present time there are 115 inmates in the workhouse, 85 healthy, and of those 11 are imbeciles, 35 sick, and there are 15 attendants upon these.

18449. Mr. MURRAGHAN.—What accommodation does the Fever Hospital afford?—How many beds are there?—It was calculated to accommodate 45, but I think that with the present scale of measurement it would not accommodate so many.

18450. If it would hold 30 beds, would they suffice for all the sick?—The numbers in the Fever Hospital have decreased wonderfully since the Public Health Act. Sometimes we don't have more than four or five patients in the year, but the number of patients admitted to the infirmary is very great, although the hospital is small, because on account of the superior nursing the duration of the illness is shortened.

18451. Do you not think that the Fever Hospital itself would afford sufficient accommodation for the sick of the Castlecomer District?—No, you would not mix the fever patients.

18452. Suppose there was a small institution with four wards for fever?—I don't think it would do.

18453. Why keep a big place like that doing next to nothing?—It is better to have it empty than to have it full.

18454. It is better to have it full of usefulness than empty and expensive?—You never know when you will have an outbreak of contagious disease.

18455. If provision was made for that outbreak, such provision as would be necessary for a small way, could not that Fever Hospital be used as a district hospital?—It may be used for infectious, which is now considered to be an infectious disease.

18456. Would it not be sufficient for all acute cases?—It would not.

18457. When the census was taken that we have before us, there were only 33 sick. In those there were many who were not acute cases?—They are all acute cases.

18458. That is not our experience?—It is so in Castlecomer. Since Dr. Smyth became Medical Inspector of Workhouses, no cases are kept in the infirmary but the acute cases.

18459. That may be so in Castlecomer, but in many of the infirmaries we found people who were not acutely sick?—That is not so in Castlecomer; they are all acute cases.

18460. You have only 30 altogether. You say you have accommodation for 45 in the Fever Hospital, why not make the Fever Hospital into a district hospital?—I am not a medical man, and cannot give you an expert opinion.

18461. But you are a good business man, and have a knowledge of the working of the Poor Law in Castlecomer; so you are a good man to seek advice from?—I don't think it would be a good thing to put the fever patients and other patients into the same building.

18462. Nobody suggested such a thing, but when you have a very large institution there for a very small purpose, why not get a small institution that would meet all the requirements of the Fever Hospital?—That is a matter for consideration. I would join the Fever Hospital where it is, and the other two buildings north and south should be a male infirmary and a female infirmary, and the two front buildings for two wards.

18463. CHAIRMAN.—Can your fever wards be approached otherwise than through the front gate of the workhouse?—They can; there is a separate entrance at the rear.

18464. Is there a public road at the rear?—Not a public road, but there is a road to the workhouse premises.

18465. Does that again go through the front?—No. You can bring your ambulance at the back and by a different approach altogether. The persons going to the Fever Hospital don't pass through the workhouse.

18466. And they don't pass through the front gate by the porter?—No.

18467. The porter unlocks the back gate and lets them through?—Yes.

18468. What Mr. Murraghan wanted to know was whether that could be used, and whether you had an approach that would enable that to be used as the District Hospital of Castlecomer?—I don't think it would afford sufficient accommodation. There are only four wards in it, and you must take into account that the attendants sleep in these wards.

18469. And not sufficient accommodation for a medical and surgical hospital nurse?—There is not.

Mr. DENIS O'CONNOR, Master, Castlecomer Workhouse, Secretary, Poor Law Officers' Association, examined.

Mr. Denis
O'Connell.

18470. CHAIRMAN.—We would be glad to hear your views on the matter?—My views partly agree with those given by Mr. Dobbs and Mr. Wandersford and the views of the Guardians for emigration on a classified scale, partly similar with the observations passed from the Bench.

18471. You would agree to the removal of the various classes?—Yes, the extension of the boarding out.

18472. As regards the workhouse as a place for a child?—I would not have one of them in it at all or any institution. They would be better merged in society, and less supervision I would go in for instead of the amount of supervision that is going on. The more supervision the more the child is made to realise that he is a pauper.

18473. As regards the class, we would like some practical evidence on the tramp class. Have you any of the class not tramps, what we call in large cities like and out, people that come in several times a year?—There were formerly, but the Guardians have set their faces against admitting them. The mothers of illegitimate children—those are called ins and outs.

18474. You have not many labouring or industrial people who get out of work for short periods?—Not from the locality; it is made a bit too hot for idlers.

18475. I don't mean idlers, but real tradesmen?—They don't avail of the workhouse in Castlecomer.

18476. You would not have a collier and his family coming in?—Well, very rarely. If the Guardians gave them more relief there would be fewer admissions. I believe the relief should be more liberal.

18477. As regards the tramp class, you have a fair number of tramps?—Yes.

18478. Of what class were they largely composed?—Nearly three-fourths of them belong to the reserve men. The army system is answerable for a lot of tramps—the six years' men.

18479. You think three-fourths would be army men?—Army reserve men.

18480. Or militiamen?—Army reserve men. The six years' system, I believe, has increased that class of paupers very much in Ireland. These men are able to work with a farmer.

18481. Mr. MURRAGHAN.—If the increase comes from

that class it is a serious matter, as the number of short-term enlistments is on the increase—I believe it will increase it if there are no precautions taken.

18482 CHAIRMAN.—Of some measures taken for enlisting these men?—Yes.

18483 I see you have had within the last year over 70 children and over 70 women. Would those children be accompanied by a woman or by a man generally only?—The rule is that the husband remains outside. Perhaps they have money to drink in the town, and the wife and children come into the workhouse. We have taken the precaution to have all married, and any of them with money they take at departure. We have ordered that neither can they be separated from their parents, and have the parents kept in detention while the children would be in institutions.

18484 Have you ever found out whether those children possessed any education whatever?—I have tried them repeatedly up to 14 years of age and they are uneducated, religiously and secularly. Some of them did not know at 14 years of age how to bless themselves.

18485 What other questions will you refer to, Mr. O'Connell?—These are the chief things the Guardians are going for. In the hospital in Castlemeane there is a demand for increased accommodation for pay patients. The classes who are relieved pay patients are not pay patients; they are only partially paying patients. Their actual cost might be £1 or £1 5s. a week. They only pay 7s., and instead of losing a profit to the rate-payers they are actually a loss.

18486 Could some of these people pay the full cost?—Yes, they would be willing to pay the full cost, but they object to being thrown among the ordinary pauper patients, and if there was provision for pay wards these patients would avail of it, and would be a source of profit to the hospital, because they would pay contributions towards the nursing and medical attendance. Their average cost is 5s. or 6s., and I put on a 1s. a week additional. They were never asked to pay the full thing.

18487 Dr. BROOKER.—Why do you put on the extra 1s.? The establishment, it comes in handy for calculation.

18488 Why not put on more than 1s.? Have you any right to put an establishment charge?—You can.

18489 Is the establishment charge only 1s.?—It is not easy to make up the establishment charges for the year. You must take the inmates of the house as well as the hospital. You cannot separate them.

18490 CHAIRMAN.—You think it wise that the governing body of the hospital should have discretion to charge as much as the patient could reasonably be expected to pay?—Yes, and be empowered to recover it by summary jurisdiction.

18491 Is there anything chief?—Unless the officials, there are some little points, I don't know whether it is proper to come before this Commission, about the appointment of officers that there should be some provision made against having everybody eligible for an office whether he has experience or not. It lowers the service by putting in men who have no experience.

18492 But he must get experience somewhere first. How would you let in the first man? He should go in training for it as a sort of apprentice?—Yes.

18493 Then there should be an apprentice master?—Yes, or apprentice clerk. It lowers the service and reduces the status of officials to have everybody going in whether competent or not.

18494 Mr. MURKIN.—Would not that be practically putting in official hands the power of appointing their successors?—I think not.

18495 CHAIRMAN.—I suppose the Guardians would appoint the apprentices?—Yes. But I think also names should be classified so that an officer would have an opportunity of rising from one station to another, and go from the lowest position to the highest.

18496 Suppose Castlemeane would be one of the smallest, then you would give the Guardians there the power of appointing their officers, who would be appointed from people who had had some training in their own institution?—Yes.

18497 And you would make a rule that the Kilberry Guardians should not have the power of appointing their own officers, but should be obliged to take a master from Castlemeane or Callan?—No; there should be a rule by which unions would be classified so that an officer would have an opportunity of rising by promotion.

18498 Would not that mean the abolition of the patronage of a union like Kilberry, which would be a more highly graded union? They would not have the power to appoint an apprentice, but should take the officers from some of the more lowly-classed unions, Callan, or Thomastown, or Castlemeane?—Yes; I would class Leitrim together and have the salaries graded.

18499 In the unions where the highest grades exist there would be no patronage or right of appointment on the part of the Guardians? They would have the right of selecting from the unions.

18500 From the half-a-dozen masters in other unions who had no connection with the locality?—I believe it would raise the status.

18501 Do you think that would be a popular thing with the Guardians?—I don't know.

18502 Mr. MURKIN.—Are the Guardians to be deprived of appointing their own officers, and have no privileges? Is it to be all week and no play with the Guardians?—They often abuse their privileges.

18503 Have they abused their privileges more than any other body of men?—I don't say generally, but it is open to them to do so. I believe the Guardians themselves would see that it would pay them to have none but efficient officers appointed in the first instance. An officer can do his duty in two ways—not to merit reward and also to merit praise. I think it would be a benefit to the Guardians themselves. I also think there should be a rule made by which when officers were appointed a maximum salary should be fixed for the appointment and a minimum on entering, the maximum to be reached by quinquennial increases. I believe that would save the Guardians themselves a terrible lot of worry with these applications for increases.

18504 It would be automatic?—Yes.

18505 No need of the Guardians to keep an eye on their officers?—No, consequent on efficiency.

18506 CHAIRMAN.—I suppose it would save the officers a lot of trouble, too?—It would, of course, and would save the Guardians, because the Guardians who elected an officer might not be there when the five years are up.

18507 Mr. MURKIN.—Your association is not likely to get the Guardians to agree to that?—Well, it would be only in their own interest. It would not be taking any power out of their hands, I believe. They are doing it in Cork, Dublin, and other places, appointing a minimum salary and a maximum.

18508 If you can persuade them as to that, but why not leave the Guardians the liberty to consider what is best for them to do in their own interest and the public interest? They are men that devote themselves to the service of the public without pay. I suppose they try to do the best for the interests of the Union. Why waste that particular body more than any other? All public bodies. I say it is the want of uniformity in the Poor Laws which makes them harsh or just according as the officer is dealt with. Anything that would lead to uniformity would tend to efficiency.

18509 The Guardians have staggered superior people by the exhibition of their administrative abilities, notwithstanding obstacles raised by their officials and the Local Government Board?—The Local Government Board require a little adjustment too as well as the Guardians. I think the Guardians should have more power. They have no initiative, and they should also have discretion, I believe, in adopting rules and regulations made by the Local Government Board. They should have discretion in their own locality.

18510 CHAIRMAN.—Do you make any definite suggestion under that head?—I will state a case in point. One of the things which leads to worry between officers and Guardians is the amount of new duties placed on officers by circulars and orders of the Local Government Board.

18511 Owing to the new Acts of Parliament?—Well, perhaps owing—

18512 Well, you see, you would have to go to the House of Commons, to reform that?—These things increase the officer's duties three and four-fold, and there is no proportionate increase in remuneration.

18513 Did you ever consider that the Local Government Board themselves have that difficulty, in an intensified form perhaps too, that they get new duties imposed upon them without any consideration of increased salary, but that their point of view is that their whole time is at the disposal of their employers, and therefore how much or how little they get to do

Aug 5, 1904.

Mr. Dims
O'Connell.

May 5, 1904.
Mr. Denis R.
O'Connell.

within their working day does not matter? Don't you consider your whole time at the disposal of the Guardians?—Yes.

18514 And are you not eligible for pension as an officer whose whole time is at the disposal of the Guardians?—Yes.

18515 Therefore, if you now have to do four times as much as when you started, don't you think it shows you had very little to do at the start?—It does not. It shows there is more mental anxiety on the officer. I am speaking generally, not for the masters, but other officers.

18516 Mr. MURPHY.—Do you really think that the Poor Law officials in this country are a suffering body? Do you think they are worse off than their neighbours outside? Are you in a worse position than you were before you became Master of the Castlecomar Workhouse? If your office was vacant to-morrow, would there not be several eligible applicants for the position?—Yes, and if an elected

form was vacant to-morrow, you would have a lot of tenant farmers to look for it.

18517 Why create in a poor country like this another privileged class?—We are public servants, and I think we should get the same privileges as other public servants.

18518 You are asking that the public property should be managed in your interest, and for all time that you and your class should have a right to draw on that public purse?—Every other class of public officers have this right.

18519 The people in England are a rich people, and they can do as they like, but the people of Ireland are a poor people, and they must see that their country is not mismanaged to the future to give privileges to any class?—Well, it is not a question of privilege.

18520 CHAIRMAN.—Was there any other point that you thought of?—I think that is all I have to speak about.

Mr. Nicholas
J. Murphy.

Mr. NICHOLAS J. MURPHY, Thomastown, examined.

18521 CHAIRMAN.—The Guardians of your union are in favour of amalgamation. If the out-door relief expenses could be charged to the electoral divisions?—Yes.

18522 You would be afraid if there were amalgamation you would have longer distances for people to go for relief, and therefore there is a dread on your part of additional out-door relief charges?—Yes.

18523 And you think that putting those claims on the division would tend to reduce them to the former dimensions?—I think so. We are in favour of amalgamation, of course, but solely in case there is a rate per capita for maintenance in any other union; that in case Thomastown Union were amalgamated we should be only asked to pay per capita for any inmates that would go to that union with which we were amalgamated from Thomastown.

18524 Suppose Thomastown were thrown in with Kilkenny the expense here in Kilkenny you think would give you a higher rate; what you would like to do would be to pay on the valuation of your own union?—Yes.

18525 That might not be fair for the Kilkenny people?—Well, that is our view.

18526 Did you think of this point of view, that instead of paying on the valuation of your own present union, that you should pay the average actual cost of maintenance in the Kilkenny Union in the same way that you would pay now if you sent a patient to a Dublin or other hospital; you would pay there so much a week for them, and in that you would pay what they actually cost; you would not pay for a share of the Kilkenny inmates, but you would be paying for your own inmates at the rate the Kilkenny inmates cost the Kilkenny people?—We would be asked to pay a head rate for them, what they cost; I may say we are not against the amalgamation of any other union with ours.

18527 You would take in Callan?—Yes; or Ida.

18528 You would take the Kilkenny portion of Ross Union into yours?—Yes.

18529 Is it not any remote distance from you?—No.

18530 How far would the River be from you?—About eight miles.

18531 Is it much nearer Ross, of course?—I don't know that it is.

18532 Is there no bridge down in the neighbourhood that gives them a short cut to Ross; would they have to go round by Roeburn Bridge?—They would.

18533 And the roads to your workhouse would be less hilly and better than the road by Roeburn?—They are.

18534 You would keep part of your workhouse open as a hospital?—Yes.

18535 If the view were taken that your workhouse might be closed, what would you do with the buildings?—A technical school and district hospital.

18536 Or if it were used as a sanatorium for convalescents?—Yes.

18537 Is that any useful purpose?—Any useful purpose without any unnecessary expense.

18538 All our suggestions here are subject to there being no greater cost as far as we can; as far as you know is there in your union sufficient accommodation for the sick?—I think there is very good accommodation.

18539 Is there any part of the union so remote from hospital accommodation that there ought to be a separate hospital?—The fever hospital seems to be a very commodious building.

18540 Is Grangeonagh in your union?—Yes.

18541 How far is that from your hospital?—Eight miles.

18542 That is the most distant populous part?—I don't think it is. Where I live myself, at Ballyke, part of it is very thickly populated.

18543 You don't go into the barony of Irek at all?—I don't think so.

18544 Are there any charges of an administrative or financial kind that you think would be desirable under the Poor Laws, apart altogether from the question of whether a workhouse is closed or kept open?—I have not considered that question.

18545 You would be in favour of getting people who could afford to pay to pay according to their means?—Decidedly.

18546 And you think the children of tramps ought to be taken from them?—I think they should be taken from them.

18547 You say you would send them to an industrial school; but would you have boarding out?—Any boarded-out children in our union seem to do very well; we have not very many of them. With regard to tramps, I was always in favour of using the most stringent measures we could, and we have done so in Thomastown, with the result that we reduced the number in the past year by 600.

18548 Mr. MURPHY.—How do you manage?—We order the master to present in all cases where they come more than once a year; he has carried it out very well too.

18549 Does he keep a record of their visits?—Yes.

18550 And is he able to identify them when they come round?—Oh, he is able to identify them.

18551 CHAIRMAN.—They give different names, these gentlemen on the road?—Generally they do; they are very numerous in my district, but I don't think they all visit the workhouse; the farming population is a good deal too generous to them.

18552 You think there is a good number of these tramps that don't mind workhouses at all?—A good many of them.

18553 What class of people are these; would these be the old-fashioned beggar-men or persons of the neighbourhood who seek alms?—The old-fashioned beggar-men.

18554 They would have a small circuit round a parish or two and put up at the same houses; a night or two nights here, and so on all round, but that class is going out?—Yes.

18555 Are they fairly welcomed?—There is no objection at all.

18556 The class that you do object to are the strong able-bodied tramp?—Yes.

18557 Do that class always go to the workhouse, as far as you know?—I don't think they do; they get accommodation from farmers.

18558 And they don't like refusing it?—Some of them don't; they would be half afraid to refuse them in some cases.

18559 What accommodation now would they get in a farm-house?—An out-house to sleep in; they might get there supper.

May 5, 1904.

Mr. Nicholas
J. Murphy.

18560. Some stirabout of bread and tea!—Yes.

18561. Mr. MURKIN.—The night that these

vectors are there do you feel as comfortable as other nights?—Not quite so.

18562. You think it would be well to take away this

class from the public roads?—Oh, yes.

18563. Would you go so far as some of the witnesses?

18564. Would you send them over to the police?—Yes; I

would be inclined to deal with them as stringently as possible.

18565. Would you go still further and recommend

the establishment of some central place, some large

farm, where these people, when they proved to be con-

stant vagrants would be kept for a term, and made

work?—I would.

18566. With a view to stamping out that trade?—Yes.

18567. CHAIRMAN. These old people that go about

from house to house, and are known as old neighbours

and residents of the locality, are there many of those?

—A great many; they are not residents of the locality;

they have different localities.

18568. I mean they stick very much in the same

small area?—They do.

18569. I think you said that class was dying out

largely; do you see fresh people joining the numbers?

—Fresh people do come on occasionally. Of course

say of them that have children going about I think

they are bound to increase.

18570. And some of these people have children?—

Undoubtedly.

18571. How is that class recruited; how do fresh

people join it?—Some go through their children. I

don't see any other way; the children stick to the same

profession.

18572. Then it is a profession. You don't think it is

the case of a widow woman or a person getting too old

to be useful, getting a bit here and there from people

who know them?—I don't think so.

18573. It is the real old-fashioned stroller going

round?—Yes.

18574. How would you regard any interference with

that class; do you think that is a class that ought to

be interfered with, except to see that the children get

properly educated and taken from them perhaps, if

necessary?—I think that is the only interference that

could be made with them—to teach the children not

to follow the same groove as their parents.

18575. These people are not undesirable guests?—

They are not.

18576. Mr. MURKIN.—Would you classify them

among the ordinary tramps?—I would not classify them

with the able-bodied.

18577. CHAIRMAN.—They don't go near a workhouse?

They do not.

18578. Mr. MURKIN.—Don't you think it would

be well for the public to have that class put to some

employment?—It would, undoubtedly.

18579. CHAIRMAN.—Are most of them very feeble?

Very few of them feeble; they may be a little old, but

they are quite capable of doing work.

18580. Mr. MURKIN.—Strong active people, who

prefer idleness to work?—Yes.

18581. CHAIRMAN.—The class I am thinking of, par-

ticularly in the West of Ireland, are feeble old people

who loiter about within a short circuit and take their

breakfast with them?—Nobody has any objection to

them; they are very few.

18582. You think that what need to be called a

"sturdy vagabond" should be taken up?—Yes.

18583. Mr. MURKIN.—In case Thomastown was

amalgamated with some other union, do you think the

Guardians should have the option of boarding out and

paying for the upkeep of these people in the neigh-

bourhood of Thomastown if they so desired, instead of

working them to the central almshouse?—I think so.

18584. If they found they could get these people

kept decently for 4s. a week, do you think it should be

optional with them to do that or send them to the

central almshouse, where they would have to pay about

the same sum?—I think they should have the option.

18585. And as to qualification, there could be no

dispute about that, because the fact that they were

Mr. MICHAEL O'NEILL, Thomastown, examined.

18586. CHAIRMAN.—You live at Ballyredin; in

what direction is that?—North of Thomastown, con-

venient to Bennetsbridge.

18587. You have heard Mr. Murphy's conversation

with as about the people who go about the country

getting support but who never go to workhouses; do

you see much of that class about you?—They are very

few and far between at the present day. In my

younger days I remember them to be very numerous.

18588. And they have dropped off?—Dying away;

the fact of it is they are scarcely more than half a

dozen.

18589. In old times it was quite the fashion of the

country?—Quite the fashion.

18590. When there were a great number of people

keeping about a parish or two?—Well, I would say

taking half the county. They would strike out from

Kilberry and take Gorman, Graigue, and round the

River, and come back another circuit—about a fort-

night on the road. They had certain houses among

the farmers to call at. In my father's time I have

house people, and where they had not a workhouse

they would go to the farmers around?—The class I

mean are old women and old men, not able to work;

these people that Mr. Murphy referred to—these old-

timers, they are all mostly extinct.

18591. Except in the very backward parts in Con-

naught there are still a certain number of the people

who keep in the road like that?—I believe they are

larger here in that district than with us.

18592. People of weak intellect go begging in that

way?—They used to do with us, but now there are more

facilities to get into asylums.

18593. Then you don't think there is any practical

necessity for our considering the question of what you

call these old-timers?—In my opinion there is not.

18594. And there is no hostile feeling towards the

few that remain?—None whatever. These are people

that have frequented my father's place, and probably

my grandfather's, and I am not going to interfere with

them; they are honest.

18595. Mr. MURKIN.—No matter what have were

made as regards a particular class of tramps, these

people would never be interfered with by the Guar-

dians?—None.

18596. The Guardians know the class, and will have

a kindly feeling for them?—Yes.

18597. CHAIRMAN.—And they never think of them

when talking of tramps?—No.

18598. As regards the amalgamation of unions, you

are very near Killybeg?—I am half-way between Kil-

berry and Thomastown.

18599. What is your view about the amalgamation

of workhouses generally over the country?—I believe

one workhouse in the county is quite sufficient.

18600. I don't know whether you were here this

morning when we took up this subject; we had some

very interesting evidence from Castlecomer; we pro-

ceeded by trying to see how many classes there are to

a workhouse at present who could be moved out of it

and would be better treated outside the workhouse, and

the evidence was to the effect that the sick, of course,

would always have to remain in the hospital, and then

it was thought that quite that come in to have illegiti-

mate children would be better treated in orphanages or

May 5, 1904.

Mr. Michael
O'Sullivan

penitentiaries, where they might be reclaimed and put into an honest life, and the children would be better boarded out than put into workhouses, and lunatics should be sent to an auxiliary asylum or the existing asylums, and tramps dealt with by the police or put into a labour colony, and that left only the aged and infirm, and that is the most numerous class in workhouses; and your evidence, I take it now, is that for the aged and infirm one workhouse in the County Kilkenny would be sufficient?—Quite so.

18603. And presumably at the central part of the county?—The central part. From my knowledge, as a member of the visiting committee at Thomastown and going through the house amongst the aged and infirm, a great many of these would be mere chronic cases; there would be no hardship in having them removed to a central place.

18604. When you go round on your visiting committee do you see many in the workhouse that are from your own neighbourhood?—Very few—about three—and those are pariahs that had no one to look after them.

18605. That is just what I was coming to; they are solitary people; they would not have one whom ask to see them?—Well, no person looks after them outside.

18606. They would not be people who would have friends to call to see them?—The visitors in that respect would be very few. Of course if I go there and know these parties—

18607. You pass the time of day with them and have a little talk, and whether they were very well off for tobacco?—Yes, quite so; and how the master was treating them. We found a decided objection on the part of old men who had worked all their life with farmers to go to the workhouse as a refuge, and in some cases we adopted a rule that whenever they set of maintenance would be in the house and they had friends or relatives outside that we would give them what it would cost to maintain them in the house, and we found it worked satisfactorily.

18608. And the people from your own neighbourhood were people who had no friends?—Well, one has, but the complaint he suffers from is of an unpleasant nature, and there should be some one to look after him.

18609. Did you ever consider whether it would be possible to board them out, for instance, to put up a notice in the locality that any man or woman, mentioning the name, would be boarded out, and invite tenders for their keep and support; do you think such a system as that might work for strangers who had no friends of their own to look after them?—I think a great deal would be with the pennons. I think we would have numerous applications if it was partly substantial, but if it was not, I doubt it.

18610. Suppose the amount the Guardians would pay would be the rent of the man's house—that would be very considerable?—It would, but then his maintenance would be something more.

18611. Mr. MURKIN.—From 3s. 6d. to 4s. a week; would they not be glad to get them at that?—I entirely agree with you. We had two men in the act of going into the workhouse and we prevailed on them to remain out—one is getting 3s. 6d., and he is fighting for another 6d., and says he would be very well off, he thinks; the other has 4s., and the man with 4s. is remarkably well satisfied. Of course they have some people to look after them.

18612. CHAIRMAN.—Are they with their own friends?—At times with strangers and at times with friends; they fall out now and again, and have a bit of independence about them.

18613. Mr. MURKIN.—Are there not many of these people that would be able to do little work, such as driving out cattle and bringing them home?—These are the men we want to keep out of the workhouse and give them assistance outside. A man might not be able to do hard labour, but might be able to do a little job about the farm.

18614. CHAIRMAN.—Has your out-door relief gone up since the last Act?—It was left to the larger number of the Board it would have gone up, but we pay also attention to it. Some of the members were very particular about giving out-door relief when it was a divisional charge, and now they are more than generous, for what reason I cannot understand, except that the whole weight does not come on themselves. For that reason I think the divisional charge for out-door relief is the proper one.

18615. Suppose your out-door relief is as much a year, and supporting this out-door relief view was an

larger and more people were made eligible for it, we got a suggestion that as soon as the present amount was exceeded that there any fresh additions to that should become electoral division charges; do you think that would be a sufficient safeguard, having the present amount a union charge and any additional amount an electoral division charge, so that if a man was bringing forward a fresh case that would not be a replacement of an old case—it would be an electoral division charge? Take your own division, you have so many people on out-door relief, you pay 12s. or 13s. a week, or whatever it is, that would be fixed as the amount that would be charged for the union-at-large as long as you did not exceed 12s. a week it would still be a union charge, but the moment you would bring forward fresh cases that would run them up to 15s. a week then the extra 3s. would be an electoral division charge?—I think that would meet it in a great measure, but I don't think it would be a sufficient safeguard, because in those cases there may be but a small number receiving relief this year, whereas they might be a larger or less number by the time this rate would be struck.

18616. You would be afraid you might work up to, say 12, where it would not merely be kept at the old figure; a man would like to get the full benefit of his possibilities?—There are divisions that, owing to the severity of the weather, out-door relief goes up in winter, and men with families must get something to maintain themselves, and they apply for temporary relief—a month or two months, if we take an average on that district where it has a large town with a large population, and there is a dearth of employment, owing to the severity of the winter. I don't think that ought to be taken as a test for the future.

18617. Could you suggest anything else?—I could suggest nothing but to have the whole thing a divisional charge.

18618. Mr. MURKIN.—But then again that would be a hardship on the towns if you have out-door relief as a divisional charge; the town has to pay a large sum of money, perhaps disproportionately large, because many of the people who are residents in the town have come from the country owing to the want of employment in the country, making their homes in the town and making a charge on that particular town; that is the disadvantage of the divisional charge, and the only disadvantage?—It might not be a want of employment in the country but a want of proper house accommodation.

18619. It might be from many causes, I only mention one; how would you meet that?—Then, No. 1, the encumbrance of the labourer when he is living in the town come into the town and see spent in the town.

18620. And if he has been some years in the town he becomes a townsman?—He does in many ways, and another way I look at it, the valuation of house property in town is very low, though the rate may be high; 23s. valuation in the town as a house is very small, while a small farm in the country will make 250 valuation, so I don't think the shopkeeper in town has any grievance.

18621. CHAIRMAN.—Your idea is that a farmer is taxed on his whole property and the man in the town is only taxed on his house rent, and his business is not taxed?—That would be a question for the Government as to the profits.

18622. Mr. MURKIN.—Is it not the other way; is not the country getting the benefits of the agricultural grant whereas the towns have got no benefits at all except the one—union ruling and the control of their own streets?—But then the agricultural grant does not give us, as ratepayers, what we formerly got when we received half the rates from the landlord—a great disproportion between what we are allowed now and what I formerly received from my landlord as half rates.

18623. Dr. BROWNE.—You have to pay more now than you had formerly?—Undoubtedly; one-third more out of pocket.

18624. Instead of its being a saving to you it is an addition?—Quite so; it is not raising taxation, though we are trying to keep within bounds as well as we can.

18625. Mr. MURKIN.—Still you must recognise that the rates of the towns are much higher, proportionately, than the rates in the country; it is a small house, the valuation of which is from 12s. to 20s.; now a man will have a considerable farm for a valuation of from 12s. to 20s., and on that valuation he will get a certain allowance, known as the agricultural grant?—But then we are dealing with the

question of rent and valuation; a man need not pay the rent of a house if it does not suit him, but once he goes there to live he is bound to pay the rates according to his valuation, and he does not, generally, go into the occupation of the house unless he sees some advantage in it, at a good rent; it must be in a good neighbourhood where he expects a good trans-fer.

18532. Do you not see some element of hardship on the towns in divisional rating?—I could not see it, sir, in my way of thinking.

18533. Still you must admit that those who cannot get houses in the country make for the towns, and in time become charges on the town?—Parties in the Agricultural Labourers Bill being passed perhaps people left the country and came to the towns, and they go out to the country and work, and at the expiration of their work they come back to the town with their money in their pocket, and I would like to know who pays it; I think where the money is spent the property ought to be.

18534. CHAIRMAN.—And the liability?—Unavoidably.

18535. Mr. MURKIN.—But property unduly-taxation is not in the town?—If you went through the town you would find people who had made piles of money and are able to take country residences and live there. I can see in the city of Kilkenny where some men sell and others are going ahead in the same house.

18536. CHAIRMAN.—Is there anything else?—There are many things; we are for amalgamation. We don't care with whom or who amalgamates with us, but we want one thing—that whatever man we join that we will be asked to pay nothing only per capita—that is a proportionate rate chargeable to the inmates of the union we amalgamate with, with house maintenance.

18537. Dr. BLOOM.—You want representation too?—Undoubtedly; but I don't think we require the same representation we have; one Guardian for each division, otherwise you would have to build an additional board-room.

18538. Do you think the representation too large at present?—In case of amalgamation I don't think it would be necessary, and if we had one-door relief as a demoralising charge it would be quite unnecessary to have two Guardians for each division—one to watch the other—one is quite enough. As regards the tramps, we go in for the most expeditious way of doing away with them—that is the jail.

18539. CHAIRMAN.—Would you not like, if possible, instead of incarcerating them in a prison for the greater part of their lives, would you not like, if possible, if it did not cost anything in the way of extra money beyond at present, would you not like to see them obliged to earn and make their wages?—That is what I was expecting you would ask me; that is what we go for—making them earn their living.

18540. Take their children from them, and while their children are being supported by the State, would you be in favour of putting them in a labour colony?—Yes, and make them earn the maintenance of their wife and children as well as whatever institution they were kept; where you have the tramp and the child of the tramp you will always have the tramp. If it would be possible I would certainly go in for a labour colony, but that would take some considerable time, but I believe it would be well to try it, and have it under State control. There are differences in tramps—a

genuine working man sometimes goes on tramp. I am instructed to make some suggestions to you about dealing with the tramp question and discriminating between the genuine working man on the road and the tramp.

18541. Mr. MURKIN.—Would not that be a proper consideration for the Guardians in the future?—How would the Guardians find out who would be a tramp on the road and who would not.

18542. You think that duty should be done by others?—The officers of the law. If a bona fide working man wanted to travel from one county to another let him get a pass from the local justices or local representatives in his district, and this would prevent a bona fide working man being interfered with.

Mr. MURKIN.—He would have to have done something before you would ask him to do that.

18543. CHAIRMAN.—You mean something to show he is not a tramp?—Exactly, because if a tramp came before me or a local justice I am not going to give him a pass to the County Workhouse.

18544. If there is a building going on—a church or something—in your place, a stone-mason's assistant or any man you like is there, and as soon as the job comes to an end, however it happens, he is out of cash, and he hears a church is being built in Tipperary or Waterford, and that man will want a pass from you or some one like you, and you say you ought to be authorized to give him a pass that would carry him on?—Quite so.

18545. And that would prevent him being interfered with by a policeman?—Yes, or any one else.

18546. Mr. MURKIN.—Ought he not first have applied to the workhouse for assistance before he came for a pass?

CHAIRMAN.—It would only be in a case where he was destitute?—Oh, yes, because if he had cash he could travel in other ways. I think it would be unfair to have that man interfered with, and the easiest way to prevent it is to let him apply to the local justices.

18547. Or police officers?—I think I would keep him outside the scope of the police; the local justice or the representatives of the ratepayers of the district.

18548. Mr. MURKIN.—Or relieving officer or master of the workhouse, if there was such a thing?—They have such intercourse with tramps I believe we could omit them. If a man is in my district and out of work I know he is out of work; if he has work to get in the district I am not going to give him a pass to leave it. But if there is a church building in another place and he is a stonemason he is entitled to go there, and if he runs out of his cash when in Kilkenny I would give him a pass.

18549. Would it also entitle him to a night's lodging and food?—Yes, I think so, because a man addicted to drink never thinks of his pocket. I think there should be some local agency like the relieving officer to give him something. The use of the pass would be to discriminate between the bona fide workman and the tramp.

18550. Assisting to protect the man?—Yes. I don't think it is any degradation to a man going to travel to procure a pass if he is destitute.

18551. CHAIRMAN.—It is because he is destitute and an honest man to protect him; if he has money he does not want it?—Oh, no; you have not to go to look for anything from anybody when you have cash.

Mr. MICHAEL MOWLAN, THOMASTOWN, examined.

18552. CHAIRMAN.—Do you agree with your colleagues who have given evidence in favour of amalgamation?—Myself and Mr. O'Neill are pretty well on the same lines; we are living near each other, and we discussed the matter very much together. I have been in Australia and he has been in America, and we had different views, but we had more knowledge than if we were always at home.

18553. You saw nothing about Poor Law there?—No; but if the parents are not leading a proper life the State takes away the children from them.

18554. Which colony were you in?—In Victoria.

18555. Is there the same law in New South Wales?—I would say so.

18556. If the parents are bringing up the children properly?—What I was led to believe was this, if the parents are not leading a proper life themselves the State considers they are not fit to be guardians of children, and that would be my view too.

May 3, 1904.

Mr. Michael O'Neill.

Mr. Michael Mowlan.

18557. Do they do anything with the father or mother of the children?—I think not until they commit themselves publicly.

18558. They don't lock them up?—I think not except they were troublesome to their neighbours.

18559. Breaking the law?—Breaking the law. The children of the tramps would remain one of the wild cattle I saw in the Bush. If a young heifer breaks from the homestead and goes out to the wild bush the calf she will rear will be wild like the crowd she picked up with; if you catch on the calf when it was young and brought it home and reared it in the homestead it would be like any other calf, and the children of the tramp would be the same; if you don't take them away from the tramp they will be tramps, and their children hereafter.

18560. It will go on for generation and generation?—I believe so.

May 6, 1864
Mr. Michael
Meylan.

18557. As regards out-door relief, do you agree in Mr. O'Neill's view on that?—I agree that the electoral division change is the proper system.

18558. So as to bring it home to the people who are voting the money?—Yes, sir; and this way it is most honest and Christian-like. If an old man worked in my division, say, or in any other Guardian's division for the greater part of his life, have we not a right to be generous to him in his old age, and have a right to be more than generous.

18559. If some people from your district go into Waterford or to Kilkenny, do the Waterford or Kilkenny people complain of having to keep him?—But they never go in their old age to those towns; it is only in their youth they go; an old person hates the town.

18560. Mr. MURKIN.—What about a labourer who gets all and out of employment?—There is no need of a labourer getting out of employment now in the country; it is what we are out of labour, instead of labourers being out of employment.

18561. CHAIRMAN.—In this agricultural part of the country?—Yes; and in grass parts too. The hay is rotting on account of want of man; a lot of young fellows rush from the country because they have not society enough at night and amusement, and leaving the land.

18562. Mr. MURKIN.—That applies to the young, but what about the man of forty-five or fifty; the farmer does not care much for that man if he can get a younger man?—Excuse me, a man of fifty is as good for a farmer if he is inclined to work; he would rather have a careful old man of that class than three young fellows.

18563. There is no farmer of sense that would take a man of fifty-five years of age to mow a field of hay?—Excuse me, tell me where is the man that is mowing hay? It is cut by machines.

18564. Kilkenny is not all Ireland?—Excuse me, mister, I am only speaking for Kilkenny, not for the West or North.

18565. But there are such people elsewhere?—But you should not bring that into the County Kilkenny at all; this is the County Kilkenny we are on now.

18566. And you have men here of fifty-five years of age whose services are as eagerly sought after as those of men of thirty-five or forty; in some cases more sought after, because they are more careful and honest?—It is a man of knowledge I want.

18567. What about the small farmer that is put out of his house that cannot pay his rent; have you any small farmers of ten or twenty acres of land in this country?—There are.

18568. Who have to give up their farms, who cannot make ends meet; what becomes of them; don't they go to the town?—Some; not all of them.

18569. Where do they go? Some stop around in the country.

18570. And don't they go to the towns?—Yes; and work for a living; they don't beg or mope.

18571. When they get past their work won't the towns have to support them?—If a man had three or four sons would the towns be obliged to support their father. Seldom I knew a poor farmer and his son who did not work together hand in hand until death; it is only the children of bad parents that turn their backs on their parents.

18572. Still even the bad parents must be provided for?—Excuse me, mister, I did not say they were to starve.

18573. You say it is only the parents of bad children who are neglected in their old age?—Yes; because you say the farmer that goes into town must have reared bad children.

18574. Suppose there is some unfortunate person whose children desert him, what is to become of him if he goes to the town; won't the town have to support him?—The division where he lived has a right to keep him, and nobody else. If a pauper comes from Waterford into Kilkenny we send him back again.

18575. CHAIRMAN.—How do you do that?—Because he has no right to be here.

18576. You have no law for that?—We have a law for that, mister. He walks up from Waterford and comes in here; we have to keep him for the remainder of his life! Suppose we had a man from Thomastown that went into Kilkenny and goes into the workhouse here can we not send him back to Thomastown.

18577. That is not the law?—I beg your pardon, it is the law; there are cases of it that have occurred.

18578. It may be done, but it is not according to the law?—How did the English send people over here.

18579. Because they have a law to that effect—I saw several cases occurring here in this country. Why did not the Local Government Board obstruct it. If a man can come from Thomastown after working all his life there and go into the workhouse of Kilkenny I would say the law is rotten. I say a man has no right to work in Danesfort all his life and then come to be a pauper in Kilkenny. Why don't they send him back to Danesfort, and I would deal with him.

18580. Mr. MURKIN.—Then you would have a law of settlement?—If he came to here to work in Kilkenny, of course he spends his money here, but to come into be a pauper from Danesfort never occurred, and would not be allowed. If he came in to work and because it and was unfit to work, do you think it would be right that Kilkenny should keep up the Thomastown man all his life?

18581. That is the law of the country. There was a chapel that cost 200,000, and every penny of it was spent in this town, do you mean to tell me the town did not benefit by every man that came into it?—A man comes in here without money, but so one goes out in the country to spend money; all is spent in the town.

18582. I happen to live in the country myself and want to look at this from a fair point of view; my view is that electoral division rating is the best and most economical, but it has its disadvantages in this respect, and what I am trying to get from you is some way of getting over these disadvantages in order to make things fair all round?—Is not the larger the population in every town the richer the town; now answer me that question?

18583. Yes; it is an element of prosperity—a large population?—And you say people go in from the country and make the town poor.

18584. Frequently they have to do; they are driven?—And how many rich men come into the town and spend money there?

18585. We are not dealing with the rich in this country?—But I am putting one against the other.

18586. I am just asking how it is fair to deal with the poor in the particular instance, and I want to know from you would it be fair that the people from the country should come into the town after giving the best years of their life in the country and be added on the ratespayers of the town?—They don't do so. I never knew an old person to come into the town except they had children that had some situation in the brewery or town, and the parents would keep house for them and cook the food and the children support them, but I never heard of an old person to go into the town as a pauper, because he dreads the town; he can get a head of cabbage and twenty things in the country for nothing, which he must pay for in town.

18587. Are you a believer in out-door relief as an economical method of distributing public assistance?—In this way the old people that would have some one to take charge of them or care them to give them out-door relief to a certain extent, that whatever their maintenance would be in the house to give them the same out, but an old person that would be in a house in the country that would have no one to look after them or take charge of them, I think the proper place for them in their old age is an institution, but for the giving of 3s. or 4s. to keep an old man or old woman there would be too much red tape. There would be an inspector out once a week or once a month, his bed is not properly cleaned or his shirt is not properly cleaned. The result is he would be taken out and put into the house again; 30s. doesn't do what they require.

18588. Don't you think some farmers would be glad to get an old man at 3s. 6d. or 4s. a week who could give some little assistance in addition to his pay?—Any man that is any assistance to a farmer he don't want 3s. 6d. a week or 4s. with him, for the farmer would give it to him himself and feed along with it.

18589. Don't you think the old man would be better out in the country than in some institution?—If old a farmer wash an old man for 3s. 6d. a week, and clean his bed and find food for him?

18590. You have some cases where they are boarded out in the country?—Have I not told you those are people who had some one to look after them, some relative or friend, but to send a stranger out and say "You will get 3s. or 4s. a week if you keep this old man and wash his linen and keep his bed clean." There is no farmer in the country who would undertake to do such a thing.

18591. Would you give the Guardians power to board out such a person?—I have not the slightest doubt if telling you it would be a failure.

18708. CHAIRMAN.—But much would a small farmer take to keep such a man?—He would not take him at all.

18709. Not if he got 10s a week?—No; because there would be such red-tape, and an inspector would want him kept cleaner than the farmer himself. It is the same way with children—they are not properly kept or looked after. Here is a farmer with ten acres of land, no one comes round to ask him what sort of lines he has on, but once you become a pauper you are a very important person.

18710. If there is public money spent on a person the Guardians would like to see that they get value for it—Yes; but the public money is not sufficient to meet what the inspectors require.

18711. The inspectors would not like to see vermin on children?—Quite right; nor I either.

18712. You think that would be right?—I don't refer to that part of the business; they refer to food and other things.

18713. The want of milk?—Want of many things that he or she could not afford.

18714. But, as a rule, if an inspector sees a child fairly clean at the ordinary run of children way, and has no vermin, and seems healthy, they would be satisfied with that?—They ought to be.

18715. Mr. MURKIN.—Have you any trouble in boarding out children?—I think there are not many of them boarded out; but, say that are I think they are going on satisfactorily.

18716. You don't hear of any complaint?—I don't know any of them to come back through neglect of the foster parents.

18717. Do you think it would be well to give Guardians further power to board out children that they cannot board out at present?—What I think would be the proper thing to do with these children is to put them all into an institution, every child in the county that is in the union-at-large, and educate them, and give them some sort of trade, in a way that they would be useful citizens.

18718. Why not put them out with farmers?

CHAIRMAN.—Who want labourers, as you told us?—Some of those are not inclined to work for farmers; they are inclined to go back to the workhouse.

18719. Not when you send them out when they are three or four years old. They never remember the workhouse, or know anything about it. The idea of boarding out is not boring out?—What would you do with these who cannot be boarded out at all?

18720. The idea of the early witnesses was to board all out?—Way not put them in a school under one teacher?

18721. You might hold that opinion. The mass of the witnesses who came up this morning expressed an opinion against rearing children together in the same institution?—I mean an institution separated altogether—a children's institution.

18722. They were rather of the opinion that children reared in such an institution would not be so handy?—Would not be regular family children?—Won't you leave them in the workhouse until sixteen years of age?

18723. No; board them out at once—as soon as they are able to use their back. Let them be brought up in a family, and let them go to school as soon as they are old enough, and then to have any knowledge of the workhouse at all?—I have no objection to that system—I would agree with that.

18724. Now, was there any other matter you would like to mention to us?—I would agree with Mr. O'Neill as far as the tramps are concerned. Myself and Mr. O'Neill are neighbours, and discussed the matter together. One hospital would do in the county, and let the fever hospital be in every union, as at present.

18725. Take Graigueanagh—would you oblige a sick person from there to come into the hospital in Kilkenny?—Stuck from what complaint?

18726. Say pneumonia or a broken leg?—With the convenience at present, how long would it take to come to Kilkenny?

18727. It would take him a long time. You or I, if we were thinking of sending one of our family to

hospital, we would be much more likely to send them to a hospital near by, where we could go see them?—Where do men with broken legs or arms come into the county infirmary from?

18728. Most of them from very near?—There is no sense in that language—that is not true at all. If you inquire, you will find what I told you is accurate. People with broken legs go to the county hospital, and there are broken legs in the country as well as in the city.

18729. Then they would be treated in Thomastown?—I never knew a man with a broken leg in Thomastown; they are sent into Kilkenny.

18730. That is not the case in Castlecomer or Ulingford or Callan, and, I suspect, not in Thomastown?—How long would a person be coming from Graigue in a four-wheeled vehicle?

18731. Well, how long—two hours and a half?—No such length. What about a motor car?

18732. How long would the Kilkenny Infirmary motor car take coming in?—I don't know; but if we got a good one it would come very quick.

18733. We have had evidence from medical men pointing out to us that the sick could be taken very long distances with good vehicles. If you put a sick person into a comfortable, well-adjusted and well-running vehicle, with good springs, that that patient could be taken twenty miles as well as ten. But then comes the other question, with regard to the people who would be likely to send them in. People would be less likely to send them in from twenty miles than from ten?—What would you do with them, then?

18734. They would make the best shift they could, and let the dispensary doctor look after them?—We are not interfering with anyone who has plenty of means. It is only the poor we are looking after.

18735. Anyway, you will admit that a hospital is more filled by people from its immediate neighbourhood than by people from a distance?—There would not be so many in it from the further distances. Odd cases come in to be lost.

18736. Mr. MURKIN.—You don't mean to say there are people in the hospitals that are not sick?—There are odd people in it that need not come in.

Mr. McKeown.—We had thirty-six cases of accidents in Castlecomer.

Witness.—I don't see the disadvantage it would be to bring patients into Kilkenny from any part of the county. I have known people if they had a broken leg would go to Dublin, and how is it such a distance to bring them into the county hospital.

18737. CHAIRMAN.—If you were sending a child of your own, you would much rather have it at a place where you could see it frequently than at a great distance?—Excuse me, sir, I would sooner have it at the county hospital, because the doctor would be there daily, whereas in the other hospital the doctor is only like the crows flies—he comes in in the morning, and when will be there again?

18738. I think you will find that in the union hospital the doctor, if there is a bad case, never contents himself with one visit a day?—Excuse me. What happened that child that died in the union at Kilkenny, where the doctor never saw him. The child was burnt, and the doctor never saw him until he was dead. Where were all his qualifications then? In Thomastown the doctor comes in in the morning, and goes away, and won't come back until next day.

18739. That is not my experience?—Are you not aware of what I am telling you?

18740. No; I am aware of the opposite?—Excuse me, a doctor will come in at ten o'clock or twelve o'clock in the day and if there is a red ticket five or six miles away he must go there, and he will attend to the patient that is paying him; then what becomes of the patient in the workhouse?

18741. I never found doctors so deficient of professional honour?—Excuse me, won't be for business.

18742. If a Poor Law doctor in a workhouse has an urgent case he is as little likely to neglect that case as one of his paid patients?—Don't you know if a doctor is continually living in a hospital the patients are better looked after than by a doctor who has ten miles of country to look after besides; that is as plain as a pike-staff.

May 5, 1904.

Mr. Michael
Keogh.

Mr. ARTHUR KAVANAGH examined.

18743. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the Board of Guardians of Ulingford?—Yes.

18744. You considered the queries that were issued?—Yes.

Mr. Arthur
Keogh.

May 5, 1904.
Mr. Arthur
Kavanaugh,

18729. I take it from your answers that you are not in favour of the amalgamation of unions?—No, sir.

18730. You think you would not make any change in the condition of affairs at Ullingford?—No; it is a long way from Kilkenny. I had to drive eighteen miles this morning in the rain.

18731. If a workhouse by any means were closed you think it might be converted into an auxiliary asylum for lunatics?—Yes; or technical schools.

18732. The Fever Hospital in your union the day we were there we could not get into it; have you ever been there?—No, it is outside the union altogether.

18733. A caretaker lives in it?—Yes.

18734. Is that caretaker a trained nurse?—I don't really know.

Mr. Shortall.—She is not.

18735. CHAIRMAN.—In answer to the third query, the Guardians state that perhaps their representatives might wish to say something on the subject?—I feel myself that the present classification and treatment are sufficient. A resolution has been passed by the Board.

Resolved unanimously: That we, the Ullingford Board of Guardians, in meeting assembled, on this day, duly convened by special notice having been given to each Guardian on this day four weeks for that purpose, hereby direct our representatives, Messrs. Shortall and Kavanaugh, to oppose the amalgamation of this union before the Poor Law Commission on the ground that such amalgamation would entail considerable hardship on the sick and destitute poor by having the sick removed at such distances as all the surrounding unions are situated, this union being so central, besides taking into account that the ratepayers would have to pay considerably higher rates than they usually pay, being the second lowest-rated union in the County Kilkenny, as shown by the report of the Local Government Board, and our rates for the year as submitted to us by the County Councils of Kilkenny and Tipperary are considerably lower than any union in the counties named."

18736. What is your average rate at present?—Is 9d.

18737. Does that do for anything except the Union?—That is for the union only.

18738. Not the roads?—5d. for the roads. There is Is. 9d. for the union and medical charities and 5d. for roads. Of course, I am bound practically by that resolution, so I come here to oppose the amalgamation of the union on the grounds stated in the resolution.

18739. Did the Guardians think that if the unions were broken up their sick would have to go to Thurles or Kilkenny?—Yes, they were of that opinion.

18740. If they were aware of the fact that their sick might remain at Ullingford and that only the healthy people would be sent to other unions, do you think they would have the same objection?—I don't know about that; I was not present.

18741. What would your own view be without judging your colleagues in the least?—In connection with the rating, we don't want to be amalgamated with towns.

18742. You would like a guarantee that if you were amalgamated your rates would not be any higher?—It would be very difficult for a Guardian to attend these meetings or District Council meetings. When we have no railway in our locality it is all drying. We have a low rate, and are satisfied with it.

18743. And you would be sorry if your rates were raised by any change?—Certainly.

18744. How many miles from Ullingford to Thurles?—I live six miles from Ullingford, within two miles of Rathfriland.

18745. As regards tramps?—Tramps are a great nuisance in our union.

18746. There being no railway they have to march across?—The Guardians would give them three months' imprisonment, but that would not be my view.

18747. What would your personal view be?—I would be in favour of not having them admitted to the house at all; have them sent to some labour colony where they would be self-supporting as far as possible. That would be my own personal view. It is not the view of the Guardians. They want legislation so as to empower them to give tramps three months' imprisonment.

18748. That would not be so apt to cure them, you think?—No; I think they would be as bad as ever at the end.

18749. Mr. MURKIN.—The Guardians want that power themselves?—No, but to empower the magistrates.

18750. That would only apply to hardened vagrants?—What they call professional tramps, those that are living by going from union to union.

18751. How do you deal with them at present?—The only means we have of dealing with them is that they have to break a few cwt. of stones before breakfast. We have no magistrate's court, only an old man who is doing no duty. I think a labour colony would be the better place for them. I understand they have these in England, and it would be easy to get them in Ireland.

MR. RICHARD SHORTALL EXAMINED.

Our rates are much less in the Ullingford Union than in any union in the County Kilkenny.

18752. CHAIRMAN.—And you are afraid that if there was amalgamation it would increase?—I would like to let the old people live there, for we have a lot of old men and women.

18753. Mr. MURKIN.—You have not very many?—Unfortunately we have not, and we have a fine house.

18754. Only about twenty-three according to the last report?—And we have a very fine house, and what it is going to be converted to I don't know.

18755. Mr. MURKIN.—Make a mill of it and grind corn?—We have not the corn yet.

18756. CHAIRMAN.—As regards amalgamation, you are not in favour of it?—No, I am in two unions, and I have a great deal more to pay in Kilkenny Union than in Ullingford.

18757. You live at Comeragh?—Comeragh Castle. My valuation is about £250 in Kilkenny Union and only £48 or £50 in Ullingford Union.

18758. You are better pleased to deal with the Ullingford Guardians—the smaller rate?—It is convenient to me.

18759. What do you attribute that smaller rate to?—I think we live economically. We don't go to large expenses, and if the people are amalgamated from Ullingford into Kilkenny, I think that the expenses will be doubled and trebled here in this union. That is my opinion, because I was a part of my time here.

18760. As regards lunatics, would you prefer keeping any harmless lunatics in the workhouse?—I would, then send them to any other institution.

18761. What do you think about the best way of rearing children that have to be supported out of the rates? Would you rather support them in the workhouse or board them out?—I would not like to have

them boarded out, bad and all as they are. I would rather have them inside to have someone look over them and keep them clean and instruct them.

18762. There would be no question of removing the sick?—If we were to amalgamate Ullingford and Kilkenny and bring in the old people, they would not live as far as Freshford.

18763. As regards the girls who come in there to become mothers of illegitimate children?—I would give them a short knock.

18764. What could you do with the poor creature?—I don't know.

18765. Some of them are very good even if they commit themselves when they fall and have to leave their homes?—That is the misfortune about it, and it is a pity to have them go away.

18766. Would you be in favour of putting them into some institution?—Where is that?

18767. There are convicts managed by Good Shepherd Nuns?—I could not answer you that question.

18768. Where you pay so much per head per week?—Would it not be cheaper to keep them in the union?

18769. It may be so. Would you prefer keeping them on that account?—I would be for giving these children trades.

18770. Would you send those girls to an institution?—I would let them go and earn their bread.

18771. What would you do with the children?—I would keep them.

18772. Would you not be afraid that these people might come back with another child?—I don't think so. There is one thing certain in Ullingford—we are so far remote from any accommodation. We have not any railway accommodation, and know nothing. All we have is plenty of water and turf and coal.

The sitting terminated.

May 6, 1904.

THIRTY-EIGHTH PUBLIC SITTING.—FRIDAY, MAY 6TH, 1904.

At the Courthouse, Carlow.

Present:—Mr. MICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. COET BROGER.

Mr. PATRICK HANLON EXAMINED.

18773. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the County Council. There was no formal resolution, I understand, from the County Council on this subject?—Not that I am aware of.

18774. I suppose you know pretty well what the feeling of the County Council would be. You cannot reduce the number of unions in the county unless you abolish all—No, we have only one union in the county.

18775. And owing to that circumstance perhaps the County Council and the Guardians did not think it a very practical question in Carlow?—Well, there are a great many matters in connection with it that we would think practical. The opinion that I heard universally expressed was that they did not think they could abolish the union in this county. Others, of course, might join with this union if they wished, but I don't think that even would be an advantage, because the house appears to be full, and if another union joined Carlow Union it would entail a good deal of building.

18776. I see that the Carlow Workhouse has become more and more of a hospital, and less and less of what we call a workhouse. In the infirmary in September, 1873, there were only 63 patients; now there are 146, and the number of children has decreased in the workhouse very much, too?—Of course, the children were boarded out at that time, too.

18777. Not to the same extent?—Not to the same extent. All the orphans and deserted children that can be legally boarded out are boarded out now.

18778. You are strongly in favour of boarding out children?—Strongly in favour. I have known some of the most useful members of society to be children that were sent out of the workhouse and boarded out.

18779. The whole of the County Carlow is not in the Carlow Union?—No; there is part in Ballynaglave and part in New Ross. The portions are not very large.

18780. What do you think of the question of taking in the parts that are in Ballynaglave and New Ross into your own union?—Well, the part that is in Ballynaglave it would be very inconvenient to bring the sick from that neighbourhood.

18781. Supposing the hospital was left at Ballynaglave, and supposing for the people who wanted to go to the hospital nearest to them you paid so much per head per week while they were in the hospital nearest to them, in that way there would be no hardship to the sick. They would go actually to the same hospital that they always were in, except that you would pay so much per head for them in an outside hospital?—It works fairly well as it is. I don't know whether that would work better or not.

18782. Do you see any advantage in having the Poor Law area coextensive with the administrative county?—I do not. For instance, we take in a portion of the Queen's County. Carlow is on the very borders of the Queen's County. We take in Slieveangry, and that is quite convenient to our workhouse, and if you acted in the principle of taking in the whole county, of course you would give that portion to the Queen's County.

18783. And they would have the same privilege of sending into your hospital, and you would get so much per head for all that came in?—I think it is a compensating system. They are more simple as it is. I don't see that the boundaries interfere in any way with the working of the system.

18784. We have received evidence in a great many places in favour of the boundaries being coextensive for all purposes. You would have the County Council the head of everything, and all the other Councils and Boards discharge their duties within the area of the

administrative county?—It would make the financial arrangements more simple, I suppose.

18785. It would also do that, and it was urged upon us. I don't say that we are at all in favour of it, but it has been put forward that it would have an advantage of that sort?—There are no advantages that I can see that would be strong enough to make me think that the boundaries ought to be altered. I think myself that the principle of amalgamation is a good one where the numbers would be small in unions that would be convenient to each other.

18786. And if the towns of Carlow were in the centre of the county instead of at the extreme edge, it would be better?—Yes, sir. I think amalgamation would be useful where there are small numbers of unions that would be convenient to each other, where the travelling expenses would not be very large, and where it would not entail a lot of additional buildings to take the inmates out of one union and bring them to another. I think in Carlow it would not be practicable.

18787. Are you a member of the Board of Guardians also?—Yes, sir. In 1873 there were 63 patients in the infirmary. It was at that time that the nurse were introduced into the infirmary, and it appeared to give a great deal of confidence in the establishment, and the numbers gradually increased ever since, until now there are 146.

18788. Those 146 are all in your registry as sick?—Yes.

18789. How many of them are really sick?—I have only taken my numbers from Mr. Glover.

18790. Who are receiving active treatment with a view to their cure?—I think, sir, Mr. Glover can answer that question. I have not that.

18791. I think you would find that a great many of those sick people are old people who have the ailments of old age?—There are infirm, wards besides those; this is the hospital proper.

18792. But some of the people who are in the sick wards are hardly distinguishable, if distinguishable at all, from some of those who are in the infirm wards?—That is the doctor's affair, registering them properly.

18793. We don't at all allege it is any bad administration or anything of that sort on the part of the Guardians or their officers. We merely point out that the fact is that the Guardians all over the country, not in Carlow merely, but the Guardians all over the country, have been taking as many into the hospitals practically as the hospitals would hold, and some of those people are not people who would be admitted, for instance, into a general hospital in any of the large cities?—I daresay that may be true to some extent.

18794. As regards the location, you would prefer boarding out lunatics to making any additional buildings?—Yes, sir. The boarding out system has worked so very well with children that I think you could board out a good many. There might be a difficulty with females. With harmless males I think there could be no difficulty at all. They could be supported very much cheaper if they were boarded out as compared with within.

18795. Is there any county except Kildare County joined with you in this asylum?—No, sir.

18796. If the Kildare people had a workhouse to spare, and if they wished to take some of your harmless lunatics to such a workhouse, would you see any objection to that?—I would. If the principle we are going on is amalgamation, if you go on extending and making new establishments, that would be directly the opposite principle, and you would increase expenses. First, of course, you must have, as they have, I believe, a Master in Cork, then after a while they apply

Mr. Patrick Hanlon

May 6, 1904.

Mr. Patrick
Baines.

for a doctor; we would have a resident medical superintendent, and afterwards it will be an assistant resident medical superintendent, and I expect a big staff after a while. It would not be the way to reduce expenditures, I believe.

18077. You are aware that they do board out inmates in Scotland to some extent?—Yes; but I am not aware how it is worked. It has been, I believe, more or less of a tentative business up to the present.

18078. Do you think there is any further accommodation necessary in the union in the way of hospitals?—No, sir.

18079. What hospitals have you got in your union?—We have got the workhouse.

18080. You have the County Infirmary and the Fever Hospital in Carlow?—The Tallow Fever Hospital and Bagenstown. The numbers in those hospitals are not very large.

18081. It is called a fever hospital, the Tallow building, but is it not restricted to fever?—No; I think it is used partly as a general hospital.

18082. What is the idea of the Guardians in adopting the plans they have got? Is it to be a general hospital with no fever admitted, or is it to be a fever hospital with no general cases admitted?—It is to be a general hospital and fever also.

18083. Are your plans suitable for taking in fever at the same time, being such a small hospital?—We gave orders to our architect to construct it in such a way.

18084. Do you happen to know how many wards there are?—I do not.

Mr. Glover.—There is a separate fever wing at one side, and a general wing at the other.

18085. CHAIRMAN.—A male fever wing and a female fever wing?

Mr. Glover.—Yes.

18086. How many wards at each side?

Mr. Glover.—I am not sure.

Witness.—I think quite suitable accommodation enough.

18087. Then as regards Bagenstown?—That is used as a general hospital, too.

18088. Do you contemplate any further improvements at Bagenstown?—We have not had any request to improve, and we don't generally make improvements until there is some application made to us.

18089. Your doctor has not made any suggestions in the matter?—Not that I am aware of.

Mr. Glover.—There is a scheme on foot at present to spend £500 in improving the drainage and providing a water supply to Bagenstown.

Witness.—But there is no change in the construction of the hospital.

18090. Do you appoint local committees to assist the doctor there to manage it, or is it altogether between the doctor and the Guardians at both Tallow and Bagenstown?—Yes, sir; I never knew a local committee to be appointed except for a special purpose, such as laying out a site for the hospital and deciding upon plans.

18091. Have you ever visited either of these hospitals yourself?—Yes, but very seldom.

18092. Have you been at Bagenstown lately?—I was not, but I visited Tallow. The house is extremely bad, in danger of falling.

18093. The doctor showed us where the new hospital is to be built. The fever accommodation at Bagenstown, you are aware, is of a very limited and not dangerous nature?—I am not aware of that. I have not visited the hospital, and I am not aware there were representations made as to the ward.

18094. There is one ward, a very small room, and when I was there they had three cases of typhoid and had but one or two, and the nurses' room was immediately over the fever ward, two nurses' bedrooms. You are remedying the water. Your present condition there as regards water is very serious, and the drainage is in a shocking condition?—I know there were complaints about the drainage, and measures were taken to improve it.

18095. It is an old house?—It was not built for a hospital. To the operating room you have to go up most awful stairs to get there.

18096. It was greatly improved, however, of recent years?—I know there was a great deal of money expended on it to improve it. The numbers in the hospitals are not generally very large; only about ten in Bagenstown and Tallow, and only about three in Carlow. Some people were suggesting that Carlow Fever Hospital might be closed, but I think that would be a rather dangerous thing where there is a large popula-

tion, because there have been epidemics of smallpox—well, I cannot call it an epidemic, but there have been cases, there have been epidemics of measles in Carlow.

18097. It is a very fine building. Do you consider it a fever building that the County Infirmary?—I don't think it is a fever. It looks a fever building in appearance.

18098. Dr. BOGHER.—You think the County Infirmary larger?—I think so.

18099. CHAIRMAN.—At present every workhouse contains a large number of classes of people all housed in the same institution, sick and aged and infirm, mothers with infants, children from 5 to 15, lunatics, idiots, and epileptics, and a few who are able-bodied. That is a very small number. Now, last I ever occurred to you or to any of the Guardians that that system of housing so many different kinds of classes of people together is not a good system? We have received a great deal of evidence suggesting that different classes should be taken out of the workhouse. For instance, you yourself are in favour of housing out the lunatics.—On the ground of economy, and I think they are just as kindly treated.

18100. Another class that you have expressed an opinion about just now were the children. You think that where the law permits the result has been very successful in boarding them out?—Yes.

18101. Would you be in favour of an extension of the law enabling the Guardians to board out all children, practically all children that is, when the parents are not desirable people to have them?—I would, sir, very strongly be in favour of it, but whether there is a possibility of getting a law passed is another question I don't know. Some people say it is a cruelty to separate parents from their children, but I think on the other hand, it is a cruelty to the children to leave them with them.

18102. Being brought up badly so that they will turn out paupers in their turn?—Being trained to be vagrants.

18103. The difficulty is that if you take away these children from their parents you leave the parents free to go out of the institution and take up another course, and perhaps an improper course of life outside. That would be a drawback?—A great drawback. It is very hard to know what to do with the parents.

18104. Would you be in favour, without discussing the actual cases in the workhouse at present, but take a few cases where a girl comes in for the first time—would you be in favour of sending such a girl to a refuge or penitentiary at the expense of the rates instead of being under religious management, the object being to examine such good influences over the girl as would enable her to go out and cease to be a charge, enable her to be put out in a situation again, and that her child should be boarded out as soon as it reached the age of a couple of years, and that the mother be put under terms of paying out of her earnings in the institution towards the support of the child?—I think it would be a very good thing to do. Of course it would be good for the child, and it might take the mother from her evil surroundings and make her a good and useful member of society.

18105. I am speaking now chiefly about the better cases. It is rather difficult with what you may call an old offender, but in all future cases?—I think it would be a good thing. It would be a good thing to try.

18106. Then you would get out of the workhouse practically the mothers and that undesirable class of illegitimate children. As far as your experience goes, is not the presence in the workhouse of such people one of the great objections why that class that you may call respectable don't go into the workhouse, owing to the necessary association with these people?—I believe it is. I think that the objection to the workhouse, at least to our workhouse, has very much died out.

18107. Owing to the nurse coming in?—The nurse here made is more respectable.

18108. Are the nurse in charge of that part of the house where these poor girls are?—They are in charge of nothing except the hospital.

18109. They are still in charge of the lay nurses and the female people?—Yes.

18110. Then you think it would be very desirable, having regard to the highest estimation in which your hospital is held, to get such a list as that on it out of the way?—You only speak of those that come in for the first time. Some others remain still of the same undesirable class.

18111. They might also be provided for, but the present room. The time of course, is very short. These

women would come to be a danger in about twenty years at all events!—Perhaps so. I always saw that there was the greatest difficulty in every workhouse in dealing with them.

18334. Do you think that idea would, as regards the female, be a useful settlement?—I think it would be a good work and money well spent even if we failed.

18335. Don't you think it would be likely to be a great economy, for now you have a girl coming in with a child for the first time, and when she comes in for the first time practically she remains off and on for the rest of her life in the Poor Law at an expense to the ratepayers, and they have from one up to seven children, as we have found in different places where we have been going, and all these become a charge on the rates; whereas if you get them to a refuge where they can be well instructed, the hope would be that after the first there would not be any more, and they would very soon themselves cease to be a burden by getting occupation outside from the man or whatever only was managing the institution!—It would be very hard to tell how it would work. There may be girls who would be badly disposed. In some cases you may succeed; in other cases I am sure you would fail.

18336. At all events, they cannot be influenced for good under the present workhouse system?—No, there is no attempt.

18337. The poor creatures are simply supported and kept there?—Abandoned to their fate.

18338. They take their discharge with their one or two children, and perhaps come back later on to have another. That is the routine. That is very serious as making a class of hereditary paupers?—Yes.

18339. These children come back to the workhouse, and they in turn come back to the workhouse themselves. We found in one case as many as four generations in the workhouse, and frequently we found three, so that that shows pauperism is made to run in families owing to the system?—I believe that. I believe as far as possible the children ought to be taken out of the workhouse. After being years in it they begin to look on it as their home, and get a real affection for it, and come back to it again whenever they get an opportunity.

18340. And seeing so much sin in the ordinary way, they get to know when they are a little older how things are, and their moral sense of shame or fear of shame is tainted?—I think so. I think the atmosphere of the workhouse is extremely bad for children, particularly as they are allowed to associate with their mothers, and as long as they are in the workhouse with their mothers they are associating with them.

18341. Now take another class—the class of people who come in with their children—will you say the casual people. I don't know whether Carlow is a town where you would have two or three families that never do anything for themselves, that keep coming in and out?—We have them.

18342. Take that class who never support themselves except for a little bit, and one does not know how often, who have no visible means of support, and the tramps and people who go round the country. It has been suggested in England lately, in the House of Commons. Mr. Marnaghan sent me a bill lately that has been introduced by some members who take an interest in the subject, and it is proposed there that there should be a labour colony or institution, with land attached and workshops attached, where such a class of people should be sent under magistracy supervision, that the children should be boarded out and the parents themselves, while their children are being supported at the expense of the State, should be retained in these institutions to prevent them still further increasing the undesirable population of the country, and make them do the same work for their maintenance.

18343. In Belgium there is such an institution which happens to be self-supporting?—Would these be unmarried people or married people that you refer to?

18344. Either?—One year we make married people.

18345. I believe it is done?—It is done in the workhouse, I know.

18346. There would be no farther separation than that?—Well, of course, you could improve that. It would be a direct benefit to the nation.

18347. The great danger is that these children keep growing up into the thistles, beggar-baby way that their parents did?—The difficulty is first you must deal with these children. Would these children be sent, in the case you speak of, to a school where they would be trained?

18348. The idea was that they should be just like workhouse children—be boarded out with small farmers

or people who would take them and train them up to be the class so much wanted in the country—the labouring class?—Would you make prisoners of their parents?

18349. Certainly, detained under a warrant. That is the suggestion we get?—I am afraid you would not get that law passed. I think it would be a good law.

18350. If a number of men like yourself—and we have had plenty of them through the country—came forward and said that would be a good law, that is what moves the Legislature to pass such a law?—I don't think any parents have a right to bring up their children to vagrancy. I think it is a crime, and it ought to be a crime in the law, and they ought to suffer for it; and then the point is how long ought they to be separated from their children? Should they remain there until their children grow up, or should they be separated from their children altogether?

18351. I think that would be rather a detail if you admit the principle?—Some years ago we decided we would like to have all the children sent away to some school away from their parents—to some central school where the children of other unions would be also sent, and then the difficulty arose that the parents could at any time ask for their discharge and demand their children back. We would have to send a messenger off post-haste to get the children back thirty or forty miles, and there would be a great difficulty in that way; but, of course, what you suggest would remedy that, and I don't see any other way that it could be remedied, to send the parents of these poor children away, detain them there for a certain specified period, and try to take the children from under the evil influence of their parents.

18352. Mr. MURPHY?—Two years has been suggested as the maximum?—It is scarcely enough to give the poor children a chance.

18353. Chairman?—Of course it would be renewable on a further application. The thing would be carried on as long as it is necessary?—My idea is that it is a cruelty to the children to leave them in their hands.

18354. It may be a great benefit to the poor people themselves to teach them habits of industry, and I am sure there would be provisions to enable these people to go out on a temporary licence to see could they make their way again, and if they could, I am sure everybody would be glad to see them start their family life again?—Where is it suggested that this colony should be started?

18355. In Ireland, of course; some central place. It is called a labour colony, I don't know why, because colony is rather a misleading word to use. It gives the idea that it is out of the country. About tramps, that would be the only other class we would have to consider in the workhouse except the sick and aged and infirm. We have got by this process of exclusion all the other classes out of the workhouse. What would you do as regards the tramps?—I would provide them with work.

18356. Would you be in favour of sending them to a labour colony about?—I would decidedly. I think if they are allowed into the workhouse they ought not to be allowed as at present to come and go as they like. I think they should be made to do a little hard work.

18357. That would close the workhouse to all classes except the sick and poor old people who are next door to be sick. There ought not to be any taint in that. We have received evidence in a great many unions of a more enlarged giving of outdoor relief to these people, so as to try and keep them as much as possible outside?—You could extend the boarding-out system to the old when they would prefer it. It would not be exactly outdoor relief, because if you do it in the way I suggest, the money would not go to the person directly. It would go to the people who support and maintain them just as it goes to the nurses of children.

18358. As a practical man, would you be afraid that such an enlargement of boarding out to adult people or giving them weekly grants to pay for themselves. Would you be afraid that that might lead to a great increase in the applications for relief, that the people would not have the same shame in asking for money from a public Board as they would for admission to a public institution?—I think it would lead to an increase in applications. I think there should be some means of preventing abuse. I think there should be a regular inspector appointed to go round and see each and every case.

18359. You have at present such inspectors in the relieving officers?—Not sufficient; it would not do. I think there should be some superior inspector independent of every one and of the county or union.

May 6, 1904.

Mr. Patrick
Hendon.

18862. Who would bring the cases before the auditor?
—Who would visit them just as the nurse children
are visited now?

18863. If you extend it so much as that, that is to
give it to old persons to lodge with their neighbours or
friends. Another suggestion we got a couple of days
ago was that some such provision should be made as
exists at present in the Local Government Act about
expenditure on roads. Where there was a limit put
down that not more than a certain amount should be
spent than was in the standard year, and anything
more than that should be dealt with under special
authority, the witness suggested that the present rate
of expenditure, supposing an electoral division is pay-
ing £1 a week on outdoor relief, that that should be
fixed, as what you might call the standard payment
for that division, and that then if anything further
was paid, if you wish to increase your payment to 25s.
a week, that that 5s. should fall not on the union at
large, as it does at present, but on the electoral divi-
sion, which exceeded the standard amount.—That
would be going back to electoral division rating.

18864. It would be going back to that extent that
the increase over the present rate of expenditure would
become a divisional instead of a union charge?—If you
enforce the principle of union rating it is not easy to
go back to the principle of electoral rating, but I do
believe a provision like that would be useful.

18865. It would have the effect of making the grants
more carefully gone into?—I hope it would.

18866. Mr. MURKIN.—Might it not be that some
electoral divisions at the particular time were not get-
ting their full share of the money expended in that
respect, and therefore it would be a hardship on
such electoral division, whereas other electoral
divisions might be getting more than their share and
would be entitled to it in future?—Yes, that the
standard amount might not be a fair one, that is the
difficulty. It was well known that electoral division
rating did a great injustice to the towns in the old
time when the famine and circumstances and land-
lords and all combined drove the people into the
towns; but that injustice did not exist so much as
at the time of the change of the law.

18867. Not so much, but still it did exist to some
extent. The towns suffered by the electoral division
charge.

CHAIRMAN.—Union rating for outdoor relief does
benefit the towns. It is not so popular with the
country?—Well, I belong to a country district. At
the same time I feel there was a great injustice done
to the towns in the old times by electoral division
rating.

18868. Mr. MURKIN.—Some of your friends in
Kilkenny went in to revert back to electoral division
rating. You would not be in favour of that?—I was
certainly in favour of union rating at one time, but
I say the injustice was not so great as all at the
time the law was changed, and a great many of the
people that were driven into the towns had by degrees
emigrated, and the numbers in the towns were not very
much more now than the towns required for labour.

18869. So the inequality has disappeared to a large
extent?—Not so much, but I believe it does exist to
some extent still; therefore, I say it would be seriously
fair to go back to the electoral division rating, but I
think a provision such as you suggest would be useful.

18870. If you could start on a fair basis?—Yes.

18871. CHAIRMAN.—You might have an inquiry to
establish a fair basis?—Yes.

18872. Mr. MURKIN.—You say you are in favour
of boarding out as many made inmates as possible.
Where do you see the economy in that?—I think they
would be boarded out for about £10 a year, and they
cost £14 or £15 in the house.

18873. Fully that?—Without counting some of the
establishment charges, £17 or £18 if you count every-
thing.

18874. And the same would apply also to children?
—The children are boarded out for very much less—I
think 6s a year and 30s. for clothes.

Mr. Glover.—£2 in some cases where they are
fifteen years of age.

Witness.—They are boarded out on an average for
about £10, and in the house they cost £14 or £15 with-
out establishment charges.

18875. Mr. MURKIN.—And the same would
apply to the aged and infirm?—Yes.

18876. Dr. BOONER.—How far does the Union of
Carlow extend?—It extends into Slieveanagh, in the
Queen's County.

18877. How many miles is that?

Mr. Glover.—Ten miles from the town. There is
an area of 24,000 acres.

Witness.—It is sixteen miles to Clonmel.
18878. Dr. BOONER.—Is that the furthest extent in
the east?—I think that is the furthest extent.

Mr. Glover.—We go below Bore.

18879. CHAIRMAN.—You have got railway lines
there?—

Mr. Glover.—We have not direct.
Witness.—Below Clonmel is just as far.

18880. Dr. BOONER.—These districts are largely
served by the hospitals of Bagenalstown and Tallow?—
Yes.

18881. What way do you arrange; have they a site
or is it all out of the Carlow rates?—Union rating.

18882. When were Bagenalstown and Tallow opened
for the reception of medical and surgical cases?—It
has been a gradual thing, when opened at first they
were supposed to be fever hospitals; but merged into
the other; the patients were admitted gradually with-
out any special authority from the Board; the doctor
undertook the responsibility of taking in patients con-
sistently, and it gradually became a general hospital.

18883. Are they popular in their district?—They
are; it would be a very unpopular thing to close one.

18884. You find the people go into them pretty
freely?—They do, and anxious to go into them.

18885. Do you think they go into them more freely
on account of their disconnection with the workhouse
buildings?—I don't think so. In the workhouse hos-
pital at Carlow they have 145 at present, and there is
only an average of ten patients in Tallow and Ba-
genalstown.

18886. But the 145 include a lot of chronic cases
and some of them may come from Bagenalstown and
Tallow?—That may be, but the 145 is a very large
number, and ten is not a large number in the other
places, so the fact of being disassociated from the work-
house does not appear to be any inducement; of course
these hospitals are not large.

18887. They are more or less acute hospitals?—Well,
they are.

18888. They don't keep patients for an indefinite
time, the way you would in the workhouse?—We are
not supposed to keep them for an indefinite time in the
workhouse, except when under treatment.

18889. They may be under treatment from old age
and bedridden, and cases of that class that don't
require active treatment?—Sometimes there were some
kept in the infirmary that we thought might have been
put into the infirm ward, but perhaps not often.

18890. After all, I think going through the hospital
you will see a great many cases that might be in the
infirm wards?—On the other hand, going through the
infirm wards, you will see many old people on the
verge of the grave.

18891. You said something about the increase in
numbers in the infirmary, during how many years was
that?—In 1873 the cases in the infirmary were 800-
three, and last September they were 145.

18892. CHAIRMAN.—How many in 1873 were aged
and infirm?—I cannot tell you, but the number in the
hospital proper and the infirmary was sixty-three.

Mr. Glover.—The number Mr. Hendon gives you is
the average daily number.

18893. Dr. BOONER.—In the body of the house in
1873 what was the number?—287.

18894. What is it now?—346.

18895. That decrease almost corresponds with the
increase in the infirmary exactly; the whole number is
very nearly the same as it was in 1873, but the body
of the house has decreased and the body of the hospital
has increased.

18896. CHAIRMAN.—Don't you think it is a transfer
from the aged and infirm wards to the hospital?—Not
at all; the sick come in immediately; the people did
not care to come in to be treated in the workhouse at
all in the old times; there was one very incompetent
nurse in charge, and not a careful one, and the people
did not very often get what was ordered for them, but
since the nurse came in the people had confidence in
them.

18897. What staff had you in 1873?

Mr. Glover.—There was only one nurse in 1873. At
first there were three nurses appointed; there was
always one who gave her services for nothing; the
permanent staff was increased to four, and now a 250
man gives her services for nothing.

18898. Dr. BOONER.—I suppose Bagenalstown and
Tallow were not open in 1873 for medical cases?—I
could not tell you; I think there were cases brought in
frequently that were not fever.

18905. So that the sick poor are availing themselves of the hospital treatment more now than they did formerly?—Perhaps they were not allowed in then.

18906. Do you think that could be extended if you opened a ward for pay patients?—I think it would be a very good thing to have a pay ward in every hospital; it may be an advantage to the establishment and secure the establishment, and it is a charity to some people who have no one to look after them to have a place where they could go to be taken care of, and pay for it, and they would be very glad to have it.

18907. Does your county infirmary take in cases at all from the Queen's County?—Sometimes, I believe.

18908. Have you any arrangement with the Queen's County?—We were trying to make an arrangement. I don't know whether it has been completed or not.

18909. You would like an arrangement with the adjoining districts that in case people went into the county infirmary you could get the cost of maintenance from them?—I think so.

18910. Your county infirmary, of course, is supported by the whole county?—Yes.

18911. Not from the Queen's County, of course; so that portions of the union that are not in the county they pay to the county infirmary?—They used not to pay anything.

Mr. RICHARD McDONALD examined.

18912. CHAIRMAN.—You have heard Mr. Hanlon's evidence, and we have gone through the various classes in the workhouse; do you, generally, agree with the opinions he has expressed?—Generally.

18913. Are there some matters in which you are not inclined to adopt his opinions?—I cannot say that I am with regard to the boarding out and the nursing.

18914. You would prefer having those in an institution?—Yes. To send out an insane party to a family, perhaps it would take up a useful person to look after him.

18915. That is rather a question of whether people would be likely to take them as boarders?—I hardly think they would wish to take them, even where people have a relative.

18916. You think it would be too great a responsibility?—Yes; they would not be very desirable lodgers.

18917. Mr. MURKHAUGH.—Still if it was not compulsory, but only optional, with the Guardians, would you give them power to do so if they thought well?—I don't think it would work.

18918. CHAIRMAN.—But you would give it a chance of working, and send those others to the institution?—Yes; I don't know that there would be any economy attached to boarding them out. I understand that if they were sent to a lunatic asylum a capitation grant would be extended to them.

18919. If they were boarded out, at all events, you think provision ought to be made for securing a capitation grant?—Certainly.

18920. Now, as regards the boarding out of aged and infirm people, do you agree with Mr. Hanlon in that?—I did not hear that portion of his evidence.

18921. His view was that a great many of the old people could be more cheaply maintained, and more comfortably maintained, if they were boarded out with friends or relatives who would be willing to take them at 4s. or whatever it might be, per week?—Yes; but my impression is that that system is worked to the fullest extent at present under outdoor relief.

18922. Takes 100 people who are in your house as aged and infirm, do you think there are a great many of those who would be willing to go out if they got 4s., or whatever it would be, a week?—I don't know what their views are, but my impression is that any old or infirm people who have friends remain with their friends and apply for out-door relief, and don't seek admission to the house.

18923. Mr. MURKHAUGH.—But if they cannot get out-door relief on their application they must come into the house; this would only apply to those who are in the house at present?—Yes; but my view is, of course, although I occupy an important position up at the Guardians for a short time, I am not very well acquainted with the working of the institution. My view is that all the aged and infirm who have friends, instead of sending the old people to the workhouse, they apply, and invariably get out-door relief.

18924. So that practically your Board of Guardians does approve of boarding out or out-door relief where

18925. I am alluding to portions of the County Carlow that are in other unions?—Yes; it is a county charge.

18926. And at the same time pay for the support of their own union hospital?—Yes; of course they have the right to send patients if they wish, but they are such terrible distances away, I don't think they ever do.

18927. CHAIRMAN.—These people pay for the sick up in parts of the county that are quite convenient to the county infirmary; people in Lifford and over in Ballinglass don't see the infirmary; which would you be in favour of, making the support of the sick all over the county in whatever hospital or place they might be—would you be in favour of making that a county-at-large charge; for instance, the sick in the Carlow Union and the two hospitals you have in the union, and any sick elsewhere in the whole county, would you be in favour of making that a county charge?—How would you manage the Queen's County portion of the union?

18928. That they should pay you the ascertained average cost per head instead of by the valuation?—Whatever injustice may be done in one way is remedied in another, and I think it would only complicate accounts.

18929. Mr. MURKHAUGH.—You think there would be no advantage in a charge?—I don't think there would.

18930. It can be applied?—Yes; we never refuse relief in anything at all like a deservous case, and the whole tendency is, as far as I know, to prevent the old and infirm from entering the house if possible, to leave them with their friends, partly with a view to economy as well as everything else.

18931. CHAIRMAN.—In which you agree. Is there any other matter in which you differ from Mr. Hanlon?—With regard to the general hospitals of Tallow and Bagenalstown, I am representing the Guardians appointed in my absence, so that I got no mandate, but my personal view is, it is a great mistake to have fever cases in the general hospital.

18932. Unless you can properly isolate them?—Yes; and the result and experience of it is this, that here in Carlow, with a fever hospital accommodating this very large union and perhaps an area of half the union in addition, we have seldom any infectious cases in Carlow, while in the other fever hospitals they are hardly ever without infectious cases, so that it often occurred to me that the system of mixed hospitals really feed themselves.

18933. You have not ever heard of an ordinary case of illness contracting fever while in either Tallow or Bagenalstown?—Well, I am not aware of any.

18934. You would be rather afraid you might hear if you inquired closely?—I imagine I would; I would not be surprised if I did.

18935. Dr. BOONE.—Are they not closed when there are fever cases in it?—No.

18936. I was told by the medical officer that they were closed for general cases when there was fever; if there was a proper provision for fever cases it would be better, so that there would be continuity of treatment?—Matters are working well in this union; things are not quite satisfactory; the system is not quite satisfactory; these mixed hospitals might be improved.

18937. You are building a new hospital in Tallow; I believe that will be better constructed and better arranged?—I don't know the plans of it; they were accepted before I came to occupy a responsible position.

18938. You may think of improving Bagenalstown hospital?—Yes; 2500 are being spent on it. Are there any other matters on which you wish to hear me?

18939. CHAIRMAN.—Is there any other matter on which you would wish to express an individual opinion different from what Mr. Hanlon has already expressed?—No, there is not. On the question of amalgamation, we are born at the very corner of the county, and if Carlow Union were to be the centre of the district we could take in a whole lot of Queen's County and Kildare.

18940. But not as you stand?—No.

18941. The Castledermot district does come very close to you?—We are within one Irish mile of the County Kildare here; if there was any question of amalgamating portion of the Athy Union with any other union we could take over a great portion of it.

May 6, 1904.

Mr. Richard
H. Donnell.

here; we have train accommodation; that portion of Ailly Union in Queen's County could be taken in with Slievecastle; they are both small districts.

12032. Mr. MURPHY.—If the Guardians in neighbouring unions had power to board out their inmates in the nearest institutions to themselves would not that be a sort of remedy?—To send the sick and infirm to the nearest hospital.

12033. Simply the class known as the aged and infirm, supposing the Guardians had power to board in each of the neighbouring unions close to themselves, do you think that would be a good provision instead of having to send them a long distance to their own particular workhouse?—I don't think the question of sending them a distance if they are in fair health is a big one; I think it is a small matter about the sending of them.

12034. But being so close to another county—only a mile distant—don't you think it would be well to give

the Guardians power to do such a thing?—If it did not cause inconvenience.

12035. From a point of convenience and economy. I have not considered that question, but my own personal view is that the boarding out of old and infirm would not work—the old people might be hard to manage, and might not pull well with the families who would take them over.

12036. Of course the boarding-out system would only work where there were people willing to take them, and there would be no compulsion in the matter, but merely the option to the Guardians. Can you see any danger in giving the Guardians power to board out an institution neighbouring themselves?—I see nothing objectionable in it.

12037. Would you see anything to commend itself to you?—Not to my mind. I have been thinking the matter over, and my impression is that it would not work. I may be wrong, perhaps I am.

Mr. PATRICK HANLON.

Mr. Patrick
Hanlon.

Perhaps you would allow me to say another word regarding the imbeciles. I believe if it became necessary that there should be a separate establishment for them that it would be better to have that establishment in connection with a lunatic asylum.

12038. An extension of the lunatic asylum?—An extension of the lunatic asylum, because the same staff

could take over the charge of them, and I think it would be very much more economical than sending them to a separate institution, and that opinion I have heard expressed by the Chairman, Dr. Foley, and a great many influential members of the committee.

Mr. MICHAEL MONAGHAN examined.

Mr. Michael
Monaghan.

12039. CHAIRMAN.—You are Chairman of the Carlow Urban Council?—Yes.

12040. You have heard most of our conversation this morning?—Yes.

12041. Is there anything that you would like to express your views on, either in addition to what has been said or in opposition to what has been said?—I may say I am in favour of what has been said; at all events I would be very strong on boarding out children, and I would have the mothers sent away from the workhouse, and to their own homes—that is the mothers of illegitimate children.

12042. Do you think in many cases the mothers would like to be received into their own homes?—I don't think there would be a good many.

12043. You are aware, of course, of the shrinking that there is in the country from poor girls who default in that way; do you think they would be welcome home again?—I think in some cases they would.

12044. Do you think the girl would even be willing to go home and leave her child to be boarded out elsewhere, or would you be rather disposed to think that the child would come to be boarded out with the mother herself?—I am afraid that would not be a good arrangement; I think the best arrangement would be to have the children boarded out as the present orphan children.

12045. In a district remote from the mother?—Yes.

12046. Do you think the mothers would agree to that?—In some cases perhaps they might not.

12047. In some cases they might be glad of the relief, but in other cases where the maternal love for the child would exist strongly she would not wish to or to have it made the member of another family. You heard the discussion we had about sending these girls to penitentiaries or reformatories?—Yes; if they were to come back a second time to the workhouse it would be a good idea.

12048. Why not the first time; I may tell you there is the greatest disinclination, and in many cases an absolute rule in some of these penitentiaries, against taking any but the first case that fall; it is hopeless to take a girl that has fallen twice, but after the first fall, when they are in a state of regret and penitence, then they are in a hopeful condition for reformation?—In that case I would be in favour of having them sent to an institution of that sort; of course they might be able to look after them and get them supplied with a situation.

12049. And then if the girl got into a situation and had to pay for the support of her child she would feel that she was supporting the child—It was really under her influence so far?—If that system could be adopted it would be a very good one. I would be in favour of that.

12050. As regards tramps, have you anything to say; you don't see much of them in the towns?—No; but still we have many of them.

12051. What class of people have you coming here begging?—Very few at present.

12052. And those that you have what class would they be. I don't include musicians?—Most of them would be professional beggars.

12053. Would some of them be old people of the neighbourhood who have been here all their lives and who got a little trifle once a week or so from people who knew them all their lives?—Yes; there are a good many of them—poor, old, decent people.

12054. Then you have the tramp or person who sells the roads and comes into the shops perhaps asking for assistance; would they go into the shops?—They would frequently, and when under the influence of drink as very boisterous.

12055. That is an undecorous class?—That is.

12056. Are there men and women and children in that class?—There are.

12057. Would you be in favour of taking the step suggested, of taking these people off the roads and streets altogether and putting the children with small farmers or people who would bring them up properly?—I don't think farmers would care to have people of that class.

12058. Take the little children?—Unless they get them very young; if they were grown up they would not be desirable people.

12059. If they were old enough to have got used to a bad life they would be undesirable?—They would.

12060. In that case would you propose sending them to an industrial school?—I don't consider it a matter, but I should say yes.

12061. Would you consider it a desirable thing to get that whole class—men, women, and children—off the roads?—I think it would be a very difficult thing to do unless you had them looked up.

12062. Supposing you look up the father and mother and take the older children and send them to an industrial school, and take the younger children that are of tender years and have not learned any wicked ways, send them to be boarded out with a view of trying to kill the class or, at least, transform the class into decent citizens, and prevent the young people growing up as members of the same class?—It would be a good thing, but who would be responsible for their maintenance?

12063. At present they are preying on the whole community—they are a very heavy charge. If, according to the suggestions we have got, you put the grown-up people into an institution their labour would be of value and would go towards the reduction of the cost of the establishment?—That might be, but, as a rule, they are people of very little use for anything.

18963. They are the worst class of the community, but the worst of it is they are rather increasing—I thought they were decreasing.

18964. Well, there are a great number of children still on the road; the old class of mendicant or beggar is said to be falling off very much, but we have had evidence lately that there is a very large increase in this army of sturdy beggars owing to disbanded soldiers and others of that sort joining them; have you observed any people that you would suppose to be soldiers?—Yes; I think they come frequently to the workhouse.

18965. And if they come to the workhouse the prospect is that they go elsewhere and beg as they go along?—Yes, they do. Of course as long as they are let go about the country as they are you will always have them, the children will be brought up in the same habits as their parents; if you can catch the young children and train them right.

18966. You would be willing to try that?—Yes; I think that would be a very good idea.

18967. Is there anything that occurs to you to say about the sick?—I think they are pretty well provided for in this town. Of course I would like to see hos-

pitals and infirmaries as comfortable as possible for old people.

18968. And cut off from the workhouse?—Yes.

18969. That would be so if you could keep all those classes out but the sick?—That is the way I would like to see them, for a great many respectable people don't like to come into the house on account of the name it bears. We find that once when people come in they are not likely to go out; they lose the sense of shame.

18970. Dr. BROOKS.—Is that a general feeling, do you think?—I think it is.

18971. The hospital acts as a feeder for the workhouse?—Yes; it would be well to discourage the people as much as possible, and to relieve them outside in every possible case—out-door relief.

18972. You would not propose an indiscriminate distribution of out-door relief?—Oh, no.

18973. CHAIRMAN.—Do you know whether out-door relief is pretty stationary in this union?—I think it is pretty steady; it increased a little a few years ago.

18974. In the union-at-large charges?—Yes; some of the divisions went up a little and some went down a little.

Mr. EDWARD P. HUGHES examined.

18975. CHAIRMAN.—You are Chairman of the Shrewsbury Rural District Council?—Yes, sir.

18976. That is altogether, of course, in the Queen's County?—Yes.

18977. It comes right up to the river Barrow?—Yes. Regarding the evidence of Mr. Harlow, I entirely concur.

18978. You followed what he said?—I followed what he said regarding the workhouse system. I altogether agree with it. Of course I am opposed altogether to amalgamation as far as the Carlow Union is concerned.

18979. Your division would rather remain in Carlow than go into one of the Queen's County unions?—I fancy so.

18980. It has been proposed in different counties that the administrative county, that is the area dealt with by the County Council, should also be the area for Poor Law purposes, and unions and rural districts should practically coincide, and that a rural district like your own should be for Poor Law purposes in the Queen's County instead of being attached to the union of another county; what is your own view about that?—I think the system as it stands at present in connection with Carlow for Poor Law purposes is working very satisfactorily.

18981. Where do you live yourself?—I live in the County Carlow myself, although I am rated in the Queen's County.

18982. Have you to attend juries in Maryborough?—I have.

18983. How do you go to Maryborough?—I go by rail to Kildare.

18984. That is a long journey?—Yes. I have one point to make regarding the county infirmary; I think the people of my district would derive great advantage if they had the right of entry into the county infirmary in Carlow, provided there would not be a rate levied on them for the maintenance of the county infirmary at Maryborough; they are a good deal nearer to Carlow than Maryborough, and it would be a great boon to the people in my district.

18985. You would like to get off that portion of the county rate in Queen's County that goes to keep up the Maryborough infirmary, and you would be willing that your District Council should be rated for the Carlow infirmary?—Provided they were not rated for Maryborough; it is twenty miles from here to Maryborough, and it is a great inconvenience in case of accidents to have to be driving thence to Maryborough.

18986. But they do receive your urgent cases here?—I don't know that they have the right to do so.

18987. I mean as a matter of practice?—I could not give an opinion on that.

18988. I know a great many cases where they do; I think they receive a lot of Tyrone cases from Strabane into the County Donegal hospital at Lifford.

Mr. MURKHAUGH.—They do; but they raise the same objection. Would not that be met if you got the Queen's County to pay for any of your patients

received into the Carlow Union. If your Guardians were empowered to send to the Carlow infirmary their patients instead of to Maryborough and pay for the upkeep here would not that meet the difficulty, it being a county charge—the County Council to pay?—My district at the present time is paying a rate for the maintenance of the Queen's County infirmary.

CHAIRMAN.—I don't think you quite follow Mr. Murkhaugh's suggestion; it goes on your lines.

18989. Mr. MURKHAUGH.—It is a point I tried to get out of another witness, in regard to inmates that would come to the workhouse of a neighbouring county that was convenient to them. If your Board of Guardians had the power to send to Carlow infirmary patients and had also the power to ask the County Council of your own county to pay for their upkeep here, would not that get rid of the disadvantage?

CHAIRMAN.—That Carlow infirmary should send a bill to the Queen's County secretary at Maryborough for the rate per head for the amount of the average cost—I think that system would work very admirably.

18990. The Queen's County would be sharing in the burden of your union?—What I want is to get the advantage of the Carlow infirmary provided we are relieved of the Maryborough one.

18991. CHAIRMAN.—You pay a rate at present for Maryborough; you have a sick men who cannot go to Maryborough, so he comes into the Carlow infirmary, you don't pay anything for the infirmary, the bill would go to Maryborough, and Maryborough would pay out of the rate which Shrewsbury pays to the Queen's County infirmary?—Of course if you can work on that system it would be satisfactory.

18992. Mr. MURKHAUGH.—You surely would not expect Carlow County to take care of your sick in their infirmary without giving them any return?—Not at all.

18993. By this method you will not have to give any more than if they were sent to the county infirmary of your own county; you would get the same benefit out of the county infirmary rate, whereas at present you get no benefit—I don't think the ratepayers of my district would be satisfied to contribute towards the support of the Carlow infirmary.

18994. It would be paid for out of your rate; the Queen's County would still make a little on you perhaps, but still you would get value?—I don't like that.

18995. If you had enough people sick you would make money on the Queen's County?—We have not many urgent accidents, but, of course, they may arise at any time; if there was an arrangement that would work on a satisfactory basis I think it would be desirable.

Mr. MURKHAUGH.—It is an absolutely simple way of getting the thing done; I cannot see how you cannot see it.

18996. CHAIRMAN.—You would not have to pay a penny more, but yet your people can be treated in the Carlow infirmary?—If that can be worked out on a satisfactory basis I think it would be desirable.

May 6, 1904.

Mr. Michael
McNay.

Mr. Edward P.
Hughes.

May 3, 1904.

Dr. W. H.
O'Meara.

Dr. W. H. O'Meara examined.

I am Surgeon to the Carlow County Infirmary, and I desire to bring forward just in a short way the amount of work that is done there. This is an extract from the annual report for 1903-04. During the year 1903 207 extern patients were treated in the infirmary and 1,366 extern patients attended and received medicine and advice. That is not exactly perfectly true, because some of the extern patients who received medicine and advice came from Queen's County and County Kildare, and were obliged to pay for their medicine, but received advice gratuitously. Forty-eight surgical operations of the major character were performed; these operations were various amputations, appendicitis, hernia, laparotomy; a very large number of minor surgical dressings were done daily; in the infirmary people attend not only from Carlow but from Queen's County and Kildare.

18967. CHAIRMAN.—What would the cost of these dressings come to in the year?—Trivial, because patients who are admitted from the adjoining districts in the County Kildare and Queen's County are obliged to pay for their maintenance.

18968. That is, personally pay?—Yes; the committee of management decide.

18969. To what extent do they pay?—From 5s. a week to two guineas, according to their means.

18970. Have they ever been asked to pay the full sum?—Yes.

18971. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Do you take in any of the poor of the adjoining county?—With the consent of one of the committees of management they must have a recommendation; the committee of management decide, or I believe approached, the County Councils of Kildare and Queen's County to contribute an annual sum towards the maintenance of the infirmary, and agreed to treat the patients from their districts. Our bishop, who was present at one of the meetings, agreed with me, or I think suggested, and I agreed with him, suggested that we should have a radius of six or seven miles round, taking in the little town of Castlebliss, which would be a great boon to the people there, who have now to send their accident cases to Kildare.

18972. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Well, we have been told that could not be done under the existing law?—I don't know that; that was the suggestion of the committee that the County Councils should contribute a proportionate sum.

18973. CHAIRMAN.—You heard Mr. Murraghan's suggestion just now that in the case of very poor or destitute people who came into that infirmary that payment should be made by the County Council of Queen's County towards your infirmary, so that in that way the district would get value for its taxes?—I think that would be an admirable suggestion.

18974. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—There is in the North a case similarly situated to your own—the infirmary of one county is almost on the borders of another, and a great many patients belonging to one county go to the county infirmary of the other; the committee of the first county came to the County Council of the other for assistance, but when inquired into it was found there was some legal disability, and the Council were unable, though willing, to give some help?—I was not aware of the legal disability.

18975. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think it would be a good thing for us to make recommendations that would result in a change of the law?—I think so; it would be a great comfort to the poor of the adjoining districts.

18976. There are a great many cases in Ireland where the county infirmary is almost on the border line of the two counties—Waterford, for instance, is close to the County Kerry?—A short time ago a man was thrown off a cart and a wheel passed over his legs, one of them had to be amputated afterwards, and this occurred on the very borders of Kildare and Carlow, within two and a-half miles of the town.

18977. Dr. BOGGER.—Have you sufficient funds?—We have been cut down from £700 to £600, and we find it barely sufficient.

18978. Why were you cut down?—The County Council thought we ought to work on a small scale.

18979. CHAIRMAN.—But you really want the £700?—We do, badly; modern surgery cannot be properly carried out without expenditure; we have all the modern appliances, including the X-ray apparatus.

18980. In Queen's County they have £1,300?—They are much larger; we have only twenty-two beds; I think they have over fifty.

CHAIRMAN.—No; they have only thirty-two, or thereabouts, with twelve outside for fever, which are not used.

18981. Dr. BOGGER.—Do you find yourself much hampered?—Of course we do; we have to economise as much as possible, and as soon as a patient convalesces he must go out.

18982. CHAIRMAN.—But you go as far as to say that your practical assistance to the sick is cramped by want of funds?—I do.

18983. Dr. BOGGER.—You are limited in the taking in of cases sometimes?—We are very strictly full; we generally have an average of from fifteen to sixteen patients.

18984. Are there cases sometimes that you would take in, but knowing you are limited in means you cannot take in?—Certainly; but I cannot say exactly that such a thing has ever occurred.

18985. As a matter of fact, in every institution there is a certain amount of establishment charges which would not be increased in proportion to the increase in the hospital?—Certainly.

18986. So if you had a larger number of patients in you could treat them at a lower cost per head than at present?—I believe I could, but at the same time the strictest economy is observed.

18987. But I mean, in proportion to the increase, there would be a certain amount of deduction per head?—That is a necessity.

18988. If you had only five in of course your cost per head would be higher than it is on account of the establishment charges, so that the County Council would get good value by increasing?—Yes.

18989. CHAIRMAN.—They would get more value for their grant if they increased it?—Yes.

18990. Dr. BOGGER.—What is your nursing staff?—As a rule we have two nurses and a probationer. We are short a probationer at present. We have a staff nurse, assistant nurse, and matron.

18991. A probationer does not cost much—practically only her keep?—Yes; she comes free for two years.

18992. CHAIRMAN.—You don't give her a certificate?—No, I am not able to give one owing to the number of beds. Beggar-street recommends us for probationers.

18993. That would be another advantage if you increased the beds?—Yes. The training of the probationer in a small hospital like this is even superior to the training in a large hospital, because she has to do a lot of things that she would not have to do in a large hospital.

18994. Dr. BOGGER.—Do you get cases from the extreme ends of the county?—We get cases from down below Borris and beyond Tullow.

18995. Mostly for operations?—Principally operative and acute cases such as pneumonia and bronchitis.

18996. Have you any views on the question of consumption?—I have set apart a particular ward for tubercular cases. I have only one, principally for males.

18997. Is that for consumption?—Yes, the tubercular cases generally.

18998. But for the county at large what would you recommend for pulmonary consumption?—I would recommend a hospital to be established by all means if funds would permit.

18999. CHAIRMAN.—You think it is a great danger to the public health to have consumption allowed to go on unchecked?—I do, and now that we have succeeded so far in the treatment of consumption, I think we should go farther. There would be a magnificent site at Cloughgreagh, but I am afraid we have not the money for it. It is just on the borders of the county.

19000. Dr. BOGGER.—A nice site?—A splendid site; but I am afraid it is too large a place.

19001. CHAIRMAN.—The Queen's County people and there would be a nice site on the Heath, and the Kildare people were in favour of a site on the Curragh?—We have each our own little place.

Mr. Neeson.—If we all joined together it would be better.

Witness.—I think we should join.

19002. CHAIRMAN.—Kildare would be a convenient site?—Our site, I think, is better.

19003. Cloughgreagh would be an expensive site?—It has been a long time vacant.

19004. The adapting of it would be a tremendous thing to suit it for male and female patients?—It is a very large house, but the situation is so fine.

19035. It would want so many sanitary annexes to the different wards!—You will have to spend money wherever you go.

19036. I think you have a dispensary, have you not?—We have an extern department.

19037. Are you a dispensary doctor?—I was, in Carlow, for a number of years.

19038. The only thing I wanted to ask you was

whether you saw much phthisis in your practice?—Oh, a great deal.

19039. And you think the provision of a sanatorium is an urgent necessity?—Yes, most desirable and necessary, when you are cognisant of the fact that people are recovering now who were located in the early stages. I was astounded to see statistics from Germany the other day that 75 per cent. were permanently cured.

19040. In first stage cases?—Yes.

May 6, 1904.

Dr. H. H. O'Meara.

Dr. FRANCIS P. COLGAN examined.

I am Physician to the Carlow Fever Hospital.

19041. CHAIRMAN.—What accommodation have you in that?—We have four wards, and we can accommodate up to about thirty; generally about twenty-four.

19042. What has been the largest number you ever had in the Fever Hospital?—In 1892 we had seventy-four, and last year forty.

19043. How many different kinds of fever would be there at the same time?—Scarlatina, typhoid, and measles at the same time, chiefly scarlatina—an outbreak in the workhouse.

19044. How did you manage to arrange?—We got trained nurses in.

19045. I mean about the sub-classification of the disease?—We had them in different wards. I quite agree with Dr. O'Meara about the sanatorium. I think there is more phthisis about Carlow than anywhere else. I have seen a whole family swept away.

19046. Dr. BROOKS.—Was it infection from each other?—Yes. If the first case was isolated, the probability is we could have saved the whole family. It seems to be very prevalent about Carlow. I come across a great many cases.

19047. You would not suggest the conversion of the Fever Hospital into a sanatorium?—You would have to provide another one. I think it is too endorsed.

19048. CHAIRMAN.—And too near the smoky of the railway?—Yes.

19049. Do you think it would be difficult to get people in the first stage to go a little distance?—I don't think so; they would be very pleased.

19050. They are glad to get to Newcastle and pay a certain sum, often very poor people. They will try to pay 7s. a week?—It is very hard to get them in.

19051. Mr. MURKIN.—Is that the minimum charge?—Yes; it used to be 5s., and they raised it to 7s.

19052. Dr. BROOKS.—You would not suggest that the fever cases from Bagenalstown and Tallow should go to the Fever Hospital?—There is no reason why they should not come. It would require an ambulance. It would not do to cart them by train.

19053. The furthest distance in the union is sixteen miles?—Bordering New Ross is a pretty good distance.

19054. That is sixteen or eighteen miles, but the number of cases coming from that would be very limited?—Yes. The worst about fever cases is that when they have to come a distance it is very hard to get them out of their houses. They would go more freely to a place that is nearer.

19055. CHAIRMAN.—Have you ever been obliged to use compulsion through the magistrates to bring people into the Fever Hospital?—I don't think we had. We frightened them, and that was enough. I am not a dispensary doctor, and don't come across them. We would want to have our staff improved at the hospital.

19056. What is your staff at present?—A matron, a trained nurse, and wardmaid, and when any case comes in I telegraph to Dublin for a nurse.

19057. Don't you think that is a fair working staff?—Yes, unless we had constant patients.

19058. What about your water supply?—We got in high pressure, but we have not got hot water up yet. They have been persisting it after this Commission. That is absolutely necessary, especially in scarlatina cases. They have to get baths frequently. It is the chief thing in the convalescent stage. If a little money was laid out on the hospital, it could be made very nice and comfortable. At present it is in a very so-so condition.

19059. Dr. BROOKS.—Do you find the Guardians are willing to do the necessary things?—The Guardians are very good. They generally give me anything I ask, but at present they are putting back things on account of this Commission.

19060. How long has that been?—For the last six months.

19061. CHAIRMAN.—But you feel quite easy in your mind about getting these improvements?—Yes, they will give them to me. They may write a few letters, but they generally give them to me afterwards.

19062. It is rather difficult sometimes to get a Board to look after infectious hospitals closely?—Yes, because some of them don't care to come.

Dr. Francis P. Colgan.

The Sitting terminated.

May 17, 1904.

THIRTY-NINTH PUBLIC SITTING.—TUESDAY, MAY 17TH, 1904.

At the Courthouse, Wicklow.

Present:—Mr. MICKS (Chairman); Mr. MURNAHAN, and Dr. COY BIGGER.

Dr. NORMAN
Thompson.

Dr. NORMAN THOMPSON, F.R., examined.

19053. CHAIRMAN.—There are three unions that have workhouses in the County Wicklow—Rathdrum, Shillelagh, and Ballyinglass?—You will look on anything I say as personal.

19054. You don't appear, then, as representing the County Council?—Not with any settled policy from the County Council.

19055. They have not given you any mandate to represent their views?—No.

Mr. Wynne (Secretary).—They expressed no views, and they nominated two representatives, but the other one would not come and withdrew his name, so I only sent forward the one.

19056. CHAIRMAN.—Now, would you let us have generally your own views in a rough way on the question of amalgamation of unions in this county?—Well, sir, my views personally are that amalgamation of unions in this county is not required, but I think it would be advisable with regard to the Shillelagh Union that some portions that once did belong to Shillelagh should be restored to it. I will give reasons for that.

19057. Where were they sent to from Shillelagh?—Part was sent into the Enniscorthy Union.

19058. That is to Wexford County?—Yes, and part was sent into Carlow, and part was sent to Gorey, another portion of Wexford, and part, I believe, was sent into the Ballyinglass Union; but you will have that certified to by some people who appear on behalf of the union. The electoral division of Moyasomb, which is only four miles from Shillelagh, was transferred to the Enniscorthy Union, and it is eleven miles from Enniscorthy.

19059. That is the central point?—Yes. The electoral division of Clonsilla is four miles from Shillelagh and sixteen from Carlow, and it has been put into Carlow. The townland of Mulkever, now in Gorey Union, is four miles from Shillelagh and nine from Gorey. Those places I am familiar with, but the electoral divisions of Clonsilla, Ballyinglass, and Ballyinglass I would like some Councilmen from the Shillelagh district to speak to. I believe they are a greater distance from Ballyinglass, the union in which they are now, than they are from Shillelagh. The reason I would recommend that they should be restored would be the benefit to the sick poor and the destitute. The distance from the union is very inconvenient, and the closer they are to the centre of the union of course the nearer they would be to the doctor.

19070. How far is Clonsilla from Newtownshandry?—About three miles.

19071. There is a hospital there?—I don't think there is.

19072. Yes, there is?—It is in the County Wexford. I don't know that.

19073. It is in the Enniscorthy Union, but it is not what you call an efficient hospital. It is an old country hospital?—I suppose it is the remains of a fever hospital. If it was in the County Wicklow I would be conversant with it, but in the County Wexford, it does not come before me in an official capacity.

19074. Is there anything as regards any other union?—No, sir. There is portion of the County Wicklow in which I reside myself—Rathdrum Union—and I could not recommend that that should be added to Rathdrum, although it is within the bounds of the County Wicklow. I think it is more efficiently managed by the Rathdrum Union, which is in the County Dublin, and I could not recommend any change in that, and I know that that is the personal opinion of all the representative ratepayers who come from that district.

19075. And of Bray too?—Bray too.

19076. It is only three or four miles from Rathdrum?—It is less than that; it is less than two miles from Loughlinstown. I would drive it in a quarter of an hour.

19077. You think Bray is sufficiently provided with hospital accommodation?—I do.

19078. It needs nothing further?—It supplies all the wants of that district, and it has come to my knowledge that two patients have come there from Rathdrum Union to Rathdrum who should have been sent to Rathdrum, which is twelve or fourteen miles away.

19079. Then you have other hospitals in the County Wicklow. You have the County Infirmary and Fever Hospital here?—Most efficient, both of them.

19080. That is in a transition stage at present?—It is in this transition stage that it is going to be greatly enlarged, and the County Council have given a large grant annually for twenty years, subject to the guarantee from some charitable people that a certain sum, a large sum of money it is too, would be subscribed, and that has been subscribed, so that it will be very much more efficient in a short time than it ever has been.

19081. Do many people go to the County Infirmary?—I don't mean from the west of the county, but from the south, from Arklow on one side and Bray on the other—I can get a written list of all the patients for you which appears before us, and it has been in my hands as chairman of the Finance Committee on several occasions, and I have looked at them. They come from all over the county except the west.

19082. And you are spending a good deal of money now with a view to making it an up-to-date hospital, where operations of all kinds can be performed?—Yes.

19083. There is a small hospital at Arklow?—That is a fever hospital.

19084. It is a good distance from any hospital?—It is a distance from Rathdrum—eight miles, I think.

Mr. Wynne.—There is scarcely ever a patient in it.

19085. CHAIRMAN.—Do the county support that?—Yes, we give some support to it.

19086. Did the county ever consider the question of making that a small cottage or general hospital?—The County Council has never had such a scheme before them.

19087. What would your own idea be considering the population of Arklow and the work carried on there and the large fishing population?—That as a medical man I would say they ought to be such a hospital in such a town.

19088. Have you been in the building?—I have never been in it. I am told it is an efficient building.

19089. It is a good little building if it was done up?—So I am informed.

19090. I rather struck us when we saw it that it was a pity to see such a hospital so well and healthily situated not doing much work?—I think it ought, but everybody does not look on it with the same view as a medical man would. I have a strong opinion that there ought to be such a hospital. There is another hospital at Newtownshandry which has been very useful in that district—a fever hospital.

19091. And is it working?—It is working.

19092. It is kept up by public charges?—We give them £80 a year from the county and the rest is private subscriptions, which they furnish every year to the County Council. Formerly the Grand Jury used to subscribe an equal amount to the amount that was subscribed from private donations, but that hospital is, of course, a long distance from Rathdrum.

May 13, 1904.

Dr. Moore
Thompson

that is Loughlinstown, and at one time I was a physician to that myself. I was dispensary medical officer there, and I cannot say what a benefit that has been in the past.

1904. You have got patients in from Roundwood?—Yes, and Kilsnade and Newtownmountkennedy, and it was used chiefly for infectious cases.

1905. You did not restrict it to infectious cases?—It was not. The very fact of the hospital being there was able to remove centres of infection and stop disease in several cases.

1906. Do you think such a hospital would be better confined to infectious cases?—I do, because I think a surgical case would be better treated here at the County Hospital.

1907. Take the fact into consideration that owing to the operations of the Public Health Act the amount of infectious disease is very much less than it used to be. Of course it is, and, and of a less virulent type.

1908. We find these hospitals empty in a great many cases over the country. Did it occur to you whether a small, almost an ordinary, cottage or isolated wing behind such a hospital as that, so as to utilize the existing hospitals for general medical and surgical cases, would not be a great advantage to the district?—Well, sir, I don't think any general surgical hospital ought to have infectious cases in it at all.

1909. In it, no; but take the case of Arklow, with six wards for medical and surgical cases, and they have a nice bit of ground outside there. Suppose they were to build a couple of wards outside, out off, which could be attended by a special fever nurse, got by telegraph, if fever occurred?—I think it would be most beneficial as a prophylactic measure.

1910. And leaving the hospital as it exists open for medical and surgical cases?—I think that would be most beneficial to the neighbourhood.

1911. Any isolated place that way that would be used as occasion arises is what you suggest?—That would be most beneficial to the neighbourhood.

1912. Would you say the same about Newtownmountkennedy Hospital that it might also be used?—Well, it is used. I have known it used in every kind of case except surgical cases. In fact, it was for that purpose it was erected formerly by private subscription. It existed since the '40s.

1913. Or earlier even?—I would not speak to that. I don't like to give evidence about what occurred before I was born.

1914. A great many of these began about 1867?—I know that this existed in the '40s.

1915. It was made under the old Grand Jury laws long before the Poor Law?—It was all started privately.

1916. With a county grant, I expect?—A county grant that existed for a long time.

1917. Is there anything else that suggests itself to you about hospital accommodation in the county or about the boundaries of the union?—Nothing occurs to me except what I mentioned about Shilleigh. Rathfarnham is a very large union, and to add to it would increase the difficulties.

1918. Then we might come to another aspect of the question, that is, whether changes under the Poor Law, apart altogether from amalgamation, could be introduced. Take your own workhouse that you know best—Loughlinstown. You have in that workhouse a large number of classes. You have got sick, you have got lunatics, aged, and infirm; you have got children at school, mothers with illegitimate children, able-bodied, which is a very small class other than these I have mentioned, and then you have got the tramps. If we go through these separate classes we might come to some view that would affect amalgamation in another way. As regards my lunatics, do you think the workhouse is a proper place to keep lunatics in?—I have a very strong opinion on that question of lunacy, and if you like I will give you my written opinion about that, and how they ought to be treated, and what ought to be done with them.

1919. We would be very glad if you would send us anything that would be convenient to you to send that we could consider with your evidence later on, but if you let us know now in a general way. Would you be in favour of retaining such lunatics in the workhouse?—I would not keep any lunatics in the workhouse at all. I would send them all to the lunatic asylum to be treated there in the best possible way. I hold very strong opinions as to the radical measures that ought to be taken to stop heredity.

1920. But that is a step outside our Commission. We had evidence from a doctor which struck us very

forcefully to the effect that he considered a great many of the illegitimate births in workhouses were with mothers having weak minds?—I would say that the case had a great deal to say to it, and I would stop that by a simple operation.

1921. Mr. WILKINSON.—By separation?—No, sir, emasculation! I say it is all nonsense, because we are piling up an agency for our grandchildren, and it is very serious to see it growing up that way every day.

1922. CHAIRMAN.—I did not for a moment think you were not serious. Then the next class we might consider would be girls who come in there to be mothers of illegitimate children. I don't know whether you happen to have seen the evidence we have received in other places about these?—I have not.

1923. It has been suggested to me that it might be a good thing that workhouses should not be open for such girls at all in future, but that the Guardians should, instead of keeping them in workhouses, send them to one of the religious penitentiaries that are maintained by both of the main religions in this country. You have these penitentiaries carried on by nuns?—I did not know there was such a thing existing.

1924. Oh, there are. There are a large number in Ireland, and it has been suggested to us that the best plan would be when these poor girls have to leave their houses, say three or four months before the child is born, that they should be sent to one of these institutions and an endeavour made to reform them and give them a fresh start in life, and that the child should be boarded out, and that this girl, when she gets a situation, should pay for her child and pay for her own maintenance while she was in the institution so as to take the charge off the rates from the point of economy, and then from a point of humanity and Christian feeling, to give the girl a fresh start?—I think it would be a very Christian act if such a thing was carried out.

1925. That has been put very strongly to us, and we have had a body of evidence on the subject all over the country?—It has often struck me. The only thing is I know there will be a rush from the different religious institutions to get hold of the unfortunate girls to make the child of their own religion.

1926. That could not be done. The girl would go to whatever religious institution she belonged to?—If that is so, there could not be a better plan adopted, because, of course, the stigma of being born in the union attaches itself to the child, and it certainly does the unfortunate female no good.

1927. We find in our inquiries that when a girl comes to the workhouse and has a child she goes out after a while?—And comes in again and has another one.

1928. They have quite a number of children, these poor girls?—I know they have.

1929. And a girl who would go into the workhouse to have a child usually marries and lives all day and all night with women who have had two, three, four, or five children, and gets utterly corrupted?—Not the smallest doubt about it.

1930. You would be in favour of such a plan?—Of course I would, and to remove them from all the bad influences they would meet inside the walls of that place, and I think if it was done, not with a view to economy at all, yet that in future it would economy.

1931. That would also destroy that class of children—the illegitimate children?—Well, I don't think it would destroy them.

1932. I mean it would diminish their number to a very large amount?—I don't know whether it will diminish their number or not, but it will prevent them having the stigma attached to them.

1933. If you get a girl into the institution?—She won't repeat the offence you think; I don't think it will stop first births.

1934. On the contrary, some people are rather afraid it might increase the number of first births; if a child could be better placed and if a girl could have the offence, as they say, brushed up, it might lead to an increase of first births, but most of the witnesses we have examined would be willing to run that risk to see how it would turn out?—I think it ought to be carried out.

1935. Then another class we have would be the casual—the man who would go in and out?—The tramp.

1936. Not so much the tramp, but the man who would go in and out from a place like Kingstown or Blackrock or Bray, who would be out of work for one week and get work for another week, and then they

May 17, 1904.

Dr. Norman
Thompson.

are usually in receipt of relief: the question is what would be done with them and also with the tramp. The casuals, I think, they should get out-door relief if they are of good character.

12120. Suppose they are people who are really not able to make a good living for themselves, owing to want of thrift, or too great a thirst, or reasons of that sort; supposing a man when he gets employed at a job, unleashing a ship or anything else you like; suppose he goes, and instead of spending his money according to his necessities, suppose he drinks it all the first week!—That man is suffering from a kind of lunacy; you cannot stop that man—he is a dipsomaniac.

12121. It has been suggested in the Bill which has been introduced in the House of Commons that the class of inefficient labourers who cannot support themselves for any considerable period of the year, but have to come upon the public rates, it has been suggested in the Bill that they should be put into what is called a labour colony—that is a large farm with workshops to which these men might be sent to work—I think the cost of running a thing such as that would be so great and the result would be so small.

12122. I was going to tell you they have started such a one in Belgium and there—I don't say it would be the case in this country—but in Belgium it is self-supporting?—I don't think it would be in this country.

12123. I think that is open to doubt!—The cost would be so great and the results so small, I would not like to recommend it.

12124. You would not recommend it for the casual in and out—I would not.

12125. Take the case of tramps—that large body of men with some women and children—who are strolling about the country from union to union, bringing up their children illegitimate and without human or Divine knowledge, do you think that those parents ought to be deprived of the children who are going about?—I do; I think it is a duty we owe to the children; I don't think any parental guardianship ought to be recognised at all; I would take the children from them.

12126. Would you take the children from some strong and lusty parents and let them go round the world to have more children again, or would you feel that it would be a proper thing that if a man and woman were such that they could not be trusted with the charge of their children, don't you think it would be a proper thing to separate them and keep them under restraint as long as their children were being supported by the State?—I do, and I think the child-bodied tramps ought to be made to do some labour.

12127. He would be detained under a magistrate's warrant while his children were being supported?—Of course the difficulty of that is that at present these tramps are, under the Vagrancy Act, liable to be proceeded against, but who is to proceed against him, who will take upon himself the odium of prosecuting him?

12128. The penalty is very small!—The penalty is very small, and, besides, anybody that is at all of a philanthropic mind does not like to be hard on a fellow that may be down on his luck.

12129. Have you seen many of these men tramping about?—I know they are the curse of the country, and intimidate farmers' wives and labourers' wives by demanding money and food from them—frightening them.

12130. It has been stated to us that a great many of these are discharged soldiers?—They are the class of men that naturally enlist either in the militia or for the short service, but I don't think it is the fact of their being soldiers that makes them tramps, but it is their natural tendency in life.

12131. And if a man has been serving for a number of years during the years he would naturally learn a trade or get employment, and if he is discharged from military service, might he not, naturally, turn to vagrancy?—He may if he does not come back to the army again and enlist in another name.

12132. So that they get two short services?—Yes; they get the smell of the barracks, and like to come back again; they know when they are comfortable.

12133. And those who don't get the smell of the barracks get the smell of the workhouse?—Yes.

12134. Do you think they are a despicable class to have at large in the country?—Most undesirable; but I don't attach any importance to the fact that some of them have been military men; I don't think it is the fact of their being military men that makes them tramps.

12141. But we have a large idle and vagrant class at present in the country quite distinct from the old beg-

gars that used to go round the neighbourhood?—They were characters that never went outside their own electoral division.

12142. These are not disliked in the country?—Not a bit.

12143. Those are freely and heartily helped?—Yes.

12144. But those strolling strangers?—Yes; getting up at the workhouse at night and living in houses given up by the people, and in my neighbourhood there are two or three old landladies whose they regularly assemble and cook their food and eat, and become the women of the locality.

12145. Do not the police take any notice of them?—The police do take notice of them.

12146. When they assist their dinner?—They have prosecuted them on several occasions.

12147. But it does not result in that class being put a stop to?—Not at all; they are on the increase. Now, with regard to the children in the Rathdown Union, we heard a large number of the children sent, and since the Local Government Act came into force we have had a number of lady Guardians who are most philanthropic, and give up their mind to looking after the children, and have increased the number that have been boarded out with the most efficient result, and they supervise them and superintend them and examine and look after them every month.

12148. Most of these children are illegitimate, of course?—A great number are.

12149. So that one might hope that they would be boarded out under a different system if the mothers were dealt with as we have suggested?—A great number of them have been taken when they come to a certain age and are apprenticed, and we pay an apprenticeship fee for them, and only in one case has it come to my knowledge that one girl was a failure—the world not do anything, and she had to be brought back to the workhouse.

12150. Would you go as far as to say that no children ought to be kept in the workhouse, but all ought to be boarded out, or would you be in favour of extending the Guardians' power to board out any children who were in their charge?—I would board out every child that was healthy and had not to be kept in the hospital, because it is impossible to think that a child can be reared properly in a workhouse where there is a crowd of others.

12151. We have dealt with all classes except two, and the evidence is that they may be excluded from the workhouse; then you come to the sick and aged and infirm; now the aged and infirm are the greater body of the inmates—in Rathdown you have 287, and 141 sick only?—The aged and infirm are the larger class.

12152. Do you see any objection to putting them into one institution for a county or for several counties, or any other method?—From my experience, with regard to the Rathdown and Rathfriland Unions, I would not make any change, but I would make some sort of segregation of that class—a sub-division of that class—because there are in that class some that are really there out of no fault of their own, or of gentler birth than some of the others, and I would make it discretionary with the master to give them privileges, or to make some sub-division.

12153. What I want to come to is this, that you have the sick and the aged and infirm only there, and if you could bring all the aged and infirm of some areas together you would be able to effect great economies in administration and management; if you left the accommodation for the sick practically undisturbed in one union, and if you only left, we will say, in the union the sick wards you would then have it actually a district hospital?—You would have it a district hospital, but don't you see that that class of sick is always being added to from the other class of aged and infirm, so that if you had any central place in the County Wicklow where you sent from all the unions they would constantly have to be re-transferred back again.

12154. If they had them there it would be, of course, at the place where there would be the old hospital; supposing Rathdown were a centre for aged and infirm at Loughlinstown it would have its own hospital, it would also take over the sick and the aged and infirm from North Dublin and Rathfriland, or some portion that might be arranged?—You would constantly have to be re-transferring them back when they got sick to the original place they came from. When once they came to the sick classes they would have to go into the hospital back again; they would have to go into the hospital that would be at their door, but it would be always a

charge against the old area unless you had a county rate, which is not generally approved of. I don't think it would suit.

19155. So if you had not that saving you would have those people charged while infirm to the extent they belong to, so much a head, and so much a head while sick if they had to be treated in the Rathdown hospital?—If it would tend towards economy.

19156. It would tend to enormous economy?—One said.

19157. Really, you would only have one staff doing what a large number of staffs do now?—If it had that tendency I would be in favour of it, but I think you will find there will be great jealousy in carrying it out between the different unions.

19158. Undoubtedly there would be a conflict of local interests and wishes, but economy would be some consolation to those who did not succeed?—It would to the general ratepayers.

19159. But not to the contractor?—No. With regard to the idiots, they are, of course, very much fewer than the lunatics, and I think they might be kept in the unions and separated altogether.

19160. If you were to get all classes but the idiots out of the idiots all over Ireland are not very generous—are not so kind people?—Quite the opposite.

19161. They might really be put in a central institution?—They ought not to be with lunatics at all; their life is the saddest in the world.

19162. The same epileptics?—They might always be with the idiots.

19163. Four hundred is all Ireland supported out of the rates; they might be provided for there?—I think Lady Meath has suggested it.

19164. Dr. Brogan.—Is there much consumption in this county?—Unfortunately, I suffer from it myself; there is a good deal of it.

19165. Have you any suggestion for the treatment of it?—I think consumptive patients ought all to be segregated, separated. I don't say that I would attempt any scheme to try and cure the consumptives that come into the workhouses, because they are too far advanced.

19166. But if there was a place provided for the early cases, do you think it would be avoided off?—I think, sir, after a time it would, because the people are beginning to understand the necessity for separating these cases and for the open-air treatment, and the benefit that accrues to them from it. Of course I know that it will be attended with very great additional expense, but nevertheless I think that if the expense is not too great that some step ought to be taken in that direction to reduce the number of infective cases that there are. I could show you one house now where members of people have died of tuberculosis in it—two generations—and there is one little child left. The mother is alive, and has re-married, and I begged of her to burn the house down. However the house was burned down without any intention, and I think the fact of that house being burned down has stopped the disease, because there has been no other case in the new house they have gone into.

19167. Would you suggest that there should be a sanatorium for, say, the County Wicklow and perhaps an adjoining county?—Well, there is a sanatorium in this county at Newcastle, but, of course, they come from all parts of Ireland to it, and the treatment there is very expensive and very expensive.

19168. And you know from your own knowledge it has done a great deal of good?—I know it has relieved a great number of the cases that are in there, but nearly all consumptive cases in their hospital stage will be improved by change of air and good food and rest and open air that they get there, but a great number of these cases lapse back again when they return.

19169. But some of them do not?—Some do not.

19170. A fair proportion that have been taken early do not?—They do not. The cases that succeed are the cases that are physically weak beings—you might liken them to a person in a commercial transaction that has not with a great financial crisis and cannot stand up then against any loss. Their physical resources are not able to fight against the disease; in fact their phagocytic cells are not numerous enough to kill the enemy.

19171. And, of course, cases like that cannot get the full benefit of the sanatorium treatment?—They cannot, and the cases that are in hospitals in the unions don't get proper treatment either, and they are dangerous to other people that are in that place. It is because they are a danger to the sound people that I would like to have them removed.

19172. So you think after all the additional expense would not be very great considering that they are kept at present in their later stages in the workhouse hospital and are a source of danger in those hospitals?—That is why I would not object to some extra cost, because I think the danger would be got rid of.

19173. Would it not be a great gain if you could save a number of lives?—I think a world.

19174. You spoke about the fever hospital at Newtownsmole?—£30 a year, you say, it costs?—Yes.

19175. Is it managed by the County Council?—It is not managed by the County Council, but the County Council elect a committee who manage it, and the committee meet and elect their own chairman. It formerly was altogether in the hands of the Protestant minister and a few of his own congregation and the gentry of that denomination who lived in the neighbourhood, and they got a grant from the Grand Jury; they applied, of course, here to the County Council to continue that grant and the County Council increased the grant and elected their own committee, which are half and half of each denomination, and they manage the place, and everything goes as smoothly as possible.

19176. Could you tell me how the committee is composed?—Half and half I think. I know that is the way it was elected at first, and I think it retains that condition still.

Mr. Wynne.—Practically.

19177. Dr. Brogan.—Is that a local committee elected by the County Council?—Yes.

19178. Are there many County Councillors on the committee?—I think myself and Mr. Simon Doyle are the only two.

19179. How many are on the committee?—Sixteen.

19180. The rest?—Some local gentry and the priests and curates of the neighbourhood and the elected Guardians of the people.

19181. And it works very well?—Oh, very well.

19182. Do the County Council manage the county fever hospital and county infirmary?—Well, they pay large grants and elect the committee in the same way.

Mr. Wynne.—Barely, about half nominated by the County Council and the other half by the subscribers.

19183. Dr. Brogan.—Does that work well?—Oh, very well.

19184. Do you think that is a better system than if it were altogether managed by the County Council themselves?—I do, and I will tell you why—I think we get a lot of private subscriptions we would not get otherwise, and we don't subscribe quite as much out of the rates.

19185. The county infirmary does a large amount of hospital work?—It is very useful. I am sure they would be glad if you would inspect it.

19186. Have you any other fever hospital supported by the county?—I cannot speak as to the rest of the county; I am not conversant with that, but I don't think there is; there are only the Arklow and Wicklow and Newsmo fever hospitals that come before us for grants through the County Council, so if there is any other fever hospital it does not get a county grant.

19187. How much do you give to the Arklow hospital?—£30 a year.

Mr. Wynne.—There is scarcely a patient in it; for five years it had two patients.

19188. Dr. Brogan.—Do you think if it were a poor hospital on the lines spoken of by the chairman it would be avoided off?—I think it would relieve the fever hospital in Rathdown.

19189. But as a general hospital I am sure it would be used.

19190. Do you think it would be well-spent money?—I do; I know that there are a large number of people, of the labouring class, who are glad to avail themselves of either the Fever Hospital or the County Infirmary here in Wicklow, who won't go into the hospital in the union, because the stigma of the union attaches to them, therefore, I think that if there was a hospital in Arklow it would be used largely, too.

19191. Would you like to see the other hospitals separated from the workhouse?—That I really have not made my mind up on.

19192. Would you like to see wards set apart for private patients?—I think private patients ought to be taken; I don't think they would come to the union hospitals.

19193. Not unless the hospital was separated in some way?—If it was within the same grounds they would not come in at all.

19194. CHAIRMAN.—If you took all those classes out

May 17, 1904.

Dr. Norman
Thompson

of the workhouse, and left nothing but the sick, and have it actually a district hospital, do you think there would be any objection to the better classes going in there as paying patients?—I think, sir, the small would be the very same, "You may break, you may shatter the vase as you will."

19195. Mr. MURKIN.—Considering that Arklow is the second largest town in the county, do you think it is getting a fair share in return for the contribution—a fair share of benefits for the sick?—I think it ought to get more; but there is a hospital there, and it is not full.

19196. There is practically no hospital—There is a little hospital there; and I am sure if numbers of patients would come into it, and they would show they were doing work, the County Council would grant a larger sum at once; they would not hesitate; there is the hospital, and for years the patients don't come in.

19197. At present, it would be irregular to bring medical and surgical cases into that hospital?—It would; it is only a fever hospital.

19198. As Arklow is a town of very considerable population, don't you think something ought really to be done with it?—I do; if there was a general hospital there, I think it would be valued largely.

19199. It seems to me, it has a very strong claim for some assistance, to help the sick?—If there is any hospital like that, there ought to be some works in it in which the patients would be made pay some small fees, anyway, because the system of medical out-door relief is being largely abused in this county; there are numbers of people who get medical assistance and medical out-door relief on red tickets that ought not to get it; that are not destitute paupers.

19200. CHAIRMAN.—Now even what you would call poor persons?—No, sir; that has come to my knowledge very often. I knew it when I was a dispensary doctor, and I know it now as a Guardian; I see these tickets issued to people who ought not to get them. So, if there is any general hospital started like that, there ought to be some scheme for pay wards, and they ought not to admit patients on the rates who are able to pay something towards their own relief.

19201. Mr. MURKIN.—Quite so; and something substantial that would meet the railway?—Something, anyway; I don't mean to molest them; that there would not be any great profit to the medical man from it; but to relieve the rates from an imposition that ought not to be cast upon them.

19202. CHAIRMAN.—You are speaking of contributions in aid of rates?—Yes; that farmers, and men who have stock, and hold a certain amount of land, ought not to get free relief on red tickets from doctors; and I know numbers of cases where they do get it.

19203. Mr. MURKIN.—Why does not the doctor bring that under the notice of the Guardians?—It is done over and over again, and nothing is done; but the ticket is cancelled, and the doctor then has the remedy of proceeding against the person who issues the ticket. But let me see the doctor that will have the pluck to do it.

19204. The doctors are not wanting in courage in this country.

CHAIRMAN.—You think they fear to do it?—If they did, a lot of them would lose some of their practice.

Mr. OWEN OSBORN, Ballynaglass, examined.

19205. CHAIRMAN.—I believe you wanted to speak as regards the proposed amalgamation of part of your union with unions in the County Kildare and County Carlow?—Yes, sir.

19206. What is your opinion?—All our people, both poor and ratepayers and Councillors and all, are greatly opposed to any change.

19207. Would you like to leave the boundaries as they are?—Yes, to change whatever. It would be very awkward for the poor people living in Grange district. I don't see how most of them could go to Athy; it runs up to Ballynaglass.

19208. Nearly as bad as coming to Wicklow?—Yes. They have to pass a high hill and go through Carlow district. I am sure it would be sixteen miles at the outside from Athy. It is eight miles from Carlow district to Athy, and I am sure it is four or five out

19209. Mr. MURKIN.—That might apply to private practice the same way?—And so it does.

19210. It would be the same thing, whether they got the tickets or did not get them?—Numbers of medical men, rather than make themselves unpopular, let the thing go on. This is a thing that the Medical Association has brought before the Local Government Board.

19211. CHAIRMAN.—We are not going into that. Well, we have got into it in this indirect way.

19212. A peep over the hedge?—Yes; but when you ask me whether it would be advisable to have a hospital in Arklow, I say it would be most advisable, but there should be some restrictions.

19213. In the County Farnagh and County Antrim Infirmary, within the last few years, nearly everybody who goes in now pays something; they say, that if a child comes in to be treated, at all events the child costs something from 6d. to 1s. a week, and it relieves the family budget to that extent; and they say, that should be a minimum; but that, if necessary, it should go up to 2s. or 3s. if a special nurse has to be got; and these bodies are very anxious that the law should be amended on our recommendation, so as to enable local managing bodies to recover such costs as they in their discretion think fit to assess?—Well, sir, I really approve of that; and one of the reasons why I think that ought to be adopted by the people who would go in there themselves would be this, that it would relieve them from the stigma of being destitute paupers, because they would pay some small amount, according to what they were able.

19214. That has been exactly the evidence we got in Farnagh, that it is popular with a great many people?—Yes; a man does not like to be called a pauper; an Irishman is a proud fellow, and does not like the stigma.

19215. He is a mixture. They would take some of that relief for nothing; but yet, if they got the opportunity they would like to pay?—They would rather pay. I know the local bodies will charge a very small amount.

19216. They won't press hardly?—Never will.

19217. Mr. MURKIN.—I suppose this county is so circumstanced, that it would be hardly possible to have it self-contained in the matter of Poor Law?—You cannot get over the back of the mountains.

19218. A good many witnesses, in other places, have spoken in favour of having the county boundaries for Poor Law matters?—I would put all that portion of the west into Carlow and Kildare.

19219. The mountain, of course, is a barrier?—Yes; it is terrible for jurors and County Councils, and everybody, to come here from that part; they have to go into Dublin and come down here.

19220. CHAIRMAN.—Whereas, they are committed to Naas and Carlow?—Commitment to Naas and Carlow.

19221. Mr. MURKIN.—If the Guardians were empowered to pay for their patients in adjoining institutions?—Naas or Carlow, I think they would snap at it, but then they would want to be relieved of their quota of contribution to the County Infirmary here, and I think it would be only equitable and right that they would be. Of course, that is a county rate and all over the county, but that would be easily separated.

to the boundary of Wicklow. I myself live in the Ballynaglass district, and that is the extreme end nearest to Athy, but it is nearest to Ballynaglass.

19222. But you all prefer Ballynaglass?—We all prefer Ballynaglass.

19223. Has the question of taxation any importance in the matter?—Yes, of course, money generally has.

19224. Is it a lower rate in Ballynaglass?—Yes.

19225. What is the difference of the rate?—About 4d. in the £.

19226. Is that on Poor Law purposes or road maintenance?—On both combined. We work our roads cleaner than they do in Athy.

19227. As regards Poor Law purposes, you would have to pay less in Ballynaglass than in Athy?—I could not really say that. I am taking the two rates as struck.

19228. Of course, the rates are struck for District

Mr. Owen
Osborn

Council and for union charges—I don't know how the union stands. I think Ballyinglass is lower. Mr. Dagg is here, and will be able to inform you on that. Mr. Brown spoke in Nass about a self-contained county. I don't see how that could be managed. If you take the Queen's County, it runs up to the very boundary of Athy, and Kildare won't compensate them.

19229. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Brown's idea—I may not be quite accurate, but what I fancy his idea—was that that portion of the Queen's County that went up close to Athy, that they would have power to send in their petition there, their poor into the Athy Union, at so much a head?—It was the paper I took for it, and that does not appear in the paper.

19230. I may be confusing it with some other witness, because we have had that question in a great many places, and that was the way in which it was

suggested the difficulty should be got over?—There is no one in our district wants to change. We have a very well equipped union, and everything works very satisfactorily.

19231. Would you rather be in the County Wicklow than any other county?—I would.

19232. Even though you have to come over here to the Assembly?—We have not to come here to Assize; we live in Kildare No. 3.

19233. But the Ballyinglass townspeople have to come over here?—Yes.

19234. They don't like that?—I suppose not; it is a very difficult country to get through.

19235. Have you anything else to say?—I don't think there is anything else I have to say. My whole business was to oppose that amalgamation.

19236. Mr. Dagg is with you?—Yes. He travelled the other end; I came through Dublin.

May 17, 1904:

Mr. Owen
Comer.

Mr. J. R. Dagg, Clerk of the Ballyinglass Union, examined.

19237. CHAIRMAN.—You have three counties in your union?—Yes.

19238. And each rural district wishes to remain in the Ballyinglass Union?—They do.

19239. What would you like to say to supplement the evidence that has already been given?—Except to mention a fact or two. If you look at the map you will see that a radius of eight statute miles takes in all No. 3 district, that they are objecting to be changed. It is nothing personal to me, and if you take a radius of eight miles from Athy Workhouse it touches only the fringe of the district. Then the two large electoral divisions which are more adjacent to Ballyinglass than Ballymore are Carrigrohane and Grangeley, in the County Kildare, and the greater part of these divisions are in the Roman Catholic parish of Ballyinglass. It is their fair and market towns and the place they attend worship, so naturally they are prejudiced in favour of remaining there. From a county point of view I dread it would be well to have self-contained counties. I made out a statement with regard to the children born in the workhouse.

19240. Your point of view was rather favourable to the workhouse. I would not put it in the shape of being favourable to the workhouse, because I think the boarding-out system and the system of taking children from their illegitimate mothers and having them brought up would be better; but I don't think that the workhouse training has been altogether as bad as has been represented in some cases.

19241. I am sure you have cases of success in after-life?—Since 1865 there were 334 children born in the workhouse—155 boys and 179 girls—and probably there was 75 per cent. of illegitimate births amongst them.

19242. Or probably more?—At least 75 per cent., and of these who have grown to riper years we have at present in the house one man, who is nearly blind, and two women. One has an illegitimate child. She was a servant in Dublin. It was there she met her mistress, and she attributes it to a civil servant. Against that I may mention we have one of these children born in the workhouse who is a nun. A great many of them were trained as servants and got into good situations. The unmarried mothers we have in the house are persons who came in there, and unfortunately some of them have two or three illegitimate children; but really my experience is that a child who is reared in an orphanage, some children at all events, as just as likely to fall as a child reared in the workhouse. I have known servants taken out of the Strabally Orphanage.

19243. Not taking that particular form of falling, but taking the question of getting on in life, have you any instance among these 330 children of success in life? You gave me one of a nun?—The others are servants in respectable situations. I have known a workhouse child to become a presiding barrister.

19244. One case?—One case at all events in the workhouse, and I have known another who became an apothecary. There was a very great prejudice some years ago against employing a girl who was reared in a workhouse, and also against employing women who have illegitimate children, but owing to the scarcity of servants that has had to be got over. It would be a very good scheme, in my opinion, to have the children taken from the unmarried mothers and maintained, but I think the contribution towards their maintenance should be a very reasonable one. The

system at present is that the unmarried mother remains in the workhouse until the child is reared; probably she may apply when the child is three years old to go out and take a situation. The average wages a farmer will give is 26 a year. She cannot get the child boarded at less than 2s. 6d. a week, and the result is she has nothing to clothe herself with. Many who make that effort have to come back until the child is six or seven years of age and able to do something. So if a child is taken from an unmarried mother the contribution should vary from 1s. to 1s. 6d. a week. They could not afford to pay more. There is one class I wish to make a suggestion about; it is the able-bodied married couples. They are not very numerous, certainly.

19245. They are chiefly of the casual, in-and-out class?—Yes. But we sometimes have an able-bodied married couple from the locality. The father, owing to ill-health, has to come into the workhouse and the home is broken up. That man is penniless when he comes in, and I think it is very hard to send him out in the same state, and the result is he remains in the house for a considerable period. I have a typical case in my mind at present. A man who remained with us for two years—he was a very handy man—did up the infirmary in dormers. He applied for a labourer's cottage that was vacant. The Guardians gave it to a better tenant—a man who was servant to a country gentleman. His wife and himself and six children cost us 23 a week for two years—that is £200. I think if the Guardians had power to hire out deserving cases like that, married couples who were known in the locality, and let their wages be put into a deferred fund until it amounted to 24 or 25. Then let a committee of the Board, with the workhouse master, be appointed to buy some clothing and furniture and utensils, and give him 10s. to start in life, that man and his family would cease to be a burden on the rates in a few weeks instead of two years.

19246. If a man were a deserving object, do you not think that the private charity of the well-to-do in the neighbourhood of Ballyinglass would be sufficient to give him a fresh start?—Unfortunately it is not. There have been in my experience about fifteen cases of that class.

19247. And would no one come forward to give the couple of pounds necessary to give him a fresh start?—There would not. Solomon says "the rich man has many friends, but the poor man is an enemy to his own relations."

19248. But even if his own relations did not do it, you would expect some of the people to come forward?—It would require a sum you would hardly expect the people to give. I saw that man before he was put out of his house, and the family had consisted of a bacon box mailed together. He had a patched quilt on it.

19249. How did he come down to that?—He was subject to frequent attacks of tonsillitis and was thrown out of work. I wanted him to get them taken out like myself, and he would not. He was afraid of the operation.

19250. That is the case of a delicate man, not of an able-bodied?—He is out for the last year and a half, and is self-supporting.

19251. As a rule private benevolence would come forward in most districts?—Private benevolence is extended more towards the better classes. If a cow dies with a small farmer a collection is made for him, but if anything happens a labourer he is left there.

19252. But the farmer for whom he worked?—He

Mr. J. R.
Dagg.

May 17, 1904.

Mr. J. A.
Dugg.

was a general man who used to work with a shopkeeper in town, who had a farm, and sometimes drove his car.

19253. Would not the shopkeeper make out the few shillings?—Very few shopkeepers will advance more than 10s.

19254. You would be in favour of giving the Guardians power to start a man like that?—Yes, a privilege not to be repeated. With regard to the tramps, there is a distinction between the Irish law and the English law, and it creates a difficulty in dealing with those who are chronic tramps; that is, if you have a relieving officer who will not swear as is required by the section of the Irish Act that the applicant left one union and came to the other with the intention of applying for relief—that is the vital clause. The English system now is—

19255. Of giving power to detain in the workhouse?—And if you had the system of ticket-of-leave and farm colony, and anyone who wishes to read "In Hardest England and the Way Out" will see how successfully a farm colony has been worked.

19256. That was rather the outline of the scheme which has since been adopted?—Yes. Our hospitals really are becoming somewhat availed of by the public generally. We have at present seven pay patients in our. Of course it would be a very good thing to make them separate institutions with separate entrances, and meet the wishes of the public in that way; but I find that the objection to them is dying out in our neighbourhood. We treated there the brother of a magistrate on my Board for fever. A clerk of Petty Sessions sent his son to us, and respectable farmers come in, and in cases where people are not able to pay the full average cost the Guardians only charge 2s. or 2s. 6d. towards it.

19257. We have received evidence in a good many places that such cases do now go into the workhouse hospital?—Yes. There is a great want certainly of some scheme for relieving poor persons. There is a

great difficulty about it. Last week we had a case in which there was a consultation fee for a doctor attending a military case in the case of a labourer's wife. That cottage is on a twelve-acre farm, and if the farmer's wife is sick he cannot afford to get the dispensary doctor or local midwife—he depends on his handy woman. I really think there should be something done towards sending those persons who are often in greater need than the labourers.

19258. There is a Poor Law midwife there at present?—Yes.

19259. And in cases in which she does not get a red ticket or a ticket for her attendance she can go and charge a fee?—Yes.

19260. She would be available at a small fee for the farmer?—The usual fee they charge is 10s., and he can get a handy woman for 5s., and that is a consideration for him.

19261. Then in that case once a year or every two years it would be a case of the difference between 5s. and 10s.?—Yes.

19262. If there is anything in the nature of a return that you would like to send us about these children we would be very glad to get it from you, showing the way in which the workhouse children have done so well in Balmalcolm Union?—My idea is that children reared in the workhouses or orphanages of the poorest class generally are open to greater temptations than others, and it is owing to the circumstances in which they are placed. There are greater risks.

19263. Dr. N. Thompson.—Before he goes, there is one question I think you omitted. You asked him about counties. Mr. Dugg has spoken of the opinion of the people of the Balmalcolm Union, that they would like the union to remain there, but you did not ask him whether there would be any objection to being transferred to the County Council?—The matter was mentioned at one time, but did not take any definite shape. It was said it would be more convenient for the parents to attend in Naas than in Wicklow.

Dr. N. Thompson.—Aye, or in Carlow.

Mr. DENIS J. COGAN, M.P., examined.

19264. CHAIRMAN.—You are connected with the Rathfrim Union?—Yes.

19265. You have been present during our discussion this morning?—I was not here from the start.

19266. Before we go into details, what is the view of the Rathfrim Guardians on the question of the amalgamation of unions?—The view I gather is that they are strongly in favour of amalgamation.

19267. As regards their own union?—Their own union, of course, is the largest union in the county.

19268. They would take in Shillelagh?—I don't know as to the details of any scheme of amalgamation.

19269. But they would be in favour of an amalgamation scheme that would reduce the cost of administration?—Yes.

19270. They have not adopted any definite scheme, though?—No.

19271. They would leave that consideration to the Commission?—They would leave it very much to their representatives.

19272. What would your view be?—I expressed my view yesterday at a meeting of the Rathfrim Rural District Council, that I think there is room for some improvement towards economy in administration in the county, and I also think that it is possible to administer the county within its own borders for Poor Law purposes.

19273. A self-contained county for Poor Law purposes?—Yes, but I don't know whether I would be permitted to go into what I consider a scheme towards that end of my own, what I would suggest.

19274. We would be very glad to hear it?—First of all, I think that the relief of able-bodied paupers within the walls of any institution should be entirely abolished. That being so, we have three buildings in the county now called workhouses, but they are really not workhouses at all. I would convert two of the existing buildings into hospitals or hospices, or whatever term you may apply to them, for the infirm and aged and sick. I am in favour of an extension of the outdoor relief system. One of the three ought to be converted into an auxiliary asylum, a county asylum for imbeciles and harmless lunatics.

19275. At present they go to Ennisceorthy?—At present they remain in the workhouse.

19276. But I mean the lunatics?—They go to the Richmond.

19277. Mr. MURPHY.—There are still a large number in the workhouses?—There are a large number of harmless lunatics in the workhouses, and we have a number of harmless lunatics in the Richmond Asylum which at present cost the county about 500 per annum. I believe if we had a county asylum for that class of lunatics we should be able to maintain them at a very much lower cost.

19278. CHAIRMAN.—And economies a good deal there?—Very considerably.

19279. Similar to the one started at Youghl, County Cork?—Quite so. I do think also that the capitation grant should be equalised, at least with the district asylums.

19280. 4s. 1s., or equal to half the cost at least for the maintenance of the patient.

19281. Mr. MURPHY.—That is to say, if the inmates were taken out of the asylum and put into an auxiliary, the same capitation grant should be continued to them?—Quite so. There are a number of this class of patients in Rathfrim Poorhouse at the present time, and they are very badly placed there. The medical officer of the Local Government Board made a very strong report about a year ago on the condition of these patients. I look upon their condition at present as very bad, no matter how the Guardians may endeavour to ameliorate their condition. The surroundings and the construction of the building itself, everything prevents them from being cared for in the manner in which they ought to be cared for. Therefore, I think it is highly desirable, in fact, absolutely necessary, that we should have in the county an asylum for that purpose. I would convert one of the existing buildings, and I would suggest Shillelagh, for we have Rathfrim on the east and Inchebeg on the west, as houses for the aged and infirm and sick, but at the same time I think, seeing that there may be a necessity for a fever hospital at the south end of the county, I would leave the fever hospital that is attached to the present workhouse at Shillelagh intact as a fever hospital and administered as a fever hospital.

19282. The fever hospital is a fine building, in good repair. Would it not do as a general hospital?—It would do, of course, for a general hospital, but whether

the necessity would exist for a general hospital or not I cannot say.

12282. Would it not be more economical and just to build a cottage hospital that would do for fever, or use a wing of that?—Yes, quite so. It might be well to maintain the hospital there as a general hospital, and take a portion of it for fever purposes.

12283. CHAIRMAN.—Otherwise they would have to go very long distances to Rathfriland?—Or to Balmalcolm on the other side. Rathfriland itself is well suited for the matter of hospitals, for it has the County Infirmary and the County Fever Hospital and the other hospitals mentioned. And so, conveniently. If that object were achieved, I would revert to the system of dispensary committees managing committees for each dispensary district.

12284. Before you leave that, do you think there would be much economy? You would keep up Balmalcolm for the aged and infirm, Rathfriland for the same purpose, and Shillelough for lunatics. You are still keeping up the same institutions with large staffs—I would appoint for each institution a medical officer superintendent or other who would act as secretary to the managing committee. I think the managing committee for each of these institutions ought to be appointed by the County Council.

12285. That is, for the institution at Rathfriland. Instead of having Boards of Guardians you would have it a managing committee?—Yes, appointed by the County Council composed of elected representatives, that is, Rural Councillors and other persons outside; a certain limited number always, ensuring to the elected representatives a majority on the committee. To that committee I would give power to appoint their own medical officer, who should be a resident medical officer, residing in the vicinity of the institution itself, and he should have the management of the institution in a similar way to the resident medical superintendent of asylums, and he should act as the secretary to the committee of management, and this committee would have the appointment of that officer and his assistants and nursing staff.

12287. Mr. MURPHY.—What advantage do you see in a committee appointed by the County Council over the present Board of Guardians?—I see it in this way that if you split the county into two sections only, east and west, if the members were elected on the present system for electing Guardians, the Boards would be so large that they would be too ponderous.

12288. What is the need of any change of area? Could not the area continue the same as at present?—Of course, you will have to alter the area. If you convert Shillelough Workhouse into a lunatic asylum, you would do away at once with the present Board of Guardians—that is the Guardians for Shillelough.

12289. Not necessarily. Could they not continue still to administer the Poor Law there in their union as they do at present? Would they not have to look after the infirmity, and could they not pay per capita for the keep of their inmates wherever they would go? For instance, the children if sent away, also for the lunatics of their particular area, don't you think it would complicate matters if you made a change such as you suggest?—I was about to suggest as part of the scheme that all the patients from each of the dispensary districts should be paid for per capita, provided you give to the dispensary managing committee the management of the poor relief system for their dispensary district. They, of course, would send their aged and infirm and their sick to the district institution west or east, as the case might be, and they then should pay per capita for the support of those patients that they would send. I think that would be the fairest way instead of as at present—that there should be a uniform rate, and that each dispensary district should pay for the number of patients it sends into an institution of the kind.

12290. I want to know where you see the advantage in taking out of the hands of the Guardians the administration of the poor relief of their particular area and handing it over to a body of people partly selected by the people and partly selected by the County Council. I want to see where the advantage comes in. Don't you know that local interests are more carefully looked after by local men, that they have a knowledge of the surroundings and condition of the people and everything, whereas if you asked the County Council to appoint a committee some of the members they appoint may not be able to attend or may not take an interest in local concerns. For instance, we experience that now in the County Tyrone. We find men are

appointed there to the Infirmary Committee who hardly ever attend. The attendance is from the locality where the institution is, with the result that the outlying districts are entirely neglected.

12291. CHAIRMAN.—You mean local committees, I suppose?—It would not be a local committee if it were for one half of the county; regard should be had to a fair representation from each part of the county. You might, on the other hand, give the management of the concerns to each dispensary committee, as each dispensary committee would have an interest in the proper management of the place, sending patients there. That would be, perhaps, the better managing body. But the difficulty with the present elected Guardians forming a managing committee for an institution which would embrace half the county you can see at once. Guardians travelling from the north or south and would have a long distance to come, and they won't come, and the present experience is that although there are sometimes about seventy members on the Rathfriland Board, yet at the Board meetings held on days on which there is no District Council meeting not more than three or four of the local men attend.

12292. Mr. MURPHY.—You seem to think that it is absolutely necessary to change the area of change. There is no necessity for it at all?—Not necessarily, if you maintain the present system of the Poor Law.

12293. In order to continue me to make any recommendation for a change in the present conditions, I would like to see some advantages in your point, which I confess I don't see. I would like to press the point further. I would ask the Commissioners to bear in mind that these institutions, under the scheme I propose, would no longer be workhouses or Poor Law unions.

12294. CHAIRMAN.—You really would abolish the unions?—I would pull the whole system up by the roots, and in doing that it would be necessary also to alter the law in regard to rural districts within a county.

12295. They might stand. They are put up for a different purpose—roads and other matters?—Except that they are the sanitary authority, of course they might stand. You might not interfere with them at all.

12296. We have no power to interfere with these. If dispensary committees were appointed for each dispensary district, and if necessary that the dispensary districts might be altered in order to have each district of an average size, having regard to the area and valuation.

12297. Mr. MURPHY.—But having District Councils at present, having the body on the spot, and remembering that they perform almost identical duties, what is the need of establishing another body?—The District Councils need not go there at all if they don't like to, and they ought not to go there. I hold if you are going to change these institutions into nursing institutions pure and simple, the District Councils ought not to have anything to say to them beyond the fact that they are the elected representatives of the people.

12298. CHAIRMAN.—You would make these county hospitals?—Or hospitals.

12299. Mr. MURPHY.—What is the advantage of making the change?—I would give to the dispensary managing committee of the dispensary district control of and management of the Poor Law relief.

12300. And you would take it out of the hands of the public authority and give it to people who are not responsible to anybody but the central authority? Where do you see the advantage of that?—Of course, they would be responsible if they are appointed by the Rural Council.

12301. They are elected on a very different basis to the Guardians?—No, because they would be appointed by the Rural District Councillors themselves.

12302. County Councillors, you know, are elected on a very wide basis. These are the men to whom you would give all power?—No.

12303. You said the County Council should appoint the committees?—To manage the hospitals.

12304. To manage the dispensaries?—No, that the Rural Council should appoint committees to manage the dispensaries.

12305. Oh, they are the people you would give the power to?—Yes; each District Council, could it not be continued as at present, just as well? I say the managing committee may consist wholly or partly of Rural Councillors.

12306. CHAIRMAN.—Your idea is that you would abolish the Poor Law system as it exists and have all

May 17, 1904.

Mr. Devlin J.
Capps.

May 17, 1904.
Mr. Deane J.
Cogan.

the hospitals county institutions with part powers to the rural districts?—Yes.

19325. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Not county institutions, but rural district institutions, he says he wants the District Council to appoint?—No, Mr. Murkaghan, I say the Rural Councils should appoint the dispensary committees, and that the County Councils should appoint the managing committee of the hospitals.

19326. And why the County Councils appoint? Why not the District Council, who have to pay for the upkeep of the institutions?—It is a matter of opinion; I would not object.

19327. CHAIRMAN.—You would go so far as to make the cost of these hospitals and hospices a county charge?—No, sir, I would not. I say each dispensary district ought to pay per capita for the support of their patients that they send in.

19328. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—And pay for the support of their poor and sick? Should they not have the selection of the people who would administer the money?—That might follow, but the County Council is the administrative body for the whole county, and they appoint at present the laymen committees for the management of the lunatic asylum, and appoint committees for the management of the County Infirmary and other things of that kind; but the difficulty about the Rural Councils appointing is that you will have more than one Rural Council to appoint a managing committee.

19329. CHAIRMAN.—It might be a joint committee?—It might.

19330. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Do you see any economy in the scheme you propose? Do you think the rates would be lowered and the administration better?—I think the administration would be infinitely better, and I see no reason why it should not be much more economical, because at present there are a certain number of able-bodied persons maintained in workhouses, and there are casuals. Our experience with regard to maintaining these people outside as against inside is that they can be maintained for a third of the cost outdoor as compared with indoor, and their moral surroundings are much better.

19331. That has nothing to do with the question of the body that administers the relief. Are not the Guardians willing now to give outdoor relief where cases are deserving, and are they not just as willing as a committee would be if there was a committee partly elected and partly nominated? Are not the present Guardians just as willing to give assistance in that way where they think it useful as any body that may succeed them?—I quite agree that the Guardians are willing to do a good many things provided that they had power to do so, but their powers are very limited under the existing Poor Law, very considerably limited as regards outdoor relief, and they are bound to do certain things under the present law which ought to be abolished—that is, if a family consist of father and mother and three or four children. If that family becomes destitute, that is provided the father is thrown out of employment, unless he gets a certificate from the medical officer that he is sick, he is not entitled to outdoor relief. Of course, I know also that the law is broken very many times in that direction because the good-natured medical officers are humane men and don't like to see a man starving or come into the workhouse. The only other alternative is that he himself must take his family into the workhouse. A family of eight persons, as Mr. Dagg pointed out, which cost £40 a year to maintain in the workhouse, might be maintained for £8 out of it.

19332. Therefore you are in favour of an extension of the outdoor relief system?—Yes.

19333. There is a danger that it might become too widespread and become even a greater tax than it is at present?—I don't think so, if you give the management of the outdoor relief system into the local committees, into the hands of the dispensary committees. I do think such dispensary committee, being a local body, having local knowledge, rather than a Board of Guardians like Rathfriland, that takes in nearly half of the county, would administer outdoor relief more judiciously, necessarily, and at the same time more economically, than a large body like the Rathfriland Board could.

19334. So you favour a narrowing of the area of management from the union to the dispensary district?—I do.

19335. CHAIRMAN.—What limitations, if any, would you put to the Guardians' discretion in considering outdoor relief applications? What class would be eligible for relief, in your opinion, for outdoor relief?—People thrown temporarily out of employment,

many times in the winter time when it is impossible for people to maintain their employment for a short space of time anyhow.

19336. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Would you still make distinction the test?—Practically.

19337. To any destitute person, any person who would be qualified to get relief in the workhouse, you would give outdoor relief?—Quite so; I would not extend it any further than that.

19338. You would not approve, as some of the witnesses said, of making poverty instead of destitution the test?—There is a danger, to be sure, when you make it elastic, but personally I would approve of it, but from the point of view of economical administration I don't know that it ought to be done.

19339. You would be satisfied, at all events, with destitution as the test?—I would. I think it would be a great advance on the present system, but I am afraid we would be getting into philanthropy.

19340. That, of course, is the danger?—I agree entirely in the suggestions made with reference to the children.

19341. And the women who come in to have children?—Yes. What you were talking of was suggested in other places, I think, would be a most excellent thing—that these persons should be sent to penitentiaries, and that their children ought to be taken from them.

19342. Would you be in favour of enlarging the powers of Guardians to board out children whose parents could not take charge of them?—I think all children ought to be boarded out from their earliest infancy.

19343. Therefore, you would approve of an amendment of the law giving the Guardians such powers?—Yes. I think the present system of bringing up children within the walls of the workhouse is a most reprehensible one, and has tended towards nothing but the moral improvement of the people; but I don't agree with those persons who say that if they were sent to a penitentiary they might afterwards be called upon to pay for their maintenance or contribute towards their maintenance while they were there and the maintenance of their children.

19344. Still, if they were willing to do it?—After all, I don't know. I am afraid the arrangement is based on a good life afterwards would not be sufficiently strong, because when we consider what females are able to earn, the best intentioned of them, what they are able to earn individually, and the difficulty they would have in contributing, while they are earning, towards the maintenance of their child. Of course, I would call upon them if they got employment.

19345. For as much as they could reasonably pay in the opinion of those who were in touch with them?—After all, I don't think they ought to be called upon to pay anything while they were in the penitentiary.

19346. That should be free for life?—Yes.

19347. But as regards the support of the children?—You maintain them at present in the workhouse for and their child, and get nothing from them.

19348. Therefore you would give them the period in the penitentiary free?—Yes.

19349. And you would like to recover the cost of the child as far as they could pay it, either up to the full extent or as far as they could go?—While they would be in employment, and I also think that the children sent out ought to be sent out to nurse at once, and maintained until they are seven years of age at least, and sent then to industrial schools.

19350. Why do you prefer an industrial school to the ordinary bringing up of these children and drawing them into the ranks of farm labourers?—I think they are better looked after in the industrial school; they are better educated.

19351. Would you prefer the industrial relief system to the boarding-out system for children?—For growing children I would.

19352. Supposing they could go there at four, five, or six years of age, would you prefer an industrial school training for a destitute child to bringing up in the country under the boarding-out system?—I would.

19353. Your evidence is unusual in that respect. I would advocate still further that when the child has finished his course in the industrial school, the commission of management of the dispensary district which he would come from should obtain reliable employment for that child, either boy or girl.

19354. Would you not then be giving advantage to destitute children such as could not be hoped for by the small farming and independent labouring class?—Would you not be taking care of the waste and stuff

for better care of them than the parents of other children could take of them?—Society has to do something to preserve itself, and we are doing it already. We are taking care of the waste and strays and putting them into industrial schools.

19335. You would take very great care of these sending them to an institution to be taught trades, and then you would arrange with the Dispensary Committee of the district and put them in the way of earning. What small farmer's child, or what independent labourer's child, could hope for such advantages outside?—They cannot, of course.

19336. I was comparing that with the other system, the boarding-out system, which sends the child to a small farmer or suitable place to be boarded out, and that child naturally goes into the ranks of farm and agricultural labourers. Do you not think that as a sufficiently good provision for the waste and strays of humanity?—I think it is quite good enough, if I was satisfied that those children would develop into respectable members of society afterwards.

19337. The evidence we have received is very strongly in favour of the boarding-out system for that purpose. They say the results are so very good?—Of course, I am not prepared to quarrel with that.

19338. But in the absence of information of that kind you look to the industrial school as the most profitable one?—Quite so; but I am not wedded to that plan entirely. I thought it might be a wiser plan, but at the same time if general experience goes to show that these children, when they are brought up under the boarding-out system, become mixed up in the community as respectable members of society—

19339. The bulk of the evidence is to that effect?—It is so, I think no better plan could be evolved for their protection.

Rev. Canon Rookes examined.

19340. CHAIRMAN.—Are you the Rector of Withlow?—Yes.

19341. You are Secretary of the County Infirmary?—I am.

19342. It is at present in a transition stage—appears as about to be carried out?—Yes; we are going to build a few hospitals.

19343. And throw the existing place, as you have partly done, into an infirmary?—Into the infirmary.

19344. About how many patients have you passed through the infirmary in the last year?—I will give you the report.

19345. That will tell us the number of patients and the amount of subscriptions?—It gives the whole thing.

19346. And the number of cases, but it does not give the distances from which people come?—No, it does not.

19347. It does not show us how many people, if any, come from the west of the county?—We very seldom have patients further than Newmarket, Newmarket, and Andover. We had one man in from Shillingleigh for a short time. He was in twice, but, generally speaking, we don't get them.

19348. Do you ever get them from Bury?—I don't remember a case from Bury.

19349. You are aware there was an infirmary put at Bellingham originally?—There were two infirmaries in this county.

Mr. DANIEL CORDRICK, examined.

19350. CHAIRMAN.—You heard the evidence given by Mr. Oughton?—I did.

19351. Are your views on the matter pretty much the same as his?—No, they are not; I differ from him.

19352. In what respects do you differ from him?—I prepared a summary of my views. I don't see how the unions in this county could be amalgamated; but I think arrangements should be made to select one of the unions having most spare room and the least number of inmates, and have several wards prepared in that union for the reception of harmless inmates and epileptics—for the present system of placing them in idiot wards is cruel. Such unions sending patients to contribute a portion to their support. The deserving poor should, as far as possible, be supported by out-door relief, and especially old married couples

19353. Was there anything else you wished to say?—With regard to the vagrancy question, it is a very burning question in this country, and rapidly coming to the front in England. I think drastic measures are necessary.

19354. Have you seen Mr. John Gorst's Bill for the establishment of labour colonies?—I have not read it. I know the General Council of County Councils have had the matter under their consideration for some time, and discussions there have taken place on it. I think the opinion is in favour of the Continental system or something on all fours with it. I suppose the bill introduced is something of the same character.

19355. It is something on the Bellingham lines?—Yes; I think something of the kind ought to be done. All able-bodied vagrants ought to be obliged to work, and those who won't work ought to be treated as rogues and vagabonds, and the law ought to be suitably strengthened.

19356. You think, if the public has to support them, they ought to be made work?—Yes. I know if workhouses were abolished they would have no place to go to, and institutions of the kind should be established for them, and I think it would be a great improvement, even if you were to maintain the existing system of the Poor Law, if something independent of the existing system would be provided to deal with them.

19357. It is largely a police question?—It is, and I don't know what power the police possess, but I am afraid they don't interest themselves very much in it at present. I would be in favour of giving them extended powers. I took the trouble of getting some figures with regard to the expenditure in the various unions in the county, and the reason I advocate the absorption of Shillingleigh is because I find that the number of inmates in Shillingleigh is the lowest.

May 17, 1906.

Mr. Deane J. Cope.

Rev. Canon Rookes.

19358. What was done with that building?—I think there is a porch there connected with it.

19359. They had two—an east and west infirmary?—Yes. I don't know whether that (proposed) might amuse you a little. I am afraid I wrote on both hospitals, both the West and this.

19360. Dr. Rookes.—You seem to get a large number of subscriptions from outsiders?—About £105; £26 we get last year.

19361. Rather more, when we take in collections?—Yes; collections from churches and chapels, £24 or £40, then there are the pay patients.

19362. You get over £150—that is a large addition to your fund?—Oh, it is.

19363. CHAIRMAN.—Did the Governors wish to put any facts before us at all?—The quarterly meeting was at the close of April, and I had not got the notice, so I did not bring the matter before them at all.

19364. Does anything occur to yourself?—No; I could not suggest anything; we try to make it as paying as we can. A great many come in that we thought ought to be able to pay.

19365. Dr. Rookes.—Do you get as much as you can from them?—These are the certificates from the Governors, and, in order to try to induce it, we put a notice on the book to remind them that when giving an order they should question them as to their circumstances.

Mr. Daniel Cordrick.

of the labouring class who have been a benefit to society, should be boarded out, and not placed on the footing that the class so long has been, a burden to the ratepayers. Tramps we cannot do away with, but we should try to utilize them by having a certain amount of useful work that those using the house as a night refuge should be compelled to perform; parties refusing to work should be prosecuted by the master. It is a difficulty that cannot be met with, no one can suggest a real remedy for the tramp nuisance.

19366. Your object is to make them useful, and make the workhouse as little agreeable to them as possible?—Yes; and make them have some little turn over for the ratepayers, even in a small way.

May 17, 1904.
Mr. Daniel
Coffey.

19367. They are not very good workers?—They won't be so fond of using the houses if they are made to any work.

19368. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—You have it in your own hands to make them work?—I think we have no power to prosecute them, if they refuse.

19369. You can make them work in the morning until they do a certain amount of work?—But you cannot detain them; when they know you can only detain them for three hours they will do nothing. On the question of out-door relief there are a great many very awkward points. You cannot give relief, at present, to a poor person under sixty years of age, no matter how deserving you know them to be, if they are not infirm, or have not a doctor's certificate. Then there is the case of the widow with one child. You cannot give her out-door relief; she is even a more deserving case than a woman with three or four, for she may have a married child who can rot the rest while she is seeking employment; and the widow with one child may not be able to leave the child, and if she is driven into the workhouse she is pressed to re-enter it at any time, and become a burden on the ratepayers; whereas, if she got reasonable out-door relief she would be a useful member of society, as she had been in the past.

19370. You would lower the age limit?—I would not exactly lower the age limit, but I would leave it discretionary with the Guardians and relieving officers, if they thought it a deserving case for temporary relief. With regard to our fever hospital in Arklow, that fever hospital is just kept floating by means of local subscriptions, supplemented by a grant of £30 a year from the County Council; it just keeps the

institution there; it is powerless for any good purpose. If there was an epidemic, and we sent patients there, there is no possible means to maintain them.

19371. It merely pays a caretaker?—It merely pays a caretaker, and a nominal stipend of £30 a year to the medical officer. I think the Guardians should be empowered to allow a capitation grant for each patient sent into that institution by the local medical officer.

19372. Put it on the same basis as other auxiliary hospitals; make it a union-of-large charge, and let the people at Arklow have the benefit of a local hospital?—Yes; that the Board of Guardians should be empowered to make a capitation grant.

19373. CHAIRMAN.—Put it on the rates and you have it all simple?—I know it is perfectly useless at present, and in case of an epidemic of fever, even if it was only a slight epidemic, the doctor could not use that institution, because he would have no means of maintaining the patients—would not even have money to buy food for them.

19374. Have you a balance sheet of the expenditure of the hospital for any recent years?—I have not.

19375. Could you get us one sent?—I could.

19376. Dr. ROBERT.—A very simple one, £30 for the medical officer and £30 for the caretaker?—Yes; they have a little balance in hand, and they have spent it occasionally, when a patient turned up. They get a special nurse from Dublin, and they set up whatever balance they had. They are not in a position to do anything at present, I know that.

19377. CHAIRMAN.—That was the chief matter that you were interested in?—I was mainly interested in that.

Dr. F. J. G. KERR examined.

Dr. F. J. G.
Kerr.

19378. CHAIRMAN.—You were good enough, when we asked you for some figures, to draw up that you would prepare them for us?—Yes; I think I have whatever figures you are likely to require. I have the returns that have been made to the Local Government Board, of the numbers admitted to our workhouse in Shillelagh sick, and the numbers that have been admitted into the fever hospital for four years.

19379. What we wanted to know was, how many acute medical and surgical cases you have dealt with for the last five years, acute cases as distinguished from apud and infirm people, who have been in the habit of getting hospital treatment?—Would you include bedridden cases in the infirm?

19380. First give us the ordinary acute cases that come in?—I don't know that I can give you these separately. In the year commencing 1st of April, 1903-4, there were under treatment on the 1st of April thirty-two patients; these were made up of—epileptics, two; ordinary idiots, three; twelve cases, including bedridden and others, requiring the special attention of the nurses; and the remainder requiring ordinary attention. Out of that number, probably seven or eight would be acute cases.

19381. Is that about an average year? How long have you been there?—Since 1886.

19382. Is that about an average year?—I can give you the average weekly for four years. That year would be thirty-two; 1902, thirty and two-thirds; the previous year forty-three.

19383. Would the ratio be about the same?—It would be somewhat about the same, except, perhaps, there would be a larger ratio of infirm cases, as lately we have sent some of the infirm cases to the

infirm wards, and kept fewer of them in the infirmary, so the ratio of acute cases would not be increased in proportion quite.

19384. Dr. ROBERT.—It means, you would have the same number of acute cases, and not so many chronic cases?—Yes.

19385. Have you any idea of the number of acute cases you treat during the year?—Suffering from accidental injury, in the year ending 31st of March, 1901, three; suffering from other diseases, sixty-three, that would be admitted to the workhouse hospital; that is, admitted from the country as opposed to cases admitted from the body of the house.

19386. Would there be a large proportion of those acute cases?—No, there would not; they would be acute for a certain length of time, and then become chronic; they are sent in as acute cases.

19387. CHAIRMAN.—As far as your experience goes, would you say that the acute cases are about one-fourth of your hospital cases?—I think so; that would be about a fair average proportion.

19388. Dr. ROBERT.—What was the total number of admissions into the hospital, counting those from the body of the house as well as from the country?—The total number of cases treated in the hospital—106 for the year 1901, and for the year 1902 it would be 211, for the year 1903 168, and for the year 1904 163.

19389. Would the usefulness of the hospital be increased if you had gay wards?—That is a matter I hardly would be prepared to express an opinion on. It would to some extent, for people would come in then who don't come in now; their pride would not suffer, in other words, by coming in.

Mr. MICHAEL BYRNE, J.P., examined.

Mr. Michael
Byrne.

19390. CHAIRMAN.—You are Chairman of the Board of Guardians of the Shillelagh Union?—Yes, sir.

19391. What are the views of your Board of Guardians about the breaking up of the workhouse there? They are all of opinion, I think, that they would not like to break it up, except they were very well paid for it.

19392. You mean, if there was a large reduction in rates?—If you promised us £d. in the £ we would be happy.

19393. Or, if I said, like the man at the fair, "Split the difference, and take 3d."?—I daresay;

but I am afraid, from what I have heard to-day, that there would be a large increase of commodes and things.

19394. I think you may make up your mind that nothing will be recommended by us that seems likely to bring about an increase?—I would expect that; but the Guardians as a body are against any suggestion.

19395. They would rather keep on their own workhouse?—They would rather keep it on for several reasons. Suppose Shillelagh was some away off, and that part of us came to Ballydoon, and part went away across the mountain to Ballyglaw, and some of us

May 27, 1904.

Mr Michael
Byrne.

would go away to Carlow, and come to Enniscorthy. Ballyglass is almost twenty miles of a drive, and it is too far for a fellow to go to sit at a Board of Guardians, to represent his division. I think it should be put out of each other's heads to touch each other at all; except that Ballyglass might concede to us what they took from us in other towns. Some-one came down from the Local Government Board five years ago, and they took Harroldstown and Mac-habstown and some very good divisions we had, and put them into Ballyglass; Moyneagh and several divisions went to Enniscorthy; they left us very small, but still we had the same amount of expense, nearly.

18398. Your votes went up?—I don't think they did, much; but they went up this year, because we were unfortunate, and got small-pox. The idea of the Guardians is, that if we got back those divisions—Moyneagh is four miles from Skilleagh and eleven from Enniscorthy.

18399. They were in the County Wexford?—Yes, that is the way the thing came in. There were in George's in Carlow, five miles from Skilleagh and fourteen from Carlow. If there could be something done to divide the thing evenly. It was all on account of these divisions not being able to make a Rural District Council.

18400. Did you get anything?—No, sir, it was all late. We lost the electoral division of Cleamore, Harroldstown, and Harroldstown. But still amalgamation would be an awful hardship. There would be no representation, and the movement of the sick—well, the sick would not be so bad, for there surely should be a hospital there, but the movement of the old people would be an awful undertaking to Ballyglass or wherever it might be.

18401. Mr. MURKIN.—Supposing the infirmary was allowed to remain there?—You surely would want something there.

18402. There would be no hardship with regard to the sick if the infirmary was there?—Yes, the infirmary should be there, and I think if the infirmary were there or any of those things our staff would be very little reduced.

18403. CHAIRMAN.—Could you not reduce all the staff for looking after the sick-bodied? We find them the most difficult to deal with. If all these went to the central institution, and you had only the sick to deal with locally?—That is a thing I have heard about, and for the aged I certainly would be opposed to that on the ground that you are moving them from their friends and relatives; you are isolating them in their old age, and they are actually locked up in one spot like thieves. I think their local place is the place for them.

18404. Would you prefer a local institution or outdoor relief?—Outdoor relief, but for old people a local institution; outdoor relief as far as they are comfortable outside and have somewhere to stop. We never ask a man in our institution to come in that we can help out, or that we have law to give outdoor relief to. Mr. Condon and I differ about cases. We have some cases in our union of old people that have a small bit of land—one acre. We cannot give them a thing; they are in worse want than people who have no land. We have one case in point at present, and wish to give him 1s. 6d. or 2s. a week, but we cannot touch him. He has a little bit of land. I think the law should be amended and people like that should get outdoor relief; but as to old people being boarded out, I should certainly be opposed to it altogether, that is, to put them into different families. Old bodies require nursing; children are quite different.

18405. Are not these the people you would not like to cut off from their friends and relatives?—Yes, but if they are in the union at near hand their friends can go on Sunday and look after them.

18406. Would not these friends look after them if they were paid for caring them outside?—I am afraid not.

18407. Do you happen to know about the number of visits paid to poor people in workhouses?—No.

18408. Would you be surprised to hear that a good many visits are paid to the sick and some to the aged and infirm?—A great many of the aged and infirm have no one belonging to them.

18409. Then it would not be hard to put a class like that into an institution?—No, so long as they are kept in their own neighbourhood.

18410. About lunatics and idiots, would you be in favour of sending them to an auxiliary asylum

rather than a workhouse?—My opinion is that they should be kept in some place to themselves in some of the workhouses, some superfluous spaces existing in some of the unions. Then as to the lunatic asylum for the county, I am afraid we would not get on with that. We have not got sufficient to keep it up, and we would only get 2s. grant for a person of the class that we are getting 4s. for in Richmond, and we are tied to Richmond for the next twenty years.

18411. If you could get 4s. for a local institution?—That would be quite different if we could get out of our obligations with Richmond, but we have to pay for all the people in Richmond for the next twenty years, and I don't see how we could make a local institution with what we have at present. If we could get those back and get 4s., it would be quite a different thing.

18412. Mr. MURKIN.—At present you are getting no capitation grant for those in the workhouse?—None, sir.

18413. Would it not be better to have them in a place where you would get even 2s. 6d.?—I am afraid not. We have a doctor already for attending to the sick poor, and he attends to the wants of those, whereas if you made a special institution for them, you have to get a special doctor and a special staff, and the same old staff does them where they are, so I am afraid there would be a rise in the rates in that point, ... about those old people, I don't see how it is to be done.

18414. Mr. Condon said there were about 100 harmless lunatics from this county in the Richmond Asylum. If you had those and the 150 or so that you have at present in the workhouse, that would be a considerable number to begin with?—It would.

18415. These poor people could be kept at a less cost than in the asylum?—Yes, if we could get them out of it. We are paying 12s. each for them in Richmond. We are paying £10,500 from this county to Richmond for our lunatics, and then there is a grant from the Government of 6s. per bed burden. Therefore, if we could take back these—

18416. Would you be in favour of boarding out the children?—Oh, very much. The moment they are children at all I would have them off, and I would be in favour of boarding out their mothers; but I fully agree with the idea of the Chairman to send them to a home or refuge. That is the best idea I heard formed on that yet, and I am for boarding out the children at once. I am always against any child being reared in an industrial school or union. Some of them get on fairly well out of both, but after all they have a much better chance when boarded out with a respectable labouring man's wife. They learn the ways of the country.

18417. You would rather make them labourers?—Yes, or police if you wish. They will be sent to school and boarded out, because we have a lady inspector going round in connection with the county who pays an odd visit; and as to tramps, it is a vexed question. I don't know much about it, but I think if you could make them work a little it would be better.

18418. Would you favour the colony system, having a large place where these people could be detained for a certain time and made work?—I think it would be a very good idea, but who is to pay for them? You don't expect that the unions will pick them up and pay for them?

18419. CHAIRMAN.—They are really a floating population?—Yes. I think there should be a country-at-large charge for that. If we could manage to make them work at all it would keep them away.

18420. It should be a country-at-large charge, as for the cattle plague?—Yes.

18421. Mr. MURKIN.—The unions are supporting them now?—Because they get their supper and boardst. If there was a law that they could not get into unions without having a doctor's certificate, I was always in favour of that. If they did not present a doctor's certificate to the porter, they should stop out.

18422. And selling that, a country-at-large charge?—You would not want any charge then, because very few of them are sick. They would vanish out of the country if they had not the unions.

18423. Mr. MURKIN.—You would do away with the capitation grant altogether?—Yes, it would wear out. A good many of them are old soldiers and short service men.

May 17, 1904.

Mr. E. J.
Byrne.

Mr. E. J. BYRNE, J.P., examined.

19421. CHAIRMEN.—You are Chairman of the Shillagh Rural District Council, and you are also one of the Shillagh Board of Guardians?—Yes.

19422. You have heard the evidence of the Chairman. Do you agree generally with him?—I do, generally.

19423. Is there any point on which you would wish to add any special view of your own?—I would. Before the new Boards came in we had power in an indirect way to give outdoor relief to poor farmers, because we were not afraid of the auditors. We had the leading landed gentry sitting in the Boardroom, and the auditors at that time were afraid of those gentlemen, and would not surcharge them. Now they are getting exchanged.

19424. Boards of Guardians and members of Parliament?—Yes. I could mention people who require outdoor relief very badly. They are over sixty years of age, but they have a few acres of land, and we are afraid to give it to them. I could mention one man in Ballymonee who had seven or eight acres of land, and we gave him 2s. a week for about eight years until his daughter realised some competence in Australia, and wrote to us and took him off our hands. He would have been dead long ago if we did not help him.

19425. You would be in favour of getting such discretionary power as would enable you to relieve destitute people?—Yes; and then that point about the widow woman with one child turns up frequently. It turns up always in the case of decent women. It turned up at Shillagh Union. A woman with one child could not be relieved, and a bad character with one child coming back with another can get indoor relief.

19426. If the auditor hears of that you will find he will kick?—He cannot life if she has two children and is in the house. We have no power over her.

19427. Dr. BODGER.—You could keep the other one in the house?—The poor woman would not come in; the cases are quite different.

19428. CHAIRMEN.—I thought it was outdoor relief you were speaking of?—No. We would like to have powers to give those people relief, and then the sixty years really works hardly sometimes. About the children, I am altogether in favour of boarding out the children. I agree with your suggestion to take up those children from these vagrants at a certain age. It is twenty-one years exactly now since I proposed a resolution at the Shillagh Union, and we carried it, recommending that, and Mr. Joe Mooney—he was the Local Government Board practically at that time. He said he would recommend it strongly, but the people were too much engaged with politics at that time to think of such small things.

19429. Mr. MURTAGH.—They passed great reforms then about bigger things?—Yes, of course they did. About the union at Shillagh, when the old Board was in existence. There is a district called

Clonsilla, and I live within a mile of the end of that district—Bodger—and these people had a doctor at that time within a mile of them.

19430. CHAIRMEN.—We cannot go into that. I think in your report and recommendations you could deal with the hardships on the poor.

19431. No, we cannot deal with the dispensary districts—Taking these poor people in Ballymonee will come very inconvenient. These people then had only two miles to go to the doctor, now they have to go eleven to look for a doctor. There is something else I was thinking about the tramps.

19432. Perhaps it was to give the master power to detain them?—That might be a good thing, but suppose a tramp starts from Dublin or from Belfast, he ought to be made to state his objective point, and then I think he should get a license the same as in Germany, and he should produce his license. At present he can come on to Rathfriland, and if he is known there he will avoid Shillagh and turn to Gorey or Ballymonee. If he had a license he should steer the course he had laid out for himself; but I am altogether opposed to that idea of these colored establishments, the colonies, for even as a country charge I think they would be very expensive. I believe short service in the army in the case of the increase in tramps, but there is a natural supply of young tramps growing up, and I think your suggestion would cut off a great number of those, and I am altogether in favour of putting them with respectable labourers or small farmers. I think the education or mode of life that is sufficient for those people ought to be sufficient for these tramps. In Shillagh Union I find the ones we boarded out twenty years ago have done much better as a rule, though there are some exceptions, than the ones we reared in the house. We should get power to take them from these women in the house—where a decent man dies with five or six small children, and his wife has to come in. Under present circumstances these are not brought into Shillagh; they get outdoor relief, but they used to have to come in a few years ago. I object to the control of the district hospitals being taken from the Rural District Councils. No matter what change you make, I don't think nominated Boards would work well for many reasons. Here we subscribe £200 a year to the hospital, and other people subscribe £500. We work most harmoniously and are doing well, but the other is quite a different thing. In Wicklow the County Council subscribes to four hospitals, and in West Wicklow we have to pay for our own accidents. If Anklew was improved it ought to be on the rates of the district. If we had a union on the county that we could abolish, we should get the sick in there, and I think Ballymonee would be the most suitable, for that suggestion that Mr. Brown made at Nass was a good one. If the £10,000 a year paid to Richmond was retained in the county, we could maintain an establishment ourselves.

Mr. PARSONS SNOW examined.

I have been asked to attend on behalf of the Rathfriland Board of Guardians, and it is my opinion that Ballymonee Union might with advantage be dissolved, and my reason for saying that is that I believe there is a necessity for an asylum for harmless lunatics, and I think it would be valuable for that purpose, and by doing that it would help to relieve the hospital in Rathfriland to some extent, which is sometimes not sufficient for the number of sick people that seek admission there, and the result is that people have to leave the hospital and go into the body of the house who are really not fit.

19433. Mr. MURTAGH.—You have forty-five or forty-six there?—I believe so, but it is a union that comprises half the county, and the hospital accommodation is sometimes not sufficient for the number of people who seek admission. I think we would relieve that by having these lunatics drafted to Ballymonee and attach the Kildare divisions of Ballymonee to Nass and the Wicklow and Carlow portions to Shillagh. I think that would simplify the County Council accounts to some extent. As far as boarding out children, I would be entirely in favour of that; in fact, we adopt it in every instance in Rathfriland to the fullest extent.

19434. CHAIRMEN.—Would you be in favour of increasing the power of Guardians that they could board

out all children?—There are disadvantages in that if their parents were in the house.

19435. Would you be in favour of a change in the law?—It would have its disadvantages, too.

19436. Separating the parent from the child?—That would not be so great a hardship, but I believe people would be coming in for the sake of getting their children boarded out and getting their neighbours to maintain them; but if that was guarded against, I believe it would be desirable. I think too much supervision is not required over those children. It happened in Rathfriland in one instance that there was a foster mother that the Guardians knew was a really reliable woman. A lady inspector paid her a visit and found some fault with the surroundings or sanitary arrangements, and the children had to be brought in, and I am sure it was a decided disadvantage to the children, because the Guardians knew well that the children did very well with her, and because absorbed into the population and became decent members of society.

19437. That is a matter of discretion largely. It would be very difficult to lay down a rule on that, but I quite agree with you that there is a danger of close supervision?—It happened in that instance in Rathfriland. We argued the matter as long as we could with the Local Government Board, but in defence

Mr. Patrick
Shear.

to their wishes we had to take the children away, and it was a decided disadvantage to the children. I saw it reported in the newspapers that the cost of maintaining paupers was £9, and the cost of keeping them in a cradle came to £11.

1943. I think you may put that down as a very serious statement—it appeared in a cutting from the Daily News. If that is the case, there would be some change necessary. I believe, too, that there are people who would be in the workhouse hospitals who would be willing to pay, and should be made pay as far as possible, and the majority of respectable people who are sometimes obliged to go into hospital, I think it would be a relief to their feelings if they were allowed to pay. It would remove the stain of pauperism that attaches to it. About tramps, they will always be with us.

1943. In the meantime, you would not like to make them too comfortable!—That is what we are doing. I sometimes get into conversation with tramps, and

they say they are very much better treated in Wicklow than in other places. I have got into conversation with fellows who have been tramping in England, and their treatment there is not nearly so kind. In Rathfriland they have reasonable bedding; in England they have only the plank bed and a sheet. That is not much of an inducement to a fellow to tramp to a workhouse. I think if we adopted the plank bed in Wicklow it would help to get rid of a few of them and make them work. I understand in some places there is a certain quantity of straw measured, and until a fellow knows that he cannot go out.

1944. You would be in favour of giving the Guardians power to keep them in until they did a fair task!—Or keep them in a week. With regard to outdoor relief, in Rathfriland they don't encourage people to come in if they can keep them out. In some cases the law works hardly against the people. I would agree with Mr. Byrne's recommendations, and with regard to the widow with one child.

May 17, 1936.

Mr. Patrick
Sher.

Mr. E. J. BYRNE, J.P., further examined.

I just wanted to mention a matter about the fever hospital. We had an outbreak of typhus in Shillagh in 1895, and the hospital got nearly full, and there was a very large building and four large wards had to be converted into observation wards.

1941. CHAIRMAN.—It was shown us!—If you don't recommend something like that for fever hospitals it would be useless.

Mr. E. J.
Byrne.

Dr. BEADY examined.

I have been Medical Officer of Cooleville and Clonsilla Dispensary District before it was reduced to the present district. I come to give you information about the old district and the new district.

1942. CHAIRMAN.—We are not making any inquiries about dispensary districts at all, and we know

the distances!—In what respect would you like me to give evidence?

1943. I don't know of any subject. Have you anything you wish to say?—Not at all, except Mr. Byrne mentioned as regards the fever hospital in Shillagh. I myself was in charge of that hospital when there were upwards of forty cases of typhus fever there.

Dr. Beady.

Mr. MICHAEL FLEMING examined.

I would be very pleased, sir, to hand in a map of Shillagh Union for your inspection.

1944. CHAIRMAN.—Was there anything you would like to point out here? Cooleville, Haroldstown, and Rathfriland have been removed!—Taken from Shillagh.

1945. You wish to recommend the restoration?—Yes; Moyneville, Clonsilla, and Mulhewer. Of course, there is a difficulty will arise there which I wish to remark. I don't know that the four divisions belonging to the County Carlow which were formerly attached to Shillagh would make a rural district. That would be a matter for you in the hereafter to consider.

1946. We have taken a note of the strong evidence in favour of the restoration of these electoral divisions to Shillagh Union, and you wish to express your concurrence with that evidence!—Decidedly. Then there has been a tangled scheme presented before you by Mr. Cogan, M.P., and I think that the representation of Shillagh, at least as far as I am individually concerned, I certainly take exception to his view. I cannot call it anything but a tangled scheme. Now I am in your hands.

1947. There is not much use in going over the same ground again. We have gone over it with so many witnesses. You strongly dissent from Mr. Cogan's view!—Certainly; he has given us nothing definite.

1948. Is there any other matter on which you dissent from him or wish to enforce the opinions of other witnesses?—There is the boarding out of children born in the workhouse. It has its arguments for and against. There is also the tramp question. That, I don't think, has been very definitely settled.

1949. Have you any definite suggestion as regards the tramps?—I would begin the boarding out of the children and the sending away of the mothers of those children to a penitentiary or religious home—some house of detention. If a mother presents herself, before a Board of Guardians and seeks admission, her admission has to be granted, and you cannot separate the mother from the baby for some time.

1945. That is not the way in which it would work. The case would not come before the Board of Guardians—I am speaking of the present. Mr. Cogan suggested to send these children away after four years to industrial schools.

1946. Well, he withdrew that afterwards. He said after all he heard in favour of boarding out he would be disposed to adhere to boarding out—I would say, independent of that, the Board of Guardians should be empowered by legislation. Of course, they are deterred to a great extent at present so long as the parent of the child remains in the house. They are deterred from doing anything towards the future of the child other than keep it in the house until such time as the parent of the child may think well of leaving; otherwise, if it were possible for the Legislature to interfere and allow the Boards of Guardians to have the supreme control over that child, taking it altogether from the parent and having it educated, whether in the house or out of it. That should be left to their discretion, and they should be empowered, say at twelve or thirteen or fourteen years of age, or even if they thought fit, to apprentice this child to some trade or business, that it might become a useful member of society.

1947. Have you anything definite about the tramps?—I think if the Act of Parliament that already exists in England were brought into operation in Ireland it would show beneficial results.

1948. You would be disposed to try that before trying anything more severe?—Exactly. Then, with regard to auxiliary lunatic asylums, I would wish to say that at the present time we are unfortunately tied to the charter wheels of Richmond, and we are paying £10,000 a year or 10d. in the £—we are paying that to Richmond Asylum, and, needless to say, against our will. We have no will in the matter; we are absolutely powerless by the resolution of the Grand Jury. I would ask you to give that your most serious consideration. To make or establish in any part of the County Wicklow, whether you turn Rathfriland or Shillagh into an auxiliary lunatic asylum, would be imposing, perhaps, what I might call not a double

Mr. Michael
Fleming.

May 17, 1904.

Mr. Michael
Flaming.

rate, but a treble rate, because, of course, a workhouse cannot be reasonably turned into an auxiliary asylum unless it ceases to be a refuge for the sick poor and those who are destitute and seek relief there, and that being so, you have the staff there. It may be reasonable for me to assume that the outgoes of your labour will be, of course, an Act of Parliament, and that being so these officers would have lost their position through no fault of theirs, and must be provided for out of the rates. Going back again to the auxiliary asylum, I would like to point out that in Richmond they are receiving 4s. per head, and if we had an auxiliary asylum at Shillelagh or Baltinglass we would only get 2s. We would then have to provide the balance

for the maintenance of each of these inmates. I believe the medical officer at Shillelagh in all probability will not be allowed to be the medical officer of any auxiliary lunatic asylum that may be established.

19454. I am afraid you are going a little into details!—It may be extraneous. Dr. Cassidy Norman has made a statement recently—

19455. That is really not the line we are going on. You have given us very valuable suggestions, and I think it is better not to go into these matters!—It is from a ratepayer's point of view I am speaking. Mr. Cogan told us the scheme he had proposed was an economical one, but nevertheless we have heard nothing about his economics.

The Sitting terminated.

FORTIETH PUBLIC SITTING.—WEDNESDAY, MAY 18TH, 1904.

May 18, 1904.

At the Courthouse, Wexford.

Present:—MR. MOORE (Chairman), MR. MURNAGHAN, and DR. COREY BIGGER.

MR. M. A. EMMIS, J.P., examined.

19465. CHAIRMAN.—Now, the County Council of Wexford have furnished us with a printed paper giving their answers. The first query was as regards the amalgamation of unions. What is the view of your Council on that subject?—The view of our Council on that subject is we don't propose any amalgamation of unions; that is to say, we don't propose the entire amalgamation of unions or the blotting out of any particular union, but we propose an allocation in the existing system to provide for the accommodation of the lunatic poor of the county in one union, and we propose Gorey as that union, because we believe the situation of Gorey for the purpose would cause less disturbance than the situation of any other union, being the smallest urban district of the county. The town of Gorey is a comparatively small town and we believe there would be less disturbance created by the transfer of the lunatic poor to Gorey than to any other union.

19467. Then you have a railway communicating with it?—All the four towns are practically communicating.

19468. One union is as convenient as another?—Except for the numbers from the urban district. A very much larger number of the inmates of Wexford Union are from the town of Wexford in proportion than from the surrounding country. Whereas in Gorey Union the larger number of the inmates will be rural.

19469. Does the Council recommend that Gorey Union as a union should continue?—Gorey Union as a union should continue, that is, the hospital should remain there. The functions of the Gorey Board should continue, and all the officials in Gorey should remain in office.

19470. Not superannuated?—No, we don't suggest any superannuation; we look upon it as a waste of public money to superannuate men who are in the prime of life.

19471. You would give them other duties?—Yes.

19472. The master, matron, and other officers, you would give them analogous duties?—It would simply mean retaining the services of the existing officers. The medical officer would remain as medical officer of the auxiliary asylum.

19473. You are not going on the lines of Yeoughal, where the doctor is the visiting doctor?—We don't suggest a resident superintendent in the auxiliary asylum; we suggest a visiting medical officer in the person of the existing medical officer of the union.

19474. He would be the medical superintendent of the auxiliary asylum?—Yes; but then we suggest he should have as a consulting physician the resident medical superintendent of Enniscorthy Asylum.

19475. In fact, he would be a sub-officer to the parent asylum at Enniscorthy?—Quite so. We take it first of all as laid down by the Local Government Act of 1896 that the lunatic poor have a right under that Act to asylum treatment. The circular from the Local Government Board has called upon the Boards of Guardians to transfer the lunatics gradually from their unions to the asylums. The asylums are overcrowded. I am a member of the Board of Guardians of Wexford Union, and of the Enniscorthy Asylum. We have forty at present more than our certified number. The last building operations for the accommodation of seventy patients cost £14,000.

19476. Do you remember the total number of patients in the asylum?—423 or 424 patients.

19477. It looks a huge building for that number?—It is spread over a large frontage, but is not deep. It is a single building, a great portion of it. The total number to be transferred from the county would be something like 140 or 150, shown by the latest returns, and adding to that forty or fifty patients who

are in excess of our certified number at present in the asylum, we should require to provide for the accommodation of 200 patients, which I estimate would cost £40,000. Our view is that the interest and the difference in cost of maintenance between the asylum scale and the scale of inmates of the workhouse at present would altogether total an extra expenditure on the rates of between £2,000 and £3,000 a year.

19478. I am not in the least disputing your conclusions, but did you at all ascertain the cost of maintenance in the asylum and in the workhouse?—Yes; the cost of maintenance in the asylum last year. Last year our asylum was the second most expensive in Ireland. The committees have been making great efforts to reduce expenditure, and this year we have considerable reductions, but the figure last year when that report was considered was a little over 227 per head.

19479. Was that in the heavy year?—It was rather a heavy year.

19480. I suppose you could do in an ordinary year with £26 or £25?—£25, perhaps.

19481. What would you put down as the cost of an inmate in the workhouse?—The present cost is £16 6s. a year.

19482. How do you ascertain that?—I got the figures from the clerk of Wexford Union. Those are the figures taken as the total cost, taking everything into consideration.

19483. Not merely in-maintenance and clothing?—No.

19484. Cost of officers and salaries, cost of the medical officer's salary, and the master and all the officials?—Cost of administration, yes.

19485. It seems rather low for that?—That is the figure that is given to me.

19486. Dr. Bigger.—Anything for bedding or interest?—No, in neither case.

19487. CHAIRMAN.—In the asylum the interest for repayment is included?

19488. MR. MURNAGHAN.—Not in the £27?—I think it is included.

19489. CHAIRMAN.—They do not make the double calculation?—I think I am safe in saying that the £27 does not include interest and repayment of the loan.

19490. I expect 5s. 6d. a week, though it is not accurate for a workhouse?—The scale is for the inmates and infants.

19491. They are much better than the able-bodied?—That is so.

19492. I expected it would be a good deal higher than that figure?—Yes.

19493. In giving the figures to Mr. Emmis, what did you take as the basis that brought out the 5s. 6d. a week for the cost of the inmates?

MR. EMMIS.—We included all the expenses of the whole establishment; that takes in everything.

19494. CHAIRMAN.—Officers' salaries?—Officers' salaries.

19495. And repayment of loans for improvement?—Everything in connection with indoor expense. I think it works out cheaper than any other place.

19496. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Murnaghan is just saying in his union, where they run things very close, it costs £17 10s.

MR. EMMIS.—I don't suppose there is any necessity of repayment of loans in the case of the Wexford Union because there have been no buildings for a long time. I should say the loans have been extinguished altogether.

19497. CHAIRMAN.—Practically none in Omagh. Would you kindly make out the calculation for us and send it to Mr. Mahon?

MR. EMMIS.—I will, certainly.

19498. CHAIRMAN.—Your committee went on to consider any alterations that would be necessary at

MR. M. A. EMMIS.

May 18, 1904.

Mr. M. A.
Eadie.

George I.—Yes, we were very largely guided in our calculation as to Geely. I may say I acted as a member of the Asylum Board Committee at the Lunatic Asylum Conference in Dublin in November last, and at that conference we received some very valuable information from the Most Rev. Dr. Kelly, the Bishop of Ross, as to the Youghal institution and as to the cost of altering that institution to the needs of an auxiliary asylum, and from our own knowledge of the structure of workhouses and of the needs, we should not suggest that these should be any very large structural alterations of any kind, but we estimated a total cost of £1,000 for the buildings.

19488. Did you provide for a waterpipe supply?—No; we wanted to provide for good sanitary accommodation, a system by which the cases which we regard as chronic cases might be dealt with and well looked after. Our idea was that additional experienced care would be necessary, but that the assistant staff of the workhouse, with a few trained attendants, say four, one for the day and one for the night in each male and female department, superintending the ordinary attendants, would be sufficient.

19489. The master, I suppose, would act as a chief over the male side, and the matron as a chief over the female side?—That was our idea.

19490. And as these officers dropped off you would appoint a chief male attendant and a chief female attendant?—Yes, and we should have trained assistants such as in the asylum. My own idea is that an arrangement might be made with the district asylum by which we would take from that asylum trained assistants, already trained, and get new hands in there, and that the medical officer of the asylum visiting the auxiliary would pick out any cases which he thought would be susceptible of treatment that might tend to cure them, and draft them to the asylum, and on the other hand we would be able to draft at least forty extra patients we have as inconvertible chronic cases to the asylum.

19491. You thought the necessary changes could be done for about £1,000?—Yes, and then there is a capitation grant of 2s. per head for the auxiliary, which we believe ought to be 4s. as in the district asylum.

19492. That is generally the opinion, naturally of the Commissioners who have given evidence?—We are no reason why the capitation grant paid for the district asylum should not be paid for the auxiliary.

19493. Or would you say 4s., or half that sum?—Quite so.

19494. It might not come to 4s., but half or up to 4s. 1.—Yes, up to the maximum of 4s.

19495. You are also in favour of boarding out the insane to some extent?—Not more than as an experiment. At the Lunatic Conference in Dublin that question was very fully discussed. Dr. Conolly Norman and other medical officers there gave a very exhaustive statement as to the system pursued in Belgium, but on the second day that we discussed a question of auxiliary asylums the resident medical superintendents seemed rather inclined to favour the sending of the lunatic poor to the asylums, and Dr. Clancy, I think it was—

19496. That is the Bishop of Elphin?—Said that on the former day the medical witnesses seemed to think that these people would be safe boarded in the country, and on the second day, when it came to be a question of putting them in an auxiliary asylum, they seemed to think they were quite different and would be dangerous. I asked Dr. Conolly Norman to let me have a printed report of that conference for you, but it has not yet been issued. I should especially like to direct attention to the able paper read by Dr. Kelly, the Bishop of Ross.

19497. You said about the opinion of the resident medical superintendents, as far as I remember from what was published at the time they seemed to be rather of opinion that it was difficult to discriminate between the harmless and the dangerous lunatics, and that a harmless lunatic might become dangerous?—There was a very decided difference of opinion among the medical superintendents on that subject, and my own real personal opinion was, and I expressed it, that whilst I thought it was worth a trial as an experiment, personally I did not feel any great confidence in the success of the experiment in Ireland, because the conditions of cottage life in Belgium and Ireland are widely different.

19498. Was the idea that these people should be boarded out with their own friends or with strangers?—With their own friends if possible, but with strangers otherwise.

19499. Have you many lunatics in your asylum whose friends could contribute largely to their support?—We have a fair number of lunatics in our asylum whose friends do contribute.

19500. There is not, in the opinion of the governing body, any abuse, any people who can pay standing in relation and not paying?—I don't think so. Every individual case comes before the committee, and the committee make a close inspection. In fact, at the meeting of our committee recently we had a case before us in which an effort was made to get a patient taken at half the cost of maintenance or 12s. a year, but we made a very close and exhaustive inquiry, and we heard a rumour that the husband of the patient had failed in for a legacy, and on investigating the matter closely, he had to admit he had married £1,000, and I need hardly say we compelled him to pay the full cost of maintenance.

19501. Then you think that grants should be made by Parliament to assist in boarding out the deserving poor?—Yes.

19502. Are you speaking of the lunatics with which the rest of the paragraph is concerned?—No, of the aged, deserving poor.

19503. On what ground do you base that?—We believe the aged deserving poor would be greatly benefited by being boarded out when it would be done with great discrimination.

19504. Had you an idea it would be the beginning of what is known as old age pensions?—Yes, to a certain extent; but at the same time I realised that in any question of boarding out the aged poor there was one grave difficulty, but if that difficulty could be overcome I should strongly approve of the system; but the difficulty would seem to be this, that many people who at present would not think of entering the union or becoming inmates would, in the event of their finding that money could be obtained for the maintenance of their aged relatives, get them into the union just to qualify for that boarding-out pension.

19505. Or perhaps would be able to get it without sending them at all to the union?—I don't think the abuse could extend as far as that. Undoubtedly I think the condition of the aged people would be in many cases greatly improved, but it is a system that I think could only be carried out cautiously and with great discrimination.

19506. Have you thought of any possible safeguard for such a system which, ideally, I suppose, is the best, that is, of supporting the poor without any establishment charges so far as possible?—I may say, I think this—it does not arise as any of the queries I have seen here, but I may introduce it in connection with this subject—I think myself that under the new Act the abolition of the disciplinary committee was a mistake. I grant you it was sometimes difficult to get a quorum together, but at the same time they gave a certain amount of attention which after a long day's business at the Board of Guardians affairs did not now receive.

19507. With the doctor absent?—With the doctor absent, and if they were still in existence I would suggest the disciplinary committee as the most efficacious to investigate each case.

19508. Did you think at all of making any different area of charge for each outdoor relief union with a view of bringing it home to the locality?—No, we did not consider that question of making an area of charge.

19509. Some witnesses have suggested to erect in the electoral division as the area of charge for outdoor relief?—I don't know. Of course, in the County Wexford there is really only one large centre of population, comparatively large—the town of Wexford, and I should say—of course, you will be able to get more clear information on that subject from the officials of the Wexford Union—but as far as I know I should say the population of the unions is fairly distributed over the county. My idea is that upon a careful advantage is to be procured, changes of system—

19510. Or area of charge?—Changes of system nearly always mean claims for increased remuneration for officials.

19511. Although their whole time is at your disposal?—I mean that where a change is made you generally find a claim that the duties have increased, and it is very hard to decide whether the duties have increased.

19512. At all events, if they were positioned on the basis of their whole time being at the disposal of the Guardians, they would be blowing hot and cold if they claimed an increase of salary for increased duties?—

I should appreciate any change in the system unless I was satisfied some material benefit was to be derived from the change.

19514. It was this question of additional expenditure, going to the substitution of outdoor help for indoor, that, as you point out, is liable to risk?—It is undoubtedly. If any recommendation could be carried into effect—I don't suggest it should, because dispensary committees have ceased to exist.

19515. You would recommend—it has been done all over the country—the restoration of the dispensary committees?—I would.

19516. And such committees should be made relief committees?—Yes, and without their strong recommendation the boarding-out should not be attempted.

19517. Another suggestion was that, taking account experience into consideration, each area should consider what was the fair amount to spend on outdoor relief in that, and that that should be stereotyped (as you say) a year should be paid to the poor in that district division?—Not stereotyped?

19518. Not exceeding, of course; revising that every year, or whatever might be decided upon, and that should be a union charge, but any payment in excess of what you may call the standard payment should be a local charge?—Yes, I should approve of that. I think that would be a very reasonable suggestion.

19519. Now, Query 4: "Whether is the work of an amalgamation or combination of unions being carried out or any other arrangements being made for the relief of the destitute poor, any changes in the law and procedure as to administration and in the chargeability of relief would be desirable?" We have discussed some of that already. How would you administer Govey Auxiliary Asylum, supposing it to be created?—Our reply is contained here. We suggest that there should be one or two Councils appointed from each union to act as a committee.

19520. Rural Councils or County Councils?—I should say Rural Councils. In many cases Rural Councils and County Councils are synonymous. We have active members sitting on both Boards.

19521. And possibly they might be the same?—In fact, I think it would be desirable that they should be in circumstances would permit of it. It would mean a representative on both Boards.

19522. At present you would have the Board of Guardians for the Govey Union administering the hospital, and through the assumed restored dispensary committee, the relief?—Yes.

19523. Then you would have the asylum committee administering what is now the able-bodied portion of the workhouse?—Quite so.

19524. That would be constituted by?—By a committee consisting of one or two Councils from each of the four unions.

19525. And urban districts, perhaps?—Well, urban districts are represented already on the unions. I am myself one of the representatives of Westford on the Poor Law Board.

19526. The urban districts might ask to have a district representative?—I don't think so.

19527. You think they would be satisfied with their share of the unions?—Yes.

19528. How many men would that committee be composed of?—We suggested one or two from each—a committee of eight or nine.

19529. Would they meet in Govey?—I should say so.

19530. That would be very small for a meeting in Govey?—Perhaps so. If we increased it to three from each, making twelve?

19531. You would always have the three Govey men there?—I think if the other members of the committee were interested in their duties they should attend, because my view is very strongly that a man belonging to a public body, if he does not mean to attend to his duties, should resign.

19532. Do you think that is general?—In the County of Westford we very rarely find a difficulty in getting a quorum at our meetings in connection with the County Committee on Agriculture. We generally meet alternately in the four towns. I was going to refer to what we consider the main objection to our proposal about Govey, because I realise no matter what system would be adopted there are objections. A very reasonable objection seemed to me to be that the able-bodied, if transferred from Govey to Emsworthy, would be removed from the visits of their friends. That was one of our reasons for selecting Govey, because the urban population is small compared with Westford.

19533. The sick of Govey would still be treated at Govey?—Yes.

19534. Did you make any inquiries—we have done it ourselves going about the country—about the visits to workhouse inmates?—Yes; I was going to say about that. Westford is a town of about 11,000 population, and Govey, I think, has from 1,500 to 2,000, and I reasoned with myself that if I ascertained the number of visits paid by relatives and friends to the able-bodied poor in Westford Union in the body of the house, that I would be able to form a very fair approximation to what it would be likely to be in Govey.

19535. At all events, it would be in favour of Govey very much, because there is so much of a rural and distant population?—I made the inquiry at Westford, and was informed by the porter that the average number of visits paid to the body of the house in Westford by people from outside would not exceed one or two per week.

19536. That practically bears out our experience. There are practically no visitors to the body of the house, but a great many visitors to the sick?—My own idea is that where children who are in employment permit their aged parents to go to the workhouse, they have not any very great objection for them, and are not likely to visit them.

19537. A good many of the poor people in the workhouse are people with no near relatives?—Quite so, so I believe the incontinence entailed by that would be very small.

19538. Query No. 5: "Whether having regard to the number, capacity, and situation of the workhouse hospitals, county infirmaries, county fever hospitals, and other hospitals existing in the county, additional accommodation is required for the proper treatment of the sick poor in any union, district, or locality in the county, and, if other accommodation seems desirable, how it may best be provided without entailing undue hardship upon the destitute or on the sick poor of the union?"—As that case we believe that a strong effort should be made to raise the status of the hospital as much as possible, and we want as far as possible to take from the hospital the character of a workhouse hospital, which undoubtedly in many cases militates against poor people making use of it.

19539. Would you do it absolutely in the case of Govey?—Absolutely in the case of Govey, but in fact with regard to all the hospitals we should like to see a separate entrance to the hospital. We should like to see it not necessary in order to obtain admission to the workhouse hospital that the name of the person should be entered on the workhouse books as a pauper. We should like to see the patient admitted to the hospital without being obliged to pass through the workhouse as an inmate of the workhouse.

19540. In Govey the arrangement would be, from your point of view, perfect. There would be no workhouse book, but merely the hospital register and the auxiliary asylum register, and there would be no question of workhouse there at all?—Quite so.

19541. You would want to approximate in the other three unions to the Govey arrangement as far as possible?—As far as possible. In fact, it was suggested by my fellow-witness from the County Council, Mr. Peacock, that the Westford County Infirmary should be abolished, whilst I think that every effort should be made to raise gradually the standard of the workhouse hospitals to the standard of the County Infirmary. I was not prepared to go that length, nor was the County Council, because at present the County Infirmary is an institution in which we have trained surgical nurses and an operating room, and all facilities for dealing with serious accidents.

19542. You have nothing then but acute medical or surgical cases?—Well, we have, but at the same time they are the bulk of our cases.

19543. There ought not to be. I suppose you would consider anything but acute or curable cases?—That is so, but then the very difficulty I have before pointed out causes some patients to go to there—people who would not go to the workhouse hospital.

19544. With relatively insignificant ailments or old age?—Oh, no, not for old age, because they would not be admitted unless curable; but still people go to the County Infirmary suffering from chest affections who would not go to the workhouse hospital.

19545. They would be cured in three weeks or so. You would not consider them, after all, unsuitable cases for the County Infirmary?—Oh, no, they are quite within the infirmary rule; but the County Infirmary deals with cases that could be dealt with in the district hospitals, but for the objection of the people to go there. But my view was that I could not

May 13, 1904.

Mr. M. A.
Reels.

quite agree with Mr. Peacock on this question, that even if one endeavoured to raise the status of the district hospitals, it would take some time to do it, and I hold no public body has a right to take action which would tie the hands of their successors. During the existence of the present County Council the thing would not be practicable.

19545. Did you consider at all whether some connection or friendly intercourse or arrangement between the County Infirmary and the district infirmaries might be possible, and whether, if possible, there should be some recognised system of transferring cases for treatment from Garry, Ross, and Enniscorthy to your County Infirmary here for surgical operations or special treatment?—That is a subject we have not considered, but, speaking from my own personal point of view, I should strongly approve of it.

19546. It has been put before us by some county officials that putting the County Infirmary on such a basis would be a systematic and good arrangement for the sick?—I believe it to be an admirable suggestion. It did not occur to me before. We did not consider it, but having heard it from you I think it is an admirable suggestion, because our desire is to make the County Infirmary as far as possible a truly County Infirmary, useful to all parts of the county. It goes without saying that the larger number of governors, those who attend mostly to the institutions, are in Wexford, and there are not a sufficient number of governors residing at a long distance who take an interest in it to send patients forward, but we believe if the Board of Guardians of the four unions were in connection with the Infirmary—

19546a. And the medical officers?—And the medical officers, it would be an admirable system, because the whole county pays for the County Infirmary.

19547. The medical officer would know, "Here is a case which cannot get the treatment here that could be given in the County Infirmary, but I can send the case over." Would you approve of that?—Strongly.

19548. Did any detailed arrangement occur to you on your answer to No. 5 as to how best in Enniscorthy, Ross, and Wexford the wards for the sick could be completely cut off from the workhouse?—No; Wexford is the only union of which I have personal knowledge.

19549. They are all pretty much on the same structure?—I don't think there would be any insuperable obstacle to providing such an arrangement for Wexford.

19550. Did any way occur to you of separating them?—I think that is a matter of detail, but from my own knowledge of the Wexford Union I should anticipate no difficulty in doing it. It would mean a separate entrance, and I have in my mind the place where, if I was to do the architect's part of the business, I should put the entrance.

19551. You would have no trouble in doing so?—No.

19552. Query 6 is answered already. Query 7: "How far in the case of persons who are not destitute it would be desirable to introduce a system of payments or contributions in aid of the cost of treatment of the sick and insane in hospitals or other such institutions?"—Well, in that case we suggest a similar system to the system adopted in the district system, that is, that the committee should consider each case on its individual merits, because I don't believe it would be possible to frame a rule which would be equitable in every case.

19553. You would recommend a discretionary power in the committee in connection with their officers?—Quite so, to fix the amount of the contribution. In the County Infirmary there is a rule somewhat analogous to that. There are three scales of payment; a governor admitting a pay patient puts on his ticket the A, B, or C scale.

19554. That is a recommendation?—Quite so.

19555. Do you find you recover the money easily?—Oh, yes.

19556. It is not a recommendation that is not successfully carried out?—I don't mean to say that there may not be some isolated cases where a difficulty may arise.

19557. You have no legal power?—The question has never arisen.

19558. You would be in favour of that power being conferred upon the managers of all hospitals, county, district, and every other hospital, of recovering out of the public funds as much as they thought the patients or their friends could pay?—Yes.

19559. Have you ever tried it in any hospital of the County Wexford?—Yes, in Woodland Union we had an outbreak of scrofula. We have recently had a number of cases treated in the fever hospital, and at the very last meeting of the Board of Guardians, I think, or the meeting before, the committee were occupied in discussing what was a fair and reasonable charge to make for the treatment of scrofula, because that is clearly laid down that employers are bound to pay for their servants, and we deal with these cases in the manner—I suggest we should have legal authority to deal with the cases—to which you refer. We find a scale; the cost of maintenance in the fever hospital was given as by the union officials as 7s. 7d. per head. But that included the extra cost of auxiliary nurses from Dublin, and we thought it was not fair to impose that rate upon the people.

19560. It would hardly be so cheap as that?—That was the figure given to us.

19561. In some county infirmaries, the County Fermagh and County Antrim, they have for some little time, a few years, had a system of getting governors, and the surgeons of the Fermagh Infirmary explained it to us very clearly. He said the committee had no considered every case that was admitted. For instance, a labourer's child, a man reading we will say 1s. a week, or whatever it may be, the committee take the view of it that at all events the man was relieved of the cost of the child's food for the time, and that they would put down at 1s. a week or whatever it would be, and they would ask him to pay that, and from that up to two guineas a week according to the actual expenses involved, and they find that they are making now quite a large income out of these payments, and the payments are popular. People like to pay their 1s. or 2s. 6d., or whatever it would be that they can afford to pay, and they feel they are paying their way and not in any way becoming the recipients of pauper relief. That would be quite in consonance with our suggestions with regard to district hospitals. It would be carrying it a step further and making the people feel, as you say, that they were not pauper, but independent and paying for the services they received.

19562. You would be in favour of the legal power given?—Certainly.

19563. Now we come to the troublesome question of the tramp. Take the tramp first?—We all, I think, realise that the tramp question is a very difficult question, that it is desirable that a respectable man of his class who is out of employment should be facilitated in seeking for employment, but at the same time we all know that the country is simply alive with a number of able-bodied men, chiefly, I am afraid, destitute soldiers, who have become unwilling to work.

19564. And maintenance?—Yes, who are roaming about the country idle, and are terrifying the rural population; and no effort should be spared to get us rid of that. And with that view we suggest a system of registration—that a man going on tramp, to get for work, should obtain from the sergeant in charge of his police district a certificate that he was genuinely going to seek for work, and that that certificate should hold in force—

19565. And that his road should be indicated?—No; I don't say so. I would let him have his certificate.

19566. If you found a man in Wexford, with a certificate from Coleraine that he was looking for work, would not that rather look like a license to tramp?—That is so; but my idea was, it is very difficult to devise a system which is perfect; but the certificate should only remain in force for six months, and at the expiration of that time the man should be treated as a vagrant, and dealt with.

19567. Or, at all events, you should have power to consider him a vagrant?—Yes.

19568. How would you deal with him?—Deal with him under the Vagrancy Act.

19569. Is not that a very ineffective Act?—I believe the law requires to be strengthened in that respect. That would mean an amendment of the law.

19570. Anything we are talking of to-day would mean an amendment of the law?—Quite so.

19571. Have you at all considered how the law might be amended, so as to do a good deal towards stopping vagrancy?—Increase the penalty.

19572. In what way. At present, we will say, he gets a short term of imprisonment?—We suggest that he should be committed to a reformatory, to which the term workhouse would really apply—a place where he should be made to work.

15675. If you make all the workhouses into hospitals, and if you have, as far as possible, out-door relief, and if practically the only class that would go into the workhouse are the sick, it might be a good thing to retain the workhouse for people of that class.—My idea is, on broad lines, that the best amendment of the poor law would be in the direction of hospitals for the sick, and almshouses for the poor, and the industrial school system for the children, and penal settlements or workhouses for tramps.

15676. Where they would be confined under a magistrate's warrant, and made to work, on make-busines, but real work?—Real work.

15677. There is another class that is not a tramp, that is the in-and-outs, we will say the quay labourer, a man whose employment is intermittent, casuals who come in and out, what do you think about those?—The casuals, I should say, so far as my experience of our own locality goes, the casuals are not large.

15678. Have you many of the class?—We have not many of the quay labourers class, but we have a number of casuals. The casuals we have got are women from the dissolute wards, beggars, people who make their livelihood by professional begging, and go out when the weather is fine and come into the workhouse when the weather is unsuitable, and, in fact, make a kind of base of operations of the workhouse.

15679. You have not many people who really earn for, say, twenty weeks in the year, and are idle for the remainder?—I think not.

15680. That is a class they have in large cities?—I think our officials will be able to give definite information on that point, but I don't think myself we have many of that class; our casuals, I think, are chiefly people who practically do no work.

15681. Do you see any reason why any people of that class should not be treated in exactly the same way as the vagrant, if they merely go out to beg and are non-productive and are raising families in looseness and idleness and begging, and, perhaps, crime and theft?—Quite so.

15682. Do you see any reason why that class should not be dealt with in the same way, giving discretion?—I think it would be desirable to deal with that class as far as the able-bodied portion; but, then, there is an intermediate body of casuals.

15683. You mean the old-fashioned beggar?—Yes; people of a certain age; people who are not quite able to work, but who are not able for heavy work.

15684. Where those people who used to work when they were able?—Yes; and have broken themselves down from drink and other causes.

15685. Are you thinking of such people in the town or in the country?—Chiefly from the town. I quite admit the desirability or advantage of having a workhouse in the town, or in the vicinity of the town, for many reasons; but, at the same time, there are disadvantages, and there can be no doubt about it that if you could remove the Worked Workhouse ten or fifteen miles into the country you would raise materially the tone of the town of Westford.

15686. And they would make a struggle to hold on?—Yes.

15687. There are just a couple of questions, taking the point of view we were on, that is—how to make the hospital quite distinct from the workhouse. If we try and do it by a process of exclusion, taking the several inmates, other than sick, and seeing how they would be dealt with, we may find that there would be very little left except the sick in the end. In the workhouse there are sick, and aged and infirm, women having illegitimate infants, children under fifteen, lunatics, idiots and epileptics, casuals, tramps, and a very small number of able-bodied people, who are not in any of those foregoing classes; they really do come under casuals—they are regular in-and-outs. Leave aside, for the present, the sick and aged and infirm, the next class we came to would be mothers having illegitimate children, of that class you have a very large number in the County Westford?—Yes.

15688. The number of children you have is extremely large, much larger than any of the other counties in Leinster, except Dublin. A suggestion that was made to us at our sitting in Dublin was that the workhouse should be closed to all such girls; that as soon as a girl would have to come to the workhouse, say, three or four months before the birth of her baby, that her case would be considered, we will say, by your relief committee or some body of that sort, and that she should be sent to a penitentiary or refuge under religious management?—Compulsorily.

15689. She would have to go somewhere, poor girl, instead of putting her into a workhouse ward, as at present, where the moment she goes in she associates day and night with women who have gone through similar experiences to hers, and have afterwards had two or three, four, five, or six illegitimate children; instead of putting her with those, that she should be sent, on the occasion of her first fall, to a refuge under religious management, according to the religious she professed?—The cost of doing so being borne by the rates.

15690. Oh, yes, by the rates; that she should be sent there, and that there should be a lying-in ward, if the managers of such an institution approved of it, to which she should be sent; or, failing that, that she should be sent, as she would be sent, to the ordinary lying-in hospital, like the Concombe or some other large hospital; that she should be sent there for ten days or a fortnight, and come back to the refuge, and never associate with any dissolute characters?—I think that would be an admirable suggestion.

15691. That the child should be kept there until it was eighteen months or two years old, whatever age the doctor would consider suitable, and that the child should be boarded out, and that efforts should be made by this religious body to place the poor children in a situation?—Yes.

15692. And she should, as far as might be considered prudent, contribute to the cost of the child?—Yes.

15693. The witnesses who brought this suggestion before we were of opinion, that after her first lapse, and when she was not contaminated by the associations of the workhouse, and with other women, we might hope for a very large number of complete reforms; and even from the point of economy, although we might pay a little more in such an institution for a girl; that, instead of becoming a life-long charge on the rates, and having a large family of illegitimate children also on the rates, that one might have for a reform; that, while we might have as many first cases, we would have very few second cases?—That would have my strongest approval; I think that is an admirable suggestion.

15694. That would exclude a very large number; it would exclude the mothers and all the children they bring in; the number of children in Westford is very large; in Ennisworthy there are sixty-one; there are none boarded out in Ennisworthy?—I may say, with regard to the children, that the Board of Guardians of Westford took action with regard to the orphan children in the school; we realised that when a girl came to the age of fifteen years she must go into the body of the house; that was, from many points of view, undesirable; it at once put her in contact with those women of whom you are speaking; but, in the meantime, before she reached that age we would not find it practicable to teach her the business of a domestic servant, because if we put her into the laundry she was put immediately in association with undesirable characters, and the consequence was, when she came to the age of fifteen years she was not qualified to earn her living as a servant.

15695. And furthermore, perhaps, that child was the daughter of one of these women?—Yes; and we communicated with the Sisters of Mercy in Westford, who have an institution for training children, and we made a bargain with them, that any child, when it reached twelve years, that we had power to send, we would send to the House of Mercy.

15696. As a certified school?—As a certified school, and pay to the rates, for a period of two years, the amount of money that the child was actually costing in the workhouse; and at the end of two or three years, I am not quite sure, possibly then, the child had become self-supporting, and the rates will keep her in the institution until they draft her into a situation, and train her in domestic work. But, of course, we are limited to orphans and deserted; and in the case of a large number of those children whose mothers are in the house, we could not carry that out without their permission, which, probably, we would not obtain.

15697. There are sixty-one in Ennisworthy, forty-four in the workhouse in Garry and four boarded out, sixty-eight in New Ross in the workhouse and thirty-nine boarded out, and in Westford thirty-five in the workhouse and fourteen boarded out. I mistook New Ross for Westford?—The county of Westford, as a whole, has a large number.

May 18, 1904.
Mr. M. A.
Foster.

May 18, 1864.

Mr. M. A.
Baker.

18595. Since this census was taken the numbers have increased in Wexford a little, but not to the extent I thought at first. Then you would get rid of most of these children, as well as the mothers, out of the house. The next class we come to would be the lunatics, idiots, and epileptics, and your suggestion about Gorry would clear those away, and cessals and tramps; your view about that would also clear that class away.—Yes.

18597. The other classes are practically very small, and most of them would be really of that class—non-earning, thriftless people, who, by drink, or one thing or another, become unproductive members of the community; and it was just a question of how far they might be dealt with as vagrants?—They might be dealt with in the same institution as the vagrants—classifying them. It would be a system of classification in the institution.

18598. And the fact of calling that institution a workhouse might tend to draw public attention completely away from the sick and infirm, and give people still the workhouse to look at, but quite a different class of institution, and take away the workhouse taint or association from the people who were there owing to sickness, or through age and infirmity?—I look upon the suggestion you have made, with regard to the children, as a most valuable one; because, I think, in any system we take into consideration the children are the most important factor.

18599. It seems to be calculated to stop the hereditary pauper?—Besides, I look upon it as the question of the proper up-rearing of the children, which is most important; because, whilst you cannot reform many of the people of to-day who have gone wrong, you can provide against their children following their footsteps.

18600. Then you would only have the aged and infirm to deal with. The sick, you at once say, and it is the general opinion all over the country, that one ought not, except in very rare cases, to lessen the extent of accommodation where there is a considerable number of miles between places where the sick are treated. You would not dream of recommending that any of the present buildings should cease to be used for sick wards?—No; we would not dream of that. Personally, I should prefer, any, an extension of the hospital system rather than a reduction.

18601. Then you would have the infirm to deal with?—In Gorry you solve the difficulty by sending their infirm to Ennisorthy.

18602. You think Ennisorthy would be adequate for the Gorry people?—I am not perfectly sure; but that was our impression. If we found that Ennisorthy could not reasonably accommodate them, I should suggest a division between the other unions as well; but our impression was, that Ennisorthy was quite sufficient to accommodate them when Ennisorthy had been relieved of its quota of imbeciles and idiots.

18603. And children and mothers?—Quite so.

18604. That would give an amazing amount of space?—I may say in general terms, that our recommendation, with regard to utilizing one of the existing workhouses for an auxiliary asylum in preference to building at the existing asylum, was due to the fact that we realised that within the last twenty-five years the number of workhouses have been a steadily decreasing quantity, and there was no likelihood of any further building accommodation being required in connection with workhouses.

18605. Mr. MURPHY.—Is not that largely due to the extension of outdoor relief?—I should say that is so.

18606. CHAIRMAN.—Would you at all consider it possible that, as had been suggested in a great many counties, that while the sick wards should be retained for their present purposes in the same way, that the Gorry people should be transferred, and that the aged and infirm of other unions should, if possible, be transferred to one workhouse, leaving in that workhouse, of course, the sick ward. Suppose Wexford were made, as the county town, and having railway communication with all the towns, as they all have, indeed—but supposing it were made the institution where all the aged and infirm of the county might be sent?—Yes.

18607. You would lose from Wexford, under this system, the women and children. I don't want you to express any opinion if you don't see your way clearly in it—but you would have a great deal of space there?—Yes.

18608. And, if the infirm of Gorry and Ennisorthy

and New Ross could be placed in the Wexford Union, so as to save very large establishment charges at the other three workhouses, would you be in favour of such a thing?—It seems to me, without attempting to go into figures, it would seem to me to be carrying out a very desirable system of classification; that is, instead of classification within the union, of classification in the number of unions.

18609. And, therefore, you would be able to sub-classify them, according to respectability or conduct?—I should, certainly; subject, of course, to getting the figures of cost, and satisfying myself that the ratepayers would not be injuriously affected by the change; I should certainly approve of the suggestion.

18610. The suggestion was made on the supposition that it would save a very large amount, owing to the cessation of establishment charges in three out of four workhouses?—The question of the cost of transference would have to be considered.

18611. It would have to be considered in reference to the existing cost. There is a cost of transfer, at present, from the remote parts of the union to the head house?—That is so.

18612. And a number of people would come?—I should be rather inclined, also, when we speak of the cost of transfer, with reference to Gorry, one of the points of objection that may be taken is the distance of parts of Gorry Union from Ennisorthy, and I should be inclined to favour a system by which the cost of railway transit from a more distant part of the union to Ennisorthy might be borne.

18613. That could be easily arranged; the relieving officer could give a third class ticket?—I should be in favour of the relieving officer providing the railway fare.

18614. They would be all able-bodied, and fit to travel?—I should also like to point out that the town of Arklow, which has a larger population than Gorry, as far as I am informed, has no workhouse there, and the urban population of that town must go to Rathdrum—and do go to Rathdrum—so that Gorry would not be placed in any more disadvantageous position than Arklow.

18615. The position of Arklow is very much worse, it is a place where there is a large factory and a fair population, and they have a small fever hospital, which is never used, practically?—Yes.

18616. Then, subject to satisfying yourself on the question of cost and room, and the cost of any structural alterations, subject to that, you would think that idea is worthy of consideration?—I strongly favour that idea, subject to the question of costs.

18617. That would completely get rid of the workhouse associations?—That is so; it would be carrying into effect practically the main outline, that I have already given as my views.

18618. Then you are aware, I suppose, that in your sick wards in Wexford Workhouse the number at present are 128; well, when these sections are taken away—say, 120 in the ordinary medical and surgical sick wards and ten in the fever hospital—I suppose you are aware of that 120 comparatively a small proportion are really sick?—That is so; they are aged.

18619. They are really more in need of what is called domestic care than hospital treatment?—That is so.

18620. If you had your infirmary or almshouse due by the same building, practically under the care of the present nurses, you could have them a much smaller place for the really sick?—I think so.

18621. We received evidence yesterday in the County Wicklow as regards some of the workhouses there, that the doctor, who had made exhaustive calculations for five years, was under the impression that the acute cases were only about a quarter of the total number of cases?—I don't feel myself qualified to give a percentage, but I realise that the acute cases are relatively small.

18622. And the same thing would apply in all other hospitals. In Gorry they could, if they wished, easily treat their acute sick in the fever hospital, sending to a couple of detached wards at a small cost for the very few cases that have to be dealt with there?—In Wexford, the fever hospital is a building totally detached from the workhouse proper.

18623. And at a considerable distance from it is the borough of Wexford?—Yes, a very healthy situation.

18624. We were over it, but you have a considerable amount of fever in Wexford all over, and you are rarely without a few cases?—Well, I remember a period of two or three years in which, I think, we had practically none; but within the past two or three

May 18, 1904

Mr. M. A.
Bain

years we have had an outbreak of fever—eighteen months to two years ago; it occurred in some low localities of the town, where the sanitary arrangements were very imperfect, and that held on for some period; and now, for the last year or two, we have not an epidemic of scarlatina and a few cases of typhoid.

1962. So that you really could not well do in Westford without your fever hospital?—No, I don't think with the population of the town of Westford.

1963. It is such a very fine building, and has so much accommodation—say, room for fifty beds?—Fully that.

1964. There is a good deal of waste there, as far as accommodation goes?—That is true.

1965. The question does arise whether you might make it a hospital pure and simple and leave the rest for a workhouse for the aged and infirm?—Speaking without time to consider it very closely, I should say it would be insufficient to provide the hospital accommodation we need without an addition to it; but in connection with your suggestion that only the real hospital cases should be retained in the hospital, and the others drafted into an almshouse, in that case I would say "Yes." But Westford is a sequester town, and we are in constant communication with Liverpool and Bristol, and anything in the nature of a smallpox outbreak or the outbreak of any disease in the large cities on the other side we are very liable to have it imported here.

1966. Yes, when we come to deal with the matter in detail, and understand exactly the conditions, you would most likely be able to make some suggestions that we cannot foresee now?—That is so.

1967. Dr. BROOKS.—Have you any other small hospitals?—In New Ross there is the Haughey Hospital.

1968. But in Westford itself?—No, we have the fever hospital; the union hospital and the county infirmary, also, I should mention. But I look upon it as practically portion of the county infirmary. There is the Lady Kennedy Maternity Hospital, which is a charity foundation, provided by the generosity of a deceased lady, and that is managed by a sub-committee of the Governors of the county infirmary. It is not under the management of the county infirmary in a sense, but it is built on the county grounds, and the infirmary Governors issue tickets of admission.

1969. Is it largely used?—Very largely.

1970. Women will go into it that would not dress of going into the workhouse?—Quite so.

1971. And in that way a number of lives are probably saved—that is, those cases that may not have sympathetic homes?—Yes, it is an institution that the women of the town make very large use of, and are very anxious to be admitted to. Of course, it is a small institution, comparatively, but it does a very good work in the locality, and it is looked upon by the public as portion of the county infirmary.

1972. You speak about trying to restore the standard of workhouse hospitals to the county level?—Yes.

1973. In that way you think their usefulness would be greatly increased?—Yes; we should like to provide them with spacious rooms and a trained surgical staff. Everything to bring them to the level of the present county infirmary, if practicable, but we realise that would be a work of time.

1974. Of course, for some of the larger operations you require more or less extensive fittings and instruments. Do you think that, as far as possible, those might be drafted into the county infirmary from the district hospitals?—Yes, I think the suggestion of the Chairman, that power should be given to the Boards of Guardians to send patients to the county infirmary, would largely meet that, in cases where the patient could be removed.

1975. For urgent cases, there would have to be provision made in the district hospitals?—Yes.

1976. But the other cases, of which there are a large number, might be drafted into the county infirmary?—Quite so.

1977. You said something about trying to make the county infirmary useful to the whole county—have you any idea of the number of patients that come from remote parts of the county?—The number of patients that come from the remote parts of the county is limited; but, at the same time, we do have patients from all parts of the county.

1978. But only one in proportion to ten from the immediate neighbourhood?—That is so; they do not by any means receive the same amount of benefit.

1942. At the same time they pay the same amount of cost; so, to get over that difficulty, would you suggest that there should be a county rate for supporting district hospitals for acute cases, so that the nurses that might be trained or otherwise employed in the larger institution might be drafted to those district hospitals, and charged and relieved in that way and sickness—do you see any benefit in that?—Do you mean the district hospitals should have an interchange of staff in case of an emergency?

CHAIRMAN.—Instead of telegraphing to Dublin for nurses.

1943. Dr. BROOKS.—At great expense; because a small hospital has to pay the cost of a nurse, say, for a fortnight, and her travelling expenses from Dublin; and then another hospital ten or twenty miles away wants another nurse in a short time. If it was managed by one committee or by joint committees in charge of the smaller hospitals—I think such a system as that, without thinking out the details of it, is a good one, and would tend to economy.

1944. CHAIRMAN.—To economy or expense?—Economy, I would say.

1945. Dr. BROOKS.—With reference to the asylum—you mentioned about an auxiliary asylum that you thought to provide for 150 or 200 additional inmates would cost \$40,000?—Yes.

1946. That is, \$200 per inmate?—I base that on what the addition necessary to provide for seventy patients already has cost.

1947. But those were severely acute, I take it?—Yes, but the district asylum is a building of a certain type and character, and any additions made would necessarily be made of the same class of building, and it would cost fairly in proportion to the number of inmates.

1948. Would not the number that would be admitted from the different workhouses be chronic cases, and would not more administrative arrangements be for those cases; you would not require additional cooking kitchens and medical officers' quarters?—I doubt if an addition of 200 to the existing inmates of the asylum could be dealt with by the existing kitchens and the existing arrangements. I fear not.

1949. A very large number of them? A certain proportion might; but I don't think it would be possible to deal with them, nor do I believe it would be advisable. I believe if we had that large number extra admitted to the district asylum we should probably have an application for a second assistant surgeon.

1950. Very possibly, and quite right, I think?—I don't think it would be feasible for the present medical superintendent.

1951. That would not be a large cost—it would be only a junior, at \$200 or \$250?—Quite so; but it would mean apartments.

1952. But when you mentioned such a large sum as \$40,000 to make provision for 200, I did not think you were going on the same principle when you mentioned \$1,000 for altering the workhouse?—My idea is that the workhouse is quite sufficiently large at present.

1953. Would \$1,000 provide for very much in the way of alterations?—I don't suggest any large alterations in the workhouse.

1954. The \$40,000 would more than build the workhouse, and on a better scale?—That is quite different.

1955. Why not calculate both on the same basis?—Because the district asylum is a building built on certain lines and of a certain type.

1956. It would not be necessary to build the chronic block on the same lines?—They have done it in other asylums.

1957. Merely a simple building, with dormitory and day-room?—It might be possible to build it at a lower cost, but I don't think you would save much.

1958. You would certainly build it for a quarter, on as good a principle, as the workhouse with \$1,000 for alterations; would not that make a great difference in your calculation?—Yes. I have had considerable experience in the building trade, and I doubt if you could build an institution to contain 200 inmates for a quarter of the sum I mentioned. You may save something if you build it. I don't think you will save anything appreciable if you build it of the same ornamental type of building as the existing asylum. If you build a very plain block at the back of the other buildings, on the cheapest and plainest method, you undoubtedly will save some-

May 18, 1906.

Mr. M. A.
Kings.

thing; but I don't think it is possible to erect a building, giving the number of cubic feet of air-space in each dormitory that would be considered by accountants necessary. I don't think you can build it for anything like £10,000.

19059. The workhouse buildings which you propose to allocate for that purpose, I think they could be put up for that amount—I doubt it.

19060. £10,000 appears to be very small for alterations, proper kitchen arrangements, water supply, and baths?

19061. CHAIRMAN.—You did not include water in the £10,000?—No, I did not.

19062. Not sanitary cesspools?—No, I did not.

19063. Dr. Bigger.—Therefore, the £10,000 is very small.—My idea was that, by transferring the lunatic poor from the workhouse where they are at present located to a workhouse utilised as an auxiliary asylum, you could very largely increase their comfort, and, in fact, put them in such a position that they would be maintained in an efficient, in a comfortable way, but at the same time they would not have all the modern appliances that they would have in a district asylum.

19064. Would they not have the use of the appliances that are already in the asylum if you built small blocks for them?—If you make an addition to the asylum, and if you don't provide for heating, as is provided for in the asylum.

19065. That is not provided in the asylum?—No; but I say if you don't provide for the heating and all that kind of thing, you may erect the building at a cheaper cost; but, then, I don't think it would be possible to erect a building capable of accommodating all those people for a sum of money that would be anything like one-fourth of the sum I named.

19066. Perhaps we will split the difference, and make it half. You spoke about the average cost, and also the Capitation Grant of 4s. a head. Supposing all the lunatics of the country went to the asylums, and the asylum received 4s. Capitation Grant for all of them, would not that mean a reduction in other grants which the country has already—would not that mean a reduction of the grant from which the 4s. is taken, which is otherwise distributed. I take it, over the rest of the country; it is not out of the Imperial Exchequer direct this 4s. cost.—That is a question which I have heard debated, and on which I have been unable to obtain accurate information as to what exactly is the source from which the 4s. is paid.

19067. Did you consider the question of construction at all—whether it would be desirable to have a special hospital for consumption?—No; we did not take that into consideration.

19068. Would not that be a very desirable change?—I have no doubt it would; but it would seem to me to raise a large question of expense, and to be a question which, if practicable, should be undertaken by three or four counties in conjunction.

19069. According to the size of the county. You have a number of consumptive cases at present in the workhouse for which you can do very little further than, possibly, to some extent, to have isolation, but not perfect isolation, so that other patients run a certain amount of risk from being in the same wards with them?—I think it would be very desirable to make an effort to deal with these cases; but, so far as the County Wexford is concerned, it could best be done by a scheme in conjunction with neighbouring counties.

19070. You think it would be desirable to have some such scheme?—Yes.

19071. CHAIRMAN.—Now Ross would be a fine, healthy site if they had water there?—Yes, I should say so.

19072. Convenient, and fairly central to all these counties?—Yes, so far as the County Wexford is concerned, dealing with the poor law, we have railway communication between our four centres, and Waterford, also.

19073. And railway from Bagenstown to Ross, which brings in Killybeggy?—Quite so.

19074. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—In regard to lunatic asylums, I would like to know how many inmates there are in the Wexford Asylum?—486, odd.

19075. Is there any for any more?—No; our certified number is 440. I cannot say to the exact figure, but, approximately, the number at present is 432.

19076. You think it would be more economical to establish an auxiliary asylum than add new buildings to the existing asylum?—That is so.

19077. Would it not have another advantage—separating these lunatic people from the violent class?—My idea is, as I have already expressed it, a considerable number of chronic cases might be transferred from the existing asylums to the auxiliary, when established, and the Resident Medical Superintendent of the Kinsale Auxiliary would be in contact with both institutions; and where he found a case, in his opinion, susceptible of treatment, he could move the case into the district asylum, and the cases he considered chronic he could transfer to the auxiliary asylum.

19078. The cost in the Yeoughal Auxiliary is estimated at £15?—I heard Dr. Kelly state that.

19079. Supposing there was an intermediate cost of £18 or £20, it would still turn out that the auxiliary asylum would be as economical as the asylum proper?—I believe it to be the more economical.

19080. In regard to the dispensary committee, I did not quite catch how you would say their committees should be appointed—whether by the Guardians or what body?—The committees were appointed by the Guardians formerly, and the committees ceased to exist under the Local Government Act.

19081. But they were a very unruly body; in some districts they amounted to fifty or sixty—I think the number should be limited to a reasonable number. But I believe that although they were not by any means ideal bodies, still they did a certain amount of work which is not done now at all.

19082. Quite so; and the reason for that is, because the area of supervision has been widened from dispensary to union district?—Yes; and also from the reason that every public board having a large amount of business on its agenda, in my opinion, if you increase the responsibility or duties of any public body, it means the neglect of some portion of their business.

19083. You think if the Guardians would choose a number of men to set as a relief committee, it would be an improvement on the present system?—Certainly I do.

19084. CHAIRMAN.—Being a County Councillor, you are aware of the number of hospitals in the county. In Wexford Union you have the Wexford Workhouse Infirmary and Union Fever Hospital and the Lady Edmunds Maternity Hospital; in New Ross, you have the Union Infirmary and the Haughton Hospital; in Enniscorthy, you have the Kinsale Auxiliary Workhouse Infirmary, the Fever Hospital, a detached building, and the Quilist and Newtownhamlets—are there any others?—Not that I am aware of; I know of no other.

19085. The county has nothing to do with either the Quilist or Newtownhamlets Hospitals?—No.

19086. And the Haughton is altogether a private grant?—It is a private charity. There is a committee which manages it, I don't know by whom appointed; I never knew the hospital in those.

19087. We visited it, and thought very highly of it. The matron, one of the Sisters of St. John of God, gave us one of the publications about it. It seems to be maintained out of private funds—I believe that to be so.

19088. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—These fever hospitals don't seem to give much value for the cost of the building?—The fever hospital is very expensive compared with the amount of work done; but, at the same time, it is absolutely necessary to have a fever hospital.

19089. If there was a wing—a small cottage hospital—adjoining this institution, and the nurse from the larger institution could be utilised in the case of an emergency, would not that save a great deal of money?—I have no doubt it would, provided the medical officer considered there was no risk of infection.

19090. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Murtaghan's idea was, that if a fever nurse was wanted at one of the fever hospitals the trained fever nurse from the county infirmary should be sent for. In some of the fever hospitals there are very rarely fever patients; she should be there for a few weeks, and then come back again.—In the Wexford Fever Hospital we have a permanent nurse, but when over five cases are in the hospital we have also to procure a night nurse; and the travelling expenses and maintenance of the supplementary nurse come to such a high figure, that it has been a subject of consideration by the Board of Guardians whether it would not be cheaper to have another permanent nurse.

19091. That is what Dr. Bigger was asking you about—whether, if you had a certified staff in your

own county, you could not save a good deal of money?—Yes; I believe you would economize very considerably in that way.

18602. Mr. MICHAELSON—I will take down a window such as the size of your own. We find we have very few cases in the year, and still we have to keep up an expensive staff, and it does seem to me if some arrangement could be made that a nurse could be got from a central place to look after those cases, it would be a good deal of saving, and would not require so much outlay without any return—I believe the suggestion Dr. Biggar made, that there should be a connection between the four institutions in this county, would be advisable; because there cannot be an outbreak of infectious disease in the whole four at the same time, and, therefore, the staffs of the four working in concert could effect a considerable economy, and be very useful.

18603. All-day that does exist. This is being done in my own county at present to some extent?—I believe that system would be very good.

18604. CHAIRMAN.—They have got over twenty nurses there?—I believe that would be a very desirable system.

May 15, 1904

Mr. M. A. Ennis.

Mr. C. H. PROCTOR, sr., examined.

My, Ennis and I are colleagues, and, therefore, our minds are in the one groove.

18605. CHAIRMAN.—You quite coincide with him as all he has said with regard to those quarters?—Yes.

18606. But when it comes to the end there is an admission. You rather thought that an amalgamation of the County Westford Infirmary might be possible?—Yes.

18607. Did you hear the recent evidence?—Some of it, at all.

18608. On that point, what do you think, would that be such an amalgamation as you had in your mind—that the four hospitals should have communication one with another and transfer; or did you look to the abolition of the county infirmary?—My first idea was that I considered it a very urgent task on the county as a whole, having a county infirmary with the principal number of patients coming out of Westford. I consider we ought to improve our hospitals as a whole, and when they were improved, I think, then, it would be very advisable if the county infirmary was merged into, say, the present workhouse union hospital.

18609. Not that the building should be discontinued, but that the cost should be put on the Westford Council?—Quite so.

18610. What would you think of proceeding in the other way. The acute sick all over the county are a very small number, and the question was raised whether all the acute sick might not be made a county charge, so that Gorey, Keshmorthy, and New Ross and Westford, being small hospitals, say, with an average of thirty or forty, could be county charges?—I could see no objection to it.

18611. And the county infirmary should be the chief hospital for operations and such purposes, and where the head staff of nurses would be employed, to be drafted locally, as they might be required?—The difficulty I see of keeping it as a county charge is the transfer of accidents long distances.

18612. That could not be done. But, then, on the other hand, there are a great many operations, rather than broken bones and cuts and injuries of that sort; there are a great many operations that are most serious, things that could be transferred; that really serious is an ordinary workhouse infirmary shrinks from performing in his own hospital?—It would be very advisable in that case.

18613. In New Ross they have recently gone to considerable expense, and provided an operating room; but, also, there is no water there!—That is essential.

18614. Dr. PROCTOR.—All classes of tumours and operations of that kind could all be transferred. The number of operations required on account of accidents is very small in the rural population, whereas the number of patients is fairly large?—I think it would be a very good suggestion.

18615. CHAIRMAN.—Then, subject to your looking into the matter more closely as regards costs and other considerations, you would be disposed to regard that idea favourably?—Very much.

18616. Now, as regards the charges that are dealt with under the poor law—the sick, the aged and infirm, the mothers of illegitimate children, children under fifteen years, lunatics, idiots and epileptics, and casuals and tramps. Take up, first, the mothers—girls who come in to have illegitimate children?—I heard your remarks before, and I happen to have been requested by members of the Board of Guardians that I belong to, Westford, to draw up a synopsis of what I thought would be advisable is comprehended exactly what you have stated here; I submitted it to my board, and they were not favourable to it.

18617. That is, as regards the girls?—My proposition is identical with what came from the chair today.

18618. And, of course, naturally, you approve of it?—I coincide with it.

18619. When you were working that idea out did you see any difficulty, any objection to such a scheme. It has been stated to us by some of the witnesses—"If you do that, you make it very easy for a girl to escape any consequences; she gets rid of her child?"—No, I looked to the saving of the girl.

18620. That would outweigh all other considerations?—With me.

18621. You would not be afraid that it would be likely to cause other girls to fall?—No, I don't think so; that would not be my experience.

18622. Then, as regards children; we would have to look at these in two groups—children who are actually in the workhouse at present, that would be a very rapidly changing quantity, and the children who would be born after this change in system, if the change in system is made. Under the change in system, the child would be born in or adjacent to one of these refuges, and would be looked after in connection with the refuge—would you have that child boarded out?—I would have all children boarded out.

18623. So as to become members of the agricultural labouring class?—That would be my idea.

18624. You would not approve of having them taught trades and put into the way of living that would be rather above their position?—That would be a very important point, naturally.

18625. It has been represented that putting them into trades would be rather raising them above the class of labourers and independent farmers?—My reply is—I am an agriculturalist, and, naturally, my sympathy runs with the agriculturalist, and we need labourers.

18626. And, therefore, you would have a supply?—Yes.

18627-28. And it would be a good, healthy, honest life for them?—Quite so.

18629. As regards the children where they are at present, would you be in favour of an extension of the law enabling the Guardians to board out all classes of children whose parents are unable to support them, and throw them on the rates, by bringing them into the workhouse?—Certainly; and we pursue that, as far as possible, in the Westford Union, and we would go further if the law enabled us.

18630. Would board them all out?—Yes.

18631. As regards lunatics, idiots and epileptics, in what way would you deal with those?—We propose, in our report to the County Council, to transfer them to Gorey. I am altogether against grouping the epileptics with them.

18632. But the Guardians can sub-divide them. In the South Dublin, Belfast, and other unions they have separate epileptic wards, where they never come in contact with the others?—That rests with our medical officers.

18633. Perhaps you have not room?—Well, I won't say it rests with him. My idea is that epileptics should be put in the country, and be looked after by the medical officer in the country.

18634. If they are bad cases, do you think it would be safe, with a person that gets frequent fits—look at the amount of care they need?—Still, I think they would be better in the country, from everything I have read. I am led to believe the attacks would be less frequent if they had country surroundings.

18635. In Germany, they have them all living in the country and doing work on a farm—that would meet your view?—Quite so.

Mr. C. H. Proctor

May 18, 1904.
Mr. C. H.
Pascoe.

19736. Your idea is that they should not be loafing around a harrack institution?—Quite so; it is a moral and thing; and my experience of our own workhouse is that it really helps to intensify the disease; and, as regards imbeciles, I think it is the saddest thing in this country. I have seen young people drafted into the imbecile ward that were only on the verge of imbecility, and twelve months afterwards they were confirmed imbeciles, and only for the contact with the imbeciles themselves they were curable cases. I wish medical men would grapple with this thing, and try to get rid of the whole system.

19737. Dr. BAKER.—Would you think that if there were no imbeciles in the workhouse that would tend to make the separation still more distinct?—They should be classified coming in.

19738. A person who was on the verge between the two classes would not be sent to the asylum, but, having portion of the workhouse allocated for an insane class, they may be sent there. There are no certified lunatics now in the workhouse, and if they had to be certified, that would classify them?—Certainly; I look upon it as a monstrous thing in a civilized country to have that going on.

19739. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—The fact exists, anyhow, that some people are at present in workhouse mixing with the insane?—Quite right.

19740. CHAIRMAN.—The imbeciles are, of course, insane?—Well, it is a generic term.

19741. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—But the epileptics are not?—Still, they are classed as such.

19742. CHAIRMAN.—They are, in the small workhouses?—I know; with us.

19743. And where there are a large number of them they have separate accommodation; but it would be far better, you think, and I don't think anyone differs from you, if the epileptics were removed from the workhouse, and put into some place where they could be occupied in physical work?—Quite so.

19744. As regards tramps?—Mr. BAKER explained that to you. It was our combined energy that drafted those suggestions, and we are quite agreed on them. Tramps are a very great nuisance going through the country. They come up to your door, and it is a kind of blackmail they enforce, especially with women, to get rid of them. I think they should be grappled with; it is a crime.

19745. If we have to support these men, you would take and make them work?—Certainly.

19746. And put them into what Mr. BAKER called a workhouse?—Yes; but I would centralise them, not localise them.

19747. Say, in a provincial institution—four for Ireland, or as many as would be necessary for Ireland?—Yes.

19748. Therefore, you would put them under a magistrate's warrant for a time?—These are matters of detail. It would require an Act of Parliament to do it.

19749. Everything would require an Act of Parliament. We are trying to increase as many things as possible that should be considered in drafting an Act of Parliament. The question is—would you take these people's children, when they have them, from them?—Certainly I should, or they would become hereditary tramps.

19750. In the interests of the children, you would take them from their parents?—Put them in industrial schools.

19751. And if you take the children away from the parents, it would be hardly wise or prudent to let those people start off again, unnumbered, to start a fresh batch of imbeciles?—You would shut them up?—The father should go in to learn a trade or some business.

19752. And not let him at large as long as the State was supporting his children?—That would depend on circumstances. If he showed himself willing to be honest and industrious, I would let him out on a license.

19753. On the discretion of the governing body?—Yes; I am sure you have been in the country where a man would come up and exhibit his license, showing he was a legalised pauper.

19754. There are a large number of persons in the country living on alms against whom there is no feeling, but a very good feeling—an old-fashioned inhabitant of the parish or neighbourhood, who goes round the same little circuit, and always receives a welcome?—We never class them as tramps. We call a man a tramp who goes to the relieving officer for a ticket for the union.

19755. A sturdy vagabond?—Yes.

19756. Then the casual—the person that comes in and out for no reason, not earning sufficient or having drunk their money, or on one reason or another?—I should prefer to give that man out-door relief.

19757. Supposing he was a man that would mispend the out-door relief?—He cannot starve.

19758. Supposing this were a man that local people would know would never earn his living, would you be in favour of putting him into the workhouse proper, where the tramps would be in a different sub-class?—I think if it were shown that he was in the continuous state you describe, I should certainly do so.

19759. During the local people the discretion to do so?—Exactly.

19760. All these laws would be enforced by the local authority?—Yes.

19761. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—That would be up to a certain age. You would not think of sending old people to a place like that?—No.

19762. CHAIRMAN.—After sixty or sixty-five, when the old-age limit is reached, they would go to the almshouse?—Go to the almshouse or get out-door relief.

19763. Whether was considered best by the local body, and there would be a sub-classification, according to respectability or conduct?—Quite so; leave it to the local people.

19764. Therefore, would you have all the people out of the workhouse except the two classes—the aged and infirm and the sick?—I would like to see the law extended, so that the aged and infirm could be more or less boarded out. Going through workhouses, you find that there are a very large number of these men who have led very respectable lives.

19765. In visiting, for instance, Workford Workhouse, you see honest, industrious people who are there from old age and having a wage that did not enable them to save?—Yes; I should like to see them boarded out, something like the Scotch system.

19766. With relatives, if they had them?—If possible. But, as well as I know, it costs 6s. a week to support these people in the workhouse.

19767. A good deal more than that?—You may be right, but these were the figures given to me.

19768. It is a good deal more; so that the saving would be larger than you have calculated?—Certainly, if that is the case. I am quite sure they could be boarded out for 3s. or 3s. 6d. a week. There are many poor, deserving people in the country who, if placed under the supervision of the medical officer as regards sanitary surroundings, would and their days more happily than in the workhouse.

19769. Mr. BAKER mentioned the body that would deal with such cases of relief for aged and infirm people—whether they would get out-door relief or be brought into the central almshouse. He suggested a committee, a local committee, the revival or the restoration of something like the old dispensary committee, a local body, which would know the local circumstances, and meet as often as would be requisite, and deal with all the cases?—I think it would be very desirable to re-create dispensary committees; but I think you would require a controlling body outside them.

19770. That body would be a recommending body, according to his suggestion, not a body whose rulings would be of force until confirmed by the board?—I should feel quite in unison with that idea; it should be subject to the veto of the central body.

19771. A committee of that sort, as a rule, would always be recommended, but in confirming you sometimes say, "Don't do that again"?—Yes, like the Local Government Board.

19772. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Did I understand you to say that you would be in favour of giving the management of the sick of the county to a committee appointed by the County Council?—That is, when you centralise the sick, you mean.

19773. CHAIRMAN.—When you bring the hospitals into consideration?—I should not do away with the Boards of Guardians.

19774. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Opinion is strongly in favour of keeping on the hospitals. It would neither be practical nor proper to centralise the sick?—I would have everything done by representative bodies—increase their powers, not decrease them. Might I say, I think the blind ought to be looked after. We have got blind, and we have numbers of poor people born blind.

19775. CHAIRMAN.—They would fall into the almshouse, naturally?—Into the almshouse, or go to a central institution for all Ireland, or a provincial institution; they would live the happier, and be looked after.

I go so far as to say they should be a State charge.

19756. Can you tell me how many blind are in your workhouse?—I asked this morning—there are eight there.

19757. Mr. MURKIN.—Do not the Guardians at present take care of the poor blind, and send them to institutions?—Yes; they are in the workhouse.

19758. CHAIRMAN.—Some are too old to go into institutions, I suppose?—Some of them.

19759. Do you suggest any change in the present system?—I would have them all sent to a central institution.

19760. Do you think they would like it themselves?—People, naturally, have their local sentiments.

19761. At all events, for new cases, you would put them to a central institution?—Yes.

19762. Dr. BRIDGES.—Do you know if the blind that

are in the workhouse have been long there?—I cannot give you a reply to that. Some of them I do know have been a long time, indeed, in, but I remember one for a long time there.

19773. Do you think he might have been taught a trade if he had been sent to a blind institution?—That would be my object—to have them centralized, and teach them manual instruction, and make them happier.

19774. CHAIRMAN.—Was there anything else you have not touched on that you would like to say?—I don't think there is anything else.

19775. Dr. BRIDGES.—Have you considered the treatment of consumptives?—We, here, in Wexford, built a consumptive ward at very great expense, and I should certainly like to see all the consumptive patients separated from the others, so that the danger of infection might be removed. I think they should be moved to some curative hospital, to give them a chance.

LEON STOKES, J.P., M.B., examined.

19776. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the Gorey Board of Guardians?—Yes.

19777. And also of the County Council of Wexford?—Yes.

19778. The Gorey Board of Guardians dissent, I understand, from the resolution passed by the County Council with reference to Gorey?—Very strongly indeed.

19779. Which of the bodies do you agree with?—I agree with the Gorey Board of Guardians; in fact, I may say that the resolutions passed by them were drawn up by me and were accepted almost word for word by the Board and passed unanimously. The reason we dissent from this resolution of the County Council, which I can say was not passed at all unanimously, and also at a small meeting of the County Council was on several grounds: first that we object to wholesale amalgamation, as I may call it, with the Ennisworthy Board of Guardians, on the ground that the distance the greater part of the Gorey Union would be from Ennisworthy would entail very great hardship on the poor, not only on the poor, but also on the Guardians attending meetings of the Ennisworthy Board. I heard it stated in this court that owing to the train service from Gorey to Ennisworthy communication would be easy. I may call your attention to the fact that if you look at the map you will see the train only runs down one small portion, the outside of the Gorey Union, so that there are many parts of the Gorey Union from twenty-five to thirty miles distant.

19780. Jack is in your union, I suppose?—Oh, dear, yes, and three or four miles beyond. The Union of Gorey goes up to one and a-half miles of Arklow.

19781. Then you take in Carnest?—That is in Wexford; we go within half-a-mile of Carnest.

19782. Where is your boundary in the Camolin and Ferns direction?—It runs very irregularly there.

19783. Where does it cross the railway line?—It crosses the railway about a mile south of Camolin.

19784. Between Ferns and Camolin?—Yes, and then it winds up to a little north of Camolin, and goes down to Cabere and three miles south.

19785. Ford and Kilmuckridge?—Yes, that is the limit. I would also like to say that any scheme of amalgamation would make such an enormous body of Guardians that it would be practically unworkable. If the Gorey Board of Guardians were amalgamated with that of Ennisworthy, the number of Guardians would be, roughly speaking, 150.

19786. Did you consider the possibility of having the existing divisions, but having one Council instead of two?—No, we take the law as we find it as far as that goes. Also we disagree that if there were amalgamation, and taking the existing law into consideration, that is, union rating, Gorey would suffer very considerably in rating, because the rates of Gorey have always been very considerably less than those of Ennisworthy. This present year the rates in Gorey are £2 in the £ less than those of Ennisworthy, and I think I am right in saying that that has been, practically speaking, the difference for many years, and owing to its distance many Councilors would not attend, so that the whole business of the Board would fall into the hands of the Ennisworthy Guardians, who would not know anything of the circumstances of the Gorey district.

19787. This scheme you are talking about is not the one put forward by the County Council who gave

evidence to-day?—No, but we look on that scheme as so completely impracticable; we take the whole scheme generally of amalgamation; but to take this scheme in detail, this scheme suggests that the able-bodied should be sent from Gorey to Ennisworthy, retaining the sick in Gorey. Well, anyone who knows the management of workhouses, knows there is very great interchange between the body of the house and the infirmary. There are many of the aged—I don't say the extreme aged—who are in a state you may say very much of going backwards and forwards between the body of the house and the infirmary.

19788. Under the present system?—Under the present system; and to have those people sometimes in Gorey and sometimes in Ennisworthy is perfectly impossible.

19789. That would not be, I fancy, all?—No, but according to this scheme as put before us, it says so. Also according to this scheme, although it is not mentioned here clearly, but either Mr. Ennis or Mr. Pascoe, I forget which, said so at the meeting of the County Council, when I spoke about the inconvenience of Councilors attending in Ennisworthy, said, "Oh, that is not intended," that the Gorey able-bodied should go to Ennisworthy and be there entirely looked after by the Ennisworthy Guardians, so that the Gorey Guardians would have no control over their own paupers. They merely would be Guardians of what they suggest as an auxiliary lunatic asylum.

19790. The auxiliary lunatic asylum, I understood from their evidence, would be under a joint committee, and the Guardians could still be Gorey, according to their scheme, deal with the relief of the poor by means of outdoor relief, and deal with the sick who are in their sick wards, and also pay per capita for the aged and infirm and other inmates who might be dealt with elsewhere?—Yes, but so far as I understood from them, they would also have the general administration of this auxiliary asylum.

Mr. Ennis.—No.

19791. CHAIRMAN.—I thought that would be done by a joint committee—two or three or four or any number from each union?—That is what I understood from this.

19792. I understood that from the evidence to-day, too?—If that were so the existence of the Gorey Guardians would cease.

19793. Oh, yes; but the witnesses who have been examined, Mr. Ennis and Mr. Pascoe, both said they anticipated that the Gorey Guardians would remain and not deal with the lunatics, but deal with the sick and with the boarded-out inmates of various ages, and also with the applications for outdoor relief through a committee. Would you see the same objection to that scheme that you see to the scheme of pure amalgamation, which undoubtedly would be open to the objections you make?—I should not approve of that scheme at all.

19794. Of neither?—Not at all.

19795. What objections do you see to the scheme that has been put forward by Mr. Ennis and Mr. Pascoe?—With regard to sending the able-bodied to Ennisworthy?

19796. Sending the aged and infirm to Ennisworthy?—I think the great objection is that the Gorey Guardians would so completely lose control of their own aged and infirm.

19797. They would not have control at all; they

May 18, 1906.

Mr. C. H. Pascoe.

Lord Stopped

May 16, 1904.

Lord Shaftesbury.

simply would pay so much per capita for their treatment either in Enniscorthy or Workford as might be settled?—Yes, therefore they simply would be in the position of paying what they were called upon by the Enniscorthy Guardians, the average cost, and they would have absolutely no voice in the control of these finances.

19796. That is a proper objection. Can you see any means of meeting that? Suppose instead of having it at Enniscorthy it should be at Workford and should be managed as a county workhouse by a body formed of representatives from the four unions concerned?—Personally I should not approve of that, because I don't think the representation would be sufficiently large from each union to be able to give proper attention to it.

19799. Of course they would only have a very small representation from each union. The work would be done with locally at Gorey?—Yes, but the aged and infirm.

19800. That is a class who live rather a haphazard life, and if one of them were to get sick, the idea is not that they should go back to the hospital of their own union, but that they should be treated in the Workford hospital, and Workford would be better off for hospitals; it would have the County Infirmary and the fever hospital and its own sick wards for acute cases, as distinguished from the feeble and infirm—I have not thought about that particular point, so I should not like to give an answer offhand.

19801. It is not open to the objection that there would be no representation; there would be representation?—Yes.

19802. And you would have an opportunity, would you not, of classifying the aged and infirm according to character?—Oh, certainly.

19803. Which is impossible at present?—Yes.

19804. There are some good points in that scheme?—Yes.

19805. And if you furthermore got rid of the cost of three establishments?—I do not see that the cost of the establishments would be so very much reduced.

19806. Gorey would disappear, according to the suggestion made, into an auxiliary asylum. If it were set, there would be no officials there at all, but that part of the workhouse would be useful. Enniscorthy, if it were not devoted to any public purpose, the officials there would cease to have any work to do, except in the sick wards, the same way in New Ross, so you would save absolutely the cost of the three establishments?—Yes, but they would have to be very much the same establishments for the sick.

19807. You would want nobody but the nurse and the doctor?—You would want a head of the establishment.

19808. Is not the doctor the head?—Would you not require someone to take the place of the master?

19809. Oh, no; under the new rules the doctor is the head of the hospital; the nurses are under him. The master has no responsibility except in extraordinary cases of discipline?—The clerk, of course, would have to be provided for.

19810. Presumably you would want a clerk to manage the business side, but the indoor officers you would want would be the relieving officer still. You would get rid of the cost of the master and matron and other paid attendants upon the able-bodied or infirm?—We also thought that this turning Gorey into an auxiliary asylum would be an unnecessary expense. We did not accept Mr. Ennis' figures any more than you did the £1,500 for the alterations.

19811. It was Dr. Bigger who was a little sceptical on that point; but it did seem small, of course?—There is in existence at the present moment a large building, which is the property of the county, which has been taken up for the purpose of generating electric light for the lunatic asylums—large mills—and at the time that that was being considered, the electric lighting scheme, it was brought forward that this building would be used as an auxiliary asylum. I am not in a position to say whether that could be done at a large or a small cost; I have never seen them.

19812. They must be down at the low level of the river?—I cannot say, but naturally, when the water power is taken there.

19813. Now, as regards the classes who are in the workhouse—you were present during the giving of evidence to-day. Have you formed any opinion as to whether the proposed plan for dealing with girls with illegitimate children would be a good one?—I am here as a representative of the Gorey Union, so I cannot say; but, personally, speaking my individual opinion,

I think the scheme that I heard to-day admirable, but what my brother Guardians would think I cannot say.

19814. They have not considered it, but your own personal opinion would be in favour of it?—Very much so. I think anything we can do to keep women who have had only one child apart from the other inmates should be done, and anything to bring up children as useful members of the community should be tried, even if it cost something.

19815. Is it your opinion that they become habituated owing to the present system which puts them with the old offenders?—I could not say whether the present system has any effect one way or another, but common-sense tells me it would tend to do so.

19816. As regards the children under fifteen, children, if this scheme were adopted, would cease to come into workhouses, and therefore would not have to be dealt with. As regards children that are in the workhouse and may have to be dealt with in the future, would you approve of boarding them out?—Where possible I should board them out.

19817. Would you consider it possible or prudent or wise to take these children from their parents and board them away from their parents?—In the case of these illegitimate children, yes.

19818. Would you not hesitate about being in favour of a change in the law to that extent?—No; certainly I should be in favour of it.

19819. As regards inmates and idiots, ought they to be removed from workhouses to your opinion?—Yes, I think so to a very great extent. Of course in Gorey Workhouse, and I presume in others, there are many on the border line who are extremely weak in and about the workhouse.

19820. They do labour on the farm?—Yes.

19821. You have practically got rid of all your in Gorey?—We have very few there; practically none.

19822. They have taken them in at Enniscorthy for you?—No, I don't think we have sent any there lately; four are there, quiet, and useful.

19823. And with the ordinary inmates?—Yes.

19824. As regards vagrants or tramps, what is the view of the Gorey Board on that matter?—The view of the Gorey Board on that matter was that it was too difficult a subject for them to tackle.

19825. Individually, what is your own view?—I have thought over the subject, but I cannot say I have studied it sufficiently to give any opinion.

19826. You heard our discussion this morning. Would you at all go to the extent of depriving these people of their children, and while their children were being supported at the public expense, putting them under restraint in some institution—say a workhouse?—I think taking their children from them would be aggravating the evil very much. When they saw the children well taken care of they simply—

19827. Supposing, as a consequence of taking the children from them, their own liberty was taken from them? If people are so bad that they cannot be trusted with the care of their children, would it be a prudent thing to let them go at large and raise further families?—No, perhaps not; but you cannot keep these people in jails or reformatories, or wherever you like to call it, indefinitely.

19828. Do you think it would be too great a strain to keep them in these institutions, workhouses, as long as their children had to be supported at the public expense, unless the governing body of that institution were willing to try them out with a license to see if they could earn their living honestly?—No, I should not be in favour of that.

19829. You think that would be too great an interference with their liberty?—I think it would.

19830. To what extent would you go in dealing with that vagrant class?—As I said just now, I have not gone sufficiently into the subject to give any opinion that would be worth anything.

19831. In England they have the power of detaining them for relatively a short time?—Yes, a very short time.

19832. And they have not found that at all effective?—No.

19833. Bills have been introduced recently by private members for the establishment of labour colonies or institutions where vagrants can be sent under magistrates' warrants and detained for such time as the law allowed?—I have read of those.

19834. Have you formed any opinion about such institutions?—No, I have not.

19835. The councils, you would not have any to

deal with in Gorse, I fancy—people who are in and out during the year many times?—Oh, no; it is practically a rural population.

18830. You might have a family now and again?—Yes, just one or two.

18831. Then I take it that, with the exception of the women and children and lunatics, your own opinion is that the workhouse ought to go on pretty much as it is?—Yes; but what we were agreed on at Gorse was that, supposing an inquiry it were found that there were too many workhouses in the country for the population, that there should be or might be a general amalgamation of unions irrespective of county boundaries.

18832. In 1850 fifty additional unions were opened owing to the necessity that then existed for more workhouses. Your idea would be to see that number burned in 1850 knocked off, and to revert to the original 100 old unions?—Possibly, something on that general scale.

18833. You have not in the County Wexford any union that was made at that time?—No.

18834. They are all of the old type?—Yes. According as the unions are now they are of the most irregular shapes and sizes. Take the Gorse Union—it winds in and out. There is one part of the Emancipatory Union which is a great deal nearer to Gorse than to Enniscorthy.

18835. Was that the result of following divisions of union at that time?—Yes, I believe so. There is another part of the union nearer to Enniscorthy than it is to Gorse.

18836. But the hardship from such contrivances of boundaries would not be so great as to call for the re-estimation of boundaries if there were no other cause?—No, certainly not. The Gorse Board were against the system of boarding out the aged because they thought there would not be sufficient control exercised over those who were boarded out. In the case of those who had relatives it would be easy enough, but it would be very difficult otherwise to get people to take proper care of those boarded out, and people would be inclined to take those old people on speculation for the sake of the money.

18837. Do you think the old people would not be very sharp and quick about getting the worth of their money? They would not be like little children who would not know their rights?—They would know their rights fast enough, but the question is whether they would get them.

18838. They would take pretty good measures for getting them?—Also there is another thing we have to look at, that several of the aged people have really come down to the workhouse owing to their own failure and faults. If these are let out they will have every temptation to revert to their old failings.

18839. There are a number there owing to poverty only?—Yes; if these could be boarded with their relatives.

18840. You would give outdoor relief as far as you could to these?—Certainly.

18841. I should not fancy that anyone would suggest that thieving people or people with drunken habits should be given outdoor relief?—No.

18842. Is Gorse you contribute to the Oulart Hospital?—Yes.

18843. Do you think you are getting value for your money there?—No, I am quite sure of it.

18850. Have you done anything to try to get value?—Any fever cases in that locality are sent there. The Emancipatory Board have the management of that, but we contribute.

18851. Did it ever occur to you that instead of having a fever hospital it might be turned with advantage into a little village or local hospital for medical and surgical cases, and now that there are comfortable accommodations in existence and good fever hospitals within a reasonable distance, that the fever cases might go to headquarters, and that these hospitals would be more useful and a great deal more availed of as general medical and surgical hospitals for really acute cases?—Yes, I should think that could be very easily done, but I don't know what the terms are by which we are bound to contribute to the Oulart Hospital, but I fancy we cannot withdraw.

18852. Yes, but you would be in favour of a change in the law which would enable you to use these hospitals as ordinary hospitals?—Certainly.

18853. Are there many sick in the union as far as you are aware who decline to come to receive medical or surgical treatment in the existing hospitals?—I don't know.

18854. There is no demand as far as you know for the existence of a medical or a surgical nurse for the sick poor in connection with the dispensary?—It would be, in my opinion and of those who know the living of the poor better than I do, it would be of the very greatest advantage.

18855. They would have the power to have them possibly now?—Not under the existing law.

18856. Are you sure of that? You can in England, but I don't think you can here. It has not been tried, as far as I know, in any case except in the County Kerry. There they have combined the office of midwife and district nurse—put it into the hands of a person who is able to do both. It is the only place that it has been tried so far, and it has been found of wonderful use?—I can quite believe it would be, but I was not aware that under the existing law it could be done. That is a dangerous experiment, because these district nurses would be expected to go to all cases. If they had a maternity case they could not attend anything that would be risky, and they are sufficiently trained in their work not to take up such cases. But then there are a vast number of cases—sprained ankles and things of that sort—in which they could be of the greatest use. They could be of the greatest use in showing the poor how to take advantage of what they can get. I should be very strongly in favour of that.

18857. Dr. BARNES.—Have you considered the question of consumption?—It has not arisen before us, but I think any plan by which the consumptive can be separated from the healthy and put in some central place should be striven out if possible.

18858. Do you think the Board of Guardians would be favourable to such a project?—When you bring these things before the Board of Guardians it becomes very much a case of pounds, shillings, and pence, and unless I knew what the approximate cost would be I should be very sorry to say what they would do.

18859. CHAIRMAN.—They would like to have a broader back than the union?—Certainly.

18860. Dr. BARNES.—But personally you are in favour of it?—Very strongly in favour of it.

Mr. J. D. DOYLE examined.

I am Vice-Chairman of the Gorse Board of Guardians.

18861. CHAIRMAN.—Viscount Stopford has enquired to see the views of the Board of Guardians, but they were strongly opposed to any amalgamation with Enniscorthy?—Under the present circumstances.

18862. If the situation were changed—you heard the different methods proposed of dealing with the various classes which would take out of the existing workhouses practically all the classes except the sick—would you be in favour of such a reduction apart altogether from the question of amalgamation? If there was no amalgamation to be done at all, would you be in favour of leaving the sick at Gorse and taking all the other classes out of the workhouse?—There is one class I would not be in favour of taking out of the workhouse—the patients classed as imbeciles. It is a very wide class.

18863. There are only four there?—You have eight in Gorse, but under the imbeciles we have four, quite

clean and useful, two more quite clean, but suffering from senile decay. Under the second class we had six at the beginning of the year, but four have died, and we have two more left that might die at any moment.

18864. They are in extreme weakness?—Yes, but still they are quiet and clean, and as long as they were able they were useful.

18865. Would you be in favour of keeping that class still?—Of keeping them still.

18866. Not in favour of sending them to an auxiliary asylum or an asylum itself?—No.

18867. What was your reason for thinking that class might be better kept in the workhouse?—Because it would be a cruelty to themselves in the first instance.

18868. Would they not have a better time of it in the asylum or auxiliary asylum?—Then they believe themselves—

18869. They are hardly conscious where they are?—

May 14, 1904.
Mr. J. D.
Dwyer.

There are those who are only just feeble-minded; their mental vigour has been impaired by old age. In the prime of life they were as sane as anybody, and had a normal degree of intelligence. They wish very much to stay where they are. They like to be amongst their friends or the people they are accustomed with.

19370. Is there any other class?—There is one we have, quiet, clean, and intelligent, but subject to epileptic fits, and if it was possible to have a central institution for Limerick or the whole of Ireland, we would be in favour of sending these patients there.

19371. There are only 400 of them in all Ireland?—We have one dirty and helpless that ought to go to the asylum. It was returned here that there were 150 or 147 in the county. Take out of those the first two classes. In all probability there would be only twenty-five or thirty that would be dirty and helpless and objectionable to be kept in the unions. If it is decided that there are too many workhouses in the county for the population, we suggest that there should be a redistribution of unions between this and the neighbouring counties.

19372. That is in the county or in the country. If there are too many unions in Ireland, you would suggest that there should be a reorganisation of boundaries?—Yes, and out of those unions we could get a sufficient number of these real imbeciles to make it worth while to put an institution apart for them. If Goryy is converted into an auxiliary system, it would be hardly worth while employing a full staff to deal with twenty-five or thirty idiots; whereas if we got the idiots from the neighbouring counties it would swell the number sufficiently that they might possibly be kept without any increase in the rates or any large increase.

19373. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Or if the neighbouring counties got them from you?—Or if the neighbouring counties got them from us.

19374. CHAIRMAN.—That would not be as nice?—It would not be as nice, but it would be much cheaper.

19375. What is your view about the aged and infirm? Would you be willing that they should go to the central institution?—The aged and infirm, these are very much prejudiced against going to Enniscorthy. This has been in the papers, and there is a strong opinion about it.

19376. Would they have the same objection to coming to Wexford?—Yes, to going outside the union. The result would be that they would hold on in their present position until they would become ill, then we would have to give them outdoor relief.

19377. You know, some workhouses have been broken up. I myself was present at the closing of two workhouses, and there were most distressing scenes. The poor people cried as if they were leaving their own homes, but I saw them a fortnight and a month afterwards, and they were as happy as ever in the new place; in fact, they were rather better off. One union was put into Mr. Murkaghan's union, and he made them over so much more comfortable than in their own union, and they like it very much?—But if they refuse to come in, supposing the present infirm would go to Enniscorthy, people that are becoming infirm, that would come in if Goryy Union was allowed to go on as it is, they would refuse to come in, and if a doctor's certificate was given that they were incapable of being removed, the result would be that we would have to give them outdoor relief and employ agents. Our nurses' bill has been enormous.

19378. There is no doubt about it if you diminish the number of workhouses you do tend to increase the amount of outdoor relief. Whether that is an advantage or a disadvantage is, of course, a matter of opinion. You think it would be a disadvantage?—I think it would increase our rates very much.

19379. Would you be against increasing outdoor relief? Would you prefer housing the destitute and aged poor in an institution rather than relieve them outside?—Very much. We have to pay from 12s. to £1 for a nurse.

19380. If an infirm person on outdoor relief got sick would not an ambulance be sent to remove them to the nearest institution?—But they would not go.

19381. It has not been found in actual experience that people refuse to go to hospital when they get sick. What is the greatest distance in Goryy Union from the workhouse?—Some points would be twenty miles.

19382. The Goryy people, of course, may have a special regard for the Goryy Hospital, but do you think the people who are living out near Arklow would have the same homely feeling for Goryy Workhouse that the Goryy people would have?—Well, they appear

to have it. There are some people living within half a mile of the union that would not come in; they would die outside.

19383. That is a class that does not impress us, because they won't go, even as it exists at present. But, then, a great many more people get the same idea as these people have at present. Another objection is that we have only three men, four women, and eighteen mothers of children among the able-bodied. These people do the whole work of the house. If we made these a permanent household, and paid for them, we would have to get twenty-five other paid hands to do the work of the infirmary.

19384. I don't agree with you; you would have very few left if all those classes went away from the workhouse?—We might not have to employ twenty-five; we would have to employ some.

19385. You have the nurses already, and instead of the paupers, who are a very undesirable class in hospital institutions, you would have to employ a couple of wardens; would not that be the object of it?—I cannot say. We have thirty-eight men and twenty ladies, women, very feeble people. If these were sent to Enniscorthy, their health is very uncertain, some of these might become ill. It appears the Enniscorthy infirmary is congested; it is not able to carry them, so the result would be they would have to build an additional infirmary to accommodate these people; and if you take into consideration the cost of the additional infirmary for the Goryy people going to Enniscorthy, and take a great many other items—

19386. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—You seem to be assuming that the same condition of things would exist in every other institution. Are you aware that if this scheme is carried out a large number of people would be taken out of Enniscorthy to make room for those who are put into it?

CHAIRMAN.—If the aged and infirm, instead of being treated at Enniscorthy, as suggested by the County Council resolutions, were removed to Wexford?—What would Enniscorthy be utilized for, then?

19387. That is another matter. We will have some opinions from Enniscorthy presently on that?—Do you propose to set aside Goryy Workhouse exclusively for the idiots?

19388. We are not proposing anything. What has been suggested is, that Goryy should be used as an auxiliary lunatic asylum?—For the idiots of the county?

19389. For the county, or, possibly, the same area as is served by the present asylum. In Wexford a county asylum?—As far as I understand, it is.

Mr. EVANS.—Practically it is.

CHAIRMAN.—Then, in all our unions we have waste space. In Goryy we have a considerable amount of waste space.

19390. If girls go out, and children and inmates go out, and children are boarded out, you have a great deal of space in workhouses?—As it is, we have plenty of space.

19391. And, then, if you removed the aged and infirm to a central institution, there would be no reason whatever, according to the suggestions we have received, for retaining the officials who look after the inmates other than the sick?—Then, it has been proposed, also in reference to the Goryy Union, to add a pay ward to the Goryy Infirmary.

19392. You have a great deal of space at Goryy; you have a very large block that lies between the infirmary and the fever hospital, where the night nurses' apartments are at present, that is never used now at all. It is never used now at all; but we made a residence for nursing sisters, and we found it was just as expensive to convert one of these buildings into a residence as it would be to build from the ground. If we laid out some thousands of pounds in creating a ward for paying patients, the result would be, that we would only get odd pensioners from the police or soldiers to occupy it. The farmers have a prejudice against coming into the infirmary. They imagine they are cared better by their own family; and when they are with their own family they are not able to get the advice they require.

19393. Don't you think that feeling is largely giving way before the improvement in hospitals throughout the country; don't you find a great many more people coming in than used to come in?—Not in Goryy. The mind of the farmer would be very uneasy in Goryy Union, because if the farm was at a distance, he would imagine everything was going wrong.

19394. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—All people that have infectious diseases have to go?—Yes; but you need

get a well-to-do person going into the infirmary; if there was an infirmary they would not come. It was suggested to isolate the infirmary from the body of the house, but it could be got over—in its present state, without a disproportionate amount of expense, because it is surrounded by parts of the body of the house.

1902. CHAIRMAN.—That difficulty exists in all workhouses, but it could be got over—in its present state, we don't see what harm it does for patients coming in to walk through the body of the infirmary.

1903. Would you not like to reduce your wards?—Certainly; but this tends to increase the rates.

1904. If a scheme was put before you, worked out in detail, which would result in an improvement and a large reduction in your rates, would you then look on it with a more favourable eye than you now seem disposed to do?—I believe the Guardians would.

1905. Your fear is that those proposals mean increased expense?—Twice the expense.

1906. If you found it meant a large reduction to the sub-payers, would you be disposed to look on it with more favour; I don't say favour exactly; I don't like to say you to give a snap opinion; but would it make a difference in your attitude towards it?—In certain respects, it would.

1907. Your objections would disappear, but your reasons for keeping the people near their friends would still remain?—They would still remain. The fear of an increase in out-door relief and the cost of supplying some of the people who got dangerously ill, would remain; and the reasons we suggested consolidation through the neighbouring counties, as that, if the neighbouring counties were taken in under the scheme, there might be a chance that these schemes would be carried out without increasing too much in expenditure. Then Gory as paying £200 a year to the county infirmary, and for several years past we have sent no patients there. It is as easy to send them to Dublin as to Wexford. In Dublin we have a choice of several hospitals, where there are specialists for each disease.

1908. And you pay for those going to these external hospitals?—Yes; but if we increased the efficiency of Wexford Infirmary, the result would be that we would have, perhaps, one or two doctors that would be experts in certain cases; they would not be very much better than the infirmary doctor at other cases of disease; and the result is that it would only be for what they had the name of being good at that patients afflicted with these diseases would be sent to them, the others would be sent to Dublin still. So, as far as we are concerned, it would be better to allow the existing state of things to go on, that is—patients being sent to Dublin, to whatever hospital we thought suited their case best, than to expend a lot of money in improving the county infirmary.

1909. You think if a person got into the train at Gory it made very little matter whether they went to Dublin or Wexford, and that they would have a larger medical aid in Dublin?—So speak from.

1910. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Still, after all, it is necessary that there should be some efficient institution in the county?—When a county is so near Dublin, I don't think it is necessary.

1911. CHAIRMAN.—Now Bess?—That is not so very far from Dublin as the back parts of Mayo and Galway; there might be some reason, then.

1912. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—While you are so situated that it might be convenient for the people of Gory to go to Dublin, there are other people in the county that are not so conveniently situated. Do you not think there ought to be a high-class institution in the county?—If there was an institution in Waterford it would suit such people, perhaps.

1913. CHAIRMAN.—There is a very good hospital in Waterford?—It was suggested, also, that a patient who enters the hospital loses his rate—would it not be very much easier for an enactment to pass that his name would still remain on the register?

Dr. BUCKER.—He does not lose his vote.

1914. CHAIRMAN.—If he pays for his keep?—But if he does not pay for his keep?

1915. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Do you give much out-door relief in Gory?—About £11 a week.

1916. Do you find it works well?—In some cases, except in the case of old people living by themselves; and, then, when they get sick it is very hard to get a nurse to mind them, and we have no supervision over the nurse. I heard of one case where we paid a woman £1s a week to mind an old man, and the report went round that she used to open the door and look at him once a day, and she was getting £1s a week for that.

1917. If the law was so altered that these people who had to be supported out of the public rates when they got ill were compelled to go into the infirmary, would not that get rid of the difficulty?—Yes, if we could compel them.

1918. It does seem a hardship to have a single person living in a house by themselves having no one to look after them when they are ill?—We had one case lately of an old woman living in a thatched house, the rain pouring in on her, and she was in a state of filth, and still she would not come in; we could not get a nurse to mind her at any price.

1919. Don't you think you would get over the sentimental objection of people to leaving Gory if the Guardians were empowered to board people out?—A great many people come down in the world owing to drink; and if these people were boarded out, the result would be that they would be continually hanging around the nearest publichouse.

1920. There is no need to give them the money direct; could you not give them their board?—I understand that; they would be in the neighbourhood of the publichouse, and spending on everyone that came. The publichouse is a general shop as well as a public-house, and a man is forced to go to the publichouse for goods, and when they get him to the counter they would be appealing to him.

1921. Don't you think the publican would soon stop that?—It depends on the publican, if he was a chronic drinker himself.

1922. Could not the Guardians withdraw the allowance if they found the money going for liquor?—Of course they could.

1923. Banning-out would be an easy method of getting rid of the sentimental objection to sending them to a distance?—Then he would become chargeable on the rates.

1924. CHAIRMAN.—What is your opinion about the tramp?—I think everybody is agreed that labour colonies, such as have been found successful in other countries, that a tramp, once there was evidence to prove that he was a habitual case, should be sent into one of the labour colonies, and made self-supporting, as far as possible.

1925. You would not object to that change in the law?—No.

1926. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Have you many of them about Gory?—There were over 1,500 relieved last year.

1927. CHAIRMAN.—They may have been the same men three or four times?—Yes.

1928. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Do they come singly or with families?—Some come with families, and the families never get any education whatever, moral or otherwise, as the children grow up worse than the parents.

1929. You would be in favour of taking the children from them?—Yes, and preventing them having more children; most of these tramps have very large families.

1930. Four or five?—Seven or eight or ten, in some cases; and a great many of these children have something the matter with them.

1931. Naturally, the poor little creatures getting about in wind and wet weather of all sorts?—They are born lame.

1932. If the workhouse was closed to such a class they would not come near the place?—Then it would be a means of preventing the next generation becoming tramps.

Mr. THOMAS BOLGER, J.P., Ennisceorthy, examined.

1933. CHAIRMAN.—That is the view of the Guardians of the Ennisceorthy Union on the question of amalgamating workhouses generally and as regards those there over?—Well, sir, I will tell what they did some time after this Viceregal Commission was appointed. The idea suggested itself to the Wexford Board

of Guardians to have a conference of the unions of this county. So they got into communication with the unions, and Ennisceorthy sent also delegates, Wexford eight, New Ross 3, and Gory 2, to Ennisceorthy, on the 22nd of last July, for the purpose of considering and debating this subject of amalgamation of unions.

May 18, 1904.

Mr. J. D. Doyle.

Mr. Thomas Bolger.

May 18, 1901
 Mr. Thacker
 Budget.

Lady Maurice FitzGerald, who is here present, was one of the delegates from Wexford, and she was voted to the chair. Lord Stopford stated that the general feeling of Gorey was against amalgamation, and spoke in that strain altogether, as you heard him here to-day. Mr. Dan Newlan, an being our senior member from Enniscorthy, spoke against amalgamation.

19027. The Chairman of the Rural Council?—Yes.

19028. And Mr. Hayes is the Chairman of the Board of Guardians?—He is not here. Mr. Murphy, I believe, of the Wexford Board of Guardians, followed in the same strain, and Mr. Collier, for New Ross.

19029. They all agreed with Lord Stopford?—Yes. There were twenty-two present, and eighteen voted against amalgamation and four for; so that was the opinion of the majority of the county. They brought forward the following resolutions, which were passed unanimously:—"That imbeciles and epileptics should be transferred to some suitable institution, and separately treated, provided a capitation grant of 6s. per head be obtained for maintenance." "That all children over two years of age should be boarded out to nurse, as far as the Guardians of the different unions think fit." "That the blind should be a State charge, and supported by some central institution, with the exception of the old and infirm." "That vagrants should be sent to reformatories, and instructed in industries; that the provisions of 5 George IV., cap. 63, conferring power on police constables to arrest for offences set forth in sec. 4 of that Act, should be extended to Ireland." "That the law regarding out-door relief be changed, and that the occupants of labourers' cottages and widows with one child be entitled to outdoor relief." These resolutions were sent to you.

They were unanimously passed; but I think I would agree with the County Council, that Gorey should be made an auxiliary asylum for the admission of lunatics or the insane epileptics of the county. I believe there are 128 in the County Wexford. As regards the resolution, that all children over two years should be boarded out to nurse, that was the unanimous opinion, but at that time, probably, we had not considered it. Since then, as far as I am myself concerned, I gave it a good deal of consideration, and went through the workhouse to see, and I must say, as far as I can see, the children are splendidly cared in the workhouses; they are clean and well-cared, and look very well, and there are almost eighty children in the workhouse in Enniscorthy; they have good teachers, and seem to be in the best of health. If they were boarded out, I question whether they would be so well cared for. There is this difference—that a child reared in a workhouse considers it as his home; it looks back to it, naturally, as we sit in a house we were reared; if we could rid them of that idea, and it had no bad effects afterwards, I would prefer that to boarding them out; but we have had no experience up to the present in our own union.

19030. Are you sure you have had no experience of that in your own union—are you sure none of the girls have come back to be mothers?—The last thirteen years there have been 100 children hired out, and only five of those returned.

19031. At what age would they be hired out?—At fourteen. I suppose. But I saw a girl myself—a very fine girl—and she was hired out by a farmer, and she came in in three days wearing crying; she was sent out again, and she came back again from four or five miles away. It was her home. I don't know whether that fine girl is there yet; but that feeling has to be got over, and boarding out might get over it.

19032. Have you ever heard any opinion expressed by the people who get the hired-out children as to whether they were handy or useful about the place?—In some cases they turn out very good.

19033. Are they found useful and handy coming out of an institution; are they found as handy and useful about a house or farm or place as children who would be reared in the country?—They are not; I know that.

19034. Do you think, then, that that would not be rather an argument in favour of boarding out?—I think it would. That is what I am debating with myself about.

19035. If a girl or a boy is not useful about a farm, he or she will not get on as well?—No; that is what I have been debating with myself.

19036. You have not made up your mind?—You could hardly tell. When you see how clean they are in the houses, and then when you see them in the farmers' houses, not so clean and tidy.

19037. Are you speaking of one occasion that you saw them in the workhouse?—No, several times; I made it my special care since that.

19038. Who are the workers there?—The men for the females.

19039. And the boys?—They are under a National teacher.

19040. Did you find them looking as clean?—Yes. There is a master, a woman, the master is a magnificent master—a better to troops. But as to expressing an opinion, if I thought they were as well treated outside and sent to school, even though it cost a little more in the rates—

19041. It costs a great deal less to board them out?—I find here that in Enniscorthy they only cost 2s. 6d. a week, the children.

19042. That is only for their bare food?—We might try it in Enniscorthy. There is no reason why we should not give it a trial, but having no experience of it, I cannot say. The children I saw in Enniscorthy were splendid, but still if the longing for the workhouse remained it is not desirable, and I would prefer to have them boarded out, if you could get any place where they could be sent to school and educated and brought up.

19043. They are sent to the house where they are boarded out, and they go from that house to the National school—no union clothes?—Yes, in that case I would prefer it, but what age would you suggest?

19044. As soon as they are able to use their teeth; say a couple of years old—I think it would work in this way. If you happened in the first case to get them out in suitable places, if the first five or six got boarded out went on very well, you would have no difficulty in getting people to take them out, because they would be useful to the people themselves.

19045. The evidence we got all over the country is that these children go to families, and they become members of the families. The payment ceased after a fixed time, and the child remains, and there are hundreds of families in the country, I venture to say, now supported by the earnings of their foster children?—Very well, I would be in favour of that.

19046. In Belfast very large numbers of children are boarded out, and they go to work as half-timers, and their wages go to the support of their foster parents?—As regards the plan Mr. Pascoda referred to—

19047. The last suggestion made that they should be sent to a central institution seems a kindly and prudent arrangement?—Oh, yes, it does. I would be in favour of that.

19048. Now the vagrants?—Well, there is nothing I can possibly say against tramps but I am prepared to say it and do away with them.

19049. I believe it is a fact that the County Wexford is specially tormented by tramps?—So it is; there are not many about Oneght, Mister.

19050. Why?—On account of our good nature and gentleness in Wexford we are preyed upon.

19051. We have met in our drives about the country large families moving about in that way, and certainly we have not seen as many tramps moving about in other parts of Ireland as here?—They are a curse to the country, demoralising it in every way, and they won't work. They levy blackmail in the country places. I know it myself. I live in the country. They go in twos, for it is very nice to have someone to talk to. There are some very fine young fellows, but they get that down look that comes from their occupation, and that suits them all to pieces in levying blackmail when there are only women in the home. There is not labour enough in the country, and they demoralise young fellows. The boys will say: "Well, look at these fellows knocking it out, and we are killed working at 2d. or 10d. a day." And in that sense they will demoralise the people to some extent. Are they not parasites taking the life-blood out of the country?

19052. Feeding on the body corporate without giving anything in return?—They are ghosts on the living. Whatever possibly can be done should be done to do away with these tramps, but it is the opinion of everyone in the County Wexford and of everyone in Ireland that a man should be made earn his own bread. It is taking from the wealth of the country; it is labour creates wealth. We have not labour enough in the country. If I could add the speemen and other boys in the towns I would be very glad to add them. Last harvest at a twelvemonth the harvest was very late. We had not any help, and these speemen got together in bodies where a poor farmer could not afford to pay more than the ordinary wage to take up the crop. They asked 6s. and 6s. a day.

19031. Did they do any work?—They would work a few hours on the day for St. No matter what way you look at the tramp, he is a curse in the country; he is no use, and should be put down.

19034. You are speaking altogether of these people that go marching around the road. You are not speaking of the poor old people that are in every parish more or less; they have a welcome?—They have a welcome every place. They have given the best part of their life to enrich people of the country, have worked around for them. They are always welcome—a part of Irish life that we don't want to get out of at all. They remind us of the days of old, when they had to sell to the monasteries and places for alms.

19035. They are all decent, poor people?—Yes.

19036. Outdoor relief?—It is hard to speak about outdoor relief. Of course, I would be for giving the deserving person outdoor relief.

19037. Do you find outdoor relief has gone up at all since it was made a union charge, or is it about the same?—It is about the same. It is not very large, but I would have it a union charge for many reasons. I live in Milltown, which is at Farna. I live in a division which is only 6d. in the 8, while Farna was 2s. 6d. or 2s. 7d.

19038. What is your uniform rate now?—Is 7d.

19039. That has hit you?—Yes, but it is this way—there are only fifteen farmers in the Farna division. They had to pay rates for the poor of the whole country that congregate in Farna from the country.

19040. And the shopkeepers?—Yes, but twelve shopkeepers. I think it is fair to have a union charge.

19041. It has hit you hard, but you think it fair?—Certainly.

19042. Would you be in favour of a large extension of outdoor relief? Would you be in favour, as some of the witnesses said to-day, of extending it to all deserving poor people who could be treated outside?—Certainly, but I am afraid both the relieving officers and the Guardians have been played on by underserving cases.

19043. You think they are a bit too soft in Wexford?—I do. It is £365 a week in Ennisceorthy, it is only £11 in Gorey, and Gorey is half the size of Ennisceorthy, so we should pay only £22. I think there should be dispensary committees or district bodies for the distribution of outdoor relief.

19044. Mr. MURPHY.—Would you approve of the suggestion made by Mr. Norris in regard to that?—I would thoroughly approve of that. The relieving officer has to do his duty. The Guardians are too cowardly in a great many instances; they are afraid to stop it.

19045. CHAIRMAN.—Would you say cowardly or soft-hearted?—Between the two; some one and some the other. I could give you several cases where people got outdoor relief who did not deserve it.

19046. What would be the circumstances of the people who got it and did not deserve it, without

mentioning names?—I know a young widow woman and she had a fine young fellow, a son. She was married very young. She had 2s. a week, and it helped her to rear this fellow till. He came to work with me, and I gave him 12s. a week. She will stick on to the 2s. My brother offered her 1s. a day to fill socks for him. She would not take it, and we struck off the sock. The son remained idle to see could he compel us to give the relief. We kept the relief away from her, and now she is better off and the son is better off.

19047. That was a very proper action of yours?—I think so.

19048. Do you know any cases in which the people are still getting outdoor relief who ought not?—I have heard the general cry. I only give you cases I know; I know three.

19049. In those three cases was the relief stopped?—It was and is stopped.

19050. I thought you referred to cases in which it was not stopped; it was going on improperly?—It is stopped in those three cases.

19051. That only shows you are administering it well?—I know it helps to demoralise the people in some way to come into the town—1s. 6d. or 2s. going into the house on a Saturday night with the relieving officer, and in a great many cases it is drunk when it goes in. A great many of the girls here won't work for you. Of course they will in Balfin or Omagh, for there are factories there; there are none here.

19052. Are you in favour of the resolution passed that the occupants of labourers' cottages should be eligible, if other circumstances required it, for outdoor relief?—Only what the relieving officer would give provisionally, or it would induce them to sponge on the ratepayers.

19053. These people in the labourers' cottages, of course, are liable to pay rent?—Yes.

19054. If they were getting outdoor relief, presumably they would be destitute and unable to pay their rent?—Yes, the people in labourers' cottages. In the first place they deserve them, they have agitated for them, and the State has given them to them. It is £150 given as a free gift to the labouring man.

19055. What about the rent?—The rent comes back, but as a general rule in Wexford it takes that to keep the house in repair. He pays about 8d. a week, and we pay 2s. a week and the rates.

19056. You are giving him £5 a year as a present and a good house all in one slap. If you commence giving outdoor relief there are clever dodges everywhere who will be able to get the outdoor relief and the house as well?—I would give provisional relief wherever necessary.

19057. And hold the relieving officer responsible for giving it in proper cases?—Certainly. Whoever suggested the idea about the fallen women I quite approve of that. It is the best plan I have heard yet as regards them.

Mr. DANIEL NEWLAN examined.

19070. CHAIRMAN.—You are, I believe, the senior member of the Ennisceorthy Board?—I suppose I am near it.

19071. How long ago is it since you were a member first?—I don't suppose it is more than seventeen or eighteen years—I am not certain. I remember Ennisceorthy a very long time.

19072. You were at the meeting in Ennisceorthy—the Poor Law Conference?—Yes.

19073. Do you agree pretty much with the evidence of Mr. Bolger?—I did not hear all his evidence; I am very deaf.

19074. What is your own view about breaking up the unions and closing the workhouses?—I have got nothing to say as regards other unions, only the union I am acquainted with myself—Ennisceorthy.

19075. What is your opinion about Ennisceorthy Union?—That it would not be right to break it up. A very large number of country people who are reduced in circumstances flock into Ennisceorthy.

19076. Would it be unfair to ask people who are sick to go further?—To the hospitals in Wexford and Gorey; I cannot see how you could remove them. We have no one in the workhouse only the old people, generally speaking, except the girls, some of whom are committed themselves.

19077. What would be the best thing to do with these girls?—If you had a house that you could send them to, such as the Magdalen Convent, New Ross, where they would be made men their living; but in the present state of the law we cannot do that.

19078. What would you recommend? An amendment of the law that would enable you to do that?—Yes; I would see that they had a proper supervision over them in such a place.

19079. If they were placed under religious bodies in these institutions you would approve of that?—Yes, I would.

19080. That is what you meant?—It is, but at the same time they are very well looked after in Ennisceorthy so far, because we have a most respectable staff, and have to be subject to the rules, and they must concede to the rules, or be prosecuted, and they have very good examples at the same time. They are people who should not be allowed to go into the towns.

19081. But they do go, now they can take their discharges?—Oh, of course.

19082. And that is bad, you think?—I would not allow them back to the same locality at all, except. They should go to some other part of the union, but I would rather see them remain in.

19083. What is your opinion about the children in

May 18, 1904.
Mr. Twiss
Bolger.

Mr. Daniel
Newlan.

May 18, 1904.

Mr. Deane
Nelson.

the workhouse?—I would not approve of boarding them out to nurse, that is, indiscriminately, except you get suitable persons to take charge of them and in a position to treat them as they ought to be treated.

19992. Good milk?—Yes, and circumstanced in such a way that they could keep them regularly at school.

19993. If they got good food and good schooling outside at a moderate cost would you be in favour of boarding them out?—I am not aware of any place where they would have a chance of getting a school equal to what they are getting in the workhouse at the present time. So far as the girls are concerned, they have as good a school as there is in Ireland, in charge of the nurse, with a lay assistant teacher under them. In fact, they are taught everything in that school—taught cooking, washing, making clothes, and scrubbing.

19994. You think that as they get such good treatment in Ennisworthy Workhouse, you would be unwilling to run the risk of boarding them out?—I would not get the chance of getting persons suitable to take them out. I don't know who the person is that would take out the children that could afford to do the things I would require them to do, or have the accommodation or be circumstanced so as to send them regularly to school. As soon as they are able to speak and walk they can go to the school in the union. It is a first-class school, and the girls there compare very favourably with the girls outside.

19995. At Ennisworthy you have never boarded out any children?—Yes, I saw a couple come in there, and they were decrepit—a couple of infants.

19996. I say you have no children boarded out?—No; there were a couple out at nurse, and I saw them in the infirmary.

19997. What age were they?—I think a year and a-half old.

19998. They might have been sent out a little bit too soon?—They were not properly minded. You have not the accommodation outside. There are unsanitary houses.

19999. You would not want to give them better houses than the ordinary run of poor people in the country?—With the ordinary run of poor people in the country there is scarcely a house they have at the present time but is condemned by the doctor except the union cottages.

20000. Supposing that all the houses might be unsanitary, you would not propose that the poor little waifs and strays in the workhouse should get better treatment than the children of the workhouse outside?—I don't suppose they would, but the people who would be taking them, if they meant to treat them properly, would not take them at all; it is only to make money by them themselves.

20001. Would you be astonished to hear that great numbers of children are boarded out in other unions? They board out all the children they can, and those children get greatly attached to their foster parents, and the foster parents get greatly attached to the children, and the earnings of the children in after-life go to the foster parents?—That may be so. I know some instances myself, but at the same time they would not have the opportunity of getting the education outside.

20002. Don't you think we are perhaps getting too much education in a small way? What education would you want them to have?—A thorough religious education. I would not allow them out until they were confirmed.

20003. Poor people's children outside get confirmed and go to school?—I find they are not as intelligent as the girls inside. We have hired out a large number of children, and I scarcely know one of them ever to come back to my knowledge. I heard evidence here that girls were not as useful, but I know very good girls entirely coming from the workhouse, and I found they were more competent because they were

better educated, and it was easier to learn them to be useful.

20004. Have you had any of these girls in your own house at all?—Never, but they are in the locality with me at the present time.

20005. What do you think about the tramps?—They are not nearly as bad as they were years ago.

20006. They are getting better now?—No, but they are allowed to get lodgings in the workhouse, and formerly there used to be a great many robberies committed, and these were accused, and I suppose properly accused for them.

20007. There is less trouble with the tramps than there used to be?—In the locality.

20008. Whereabouts is your locality?—Two miles from Ennisworthy, on the east side of the river.

20009. Do you think there is any necessity for doing anything at all about the tramps, or would you just go on as you are?—I suppose they should be prosecuted if they did any injury. I cannot see what can be done with tramps. They are allowed in Ennisworthy to stop in the workhouse, but they have to earn almost what they get through breaking stones. There are not so many of them as a few years past. Formerly they were not allowed in Ennisworthy at all. At that time, though, they were very disagreeable through the country.

20010. Is there anything else that we have not asked you that you would like to mention?—You were not asking me anything about the idiots.

20011. Would you keep the lunatics and idiots and imbeciles in the workhouse, or should they go to some institution specially kept for brackies?—I think if there was an auxiliary asylum, but it is my opinion every more increases the rates, and probably they would be no better there. As far as the male idiots in Ennisworthy, they are very well off.

20012. You think every change makes more noise?—Certainly, that is my experience.

20013. If you saw a change that resulted in economy, what would you think?—I would approve of it, if there was not unnecessary hardship attached to it. If there was, I would not approve of it, and I think there would be unnecessary hardship attached by moving persons from one union to another, and of course entailing greater cost.

20014. How do you think the greater cost would arise?—Removing them. You have to treat them in whatever place you send them in and find attendance for them, the same as where they are at the present time, and probably not have as good attendance.

20015. If you had one set of attendants instead of four, would not that be economy?—You have to have a certain amount of attendants for a certain number of patients.

20016. But not to have four times as many as in one place?—In Ennisworthy Union you have as attendants for them, except the nurses, and they are in charge of the nurse; there are no special keepers there, and they appear to be as well off as possible, even the inspector gave it down that he did not see what was required.

20017. You have a good many in Ennisworthy between forty and forty-five?—Yes, and that would cost £450, if you change them to an auxiliary asylum, over and above the extra expenditure. They cost the union of Ennisworthy, at the present time, £15 a year, and, I suppose, in Ennisworthy Asylum the inmates there cost £25, so that we would have to pay 20 sh. out of the rates for each insane person. We could not approve much of that, and have them no better in the end. You would support them, probably, as better than they are at present, and go to the expense of keeping and preparing accommodation and everything in connection with them to get the asylum going. I would have wards set apart for patients willing to pay; and long since the hospital in Ennisworthy would have been arranged in that way only amalgamation in the county was talked about, and the Guardians did not think well of going on with it.

Mr. M. J. WHELAN, Relieving Officer, examined.

Mr. H. J.
Whelan.

20018. CHAIRMAN.—You spend about £2,000 a year in the union on relief?—Yes; on the whole union.

20019. How many relieving officers are there?—Three.

20020. What is your district?—Ennisworthy town, I come to the bounds of the Ross and Carlow Unions; about twelve and a half and ten miles to the bounds of the Wickford Union at Oulart.

May 18, 1904.
Mr. M. J.
Wheeler.

20023. What is your greatest distance?—About twelve miles to Palace Station. The extent of my district is over 80,000 acres, and it includes two-thirds of the population of the whole union.

20024. You visit the people regularly?—Yes, always, on a week. The average cost in Enniscorthy town is 1s. 2d.

20025. How long have you been relieving distress?—Thirteen years.

20026. How much was spent in out-door relief thirteen years ago, if you know, on the whole union? I would like to know that?—I would say 24s.

20027. And how much in your own district?—That would be about £25 or £27. It is now £22.

20028. Has poverty increased since then, or is it that there is more generous dealing with applications?—I could answer both ways. I think there is a little more poverty.

20029. What class of people chiefly are on your out-door relief list?—Sixty per cent. of the cases of out-door relief with me are old widows or old single women, and old men twenty-three or twenty-five per cent.

20030. Are they single?—Some of them married, old ones, old men with wives, and seven per cent. are on temporary allowances; and ten per cent. as even as possible, are able-bodied widows, with two or more children.

20031. Do you find much hardship resulting from not being able to relieve widows with one child?—I have met with extraordinary cases of hardship of that kind, and they are obliged to go into the house. It has to be accepted, because in most cases the child is too young for the mother to go to work.

20032. Do you think it would be a proper and humane thing to extend the out-door relief to that class?—I do.

20033. In any other class?—I don't think so. People in labourers' cottages are in receipt now of relief, as the rent they pay does not repay the full interest on loans. Comparing the relief, the average per head in Enniscorthy is 1s. 2d., and the average for the whole union is 1s. 9d. The people in Enniscorthy only receive about two-thirds compared with the rural districts, but the majority of these old women live more or less by begging from door to door and shop to shop.

20034. And it is to supplement that begging the money is given?—Yes; I mean the amount the Guardians give does not support them; it could not possibly support them.

20035. Does it pay their rent for them?—That is just it. When we have an application for out-door relief from a poor person, they come before the board, and if they don't get something they must come into the workhouse, and what the Guardians give them barely keeps them out. Just one remark. I don't know whether I have any right to mention it?—Mr. Doyle speaks about the cost of nurses in Garry for people who would not come in. I speak from an experience of thirteen years in Enniscorthy, and I have only had about six nurses during that time for old people who refused to come in. Of course, I don't speak of temporary nurses, for sudden illnesses of young people.

20036. When you began first, was there much employment of nurses?—I would not say so.

20037. At present, how much is paid by you in your district per year for nursing; if you did employ them they would have to stay on for a few weeks?—The case Mr. Doyle referred to was until death.

20038. They would stay on for a few weeks?—Yes; two or three weeks.

20039. At how much a week?—It varies very much. From 5s. to 12s.; in one case I gave 15s. for contagious disease more.

20040. Say, 5s. at three weeks, 25s., and six times that would not come to a £10 note?—It would not be a consideration at all, in my mind; and, then, if the hospitals were improved, perhaps, these very people would come in. You have to use all sort of tact to get them in at present.

20041. And the nurse of a hospital?—Yes, of course; if they were better treated.

20042. Do you think it would be much use to have a dispensary nurse, who would act under the doctor—either here and there in the sick in the dispensary district?—In Enniscorthy we don't require that; we have nursing sisters.

20043. Do they go through the town?—Yes.

20044. They don't go through the country?—No, except short distances out.

20045. In the country would they be much use to you?—I don't think so; the cases are very exceptional and far away from each other.

20046. In each of your districts is there a qualified midwife?—Yes. And speaking of the hired-out children, I must say I visit those. There are thirteen of them at present, and speaking to the people who had them employed as late as last Sunday, all were highly delighted with them except in one case, and in that they complained of the boy's eyes being weak, but with the exception of that case they were pleased with them. They were three girls and ten boys. Then with regard to district bodies distributing outdoor relief, I think the existing system would be as good as that or better.

20047. Dispensary committees?—I believe the Chairman, in answer to you, said something about giving it partly from deed and partly from good-heartedness. There would be much more dread with a local body.

20048. Much more softness?—Yes, with nearer neighbours. I find when I bring up a case of relief from Enniscorthy I have all the country Guardians jumping up against it, and there are only four Guardians from Enniscorthy.

20049. Is relief often given in opposition to your opinion?—No, it is never given in opposition to my opinion, and I have never given it against the advice of the Guardians, even provisionally.

20050. Do you mean to say you never have any difference of opinion whether relief should be given?—Practically no difference. It is my interest as an officer. The less cases I have the less work I have to do, and in all reason I try to keep it down, unless the case is very deserving.

20051. You have a good number of cases?—Yes, but they are all getting as little as possible, and 50 per cent. of them should go into the workhouse if they did not get it.

20052. They never struck the relief off to see would that happen?—No, they never put on that test. I need about it in Garry. If a person is destitute and is 2s. keeps him out of the workhouse, it is a great saving.

20053. Of course that would not support them?—That is the average in Enniscorthy.

20054. What rent would they pay?—5s. or 1s. a week.

20055. Dr. Broome.—How do you admit to the workhouse?—I have no authority to admit to the workhouse.

20056. Do you give tickets?—Yes, only to tramps.

20057. The tickets are printed; do you leave these wholesale to be distributed?—When I have to go away to the country to visit recipients of outdoor relief.

20058. So that a person has nothing to do but just call for a ticket?—Yes, a tramp, but only for the night.

20059. Are you in business in Enniscorthy?—No.

20060. CHAIRMAN.—Do you mean to say that you have tickets signed?—No, I leave printed ones.

20061. Kindly wait until I have asked the question. You cannot answer a question before it is asked. Have you ever left signed tickets for people to take from your house for admission to the house?—I have, for tramps.

20062. How do you know what they were? Were you there when they got them? Was your name signed or printed to these tickets?—Printed. May I explain how that came? It may seem rather a queer thing. The tickets were run out, and I gave orders to the printer to print them—the "Echo" in Enniscorthy. And the very week after I gave those orders the press was burned out, so I got a ticket from the workhouse, as a sample, and I crossed out the name that the ticket was filled for, but I did not cross out my own name, and they printed the ticket from that.

20063. Dr. Broome.—It did not prevent your using them?—It did not for the week until I saw the difference.

20064. CHAIRMAN.—It was only used for a week?—A fortnight, I think.

20065. Dr. Broome.—You think it might not have gone on longer if we had not been there?—Possibly, if I did not see the harm.

20066. CHAIRMAN.—Before you got these printed tickets, did you leave them signed behind you?—I have on three or four occasions for tramps.

20067. How do you know for tramps?—The persons I would give these to would know. It is impossible to do a large district like mine, to go out to a case and inspect it, or do any sanitary work and remove a person in the van without leaving them with somebody.

20068. Could you not leave it to the master?—Yes, I do believe that.

May 18, 1904.

Mr. William
Thorne.

Mr. WILLIAM THORNE examined.

20067. CHAIRMAN.—You are one of the Chairmen of the New Ross Board of Guardians?—I am Vice-Chairman of the District Council.

20068. Are you often present at meetings of the Board of Guardians?—Yes, very often.

20069. What is your view, the view of the Guardians, about the amalgamation of the New Ross Workhouse?—They are decidedly against the breaking up of the New Ross Union; in fact, they think it impossible it can be done without, as beyond New Ross there is a stretch of country down to the Hook, twenty-two miles. In fact, they were so sure it could not be done without, that they took very little notice about this Commission; they felt perfectly safe.

20070. I suppose there is a good deal of population south of Dunsmut?—Yes, Fethard and Churchtown. There are villages there. Of course the land is very narrow.

20071. Do many of these people come into the New Ross Workhouse?—They do; the van is down there very often.

20072. I suppose once they get into the van at Churchtown it would not make much matter whether they went to Wexford or Ross?—I am not aware of the distance to Wexford.

20073. It would not be much in the distance?—I think the distance to New Ross is very little nearer than to Wexford—about five miles, perhaps.

20074. So that that part of the union would not suffer so much. Is there any other part of the union that would suffer as much?—Then on the Kilkenny side.

20075. How far up do you go there?—Glennare. The River is on the Thomastown side.

20076. Is the River in New Ross Union?—Yes.

20077. Is it practically as near Thomastown as New Ross?—I would say it is about that; then we come on towards Glennare.

20078. How far is that from Rosbercon?—About eight miles.

20079. Then it is not more than that from Waterford?—No, it is about halfway.

20080. Is there any other part of the union you think would be injured by having to go to another place?—Well, there are the furthest points. Of course all the union is against changing from New Ross.

20081. What other reasons have the Guardians for objecting to the breaking up of the union except the reasons given on the ground of distance?—They would not like to have the sick poor going away.

20082. Supposing the sick were well treated at New Ross and only the aged and infirm?—They would not like to have the infirm going away.

20083. On what ground would they be against that?—The inconvenience to the people going so far out of their own locality where they had been reared. When I speak of the infirm I speak of the industrious people; we would not consider the others.

20084. You mean the decent old people who worked?—Yes, who worked while they were able to work.

20085. Your objection is to take them away from their own neighbourhood?—Yes, and they are nearly all buried in their native graveyards.

20086. Are those many buried in the union graveyard?—A fair share, but mostly people with nobody belonging to them.

20087. You mean all their relatives have died?—Yes, or perhaps gone to America.

20088. As regards people like that who have no friends in the country, do you see any objection to removing them to another centre?—Personally I could not see any, but the people themselves would object and the feeling of the Guardians is against amalgamation altogether.

20089. As regards those who come into the workhouse to have children, were you here when the evidence was given on that matter earlier in the day?—I was here when Mr. Ennis was giving his evidence.

20090. What do you think about the suggestion that was discussed then?—I think it a very good one. The only thing I am in doubt about is whether I would take very strong measures with those at first. I certainly would take the first child from them.

20091. If that girl went back to ordinary life and fell again?—Then I would put her under restraint in some working institution.

20092. The first time what would you do?—I would take the child from her and let her go back to her native district.

20093. Do you think that in Ireland there is not a feeling that would make it very unhappy and miserable for that girl to go back home even if they were willing to accept her? Is there not a feeling against such a fault that would make it unreasonable for the girl?—There is, and I think it right so, but I have known several girls that are working in the district and the mothers are rearing the children for them.

20094. It is known there that the poor girl fell?—Yes.

20095. Do you think that is not a drawback to the girl's welfare in life, that her fall is known? Do you not think it would be better if she were employed far away from her own home, where there would not be this to be thrown up to her or known about her?—I think that she is less likely to go wrong again in the midst of her own people. She would be much more ashamed.

20096. Will she ever hold up her head again properly?—I have known those to do it.

20097. Would she ever be married?—Some of them, not others.

20098. As regards the first fall, you would do nothing except let the girl go home again?—I would not like to take very strong measures about the first.

20099. Would you regard that as a strong measure in the sense of being a stern measure?—I don't think she would consider it in that light.

20100. Would you not rather look upon it as a very kind measure altogether in the interests of the poor girl and her child?—She would be taken away from her own neighbourhood.

20101. The position would be that she would go to this refuge, where efforts would be made to turn her up to a fresh start, and the child would be boarded out for her. She still would have the right to go the child if she could support it?—I certainly think it would be a good idea if it would not be so regrettable to them girls, but I am afraid they would be inclined to do something to conceal the kids of the child if they were forced to go to these institutions.

20102. Do you think they would not prefer to go to an institution of this kind where their fall would be practically unknown rather than go to the workhouse, where they would be mingling with the same class and worse?—I think it would be very much better for them.

20103. Then you really don't think it would be a hard measure?—I think they would consider it so.

20104. Have you had much experience in New Ross of boarding out children?—We board out all we are allowed.

20105. What is your opinion of the result?—We are unanimous in wishing to have power to board all every child in the union. We have twenty-seven boarded out at present.

20106. I thought you had about forty?—That is the return I got yesterday.

20107. About the lunatics, idiots, and epileptics, would you have them removed to a central institution specially for lunatics, or would you have them left in the workhouse?—I think there is no place they will be done as cheaply as in the workhouse, but it is not suitable for a good deal of the imbeciles.

20108. What would you do on the whole?—If there was a central institution and the expense not too great, I would recommend they would be treated there, but any that could be suitably treated in the workhouse, I think it is the cheapest place from the taxpayer's point of view.

20109. Now the tramps?—We are as strong as we can against the tramps; in fact, I would agree with Mr. Belger's evidence on that line. I think the children should be taken from the tramps.

20110. So as to prevent the perpetration of the class?—Yes, at present the system is only multiplying paupers.

20111. Is there anything that I have not asked you that it occurs to you to say?—Our outdoor relief in 1897 was £26 10s. a week, now it is £55 14s.

20112. What do you attribute that to?—Primarily to union rating.

20113. You think the Guardians are more willing to grant applications when the case comes off the board

union?—Certainly. The people in one district won't know when a Guardian is asking for relief for persons in another district whether it is an extreme case of hardship or not, and they always go on the safe side and grant it.

20114. It is put forward as a case of hardship by the local people?—Yes, and the Guardians that don't know the difference let it through.

20115. Mr. MURMAGHAN.—Does not a good deal depend on the relieving officer and his report?—The relieving officers are always guided a little by the Guardians.

20116. Don't they make their reports independently?—Certainly; a relieving officer will make a report that this man is in want of outdoor relief, and they can either vote 2s. 6d. or 2s. or 1s. 6d. as the case may be. But the fact remains it has gone up since we had union rating.

20117. CHAIRMAN.—Do you make any suggestion about that?—I think we ought to go back to divisional relief.

20118. You are a country Guardian?—Certainly.

20119. Now the New Ross Town Guardians would not approve of that?—No, but then we had a rate in aid in former times.

20120. For a highly added part of the union?—I think it would be only fair where the country population drift into towns that there should be even a mere liberal rate in aid than they had formerly.

20121. You don't want the indoor paupers made disincorporated charges?—I would make all charges as far as possible on the division, or they might not be on as small a district as the division, but smaller districts than they are at present. Some of the dispensary districts were very large and very crooked.

20122. Mr. MURMAGHAN.—The people of the dispensary district know the needs very much of their own particular part of the country?—No, some of our dispensary districts are most awkward. There is one nine miles long. We would not know at the lower end whether the people at the other end were badly in want or not.

20123. Did you hear the suggestion of the first witness with regard to having relief committees appointed by the Guardians? What do you think of it?—It would be a move in the right direction, but I don't think it would be as good as to have the charge directly made to the district.

20124. A fixed charge on the particular area?—No, but to give outdoor relief as formerly, and the other charges, to go back in that respect, I think it would tend to decrease the rates.

Mr P. A. Pees, Clerk, New Ross Union, examined.

I can only give you my own personal views.

20125. CHAIRMAN.—We shall be very glad to hear them. We know what experience you have had in the matter. You have been present all day and heard a good many new suggestions, perhaps?—Yes.

20126. Will you tell us generally how these suggestions have affected your view?—I would prefer you would ask me questions.

20127. About the workhouse itself, what would your view be about closing up the workhouse except so far as leaving provision for the sick?—I would be very much in favour of closing all the workhouse if possible. If you had 100 instead of 150 or 160 that would be about the right thing.

20128. Supposing you closed practically all the workhouses except for the sick, closed the workhouses so far as making these places where a large number of different classes are kept together; suppose you sent the different classes to different institutions instead of keeping open an institution here in each union for all the classes of that district?—It would be an admirable idea to separate them. The present system is not at all open to be admired.

20129. You don't think it good to have the various classes together?—No; I would send the children away as soon as possible.

20130. Would you admit the mothers at all into the workhouse, or would you prefer dealing with them in some place where a religious body would have charge of them?—That would be my idea.

20131. Then the child would never enter the workhouse?—No; I would have no contact at all with the workhouse on the part of the child.

20132. Then women and girls would never enter the workhouse—that would wipe out the children after the present inmates are dealt with—lunatics, idiots, and epileptics?—They should not be in the workhouse at all.

20128. Still, following the electoral division charge, you think the dispensary committee would be preferable to the existing body, the Guardians?—It would, if you got the right men on it.

20129. Would not that be a consideration for the Guardians to pick the right men?—Yes.

20130. CHAIRMAN.—Would you have the elected Guardians of the district the only members of the committee, or would you add some others to it?—The elected Guardians of the district ought to be enough as proposed to pick from, but it would be well to have the clergymen on that relief committee as well.

20131. You would leave that optional with the Guardians?—It would be a good thing.

20132. Mr. MURMAGHAN.—You say the cost of maintenance in the workhouse is much less than the cost of maintenance in the asylum, notwithstanding the capitation grant? Have you gone into the figures with respect to that matter?—Not very much.

20133. Because perhaps it may interest you to know that the average cost of an inmate in an asylum in Ireland is something like £36 a year; in an institution that I know something about it is £34; in some it goes as high as £38 or £39, but a fair average would be £35. Now the average cost of maintenance in a workhouse is £17. If you get £10 as a capitation grant off the £35 you bring down the cost a little below workhouse figures, so that local rates are less for asylum than for workhouse inmates. You did not look at the matter in that light?—Not exactly. Our average cost in New Ross Union for maintenance is only 2s. 7d. a week; I don't mean establishment charges.

20134. CHAIRMAN.—You might as well take the cost of the tobacco or something of that sort?—I understand; I am not taking the complete charges.

20135. But the asylum has the establishment there?—They have not an establishment that is able to take in the inmates of the whole country.

20136. Very well, if you take the cost per head of an inmate of the institution, you must take all the outgoings and divide them by the number of inmates either in the workhouse or the asylum if you want to compare the two fairly?—You will be able to get that from Mr. Pees in our union.

20137. If you were satisfied that the cost in the asylum or in an auxiliary asylum was less than in the workhouse, would you favour these inmates being put in an asylum suitable for them?—I would, certainly.

20143. You heard Mr. MURMAGHAN's calculation. If you take the same basis of calculation, putting everything into the workhouse cost and everything into the asylum and compare them, you will have less cost, with the aid of the capitation grant, in the asylum than in the workhouse?—There is one thing that people forget—that if they do away with sixty establishments, there may be in the first few years a little extra cost, because perhaps of the pensioning of officers, but then they are done with them, they are a charge no more. People forget that altogether.

20144. They forget that thirty years means a great difference in a pension list?—Yes, or twenty-five years.

20145. Even the most liberal scale of pensions, if you abolish that large number of workhouses, means a great economy, even at the first?—Even at the first.

20146. And ultimately, as soon as the pensions disappear, it will mean a considerable addition to the saving?—Yes, it will tend to a great deal of economy.

20147. And then you will have the system better in every way?—A special class which will be better treated.

20148. And you could deal with the aged and infirm in one of these workhouses?—I should think so.

20149. As regards the tramps and their first cousins, the casuals, what would you say about those?—It is a very serious question with us. Our average of tramps every week is over 130. Last week we had 111; one week recently we had 170. The tramps are increasing every year.

20150. You heard a witness just now say that the tramp evil was less every year?—They are increasing—that is my impression. Perhaps they don't meet as many of them up here as we do, but our union is on the high road between Kinsordy and Waterford, and from Thomastown we have them. They come from Tipperary and Clonmel, all through New Ross.

May 18, 1904.
Mr. William
Thompson.

Mr P. A.
Pees.

May 13, 1904. 20151. Would you be in favour of taking these people's children from them?—Certainly.

20152. And if you take the children, do you think you could fairly allow the parents to remain at large?—Well, I think there ought to be some system of registration.

20153. If you take from a man and woman, or from either, their children, do you think it would be right to let them go off again and probably have another family?—Oh, no; I think we should have no idlers in this poor country of ours. There should be some labour colony or some institution where they could earn money for the country.

20154. And keep them there as long as their children were supported out of the public funds?—Certainly.

20155. Or if they were sleeping well let them out on a horse or ticket-of-leave?—Yes, so that they would not go tramping around again.

20156. There is no question about it, there ought to be good hospital accommodation for a score like Rose?—We always require that.

20157. You could not shut up the sick wards in Rose?—No, but if you had a district hospital.

20158. Would it not become a district hospital when all the other classes were moved?—Certainly.

20159. Any chance of getting water into your hospital?—We want leave that so you.

20160. It is hardly a matter for us, but it might affect our judgment about the hospital if we found you could not get water?—It is a matter for your Board. Our Town Commissioners will not bring in the water unless they are compelled to do so. In any case, they would have to bring it five miles.

20161. At present you have to cart your water, what distance?—About a mile almost every month in the year. We have pumps on the premises.

20162. But they don't act in some parts of the year?—No.

20163. Is there anything you would like to say about the administration of outdoor relief in your union?—Well, it is increasing every year.

20164. What is it this year?—Close on £5,000.

20165. Is there any strong feeling amongst the Guardians similar to what the last witness stated—that there should be some divisional charges?—I have heard them saying very frequently that the outdoor relief would not be so high if there was.

20166. What do you think the majority of the Guardians would say, except the Rose Town Guardians? Do you think they would go with the other witnesses in favour of divisional or some such check?—Divisional is too small. Supposing you had a dispensary district where you would have six or seven or eight divisions, that would be sufficiently large.

20167. There was another suggestion—that one should try to find out what would be the fair amount that ought to be paid in each locality for the sick?—It would be very hard to draw a hard and fast line.

20168. You would have to do a good deal of cutting down by Rose to reach that?—Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM THORPE further examined.

Mr. William Thorpe.

There was one point I forgot to mention, that is, that the County Infirmary is no use to us at all in New Ross. I don't think we ever have a case in it, and it is costing us £200 a year from the rates in or about. If we had that £200 a year to spend on our own hospital and bring it up and make it more efficient than it is, it would be more useful to our district.

20169. CHAIRMAN.—If you and Geary got off that £200 each they would have to raise the £400 of Wexford and Enniscorthy?—I consider they don't want it at all, if they make their workhouse hospital efficient and get an operating room into it. We are getting no value at all for it.

Mr. Pope.—Formerly a great number used to come from New Ross, but latterly they are treated at home.

Mr. Thorpe.—We want to a lot of expense getting that operating room, and I would recommend other unions to do the same.

Lady MAURICE FERGUSON examined.

Lady Maurice Ferguson.

20170. CHAIRMAN.—You took the chair at the Conference at Enniscorthy?—Yes, I did.

20171. And the resolutions that were read out to them commended themselves to you and your colleagues from Wexford?—Yes, it was the universal

20169. You are one of the managing body of the Houghton Hospital?—I am.

20170. That does very good service?—It does. We have had a great number of cases this year more than for a long time.

20171. It is a very good little hospital and greatly liked by the people?—Yes, it is.

20172. I suppose the workhouse hospital is becoming far more popular than it was ten or twenty years ago?—Oh, it is. They are very well treated down, and the attendance there is exceptionally good, and the doctors give them great attention.

20173. And you recently got a very fine operating room?—Yes, a very nice one.

20174. Mr. MURPHY.—Is the Houghton Hospital much availed of?—Oh, it is by shopkeepers and their assistants. I have known one of the members of the committee, one of the most respectable members, when he was ill himself he went in there.

20175. CHAIRMAN.—Are they ever short of funds there?—We have a capital of £10,000, but we are living practically on the income.

20176. Do you find yourselves hampered for want of funds?—We do.

20177. Did it ever occur to you, or would it be open to your Board of management, usefully to take help?—Certainly, I think so.

20178. From the local bodies?—Certainly it would. We would be delighted to receive it.

20179. Did you ever consider the question of negotiating with any of them?—No, we never thought of it at all.

20180. If you got help it might mean some corresponding share of management. Did you face it from that point of view when you had power under your trust deed?—The management is confined to certain classes, subscribers, and two trustees, the Protestant rector and the parish priest. The committee of management is twenty, and they must be half Catholics and half Protestants, so that it works very smoothly.

20181. Is there anything to prevent representation from the Urban or Rural Council going in on that if they contribute?—I think we should get our constitution altered in Chancery. We get subscriptions from the public, and the lowest subscription is 12s. 6d. a year for members of the committee.

20182. I suppose it is difficult to get up the money often?—Yes; we have a collector specially appointed for that purpose, for instance.

20183. Mr. MURPHY.—What class is benefited principally by that institution?—Respectable tradespeople that would not go into the workhouse—shopkeepers' assistants.

20184. Is it not for the poor?—Oh, yes, if they are recommended by the doctor; some special cases.

20185. CHAIRMAN.—An ordinary case of bronchitis would not be taken in as long as there is room in the workhouse?—No.

20187. CHAIRMAN.—You would not recommend the County Infirmary to be brought up to a good pitch for doing the difficult cases of the county, and letting the doctors from Ross, Gorey, and Enniscorthy send cases on to Wexford to be treated?—Yes, except in the case of the nurses. The County Infirmary cannot be more efficient than New Ross. The doctors are of the old standing.

20188. CHAIRMAN.—I would agree to a good deal of what you say as soon as you get water into it. As long as you have to bring water into that huge institution for 500 people in barrels I cannot say anything about it.

20189. CHAIRMAN.—I would agree to a good deal of what you say as soon as you get water into it. As long as you have to bring water into that huge institution for 500 people in barrels I cannot say anything about it.

Mr. Doyle.—In the case of Gorey we have not to bring our water in barrels, so I hope you will recommend to let us off the £200 a year of which we have been robbed for twenty years.

20190. CHAIRMAN.—You took the chair at the Conference at Enniscorthy?—Yes, I did.

20191. And the resolutions that were read out to them commended themselves to you and your colleagues from Wexford?—Yes, it was the universal opinion of my colleagues from Wexford; they were all against amalgamation.

20192. Today the question of amalgamation has taken rather a different turn to what you would have expected from the Enniscorthy meeting, perhaps?—Yes.

20181. It has taken more the form of getting the different classes of inmates out of the workhouse and putting them together. Do you see any objection to some kind of congregating of classes that you would be the amalgamating of the unskilled—I think it might be a new hardship on some of the poor, and would add to the expense in that way.

20182. You think taking away the people from the district to which they were accustomed all their lives would be a hardship—I think it would be, and particularly to their relatives.

20183. That would be the case, of course, as regards the sick. Do you think it would be very much the case as regards the aged and infirm classes? Do you think they have many friends who look after them and mind them or are concerned about them?—Some of them have and some of them, of course, have not. On the whole, I think it would be a hardship.

20184. You heard the evidence that one of the Guardians gave to-day about the number of visits paid to the aged and infirm?—Yes.

20185. Did that surprise you at all?—In a way, but as a rule going round I have seen a good many visitors at the workhouse to the sick.

20186. Ah, yes, to the sick. It did surprise us when we began to make inquiries that there were so very few visitors. The result of our inquiries was the same as Mr. Peacock's. We find there are a great number of visits to the sick, but very few indeed to the unskilled, so that if they are not visited by their people would it not rather be a sentimental attachment?—Of course it might be, certainly.

20187. Without any practical costing off from society?—Yes, decidedly. Then my Board thought that their travelling expenses to and fro would be an increased expense. That was also one of the arguments.

20188. The way it works out now is that an aged and infirm person becomes detestable, say in Goucey or Ross Union, and they get a ticket from the relieving officer. If Wexford is the union, they get a ticket for Wexford instead of Goucey or Ross as the case might be. That would be a long way to go, and would perhaps encourage outdoor relief more. Is that the way you think it would act?—Yes, that is the way, I think.

20189. Would that make you disposed to be against detaching the aged and infirm to go to a distinct institution?—Yes, decidedly.

20190. Then you heard the evidence about our not having girls and children in the workhouse. Do you approve of those suggestions? I do, entirely. I am not speaking for my Board. I think my Board were against it, but my own personal feeling is strongly in favour of it.

20191. Lunatics, idiots, and epileptics?—I should separate the epileptics from the idiots.

20192. Have you any sane epileptics in your own workhouse?—Yes, three or four, and there is no place separate for them.

20193. No place where they might be put?—I think it could be arranged.

20194. If it could not be arranged, you think they ought to be sent to a separate institution?—Yes, those that are insane, but a good many of the chronic idiots I don't think they could be improved by being removed. I am speaking for Wexford, and I think they are as well cared for as is possible.

20195. Do you not think it is desirable to have as few classes of inmates in the same institution as possible?—If it could be managed economically, I suppose it would be.

20196. You have institutions already in the county for lunatics. In Wexford you seem to be overcrowded, but if it were not crowded the natural place would be—?—The lunatic asylum, certainly, with a capitation grant.

20197. If they go there they get the capitation grant. If they did not go there and any other public building, portion of the workhouse building, were available, and they could be kept there at a much smaller cost than they cost at present in the workhouse, would you be in favour of such an auxiliary asylum?—Yes, if it could be done economically.

20198. It is done, I believe, at the Finghall Asylum. They say it is very much more economical, although they only get 2s. a week capitation grant?—I think the average cost in Wexford is 21s 7d. for maintenance, covering everything.

20199. Well, the clerk of the union promised us to-day that he would send us the particulars on which that was based, for we felt rather inclined to—?—

To doubt it; I know you did. There it is (produced).

Mr. KILMER.—I made them up for two years.

20200. CHAIRMAN.—You did not take the collective number of days?

Mr. KILMER.—I took the collective number of days and divided that by the total amount. It works out something like 21s; then, taking into account the extra duty, it would amount to about 21s a year. They are taken for two years, and then we missed the year in which the change of accounts came in—1902 and 1903.

20201. CHAIRMAN.—Establishment, 200, seems low.

Mr. KILMER.—Yes, it was very low.

20202. CHAIRMAN.—This is the complete expenditure on Poor Law purposes?

Mr. KILMER.—That is the complete expenditure for Poor Law purposes. That takes in everything, with the exception of law costs—25 or 35 a year.

20203. Dr. BOGGER.—You have 22 lbs. deducted?

Mr. KILMER.—That is the extra grant.

Mr. POPE.—The Government might not give 22 lbs. if there was a change in the system.

Dr. BOGGER.—I make it over 21s.

20204. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Mr. POPE, have you any knowledge of what the cost per head in your workhouse is?

Mr. POPE.—I am quite certain it is over 21s.

Mr. MURTAGHAN.—That looks very low—less than the average for Ulster unions.

20205. Dr. BOGGER.—How did you make up your average daily number of inmates?

Mr. KILMER.—From the number of days.

20206. CHAIRMAN.—Divided by what?

Mr. KILMER.—201.

CHAIRMAN.—By 205.

20207. Dr. BOGGER.—How do you arrive at 200 or 201?

Mr. KILMER.—I take the average for the whole year from every week.

CHAIRMAN.—I am afraid you are off the track there somewhere.

20208. (To Lady Fitzgerald).—As regards the children who are already in the workhouse, are you in favour of the boarding-out system?—Yes, certainly; in fact, we do it wherever we possibly can.

20209. Have you yourself looked after some of these children?—I have.

20210. From your actual observation, what is your opinion of the boarding-out system?—I think it answers well; except in one or two cases it has not been so successful.

20211. Then you change to a different foster parent?—Yes, I think the ladies' committee has done good work here.

20212. Then you have a ladies' committee that looks closely after these matters?—Not too closely.

20213. Do you think there should not be too close an inspection?—No, certainly not.

20214. For instance, to the extent of making the children realise that they are union children or supported out of the public funds?—I think the less they know of that the better.

20215. Even if you went to inspect or look after these children you would not let them know exactly?—No, but I am afraid they always do know.

20216. Are they inspected closely about the clothing, they wear?—I think so, but at present none of them are under my inspection or observation, but I think from the reports the ladies send in they do it thoroughly.

20217. Do you think it a good thing to examine each child's clothing closely?—Certainly I do.

20218. Do you think it might not be a better thing to give a friendly close eye at a distance?—I think if the foster parents know the ladies are likely to come round to examine the children they are more likely to be kept in proper condition.

20219. Take the ordinary children in the country: there is always a certain amount of untidiness?—I think we must use commonsense as to what is required for these children.

20220. I would be rather inclined to think there might be in the boarding-out system a danger of over-inspection, or rather too close inspection. I think as regards examining the child's own clothing, for instance, and its little body, unless there was some reason to suspect want of care or neglect—I think it would be a fault on the right side, if it is a fault, to have a strict examination.

20221. I have had to inspect—perhaps it is my

May 18, 1904.

Lady Maudie Fitzgerald.

May 18, 1904.
Lady Maude
Wingfield.

machines failing—but I had to inspect a number of children when I was an inspector, but then I was satisfied if I saw the child healthy and apparently clean and apparently happy, I came to the conclusion that that child was all right, and that the Guardians were getting value for their money, but if I saw a child looking delicate and dirty and neglected and unhappy, then I made close inquiries. That would be the line I would draw. If I saw a child looking well and clean enough, a little bit untidy, perhaps, the way every child would be, I did not make any close inspection then—Everyone should use their individual judgment on the case.

20232. What would be your advice to the relieving officer? Would you be disposed to suggest the wavy eye or the very close eye?—I am afraid I should go for the very close eye. Perhaps a woman looks upon it in a different light to a man.

20233. Do you find the foster parents recent at all very close inspection?—I should not think they do, but personally I have never had to make such a very close inspection.

20234. We have heard a great deal about tramps all day. Is there anything you could add to our stock of information?—I am afraid there is not. My Board recently insisted upon having stores for them to look, and if they do not do so, we have a prosecution for refusing to work. I am afraid the tramps in our district are on the increase.

20235. Have you prosecuted them?—No.

20236. They have broken the quantity of stores provided?—They have, but it is more difficult to know what to do with the women tramps.

20237. Would you take their children from them?—I think it would be a good thing certainly.

20238. Would you be in favour of some such institution as a labour colony or workhouse, as it was called, for both?—Yes, personally, I am only speaking on my own responsibility. My Board are not anxious to make any change.

20239. Your Board of Guardians are strongly in favour of a repeal of the quarter-acre clause?—Very strongly.

20240. What claims do they expect to get in chief by that? Would it be labourers holding half-acre allotments?—Yes, some of them that would apply, but generally to have it to the discretionary powers of the Guardians.

20241. They are the chief holders of between a quarter acre and an acre in the union?—Yes.

20242. You have a very large number of cottages in the rural district of Wexford?—We have, and we have constantly hard cases before us that we cannot deal with on account of that clause.

20243. You also sit on the District Council?—I do.

20244. Do you happen to remember how the collection of rent stands?—As far as I know it is fairly satisfactory.

20245. In those cases that look for outdoor relief

these people would hardly be satisfactory?—These cases are more from accidental illness.

20246. Are all those cottages occupied by persons who earn wages and pay in cash?—Yes, I think I am safe in saying so.

20247. The Board of Guardians are also in favour that power should be granted to give outdoor relief in the ordinary way to persons actually destitute without requiring their removal to the workhouse?—Yes.

20248. Mr. MURPHY.—Have you not that power already?—Oh, yes, to some extent.

20249. CHAIRMAN.—But you would not have it for widows with only one child?—Yes, that, I think, is a great hardship. We ought to be allowed to use our own discretion.

20250. Mr. MURPHY.—Any particular age limit in the outdoor relief?—Without a doctor's certificate, I don't think a person can be relieved under 65.

20251. Do you think that age is too high?—Of course, it depends.

20252. Does your Board wish that they should have power?—My Board never expressed a wish on that subject.

20253. In regard to the question about untrained mothers, do you think it would be a safe thing to let these women go free and the child be taken from them and sent to some place to be supported by the ratepayers?—No, I think they ought to have a training first and sent into religious homes until it was seen how they conduct themselves, and then give them a chance.

20254. You think they should be restrained for a limited period?—I think so; it depends on the character of the girl and the manager's discretion.

20255. Do you think there would be any difficulty in getting these women taken into religious institutions?—I cannot say that. There are certain institutions where they do take girls of that description.

20256. Do you know anything of the working of them?—I do not personally.

20257. Dr. BRUCE.—Did you consider the question of separate treatment for consumptive cases?—I think it is most desirable. In the workhouse here we have set apart a male and female ward, but that is more for the helpless cases—invalids, not cure; they come in past cure.

20258. But for the cases that would be curable, what would you suggest?—That is a very big question. If several counties could combine together and buy an hospital on purpose for that, I think it would be a very good thing. I am all in favour of it.

20259. The Board have not expressed any opinion?—My Board have not expressed any opinion; I am speaking for myself.

20260. That might lead to a diminution in the number of cases of consumption and save many valuable lives?—Of course it would.

20261. CHAIRMAN.—Have you left untouched any question that occurs to you?—I think not.

Mr. JAMES MOON examined.

20262. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the Wexford Urban District Council?—Yes.

20263. Are you also a member of the Board of Guardians?—Yes, an elected Guardian.

20264. What do you think of the idea of leaving the acute sick pretty much where they are and removing the other classes to various other institutions? First let us take the girls who come in to have children. Would you be in favour of a change in the system that has been suggested?—I would not be in favour of taking their children from them.

20265. Does the suggestion take their children from them?—It does; they won't be taken in these Magdalen asylums with children.

20266. They would not take them to retain them for any time?—Oh take them at all; and even if they did, I would not separate the children from the mother.

20267. It was not the intention that there should be any forcible separation between the mother and the child. The idea was that the women should go into an institution, and that as soon as the managers of the institution thought possible she should be turned out, she should get a situation, and that she should contribute as much as she could up to the full cost towards the cost of the child, which would be boarded out?—A very difficult matter to arrange.

20268. It is, but it is every day arranged?—Not so well. You could not keep these women in the institution.

20269. It would be by their own free will?—It is only very few would go of their own free will.

20270. Where do they go now?—They remain in the workhouse for a time.

20271. If you had been asked before the workhouse was established, would you believe it possible that a girl would go to such an institution to have a baby and stay there all her life?—It was a matter of necessity.

20272. Very well, you shut the workhouse door and say they shall not go into the workhouse. Then there comes a necessity, and the only place provided for them is such a refuge under religious management. What would you say then?—I don't approve of putting these girls into such institutions at all. I would prefer their taking their chance as at present in the workhouse. They are very uncontrollable.

20273. They are uncontrollable when they get settled in their ways; but don't you think that a girl after a fall of that sort is impressionable and open to good influences and might be set right? At present they go into the workhouse, where they necessarily meet other girls who have fallen once, twice, or up to half-a-dozen times or more?—If they go into these other institutions of course they will meet the same.

20274. No, the separate system is in operation there as far as possible, and they don't take hardened offenders there?—Then you must provide a place for the hardened offenders.

20275. As soon as a girl becomes a hardened offender I would not feel any limitation in suggesting that she

Mr James
Moon

should go to the workhouse. That is where the failures go, the tramps and vagrants and all others. You would have done all you could if you tried to save her, whereas these institutions as a rule are only open to first offenders. They go into the workhouse and have no fair chance. They meet these classes much worse than themselves and go from bad to worse—below the same line as the others. You very rarely hear of one who gets right again!—Not often, indeed.

20276. Would you still prefer keeping on to the workhouse system to that effort to try to reclaim them?—I would try to make an effort to keep their child with them, but only for those with a first child.

20277. As regards lunatics, idiots, and epileptics?—To speak of this workhouse here alone, they are kept clean and comfortable, and looked after by medical men every day, and I don't think they would be any better off even in the lunatic asylum.

20278. You don't see any reason why they should be moved from Westford?—I do not.

20279. Do you see a great disadvantage in having a number of different classes in the same institution?—It comes as a matter of necessity.

20280. But if you can devise other means, do you think it would be a good thing to get over the keeping together of various different classes, and, as far as possible, different sexes?—I look at it in this way that the four workhouses in the county are fairly full, and no amount of juggling or shifting the inmates could make them able to contain any greater quantity.

20281. Do you think you are right in that?—I do.

20282. Do you think that the apparent fullness is set due to the fact that the necessity for classifying makes a great deal of the room only partly occupied, and that part may be overcrowded? For instance, there are plenty of small classes, the lunatic class is a very small class, and there are a great many other classes very small, and if you took these away you could have room for three times the amount of that particular sub-class, and if you take away that small sub-class you will increase the accommodation very much in the workhouse?—But even as the thing stands, if you think it is not crowded, further classification would make it more crowded, and we want at present an extended classification.

20283. Take Westford Workhouse; if you had only one class in the workhouse, only the aged and infirm, do you think it would not easily hold all in the county?—I think not.

20284. Do you know how many there are in the county? There are only 373 in the biggest part of the year in the whole county?—That would fill the Westford Workhouse.

20285. It was built for how many?—700.

20286. There you are. You would only have 373?—But it is now a totally different system from what it used to be. They used to sleep on the floor. There have been as many as 1,000 people in it.

20287. You are right about that; the cubic space is different, but at all events there would be room enough for 373?—Yes, if all of one class.

20288. Now, the tramps and criminals?—The average number of tramps in the Westford Workhouse is four a night. They come in and get a crust of bread or shirkout and are discharged in the morning, and the cost is very little. In fact, I think it is money well spent to give it to them. There is scarcely any town or congregation of people in which you won't have three or four people destitute. We are short on an average with the worst of Ireland. We are short on an average with the worst of Ireland.

20289. There are a few places like New Ross?—Yes, some special circumstances.

20290. You then don't see any necessity from a ratepayer's point of view of dealing with the tramp question?—No, dealing with the tramp in the proposed way that is sending him to an institution, of course, means money, and much more money than we spend on them now.

20291. Of course he costs a great deal more to the community, because he is supported by the community and he does not work or earn. It is by blackmail or begging or such like performances he gets his living?—It is just like temperance; you cannot make him good by Act of Parliament.

Mr. MURKIN.—You can restrain his opportunities.

20292. CHAIRMAN.—You would let them run on?—I would, as they go at present.

20293. Would you leave them their children?—Oh, certainly, the more obligations on them the better to prevent them travelling.

20294. That might be true if it were portmanteaus

or impediments of an inanimate kind, but what do you think of all these circumstances turning out tramps in their teens?—If they are healthy children they will drift away from them.

20295. They won't follow the old parental footsteps?—They will not.

20296. Do you know how much education those little children have got? Do you know where they go to school?—Very little, except they are detained some time.

20297. Do you know how many of them have any idea of their catechism or of any other religious belief?—Well, they do scold down in spots, these people, and then go on again.

20298. A kind of retreat?—Yes. I have known a steady tradesman to start off from his work where he had good employment and go a four round the workhouse of Ireland and come back again.

20299. Mr. MURKIN.—We are now tramping along the road, going from workhouse to workhouse. Don't you think it would be a good thing to put these people to do some honest work instead of paying on the country?—If they are bent on doing this, if you don't give them accommodation in the workhouse, you send them to highways or other places, where they are likely to do damage.

20300. If it is found that these people won't work or earn an honest living, should not the State take charge of them and put them somewhere where they cannot prey on the country?—If you came to establish that by the law of evidence, you might find it difficult to do so.

20301. CHAIRMAN.—Supposing you throw the onus on the tourist to prove he is a bona-fide traveller?—It is not worth trying.

20302. Mr. MURKIN.—It seems there is a large number of this class in Westford?—Well, you have only four a night in Westford.

20303. CHAIRMAN.—You don't see much of them in the town?—No.

20304. They don't come begging from the shopkeepers?—No.

20305. You heard the evidence about their demanding aid outside—blackmail?—They would in country places.

20306. Don't you think these country people have a fair grievance if these men are allowed to roam about that way?—That violent class don't come to the workhouse.

20307. Mr. MURKIN.—All the more reason for putting them in a place where they won't prey on the country?—All the more reason if they come under the criminal law that they should be punished.

20308. CHAIRMAN.—But as you say the law of evidence is rather in their favour?—Makes it difficult.

20309. Mr. MURKIN.—Have you any means to suggest for the discouragement of vagrancy?—I think if you cleared the whole country of every man and woman that is loitering at present and put them in institutions, that this day twelvemonth you would have a new beach.

20310. Even under the observant eye of the Royal Irish Constabulary?—Oh, certainly.

20311. What about the children? Don't you think it would be well to board out the children amongst the farmers?—It seems hard on the children, but still it is giving a premium to the parents to have the children of tramps provided for at the expense of the community.

20312. It is no harder on the children of these people than on the children of the farmer or labourer. Don't they get the same food?—They don't get the same education. Do you mean if they are put into an institution?

20313. I am speaking of the children in a workhouse who are boarded out?—I approve of that.

20314. If you had that do you know what you would do in this County of Westford? You would cut down about 200 out of the workhouses; you would be thinning them?—In Westford Union we send out all the children that we are satisfied by law to board out.

20315. In one institution alone you have eighty children?—That is the fault of the Guardians.

20316. Do you think it is a good thing to keep these eighty children pent up in that institution?—I do not.

20317. And don't you think the lunatics would be better in an institution to themselves where they could have healthy exercise and occupation instead of being pent up as they are in a badly ventilated day-room all the winter through?—The people we have are capable

May 18, 1904.
Mr. James Haughey

May 18, 1884.

Mr. James
Hess.

of very little work, people of that class, and as regards exorbitant, it is quite in the hands of the medical officer to expound them or send them out as he thinks proper.

20312. You know the expense they got is very limited and the occupation all?—If there was an absolute necessity for removing them from the workhouse, I would put them in a lunatic asylum.

20313. Rather than an auxiliary asylum?—I would.

20314. In the auxiliary asylum there would be one class—barnacle people who would not require so much care and could be kept at a lower scale of expenditure?—But if this was locked on to the existing institution, they could be maintained at a cheap rate. With regard to the idiots, the existing institution could mind them. The same officers could do more work instead of getting a new staff.

20315. One staff would do for all, whereas now you have attendants in each house?—No, you only get rid of the idiots, which I don't think is necessary, and send them to the asylum in a place provided for them. It was proposed to send the idiots from the three unions to Gorey, and the able-bodied and others in Gorey to Enniscorthy; that is only a temporary makeshift. For instance, they would send forty persons to Gorey from Enniscorthy, and they would get more than forty into Enniscorthy in place of them, and at present Enniscorthy is crowded. They are thinking of building an addition. You would make Enniscorthy worse than it is.

20316. But you would have classification; you would gain that much?—How could we have classification if we had not room?

20317. But in putting particular classes into a particular institution, you would arrive at that benefit. You would have classification, which you cannot have at present?—It means more cost.

20318. If it could be shown to you in pounds, shil-

lings, and pence that it would not mean more cost, would you change your views?—If it could be shown for a certainty, but then figures can be manipulated so well.

20319. CHAIRMAN.—You would not like to trust anything but the demand note for the rent?—No, I have practical experience for many years of workhouses, and I have been a Guardian in more unions than this.

20320. Your fear is, as one witness said to-day, that any change means more expense?—Well, it is, as a matter of fact.

20321. Therefore you are for the status quo until?—No; there is a way of looking at things. If the present system can be improved at the same cost, make any change you like, but spend no more money.

20322. Mr. MURPHY.—I am delighted I brought you so far.

20323. CHAIRMAN.—Our object is, if possible, to reduce the rates?—The proposals made to-day would not reduce the cost.

20324. Wait until you see their working out and the number of salaries that will be dropped?—But if you know up institutions you must keep up salaries.

20325. How many institutions would be closed in the county?—None in the County Wexford.

20326. Oh, yes, there might be according to the suggestions?—If counties are to be dealt with on their own merits there cannot be any one of the Wexford workhouses closed as long as the present inmates stay in them or a supply comes in to take their place.

20327. You would not diminish the accommodation for the sick?—Oh, no; we have been extending the accommodation for the sick.

CHAIRMAN.—I think we are agreed on the broad principle that what we ought to aim at is the least cost possible.

Mr. NICHOLAS KERRY, Clerk,

Wexford Union, examined.

20328. CHAIRMAN.—How many cottages do you say you have in the union?—620.

20329. Are there many cases in which the occupants of those cottages want outdoor relief?—Yes, very often for a period of a month or five weeks—temporary relief.

20330. How is the rent collection going on in the rural districts?—There are arrears of about £15 a year; they pay up extremely well.

20331. And what these men want is some special relief when there is some illness?—Yes, sir, they want power to the Guardians to grant relief.

20332. And do the Guardians want it?—Yes, to grant relief and not to leave it in the relieving officer's hands in these cases.

20333. The relieving officer says he cannot give it to them now?—Only for one week, and he cannot give it any further except the Guardians make an order, and they are deterred by the section from making the order, so provisional relief runs on from week to week.

20334. What is the recommendation?—They think it a hardship that young men who are only temporarily sick for a month or six weeks should have to break up their homes and come into the workhouse.

20335. Was there ever a case of it in which a tenant of a labourer's cottage closed his cottage and came into the workhouse?—Yes, there was one case in our union.

20336. I don't want the name, but what were the circumstances?—He was a man with a wife and five or six children.

20337. And he was in one of your cottages?—Yes, sir.

20338. What was the reason why he sought relief?—Sickness in the family; the wife was sick.

20339. Was he caring himself?—He was.

20340. And was in receipt of his wages at the time?—Portion of the time, at all events.

20341. Could he not have got the wife into hospital for treatment?—Yes, sir, he could, of course.

20342. And was there no neighbourly person in the neighbourhood that would care for the children at home while the man was at work?—I could not say.

20343. Do you tell me in that case the man broke up his home, left his wages, and brought his wife into hospital, and himself and his family into the able-bodied wards of the workhouse?—Yes, sir, in an individual case.

20344. Now, can you explain why he did so?—Well, I could not.

20345. Could you imagine yourself in his place, w could you imagine yourself in his place doing the same thing?—No, sir.

20346. If that is the only case you have got?—You only asked me with regard to that particular case. There have been a great many cases on the relieving officers' books.

20347. That was the only case that came into the workhouse?—That was the only case in my time.

20348. It does not seem a very strong case?—I don't build on that case, but the Council feel very keen on that matter. They think that if they had power to give relief for a month such a thing would not happen.

20349. I would not say that such a queer case might do it even then?—That is the only case in point, but there are several other cases on the books where the family was sick and the relieving officer had to grant relief.

20350. Could he not send the family into the house?—It would be breaking up his home.

20351. How would it do that if a child was sick, could he not send it into hospital?—But if he wife and the children were sick?

20352. Then they could all come into the hospital. That would be simple?—They don't do that. They prefer getting a month's relief. The auditor made some exchanges in reference to relief in cases of that kind.

20353. I think he was bound to do it, was he not?—Certainly, but it affects our district to a large degree than other places on account of the number of cottages.

The Sittings terminated.

FORTY-FIRST PUBLIC SITTING.—TUESDAY, JUNE 21st, 1904.

June 21, 1904.

At the Town Hall, Waterford.

Present:—Mr. MICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. COREY BIGGER.

Mr. PETER WALSH, J.D., examined.

20360. CHAIRMAN.—You have been for a very long time connected with the Poor Law administration locally in the Counties Kilkenny, Waterford, and Tipperary?—Yes; I was an ex-officio Guardian.

20361. About how long?—I became an ex-officio Guardian in 1876, and then I was on until the new Local Government Bill came in, and then I did not seek election because I wanted to put in another man, and I could not be voting for myself and another, and I put in my man—that was Lord Dunsany.

20362. In addition to that you have held public positions under the Poor Law?—Yes, I believe I am the senior Vice-Guardian of Ireland, and when Mr. Balfour appointed temporary inspectors I was one of them for some time.

20363. So you have experience of Poor Law administration in other parts of Ireland as well as your own district?—Yes, I was a representative of the Grand Jury from my own barony for years.

20364. Taking your queries, if you kindly turn to them, what is your view as regards amalgamation of workhouses? Taking your own district, what would you be disposed to recommend?—I am in favour of having but one central workhouse in each administrative county. I drafted a Local Government Bill in 1892, and I advocated that.

20365. Suggestions for a Local Government Bill?—Yes. And the paupers should be classified and allocated in separate workhouses if you want to amalgamate. This includes housing over the workhouse under section 75 of the Local Government Act to the County Council for harmless inmates.

20366. Coming to details, what would you do as regards your own locality?—My own locality, there is a small portion of the Carrick-on-Suir Union.

20367. It is in three counties?—It is in three counties. First and foremost the workhouse is built to contain 721, in the fever hospital 67, and in the sheds 29—that is 817. Well, the average in 1891 was 221, at a cost of £1,585, in 1901 it was 294, at a cost of £1,977, and in 1903 it was 185, at a cost of £1,585. The union charges are far more. The establishment charges in 1891 were £1,400, in 1901 £1,813, and in 1903 £2,116, and the average number of inmates was only 182.

20368. Did you look into the reason of how it was that the cost went up so much?—I suppose the cost of different articles.

20369. Did you think it was the cost of the articles?—I will come to that by-and-by. There are a lot of officials. The area of the union in the County Tipperary is 25,269 acres and the population 8,554. In the County Waterford it is 54,453 acres and the population 5,313, and in the County Kilkenny 32,130 acres, and the population 4,466; and in the whole union the acreage is 122,852 acres and the population 17,767. The rates struck in 1891 were £3,957 10s., and the gentleman of the County Council will tell you what was their rate. Then the inmates of the workhouse in January, 1903, were eleven able-bodied inmates, and of these eight were tramps. In 1904 it was eleven, females eight, and four of these tramps. In 1903, girls with illegitimate children, three, and in 1904 four; old and infirm, fifty-five, and in 1904 eighty-one. Then there are children, nineteen, and in 1904, forty-four; hospital and infirm patients, eighty-nine, of which twenty-four were idiots, and in 1904 seventy-five. And in 1904 one tramp was included among the eighteen able-bodied females. I don't put down the position of the relieving officers, because they will be wanted, and I don't put down the emoluments of Mr. Mullins, because he will have to do labour for that.

20370. You are going to give us some information?—As to the salaries of the officials.

20371. With what object?—To show the increase;

lastly they have increased. The salaries of the officials amount to £344 2s. 6d., and the cost of their rations is £297 10s.

Mr. Peter Walsh.

20372. What was it when you had a knowledge of it?—In the first place, there were not so many ward-maids; in the second place, there were not seven scrubbers at a cost of £150 13s. 9d.—that was done by the people of the house. Then the car-driver has £22 11s. All these things were done by pauper labour.

20373. What would you do as regards the Poor Law arrangements of the County Waterford? How many unions or workhouses would you keep up?—Only one; in Tipperary I would two; in the counties of Tipperary, Cork, Galway, and Mayo I certainly would keep two in each of these.

20374. Your idea is to have one central institution, say for the County Waterford?—Yes, sir.

20375. And two for Tipperary?—Two for Tipperary.

20376. And one for Kilkenny?—Yes, sir.

20377. Was your idea that all the various classes who are at present kept in the workhouses in this country should continue to be kept in a large central institution, or would you aggregate them in some way?—I would have a radical change. I would have none in the workhouse except those who actually could not be kept out of it. I would board out all children. In the year 1885, I think it was, I brought forward a notice of motion to have all children boarded out, and I was met then that there was no necessity for it at all, that there was a law already in existence. Then I worked it up ever so often since, and I was beaten on it. It seemed to be a party business. In Carrick-on-Suir. I would put out all the children who are illegals.

20378. You approve of having children brought up in the country rather than in institutions?—Certainly.

20379. At present the law only allows orphans and deserted children to be boarded out?—Yes.

20380. Would you be in favour of an extension of the law which would enable the Guardians to board out all children who come in under their charge?—I would if the parents were not able to support them.

20381. They would not be in the Guardians' hands if the parents could support them?—Yes. I would increase the outdoor relief as far as the old people.

20382. Let us finish off the children. About this question of extending the law so as to enable the Guardians to do more in the boarding-out way, a number of witnesses who have come before us have expressed the opinion that it is most undesirable that any children at all should be kept in the workhouse, and that the workhouse should be closed to children. Would you agree with that?—No, I would not; not a hard and fast rule, I would not.

20383. You would not be in favour of closing the workhouse, particularly to children?—No, sir; but I would be for that—as far as possible I would board out every child.

20384. Would you be in favour of giving the Guardians power to do what they can do in extreme cases now, that is, pass a resolution putting themselves in the place of the parent with a right to keep the child?—If they had the right to keep the child, I would say they had the right to board it out.

20385. Why would you be in favour of keeping part of the workhouse open for children at all, having those very strong views about boarding out that you showed as very far back as 1885. Why would you be in favour of keeping parts of the workhouse open for children at all?—The only reason is that there may be extreme cases, but from experience I find any children that are reared like a flock of sheep, I don't care in what institution, are reared as God Almighty

June 21, 1904
Mr. Pear
Walshe.

never intended them to be. I would say that they should be loaded out and become amalgamated in the population.

20385. Family life?—Family life.

20387. Everything you say is in favour of having children boarded out?—Yes, sir.

20388. As you have that opinion, why would you be at all in favour of keeping any word in the workhouse open for the reception of children?—Except that there may be extreme cases.

20389. What kind of case would you call an extreme case?—I never heard before that you should board out every one.

20390. We have had evidence that it would be better not to have any word in a workhouse at all for the reception of children?—Supposing there were a father goes in and that it could be proved afterwards that that father or mother had the means of supporting their own child, I would say that the State should not take the place of the father or mother.

20391. Certainly not, but that would be a very unusual case, where a man having means would be willing to go into the workhouse?—There are a great many men do it.

20392. They might have strength to labour, but they would not have the means at their disposal—people who would not go into the workhouse except for a casual night's shelter?—Any child that the Guardians assume the responsibility of being a foster-parent to, I say that child should be boarded out, but I would have it very restricted. I would not allow that the Guardians would take the responsibility of that in any case where the father and mother could board out the child.

20393. You think it highly undesirable that children should be in the workhouse?—I do.

20394. And if some other institution, which does exist for the care of children, could be used for the temporary housing of such extreme cases as you think might turn up from time to time—for instance, an industrial school, or orphanage of any sort—would you be in favour of allowing any child that might become destitute to be sent into such an industrial school or into an orphanage rather than into the workhouse?—Well, sooner than into the workhouse.

20395. It would be only temporary?—Well, I would, sir; but then I would say that instead of having them in these industrial schools, especially as they are now, the best thing is to board them out and mix them up in the population. We are wanting labourers, and by that means you increase the labouring population of the country, which is desirable.

20396. Mr. MINNAMAX.—Then would homes in which the Guardians could place children temporarily meet your view until they dispose of them?—It might.

20397. Some home certified as a suitable place for the keep of these children?—Yes, or industrial schools.

20398. CHAIRMAN.—There is a case that does occur sometimes—a father or mother who will be apt to prison, perhaps sometimes even for cruelty to children, but at all events they will be sent to prison from one cause or another, and the children in such cases are remanded to the workhouse—would you be in favour of remanding them for the period to an industrial school?—Oh, yes, certainly.

20399. You would be in favour of that?—I would, certainly; in fact, as I said in the letter, I would put the institution of penitents in every way.

20400. Following on that line of yours, there is another class that we have in workhouses—lunatics and idiots. Would you be in favour of sending them all to be dealt with in lunatic asylums or auxiliary asylums?—Auxiliary asylums, according to the Local Government Act.

20401. Similar to Youghal?—Yes.

20402. Have you formed an opinion which would be the more economical and better way of dealing with such cases, whether you would send lunatics to the asylum or to an auxiliary asylum?—The lunatics that are generally in workhouses are harmless lunatics.

20403. You may say they are pretty much the ordinary run of lunatics?—Then don't you see all lunatic asylums, at least around us, are becoming congested—Kilenny and Waterford.

20404. Do you think it is more economical and better to send them to an enlarged asylum. Would you be in favour of enlarging the asylum or taking a closed workhouse as an auxiliary asylum?—For the present, as a temporary thing, I would have an auxiliary asylum in perhaps two or three counties, if it were necessary.

20405. Whatever would be the area that would supply the inmates?—Yes.

20406. Similar to the institution that exists at Youghal?—I don't know that.

20407. It is the only place in Ireland where they have started an auxiliary asylum up to the present?—It was after my time.

20408. It is only just being started, but it is being started on more economical lines than the asylum. Opinions are very much divided which is the better way of dealing with lunatics—whether in a regular asylum or an auxiliary asylum. Have you formed an opinion on that subject?—No, sir.

20409. At all events you are strongly in favour of getting all the people suffering from mental disease out of the workhouses?—Yes, sir.

20410. Then you have another class in the workhouses, you have mothers, chiefly mothers of illegitimate children. We have received in different places a suggestion that the workhouse should not be open any longer to that class, but that they should be sent to a penitentiary or refuge, under religious management; that the girl should be sent say a couple of months before the birth of her child to such an institution as that sort; that she should be there paid for out of the rates as if she were in the workhouse, the object being on the part of the witnesses who put forward the suggestion, that the girl should be reclaimed after her first lapse and be put forward into honest life again?—Yes, that may be if there were such places to receive them.

20411. You are aware of course that there are a number of such places?—I know there are Magdalen asylums.

20412. Do you think that would be more likely to reduce that very large and perhaps increasing class of paupers, that is the infant pauper who is born and brought up in the workhouse and continues. Do you think that would be a more likely plan for reducing that class than the present workhouse system?—Certainly it would.

20413. Would you be in favour of it?—I would.

20414. Do you think if you look at it a bit that it would be more economical than the present system. You are aware what happens in the present system. One of these girls comes in and, as a rule, becomes a permanent inmate, with perhaps two, three, four, five, or six children depending on her before she dies?—I know that.

20415. If a girl were sent into one of these refuges one might hope?—Yes, that she would be reformed.

20416. Even on the ground of economy alone rate-payers would have to support very many fewer paupers?—Yes, but I would not leave her longer than would be absolutely necessary.

20417. They do not, I think, in these institutions. They get them situated outside as soon as they think they can be safely put outside. You would like to limit their stay in such institutions?—Yes, I would not like to say that because they come full that was the reason they should lead a life of idleness.

20418. I think they are worked hard in such institutions, employed in laundry work and other occupations of the kind; that would exclude a very large and objectionable class from the workhouse, the mothers of illegitimate children and the children depending on them; really all the children in the workhouse are illegitimate?—A good deal of them are.

20419. Nine out of ten about?—I don't say very near that; either that or deserted.

20420. Most probably when they are deserted they are illegitimate; that would exclude children from the workhouses?—It would, practically.

20421. Then the only class you would have coming to the workhouse in addition to the sick, aged, and infirm, would be tramps. Have you thought what you would do about them?—What I would do with them is, I would give power to the Guardians to send every one that applies for out-door relief to their own unions, to give a work's notice to the union, and then if they did not send for them I would send them at the expense of the union.

20422. If you get a man at Carrick-on-Sale, supposing that workhouse were kept open, from Waterford, you would send him back to Waterford or charge him against the Waterford rates?—No; I would send him back to Waterford.

20423. That might suit him?—But if a man goes to Waterford and gets a work there and then comes on to Carrick-on-Sale, or any other union, he is guilty of a breach of the law. When I was an ex-officio I got the

police to come down there every morning and inspect them. Now the police do it as a mere matter of form. I am informed they come there and look at them and see if they have heads on them. They should make some inquiries. If they found a man coming from Armagh or Mayo, looking for work, he may be compelled to go in there through necessity and seek a night's lodging. I would not punish that man, but then if he kept tramping on and not striving for work I would send him back to his own district, and let his own Guardians, who knew all the circumstances of his case, deal with him.

20438. From the notes of your evidence that you lately supplied us, you put the case of proving that he was not a vagrant on him?—Yes, sir.

20439. A man who is wandering about is to all intents and purposes a vagrant, and you would put on him the case of proving that he was not?—Yes.

20440. If a man had to tramp in search of work, or other bona fide reason, would you be in favour of obliging him to carry some documentary evidence that he was a bona fide workman?—Yes; I would make him go to the police and get a certificate from them that he was a man of good character, and he was really here doing some seeking employment. In some of the unions I had to deal with there were men who came periodically, in Swindon, especially—men and wife and a whole crowd of children. That is in open defiance of the law. If the Guardians had the power, either there or here, of sending that man and his children back to his own place, the Guardians then could give him some relief, if he was incapable of working, or treat him as they thought the case demanded. But I would not have it a hard and fast line, that they should do it. There may be a case where a poor woman or man came in under circumstances that it might be cruel to drive her or him back to their own place. I would leave it to the discretion of the Guardians.

20441. All these tramps are, I suppose, an undesirable class, who do as little work as they can. Is that your view of them?—Yes; and I have formed that view from asking them during my official capacity, and during a long period, as an ex-officio Guardian, I have frequently asked them could they not get work. One man said he never worked in his life; another man said he did not like it, but I don't see why I or any other ratepayer should support a man because he had not a fancy for work.

20442. So this class, which is a large and increasing class in the country, does not support itself at all; it preys on others?—It preys on others.

20443. Would you be in favour of the suggestion that has been made to us in a good many places, that is that such people should be liable to arrest and detention in a place—call it a labour colony, or a workhouse, or whatever you like—that they should be detained there under a magistrate's warrant after the investigation of the circumstances of the case, if they could not explain their vagrancy, and that they should be set to work and obliged to work. It would be virtually a prison?—But we have the power at present if a man comes as a vagrant.

20444. You have only the power of a small sentence. Would you be in favour of giving power for detention for one, two, three, or four years, or any period that might be thought desirable with a view of habituating these people to work?—I would prefer sending them to their own unions.

20445. Suppose you got them back in their own unions—supposing they got in Waterford their share of the tramps of the country, say 100 tramps—what would you do with them?—My idea is I would send them to the union from which they came.

20446. Suppose you had 100 sent to Waterford, their own union?—If they were deserving men I would give them out-door relief.

20447. But they are not deserving; they are chaps who don't want to work and walk about to avoid working. What would you do with them when you had them here now?—In that case they might be sent somewhere.

20448. Is not that the case with the whole of them—four or five thousand, as the case may be, all over Ireland. What would you do with these people?—I would put the vagrancy law in force.

20449. Do you think it would have any effect?—If they got hard labour for a month or two it would alter their opinion.

20450. Would it not naturally make criminals of them; would it put them in the way of getting a start?—If you formed a colony of the class.

20451. I mean an institution here in Ireland; call it a workhouse?—If you do that you might have a joint one for two or three counties.

20452. Or for a province?—Exactly, and make them labour there.

20453. Would you make it an offence against the laws of the country that men and women and their children should go strolling round the country begging blackmail and supporting themselves at the expense of the farmers and other people when they visit; would you make that an offence by law?—I would try the other way first, and then if that did not do I would.

20454. The other thing would be merely grating them a month in jail; do you think that would have any effect; take this gentleman you mentioned—the man who says he does not like work?—A month's hard labour might alter their opinion.

20455. They don't know how to work?—One man says he is one thing and one another.

20456. Take the case of the gentleman with hands fine enough to play the piano, that has never gone through any labour at all, what would you do with that man?—I would try the Vagrancy Act first, and if that did not do—

20457. Do you not think it would be a good plan to try something that would get them into the habit of working?—I say in my suggestions that in the central workhouse there should be a farm attached, as in America.

20458. That is virtually a labour colony, and in such central workhouse you would put these men to work?—Yes.

20459. For what period would you detain them; do you think it would be any use detaining them for such a short period as a month?—I would try that first. I am for the liberty of the subject, and if that did not do I would give them a year. The tramp system was allowed to grow up like many other things; it is there now, and the only thing is to grapple with it in the best and most constitutional method you can; instead of rushing at them I would treat them on the principle of the Vagrancy Act, and if that did not do I would have an Act passed empowering the magistrate to give them a long term—not longer than three years.

20460. With power to give them a ticket of leave or licence if it was thought they really were inclined to work?—Yes; I am one who never shrunk from doing my duty; I did not care what it was.

20461. Those tourists that we speak of are men that take an exactly different view of their duty; they always shrink from doing their duty?—No master.

20462. What remedy would you take, whether the vagrancy law or a labour colony; would you have these people the power to take round their children with them; do you think they are the proper people to have charge of children?—Oh, dear, no.

20463. Do you think it would be an undue interference with the liberty of the subject and the power of the father and mother for a Board of Guardians to step in and separate under the law, if power was given to them to do it—to separate the father and mother from the children—and board the children out?—I would not, as long as they were tramps.

20464. Then if they were to settle down and establish a home?—If they got a ticket of leave I certainly would make them take home their children.

20465. Some witnesses have pointed out to us that if you take away children from a father and mother, and if this father and mother are people of any or bad character, they might be glad to be rid of the embarrassment of their children, and if the children were taken from parents like that it would be far wiser to look up the parents in a labour colony while the State had to support their children?—And make them labour.

20466. While their children were being supported, and to prevent them making a fresh family for the ratepayers, what would you think about that; you would interfere with their liberty so far?—Yes; if they were unfit to take charge of their children they should bear the penalty of it; that is the reason I would be for trying the milder thing first.

20467. Then we would only have two classes in the workhouse—the sick and the aged and infirm. A few minutes ago you told us, I think, pretty much what I gather in your view about the aged and infirm; that is to have one central institution for the county?—Yes, sir.

June 21, 1904.

Mr Peter Wilson.

June 21, 1864.

Mr. Peter
Wells.

20454. Into which you would put all that class—
Yes, sir.

20455. And in that you could grade them according to their character, sex, or other desirable distinctions?

—Yes; but then don't you see another thing—I would be for extending out-door relief. A great many people find fault with that, that it would be ruinous to the ratepayers. I say no, because I went into the matter fully and made up my mind that the proper thing to do is to amalgamate two or three electoral divisions and put in a different class of Guardians—one on a high qualification and another on a lower, and let these men have power to strike an electoral division rate.

20456. Or a dispensary district rate?—Yes, exactly; and then I would board out every old couple or widow with two children.

20457. Or one child?—Well, one or two children, and that under strict supervision; that these people should be people who were not capable of doing much.

20458. People were out from their labour?—Yes; they could rear food or mind cattle instead of being cooped up in a work-house. You may say it is old people, more or less. Then you have the old people in the latter end of their days in the places in which they were born and reared, and then you have them getting some little thing to support them, which, ultimately, would be far better than having a whole body of them in the workhouse with a whole army of officials.

20459. You would rather have that a charge on the dispensary district than on the entire union?—Oh, certainly; if you have the entire union there is no supervision at all. In Carrick-on-Suir Union, with the best ideas possible, they put in a whole lot of applications for cottages; then when we decided to have an electoral division charge a lot of them fell to the ground, but when it was a union charge they were all for it.

20460. Would you not be afraid that your idea of giving the old people that relief on a small area might fall to the ground the same way as the cottages?—No; then I would leave power in the hands of the Local Government Board.

20461. The Local Government Board are prohibited by law from interfering in any individual case of relief?—I don't think it would. I never heard of it. It would be worth trying, at any rate.

20462. The reason you want the small area is as a check on extravagant relief?—Yes.

20463. That suggestion was put forward by other witnesses, and one witness gave me a new idea on that subject—that was that if an Act were passed revising this system of chargeability for out-door relief the Guardians, or whoever body were administering the matter, should decide what is the present law amount that should be paid for out-door relief in any district, be it a dispensary district or anything you like, and that anything over and above that amount—say for a certain area, at a work-house electoral division charge, but that anything that is now ascertained to be what you might call a fair amount for out-door relief should continue to remain a union charge; would you agree to that?—If you had that as a check you might.

20464. That would be leaving the broad back for what is fair, and putting anything that is excessive on the district?—Yes; that is really the principle that there was before; there used to be a rate in aid; this reverses that.

20465. Would you approve of the reverse?—I would; that might do; but my object in having it on the lesser area is to prevent men, from whatever their object may be, being too lavish with other people's money.

20466. Do you think the other arrangement would have that effect?—It may.

20467. And at the same time secure that all reasonable applications should be dealt with in the way you think wise?—Yes; but I would have it in that case that the Local Government Board should approve.

20468. It would be automatic?—Yes; say an area was 1s. or 1s. 6d. in the £, if more relief was required—

20469. That is always left to the local body?—Yes; the rates.

20470. The amount of relief and the people to get it is for the local body to consider; you could not make a central body judges of individual cases?—What I want is to keep a little rein on them.

20471. The only class you would have left in the ordinary workhouse would be the sick; would you be in favour of keeping up at the present centres where union workhouses now exist, would you be in favour of

keeping up at most, if not all those places, a little hospital?—I would be for having village hospitals certainly.

20472. Do you mean to suggest a larger number of hospitals than now exist; you have one in Carrick-on-Suir at present—a workhouse infirmary and a fever hospital—would you be in favour of any other hospital within your union, or do you think those hospitals are sufficient for your requirements?—I think so; and then there is a small one in Portlaoine.

20473. A cottage hospital under private management?—I would have it under public management.

20474. But if people wish to have a private hospital, of course, they can have it?—You cannot interfere with them.

20475. That is the Martin hospital. Have you studied the question about what extent of accommodation would be necessary for the sick in Carrick-on-Suir?—I don't think it would be very much, because if you had all the old people that are incapable of doing anything in the central workhouse then the only thing these village hospitals would be for would be broken legs or fever.

20476. Or chest or anything acute?—Yes; but then I would have a fever hospital kept up; there is one in Carrick; I would have the district contribute to keep that up; I would have an area contribute to keep up the fever hospital.

20477. It is in the County Tipperary?—It is just on the borders.

20478. Supposing the County Tipperary kept up that hospital and charged as much a head for every Waterford or Kilkenny patient coming in, would that meet your views?—Yes, sir; that is the very thing. The principle I go on is this, that I would have the central workhouse as a workhouse, and I would have all these village hospitals as infirmaries, and I would have all acute cases sent there, but as soon as they could be removed they would be going on to the central workhouse.

20479. Supposing you don't look on them as auxiliary workhouses or anything connected with workhouses at all, suppose you look on them as village hospitals, where the sick person—the honest labouring man or small farmer, or anyone that wants it—comes in and gets treated for a week, or two, or three, or six months, and goes out when he is cured, then he is not destitute?—Yes; but I would say there should be wards in the central workhouse that should not be managed in a pauper institution.

20480. A minute ago we got our central workhouse with nothing in it but the aged and infirm; then would have to be, necessarily, a very large infirmary, but here besides, according to the scheme you checked out, they would have the aged and infirm for the whole County Waterford?—Yes, sir; but then you need not have it here, because you have the larger hospital, now the county infirmary.

20481. You would want some place for the chronic sick?—For those that are respectable people; the chronic sick I would have in a ward in the central workhouse, but not under proper management if they could pay I would have them pay.

20482. It would be no longer a workhouse at all; it would be a large chronic infirmary?—Yes, sir.

20483. That is your idea?—Yes, sir.

20484. In the small hospitals of the country you would have only acute cases, and if any case was in there that began by being acute, and was under observation for some time, and the doctor found it was going to be a chronic, life-long, or tedious case, he would send that into the general infirmary, we will say, at Waterford, or wherever it might be?—Exactly.

20485. Have a paragraph here as regards persons who use these acute hospitals; you are in favour of getting people who can pay to pay in these local hospitals?—Oh, certainly, anything at all, and also to pay the doctor.

20486. You would not be in favour of the patients of a public hospital paying the doctor?—Not in a public hospital. The doctor at present under the law is obliged to attend any poor, but any man that can afford it—

20487. You would give the doctor his right, whatever it might be; if you or I had to go in, going to some of circumstances—if we got a broken leg—you would oblige us?—To pay your full share.

20488. And pay the doctor's fees besides?—Yes. And if a man was a farmer, according to his means.

20489. There are a number of people who could pay a little, but not a great deal, say a labouring man—

one of his family, a girl or a boy, might have to go in there, at all events they would cost him at least 6d. a week at home, even if he paid that 6d., do you think it would be a good thing?—I think it would.

20490 And you would give the managing body of that hospital power to recover what they, in their discretion, might declare him liable to pay?—Yes, sir.

20491 I think I have asked you, so far as I see, taking a somewhat different order to what you did, I think I have asked you all your points except that you would turn any diseased workhouse into industrial schools, or such things as might be possible—I would turn them into some things of industry.

20492 You would look to the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction; you would place the buildings at their disposal, if they had any use for these—broom factories or wooden factories?—Yes; I would be for amalgamating the electoral divisions and having two classes of men. I am certainly dead against the present system.

20493 You would be in favour of such administrative county discharging all the Poor Law matters in its own area?—Yes; then I think there are too many Guardians to be a workable body. I would amalgamate the electoral divisions and have two Guardians for each.

20494 Take a county like Waterford or Kilkenny, do you mean to say you would have on the governing body as many as two members for each electoral division?—I would amalgamate a whole lot of divisions and have only two members for the amalgamated divisions.

20495 You would make fewer electoral divisions?—Yes.

20496 Something like the county electoral divisions now?—I would not have them as large as that.

20497 Or would you make it a dispensary district?—That would be too large, I think.

20498 And enable them to return as many as you thought desirable?—That might be. As I said in my suggestion, I would have two classes of men—one elected on as low a franchise as you like—

20499 I follow that, but it is a little bit of a retrograde movement now to have any high property qualification?—But when a man is paying high rates I think he should have some higher voting power.

20500 You perhaps thought anyone having £50 a year—whatever you like; what I said in my suggestion was that the man should have £300 a year, but then I suppose all landlords will be done away with; he should hold land or something rated at £100 a year, and he should be elected by an electorate

which would be composed of men valued at £50 a year, then these men would have an interest in keeping down the rates and in the expenditure of the rates. I heard of a man who found fault with the excessive taxation, and that man's valuation was 10s., and he never paid even what he was rated, then he voted, of course, as he was told. I always held, and do hold, that there should be two classes of men, and I don't think that the sensible people—well-to-do farmers or shopkeepers, or any man of that class—would object to it, because the man has a greater interest, and so a man who has property is an educated man. Of course, it would be a retrograde movement to give multiple votes; I don't want that at all, only let it be a rating qualification.

20501 Let everybody who has £50 a year or over, let that class in each electoral area elect a representative of their own, and let those who are under £50 elect one for themselves?—Yes; and that man should hold property of some kind or another at £100 a year. A farmer at £100 a year, I don't think he is a magnate.

20502 You would have very few eligible?—In counties in the West you would not have one at all. In Mayo, I suppose there would not be ten in it.

20503 What would be the body that would manage all these institutions, take first the central almshouse or place for the aged and infirm?—I would have the County Council.

20504 Or a committee of the County Council?—Let the County Council appoint a committee if they like. They are the elected of the people, and when the Government have put all the power into their hands, I would not like to take it from them, but let them either act individually or appoint a committee and work it that way.

20505 You see that is what you call yourself a retrograde movement, but do you think it would be an improvement?—I am sure of it. I am as convinced as of

my own existence. Then with regard to lunatics—if I am sending on a lunatic, as unfortunately I often have to do, the doctor that is called in for the certificate must be the doctor of the dispensary district, in which we now are; I say that that is wrong. In Swinford we frequently had our five doctors there, and every doctor used to follow his own case until I broke that up. What I say is that it should be the doctor who was the medical officer of the district in which the lunatic resided, because he knows more of the case and the antecedents of the family than the man who perhaps never saw the lunatic before. As to the tramps, I think we want into that.

20506 Mr. MURPHY.—You seem to be in favour of an extension of out-door relief?—Yes, sir.

20507 You spoke about having a test. What test would you have? You said strict supervision would be necessary—I would have the test that the people were not able to support themselves, that they were aged and infirm.

20508 On whose would you place the responsibility of granting relief—on the shoulders of the relieving officer or of the Guardians?—On the shoulders of the relieving officer first, as recommending it, and secondly, on the committee; whether you will have a dispensary committee or a local committee, as I said, and amalgamate the electoral divisions.

20509 You would not do away with Boards of Guardians?—No; but then, don't you see, let the Guardians be the body; but the Guardians should set as they are now, in District Councils; let them set as Guardians of that district.

20510 You still intend to retain the Guardians to look after the Poor Law business of their own particular union?—Of their own particular district; I would have it all one union.

20511 Of their own particular present unions?—No. Supposing, as the Chairman said, that each dispensary district forms an area of charge—for instance, now take our own, Pilltown, that is a dispensary district, and could form an area, and let the Guardians of that with the relieving officers be the people who will be responsible for it.

20512 You think there would be no other check necessary to curb the spread of out-door relief than simply the report of the relieving officer and the assent of the Guardians. Do you not think there would be something more needed, provided you did extend out-door relief on the scale suggested by yourself?—No, I don't see that there would. The test now is the workhouse. I think that is an inhuman test.

20513 Would you suggest that there should be any alteration in the law as regards the limitation on the extent of land they held at present. You know it is confined by the quarter-acre clause?—Certainly. I would not be for giving it to farmers or shopkeepers.

20514 Well, you would extend it from a quarter acre?—I would not; indeed I think that is enough. I mean that the poor should be relieved, but I would not say that the lazy or the idle should live on the morality of the ratepayers.

20515 Does it not sometimes happen that small farmers of four or five acres are often in as great need of help as a labouring man?—I don't think when a man has land he wants out-door relief.

20516 You would not go for extending the limit?—I would not.

20517 CHAIRMAN.—From your knowledge of the West of Ireland, would you do it there at all?—That is quite a different thing. There are people there who would be well off if they were kept within bounds, but the people were allowed to do as they liked. I used to have to attend Kilkenny Sessions. I used to have to attend that, and when you look Swinford on both sides of the road the turf is cut down as bare as that, and nothing but the primeval forest there—the roots, and trees, and white gravel. I asked the man who was driving me was there over turf there. "Begar, my father told me there were 4 ft. of turf on the top of that hill." They were allowed to burn it until there is nothing there now.

The same about Charlestown. I went out there one time, and all the whole place was dry. That day fortnight I went again and it was all green strips. "What are these?" "These are the trenches," said the driver; "they were dug up and put on the ridge." That day fortnight I went and every one of them was burning. That went on for generations until the roads are 4 ft. above the level of the surrounding district.

20518 Dr. BROWN.—You mentioned small village hospitals. You did not say how you would have them

J. 21; 1904.

Mr. Peter Walsh.

June 11, 1904

Mr. Peter
Webb.

managed?—I said in my suggestions that I would have them managed under the dispensary doctor, and with proper supervision and a proper nurse, a regular trained nurse, to attend them.

20518. Would that be under a committee of management?—Yes, and ladies could be eligible to be on the committee. We have a lady in Carrick, Miss Grubb, and another we had, Miss Curtis, and they were the two most energetic people on the Board.

20519. How would these committees be formed?—The District Council.

20520. Then every man in the District Council should be a member of it, and if they liked to select one or two outsiders to form a hospital committee, not too large?—Not too large; the Local Government Board could define how many.

20521. Would you have these small hospitals in connection with the county infirmary, so that a large portion could be drafted off to the county infirmary?—Any case that was recoverable I would send to the county infirmary.

20522. You would only have them to supply local wants and cases of emergency, but for larger operations you would draft them to the larger institution?—Yes.

20523. Therefore they would be an adjunct of the county infirmary?—Yes, sir.

20524. With regard to consumption, have you any idea about the treatment of consumption?—I have not.

20525. Do you think it would be desirable to have a county hospital or sanatorium for the county, or two or three counties?—I would.

20526. It is a very great scourge; however, you have not thought anything about it. With regard to the fever hospitals, would you have these in connection with the small hospitals?—People have a horror of going into a fever hospital. I would have an area or district, not absolutely necessary to be in the same county—suppose now, for instance, there is one in Carrick, I would have an area around them in Tipperary, Waterford and Kilkenny. The same way in Callan.

I would have an area outside Callan Union. In that way I would have two or three areas, to pay so much a head for every one that went in.

20527. There would have to be some management for the hospital?—I would give the liberty of sending patients to the fever hospital; perhaps it would be better to have every disease pay only according to its valuation towards the support of the hospital, and send patients in. It would be rather inviting to have Tipperary pay the whole expense and the others having power to send in patients and only having to pay according to the capitation fee for those sent in. I think each district which has the power of sending in should pay some part of the establishment charges.

20528. CHAIRMAN.—They would be paying for the establishment charges to the hospitals in their own county?—Yes.

20529. Would it not be as broad as it is long all round?—Well, it would, but then don't you see I would have the fever hospital separated from the workhouse hospital. They would not have the taint of pauperism on it.

20530. But suppose the workhouse to be closed by that time. By this supposition you have no workhouse in being. In Carrick you would simply have the district or little hospital for acute cases, and a place for fever?—Certainly the aged people would be sent on.

20531. Dr. Brown.—You did not think of any system whereby all the fever hospitals would be connected to some extent—where a fever nurse could go from one to another, and the small district hospital could be connected with the county infirmary, so that a larger staff of nurses would be available all over the county?—There certainly might be such a system.

20532. Instead of having at Dungarvan and the more fever nurses, at very large expense, often for one single case, if you had them at the county infirmary they would be doing useful work and could be drafted there when wanted?—Yes.

Captain W. G. COOMAN, R.F., examined.

20533. I have been deputed by the County Council to give evidence here.

20534. CHAIRMAN.—These queries were sent to the County Council, and they have answered them in a general way, I think, by saying that you would explain more clearly your own views for them on the subject. What was the view of the County Council about the number of workhouses in the Co. Waterford?—I am, unfortunately, in a position, though deputed by the County Council, I am unfortunately in a position to actually not know what the opinions of the County Council are with reference to this matter, and I endeavoured to find out, by communications with one gentleman in the Council, a very influential person. The answer was very much that he approved of the replies of mine pretty fully. That gentleman is here present. He was chairman of the County Council for a number of years, and I think if he gives evidence he will be able to give the opinion of the Council actually better than I can. These are the answers that I formulated.

20535. You think that Kilmacothomas certainly might be closed?—I certainly think that Kilmacothomas might be closed.

20536. You did not think any other in the county?—There is Dungarvan and Waterford; you cannot close either one or the other of those. Then there is Lismore; that is in a district some distance from Dungarvan. I think you cannot interfere with those three unions in the County Waterford. The Kilmacothomas is an intermediary union which might, according to my experience, —

20537. Be closed altogether?—No. I make suggestions with regard to that matter. I would like to read them. I have the extract from the terms of reference.

20538. Kilmacothomas, you think, might be attached to Dungarvan and Waterford?—Yes.

20539. Would you leave any accommodation there for the sick?—You must do something of the kind.

20540. You would leave some accommodation for the acute sick?—I think I touch on that question further down. I would dissolve Kilmacothomas Union and convert it to the purpose above, that is a technical school and experimental plot, which is available there—some thirty or forty acres—and I should turn it to that purpose.

20541. The village of Kilmacothomas is about fourteen English miles from Waterford?—From Dungarvan provision should be made for the conveyance of the sick poor. This might be considered an obstacle to the amalgamation, but it may be easily got over by the railway or an auxiliary hospital, located in one of the present buildings, quite separate.

20542. Which do you think would be the better course, to leave a little hospital or not?—Undoubtedly I think for the advantage of the sick poor, I look upon the regulations, laws, and everything connected with the Poor Law Unions.—

20543. As an outgrowth?—The Medical Charities part of the Poor Law is I think the only thing worth keeping in the whole affair.

20544. You would approve of that?—Yes.

20545. Therefore you would be in favour of village hospitals?—Yes, so far as Kilmacothomas, I would; and of course the medical officers that are at present contented with regard to the looking after the transfer by railway or other conveyance, if necessary, of patients that might be transferred to Waterford or Dungarvan; but in case of sickness, and so on, you would have some receptacle in the shape of an auxiliary hospital at Kilmacothomas. That is my idea with regard to that, but I am afraid you could not carry out my idea with regard to the technical schools.

20546. We could only of course put forward your views?—Further down I also state—I would like to read my observations—Kilmacothomas should be attached to Dungarvan and Waterford, and attach land available for experimental plots.

20547. They are suitable you think for experimental plots?—Yes, and the land is beautiful land; and a technical school of instruction would be a relief to the rates.

20548. Very big for a school, is it not?—Oh, not at all. By reading this through you will see that I suggest an auxiliary hospital separated from the rest of the department. I also suggest that children from Dungarvan and Waterford be transferred to Kilmacothomas. The transfer of children from above two unions could be accomplished, and the proper youth brought up to some useful purpose attached to the technical school, and free from the vitiated atmosphere of the home.

20542. Would you prefer that to boarding-out?—I would, undoubtedly, because they would be under proper supervision. I would work them at the thrupps-are exportation. I would work them at the thrupps-are exportation, and I would teach them trades also, because that is the important matter for youth, and that is to be taught some trade or other that will teach them how to gain a living in after life.

20543. Do you not think the most useful trade for the community and for the people themselves would be that of an agricultural labourer?—Undoubtedly I do; and they are very much required at present, and the future will be the same.

20544. Why would you go further and teach them trades which are already perhaps over-trained in some places?—I don't think so. In the country, as far as my own experience goes, you cannot get a single tradesman of any description except a smith, because I suppose that pays best; they all go into town with trades.

20545. Would they not continue to go into the town if you train them in the country?—Some might locate themselves.

20546. This technical instruction is rather teaching country boys to be lousy about tools?—A good deal.

20547. So that largely of necessity these boys themselves would be taught the use of tools; would not the necessity for tradesmen disappear somewhat?—I don't believe it is the case. In my early days there were tradesmen, and all the children, even in the country, were bound for seven years to take up a trade, but I don't know of a single instance of a young lad being bound to a trade in the country at present.

20548. You don't mean to say that long ago all the country boys got a trade?—I don't say that, but then there were sufficient that took different trades.

20549. They had sufficient employment?—There were sufficient taking the different trades to supply the wants of the locality, but now my experience is that the wants of the locality are totally neglected.

20550. Owing perhaps to the development of trade?—Owing to emigration and better wages in the towns.

20551. And to journey at large concerns which supply all the articles that are wanted at a low cost?—However, that is a question to solve in this country, I am afraid.

20552. But at all events you would rather keep these boys in no institution than board them out and make agricultural labourers of them?—I would.

20553. Have you had any experience at all of the boarding-out system anywhere?—I have, so far as I understand it, as a Guardian for a number of years in Waterford Union.

20554. How have your boys done that are boarded out?—The boys and girls are sent out at fourteen.

20555. You would not call that boarding out. The boarded-out are those that are sent out to nurse at an early age?—I look on that.

20556. How have they done with you? what are your reports?—Well, they are sent out to nurse at the Waterford Union, and they are looked after to a certain extent. A committee of ladies has been appointed to inquire into the houses where the children are.

20557. What are their reports?—And a very necessary thing too. It was originally under the relieving officer's discretion to visit and send in monthly reports as to the state of the boarded-out children; then was added to that the ladies' committee, which was looked on at the time with a little suspicion, that they were in the way; but I thought it a very necessary thing, because I know how relieving officers do their work pretty well, and that every one in assistance, in my opinion, no matter who they are, even myself, waste a little looking after, so I approved decidedly of the committee.

20558. How have the children got on that were boarded out with you. What are the latest reports. Are they satisfactory?—Sometimes they are, and sometimes not.

20559. On the whole, what is the opinion of the ladies' committee. Are they in favour of boarding-out?—I cannot answer for the ladies.

20560. Can you tell us the nature of their reports to your Board?—Well, the clerk of our union is here and he will be able to give the information.

20561. Is your impression that the ladies' committee is favourable to the boarding-out of children?—I don't think they have anything to do as to whether they are boarded out or not; it is the Guardians.

20562. But are they in favour of the system?—I am afraid I could not answer that.

20563. Is your own opinion favourable or unfavourable to putting out young children?—It is as far un-

favourable that they are cast away; they are sent into the country and used.

20564. The same way as any little child would be used in the homes?—Exactly, and not taught a single thing.

20565. What would you say they are not taught?—They are taught how to drive cattle, of course.

20566. And to weed?—Certainly not that, because the people with whom they are boarded out have not got a peck.

20567. You think not?—That I am certain of; they are not farmers; they are labourers or old women that want somebody to nurse them and help them.

20568. You mean they are put out with these people as a means of increasing their stipend?—That is why these people take them.

20569. I understand thoroughly your not having an unqualified approval of such a system?—I certainly don't approve of it. I would approve of my system, that is a technical school to teach some useful object, that they would afterwards derive benefit from.

20570. Have you any experience of children that are brought up at a central institution?—That is, for instance, the Union of Waterford?

20571. Any institution, orphanage, or school of any sort?—I have a good deal of experience of children that have been sent out into the country at the age of fourteen from the Union of Waterford, and I have taken an interest in some six or seven of them.

20572. Very good, tell us about these?—My impression is they all turned out badly; every one of them that I have known in the country turned out badly—that is, so far badly, that they were no use to the country. They would not get up in the mornings, they would not do what they were told, or they had no idea of obedience.

20573. Had they any intelligence?—Smart enough. I expect they could not know much at fourteen, and particularly being brought up in the precincts of a workhouse. But my idea was—bring them up where these technical schools will keep them at work, when they are able to work, and teach them how to work.

20574. Have you ever been through any institution where technical instruction was given to the resident pupils?—I cannot say I have, because it is of late introduction into the country, and I regret much that I have not.

20575. Because I am afraid you would find the children that came from such institutions that similar complaints are made about them very often—that they are not extremely satisfactory?—Then I would scold the right boys, and condemn the institution that had charge of them.

20576. Do you not think that instruction in family life is the better education for a little child than in a barracks institution, where children are all drilled, and kept together and taught together?—I am afraid the best of teaching is discipline.

20577. Don't you think they would have more of a friendly, good discipline at home than in an institution?—Yes, if the person that had them under charge was capable of instructing them.

20578. I agree with you thoroughly if you selected a proper home?—That is, the infant school.

20579. Take the child as soon as it can use its teeth or a couple of years or three years old, it is at an attractive age, it gets adapted into the family?—I look on that as a sentiment.

20580. Don't you think it is a real sentiment?—The sentiment may exist.

20581. If there was a little child quartered on you would you not feel a bit tender towards it?—There is no doubt of that; if an old woman had charge of that child she might get fond of it.

20582. Or even a young woman?—My experience is that it is the old women, who get hold of three or four names. No, 2, lunatic, epileptic, or idiot should be removed from the workhouse. There is one objection, of course, the reformatory might have to that, and that is, it would cost them more in a lunatic asylum than it would in the union.

20583. Are you sure of that?—I am very nearly certain of that; about 2s. 6d. or 3s. 6d. it costs in the union.

20584. That is only for their food. What is it in the lunatic asylum?—I think 4s. 6d.; that is the return of the cost of each patient.

20585. In the lunatic asylum cost of maintenance they take everything into consideration—salaries, support of looms, in some cases—and they divide all that annual expenditure by the number of people?—

June 21, 1894

Captain W. C. Coghlin.

June 11, 1904.

Cynthia W. C.
Cogan.

However, I should not look on that as an obstacle at all; for I think lunatics, idiots, and epileptics should be properly looked after; and I consider the unions are not the places suitable for such cases. They should be removed from the workhouse to the county asylum, and not to vacated unions. That is, for instance, I call Kilmacshannon a vacated union, which could be more efficiently used, as detailed above. The above observations dispose of No. 3. No. 4, if the idiots and children were removed, as suggested above, lots of room in the two unions could be found for hospital purposes. These are fortresses or fifty male idiots in Waterford, there are sixty to seventy female idiots there; if they were removed, as I suggested, to the Insane Asylum, then all the room they have could be used then to supply hospital room. No. 5, by amalgamation, the staff, which is the expensive part of the present arrangement, could be reduced without impairing the efficiency of the administration—making the staff of Waterford and Dungarvan Unions perform the duties consequent on amalgamation. Then you would get rid of the staff of Kilmacshannon altogether, and the expense in connection with that.

25693. Mr. MURPHY.—You won't get rid of them. Won't you still have a staff at Kilmacshannon?—You will have only the medical staff.

25694. What about the staff looking after the children; you will have that; you will be going deeper into debt by your proposal—I don't think so; because you have no clerk, no master.

25695. CHAIRMAN.—Well, you will want a clerk, in any case?—It may be so.

25696. I am afraid, as far as economy is concerned, there would not be much to be got in that direction. If you could conduct the business successfully and properly for the care of the sick poor and for the care of the orphan children I, personally, would not object to the expense as far as that part is concerned.

25697. Mr. MURPHY.—But we, personally, have to look after that point, that is our job!—That is the question—the reduction of the rates. Now, then, comes the last of the queries. I would dissolve Kilmacshannon Union, and convert it to the purpose above. The village of Kilmacshannon is fourteen English miles from Waterford and eleven from Dungarvan. Provision should be made for the conveyance of the sick poor. This might be considered an obstacle to amalgamation which might be easily got over by railway or an auxiliary hospital located in one of the present buildings, quite separate from the sick and destitute. I don't approve of auxiliary infantic asylums.

25698. CHAIRMAN.—Why don't you approve of these?—Because that would increase the staff.

25699. You would have a fresh institution and a fresh staff?—Yes.

25700. Mr. MURPHY.—Won't you need a fresh asylum and a fresh addition to the asylum?—Now, for instance, they are spending on the Waterford Asylum at present £40,000 for the purpose of building additional accommodation to supply the wants of the quantity of lunatics that come there.

25701. CHAIRMAN.—Do you know for how many inmates there is accommodation?—I cannot exactly say; I only know we have to pay something like £40,000 for the purpose of building further accommodation there.

25702. If that is being built you would have sufficient accommodation for the idiots of both Dungarvan and Waterford Unions transferred to Waterford Union?

25703. Mr. MURPHY.—Yes, you have 120 in the workhouses of the county?—A question of detail which may not be worked out. 5. Unless distance would intervene, I see no necessity or undue hardship. Certainly, if the able-bodied were made to work, the sick

poor and other classes would not suffer. A proper distribution of duties is essential. What is more essential is an official to see that the respective duties are performed. That is one thing that, as far as my experience goes, there is no authority in the different unions in Ireland on the actual requisite in discharging cases. Making tramps work in clearing their latrines is a difficult question to solve. Now, these are obvious values of my own that I have written since I furnished you with that. I would further observe that I am of opinion that under the present Poor Law union arrangements there is no responsible authority except the master, and he can throw all responsible action upon the board. Were a man paid sufficiently well, and given security for his action and duties, then you would have the work done with economy and common sense. He is appointed, and has certain powers; he is answerable to the Board of Guardians; the Board of Guardians inquire into any irregularity, as matter when it may be, which may be brought under the notice of the board that the master has fallen into. I know the working of Boards of Guardians for years, and I know there is no authority whatsoever external except very trifling. However, I don't want to put my foot into it too much in expressing an opinion.

25704. Do you mean to say the Guardians don't insist on the master doing his duty?—I could give you cases in point where I was on committees myself—it was a case of deficiency, it is many years ago, however—it was a case of deficiency on the part of the master in supplies, and there were three of a committee appointed to go in and inquire into this deficiency. I was one member of committee. I cannot think of the other two gentlemen's names, but, however, we came into the board with our report that the master should pay for this deficiency. It was brought before the board, and the master got sent free. For years I did not attend the union after that. I only give that instance, because it came under my personal knowledge of how duties are done. That was a particular case. I have knowledge of cases where charges were brought against a master; the Guardians went into it exhaustively; they brought down a Local Government Inspector, and the result was that the master was dismissed. Boston differs. We have had many instances of where Boards of Guardians have been suppressed. To fully give evidence regarding Poor Law reform I would have to spend too much time to inquire into the economic questions and the administration of the different institutions under Poor Law management in Ireland, so, consequently, no, not, as I would wish, convey evidence and impressions with satisfaction to myself, and correct many errors that I believe to exist. Now, where I see the want of authority, which I say there is in the unions of Ireland, is that the authority vested in the master is transferred from him to the Board of Guardians, which is the actual authority. I have known instances, and I have given one.

25705. CHAIRMAN.—Have you any definite suggestions to make?—That I was just coming to. This would get rid of all the Boards of Guardians. Appoint three men to the unions, and give each of them £200 a year. I am democratic enough to say that those appointments should be in the hands of the ratepayers of that union; and, unless we are an office people altogether, three men could be got from, say, the Waterford Union, to conduct the business of the Waterford Union, and let those three men be appointed by a vote of the ratepayers of the Union of Waterford. It is all a question of efficiency, and you would get efficiency in the Waterford Union with three men elected, instead of being appointed by the Local Government Board, which was the usual manner in which that was carried out. I think, gentlemen, I have given you my ideas on the subject.

Mr. MAYNARD DOYLE EXAMINED.

Mr. Maynard
Doyle.

25695. CHAIRMAN.—We would be glad to hear from you the views of the Yeastall Board of Guardians. You came from the County Waterford rural district part of the union?—Yes, sir.

25696. What are the views of your district?—There was a special meeting of the Guardians—

25697. Are you speaking for the Guardians or your own Council?—Both together. There was a special meeting of the Guardians and the Rural District Councils together.

25698. You had not a separate meeting of your own District Council?—No, it was one meeting.

25699. What was their view?—That amalgamation was necessary.

25700. Did they think their own union ought to be broken up?—Yes, abolished. There is portion of the union in the County Cork and portion in the County Waterford. The portion in the County Cork would go to Middleton, and the portion in the County Waterford to Dungarvan.

JAN 21, 1901

Mr. MARSHALL
Boyle.

20531. How far would you be from Dungarvan?—There are eight electoral divisions.

20532. How far is Ardmore from Dungarvan?—Youghal is altogether eighteen miles; Ardmore would be ten or twelve.

20533. Youghal would go to Middleton, and there is railway communication between Youghal and Middleton?—Splendid.

20534. Ardmore would be one of the most distant points from Dungarvan; how far is that?—Forteen miles and a half. There is one district of the County Waterford at the Cork side of the river—that is, Teplenishal, above the bridge—that is a long distance from Dungarvan; that would be over twenty miles.

20535. What county is that in?—County Waterford, at the other side of the Blackwater.

20536. And how far is it from Tallow?—Eight or ten miles.

20537. Twelve miles from Lismore?—Yes, or fourteen.

20538. What ought to be done with that district?—It was originally in the possession of Lismore. The question at their meeting did not decide that point.

20539. What is your personal opinion?—Really, my own personal opinion is that if Lismore were allowed to stand, it ought to go back to Lismore or Middleton.

20540. How far would it be from Middleton?—The train facilities to Middleton are very good from Youghal.

20541. It has a steamboat service to Youghal?—Yes, but it would not serve; the boat is not very regular.

20542. How far is it from Youghal?—Three or four miles.

20543. How far is it by road from Middleton?—It is just in a line with Lismore from Youghal.

20544. How far is it by road from Middleton?—Sixteen or eighteen miles.

20545. You would have to consider that about the removal of the sick; some acutely sick people could not be removed by railway?—To be sure.

20546. What county is it in?—County Waterford, at the other side of the river.

20547. Then, it would either go to Lismore or Dungarvan?—Yes; but Lismore would be the nearest place; that is my own personal opinion. It would be a long distance, eighteen miles from Youghal to Dungarvan, and that is four miles further on, and you should come to the bridge to cross to Dungarvan.

20548. Was there a division at your Board of Guardians or was it the unanimous opinion that the Youghal Union ought to be broken up?—That was the unanimous expression of opinion, owing to the union being divided by the river into two counties; and it would be a very feasible thing to have the portion in the County Waterford attached to Dungarvan; and, then, considering the good facilities to Middleton from the Cork side, to attach it to Middleton. We have a very suitable hospital or sanatorium for consumptives or a convalescent home.

20549. Are the lunatic buildings large enough for the requirements?—I am afraid, hardly. It is full at the present time. There are very nearly 400 or 500 there at the present time, all of the imbecile class—work-minded. Youghal Union would make a beautiful hospital from its situation. It overlooks the Blackwater, and is away from the town completely as an asylum.

20550. Have you a new fever hospital there, or is the old one still standing against over the graveyard?—It is in the same spot, in a very bad way.

20551. Did you consider generally the question of what might be done with the other unions in the county?—Entirely our own union; however, KilmacThomas was spoken of.

20552. You think it might follow your example?—Quite so; that it should be abolished as well.

20553. That is a matter you did not pass any resolution about?—Not exactly. At the same time, it was the opinion of the meeting that KilmacThomas should be abolished owing to its proximity to Dungarvan and Waterford. These were the only two unions spoken of.

20554. Were there any other questions discussed that you would like to call attention to. You discussed the question of caravans or tramps?—Yes, the matter was gone into. The abolition of the Youghal Workhouse would be a means of diverting the tramp business from that part of the county, inasmuch as it would break up the line from Waterford to Cork.

20555. Take a link out of the chain?—Quite so; it is a clear day's walk from here to KilmacThomas, out

to Dungarvan, one to Youghal, and so on to Middleton and Cork, and the effect of abolishing the Youghal Workhouse would be to make it more difficult for them to get a rest at night.

20556. Would you be afraid of their looking for accommodation in the out-houses and behind haystacks?—Really, I suppose they would be forced there.

20557. Would you be in favour of allowing people with no business to tramp about the country, getting their support from other people?—Certainly not.

20558. Do you think it would be an unfair interference with their liberty, if they would not work and earn their living, to lock them up in a place, and make them work for their support?—I suggest that the tramps, should, in the first instance, when they go to the workhouse, apply to the police barracks.

20559. Supposing the Youghal Workhouse was closed, would you do in Youghal if tramps came there?—I don't know what you would do with them then.

20560. Would you be in favour of making it illegal for people to go about the country like that?—I certainly would.

20561. And give magistrates power to put them into a workhouse or labour colony?—I would be in favour of that, for really it is not safe to let them go about the country; they will break into houses, as you say, and may do some injury.

20562. I have no knowledge of that exactly, still I am aware they are not favourites on their way round?—I would like to see them work.

20563. It might be a chance of getting them into working habits, so that they could subsequently, after a little training of that sort, earn their own living outside?—Certainly. I, furthermore, say it would encourage them to work if they saw you were in earnest in putting a stop to the vagrancy. I certainly would be in favour of encouraging them, if there could be any means adopted to encourage them.

20564. Mr. MURPHY.—But, in the first instance, when the house of yours would be done away with, what would you do; would you not empower the relieving officer to give that man an order for a night's lodging and breakfast, and only in repeated cases would you apply stringent measures?—Yes; I would certainly say that it should not rest with the relieving officer to give a tramp a night's lodging.

20565. He might be a man out of employment, looking for work, would you put that man at once under the charge of the police?—By having a system of identification established, and let him account for himself.

20566. How would you identify a man until you first saw him, if this was the first house he came to?—Let him identify himself.

20567. CHAIRMAN.—You would require him to have a certificate of character?—It would rest with himself to prove that he was not—

20568. A harmless vagrant?—Yes.

20569. Mr. MURPHY.—But would you not, in the first instance, when a man applied for assistance, give some one authority to give him assistance until he proved himself to be a tramp; don't you think he should get assistance—a night's lodging and breakfast?—By all means.

20570. And it would be only after he had been found out to be a tramp?—Yes; we must admit he is a human being.

20571. CHAIRMAN.—How are you ever to put a stop to them if you let them come as often as three times. A man may come three times in eighteen months under a different name, or his face is not remembered?—I would certainly provide some work for him to do in a house of correction, if there was some system established.

20572. Do you think it would be any hardship to oblige a man who was going to go about to have a certificate from the place he came from. Supposing there was a Waterford man started looking for work somewhere, or a Youghal man coming to look for work on the railway here, do you think it would be any hardship on him to oblige him to carry a certificate stating—“This is a labouring man who is bona fide stating.”—This is a labouring man at Waterford.” If he had no work evidence to produce, do you think it would be an unreasonable thing to assume he was a tramp?—I don't think it would be necessary at all to have a certificate.

20573. How would you get at it?—There are well-known tramps.

20574. They cannot even prosecute them as vagrants now, practically?—There are well-known tramps that

June 21, 1904.
Mr. Maurice
Doyle.

visit the Youghal Workhouse, and they apply to the relieving officer for a night's lodging; he gives them a ticket of admission to the workhouse, and they get it.

20655. Are these people who never do a day's work, as far as you know?—They are that class.

20656. Do you think that is a good class to allow to go at large in the country?—If you could get them to work it would be better. Certainly they don't care to work. They go to the farmers' houses; they leave the Waterford Workhouse this morning, and go through the country, and will go to the farmers' houses, and get, perhaps, a crust of bread or a copper, and they go to the workhouse at Kilmartins next night. They are a class of men that don't care to work at all; that is my opinion. If they could be trained to work I think, in the first instance, that a tramp coming into Youghal for a night's lodging, should apply to the police barracks, and on the certificate or requisition of the constable, to the relieving officer, and get a ticket of admission.

20657. Admission where—we are supposing there is no workhouse in Youghal?—Then, of course, he would not go to Youghal for lodging.

20658. He would, if he would be there destitute?—Where would he get a night's lodging?

20659. That is what I am asking you?—I think it would make him work to get the price of a night's lodging; they are strong, hearty fellows, but they won't work.

20660. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you think if there was a workhouse established for these fellows for a province where not only the vagrant class could go, but where men who wanted employment, but could not get it, might go, and get work for a certain time?—I know a great many of them would not go there.

20661. But, still, if you had such an institution, it would take out of their mouths the statement that they could not get work?—Yes.

20662. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think it would be a good speculation to rig up a large institution, with officials, on the prospect of men, like tramps, going there to stay?—They would not stay there.

20663. Mr. MURKIN.—But they could be sent there?—Yes.

20664. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think it would be a good thing to have an institution of that sort, where they could be sent?—I think so.

20665. Mr. MURKIN.—And where, if they were not sent, they could go there, knowing they would get employment?—That would be it; it would be, perhaps, a help to get them to work.

20666. And some little payment given to them for the work they do there?—That would be a very good thing, in my opinion.

20667. CHAIRMAN.—Some of these people have wives and children going about with them; would you be in

favour of allowing them to drag these children about the country, as they do?—Not the younger ones.

20668. Or the older, or any children?—The children able to run about with them.

20669. Do you think it is a desirable way to have children brought up?—Younger children should be taken from them, and the Guardians in the meantime act in loco parentis.

20670. Would you let the old birds go on gaily in the meantime without their innumerable?—It would be better to leave the old ones with them.

20671. Mr. MURKIN.—You would apply the trumpet law to the older ones when you took the children away?—Yes.

20672. CHAIRMAN.—I see, you would be in favour of different workhouses for different classes of inmates. That is the answer to No. 3. That certain classes of paupers ought to be kept in separate houses. Therefore, you would approve of having one institution, say, for the aged and infirm, of a whole, large area like a country?—Yes.

20673. You don't approve of the boarding out of adult workhouse inmates, you don't think that would be feasible?—I don't think it would.

20674. But are you in favour of the boarding out or putting out at home of young children?—My own impression about young children where I saw them out I found those boarded out to be better citizens than those that are kept in. Not far away from my place there are a few of those children out; you can see them at Mass every Sunday, and they are as clean as any other children I see there.

20675. Healthy-looking?—Healthy-looking. Attached is it identically the same thing. Where they are nursed is practically a home for them, provided you get a proper place; and the Guardians, as far as I know, when there is a child to be sent out to nurse, select the most suitable persons; perhaps two or three may come forward for the child.

20676. There is a good demand for these children with you?—Yes, sir; in some of the poorer houses, where there is, perhaps, no child at all, the couple, the husband and wife, like to have a child with them, and to get paid for it. As far as I know, I find these children are very healthy and clean, and all that, and the place is really a home for them; they are not school; and with regard to sending them after work, I don't believe that at all.

20677. Why should they not go after cattle?—Generally; but not to send them drudging about.

20678. Should they not get work, and plenty of it?—Quite so; it develops them every way, and gives them an idea afterwards to be hard workers. They draw water and keep the houses clean, and that is certainly a practical technical instruction for them.

Mr. MICHAEL CUNNINGHAM examined.

Mr. Michael
Cunningham.

20679. CHAIRMAN.—You heard your colleague's evidence?—I did, and I almost agree with him in everything. I was first in favour of abolishing the Midleton Union, but I found the majority was in favour of abolishing Youghal. My reason was that it was so near Cork, and from Midleton to Cork would go to Cork, and from Midleton to Youghal would go to Youghal. However, I gave in in the end, and agreed with the majority.

20680. But you think it is a matter the Commission might look at, to see whether Midleton might not go instead of Youghal?—Exactly.

20681. Was there any other matter that Mr. Doyle did not allude to in which you differ to any extent from him?—With regard to the boarding out of the children I approve of it very much. I have some from nurse myself and they are excellent; they could not be better cared.

20682. Do these children, as far as you know, get good, sweet milk to drink?—Certainly. Some poor people have goats, and goat's milk is very good for children; and, of course, they can go to farmers and buy milk.

20683. Some of these are boarded out with small farmers?—Yes; we see very particular about giving the children to good houses. We have children at present, and we cannot get a person to take them. There are two or three children.

20684. Were you looking in any particular locality?—The relieving officer made inquiries round—that is his duty—and he could not find anybody to take them.

20685. How many children have you boarded out at present?—We have a good many; and after their term of thirteen or fourteen years they go to work with farmers, and are very useful.

20686. They understand country ways?—Certainly. They are always kept at school until the age, because the relieving officer visits them regularly.

20687. Dr. BRIDGE.—How much do you pay for them?—3s. or 4s. a week.

Mr. ROSSIGNOL.—3s. a week.

20688. CHAIRMAN.—How much clothes.

Mr. ROSSIGNOL.—We don't supply clothes; that covers everything; except, of course, children that are under two years of age. We give them up to 4s. a week, and there are very few of them.

20689.—I agree with what Mr. Doyle said.

Mr. F. R. ROBERTS, Clerk of the Youghal Union, examined.

Mr. F. R.
Roberts.

What the board intended was that Youghal should be the hospital for the Youghal Union; that is to say, sick patients from the Youghal Union, as it at present exists, should be dealt with in Youghal.

20690. CHAIRMAN.—That you should have as many still?—Yes; only amplified.

20691. And fever hospital?—Yes.

Mr. PATRICK O'GORMAN, Chairman Limerick Union, examined.

Jan 21, 1906.

Mr. Patrick O'Gorman.

20701. CHAIRMAN.—You have your replies to our queries, and you might kindly go over them for me?—Our Board are unanimous in saying that it was expedient to amalgamate unions; they went for the principle, but we find it is not very expedient to amalgamate our union; we have a large area; it is seven-and-a-half miles long by fifteen wide, and I think it would be either a hardship on the poor, and it would not be advantageous, I believe, to the ratepayers.

20702. You are between Fermoy and Dungarvan?—Yes, and Youghal; amalgamating with the district down there would give us a larger area still.

20703. Then your Board of Guardians are unanimously of opinion that it would not be wise to discontinue Limerick; what do you think about the proposal to discontinue any other union in your neighbourhood?—I think one union, at all events, could, with advantage, be utilized as an auxiliary lunatic asylum for juveniles.

20704. But that is the case at present in Youghal; they have a building—part of the old industrial school—as an auxiliary asylum?—I did not know that. Then I think the lunatic hospital could be put together there; for myself, I am in favour of a complete classification of inmates of the union. I think all the delicate old and feeble should have a home for themselves; one union should be given to them, and they should not be left associated with these fallen women or respectable characters; these fallen women and their children should have a separate place for themselves, where they could be made to do laundry work or something else; be made earn their living.

20705. Would you approve of placing them in religious refuges and penitentiaries if they are taken in there?—I would; but if they were not taken in there one institution could be devoted to them, and isolate them; we were in favour of a sanatorium for the county; we would contribute our portion of the expense to isolate consumptive patients.

20706. And try to cure them?—Yes. We approve of boarding out children.

20707. Have you many boarded out in Limerick?—We have a good many.

20708. What are the reports about them?—It is always favourable; children that are reared out in the country associate with farmers' sons and labourers' sons, and learn to milk cows, and are useful otherwise; whereas children reared in the union, when they go out at fourteen or fifteen, they are incapable of doing anything; they won't get situations; they are scholars enough, but the market is overcrowded.

20709. Are they handy about the place?—They are not, and the next thing you will see, they enlist; we have them at present in the streets of Limerick, young fellows, reared up in the union, and they are young soldiers going about the town; they thought work was to be had for them. If they are reared up among farmers' sons and labourers' sons and daughters they learn to milk cows and do things that would be useful elsewhere.

20710. And they get employment as labourers?—They do.

20711. Are you aware of some of these children who were boarded out becoming regular labourers?—I am; I know that.

20712. You don't approve of boarding out adults?—No, sir.

20713. What is your objection to that; do you think it would be too much abused?—It would be too much abused; everybody would have friends, and would be wanting to get payment for them.

20714. You had a division on your board on the question of chargeability?—We had.

20715. Right to live, and the majority were in favour of letting the present union retain certainties as it is?—Yes; we thought it less troublesome and safer, and a more equitable way of doing it. And the board too were unanimous in saying that healthy tramps should be refused admission into the union; if you want to put a stop to it you must use extreme measures.

20716. Do you think they would not go into farmers' places?—They would not. If one or two get twelve or fourteen or sixteen months it would stop it.

20706. Do they ever get that?—I don't know whether they ever do; they are bellied singers and bawdy players, and so forth; they are systematic tramps; and each of them earns as much as will pay his lodgings, but they drink it, knowing they will have the money to go to, and every penny they make before they go up to the union they drink it or else put it to hide in holes in chimneys, so that it won't be found when they are searched by the porter.

20707. Have you ever noticed of what class the tramps are; some are musicians?—Yes; and disbanded soldiers. If they had to collect for twenty-one years instead of six you would not have half the tramps. You have these disbanded soldiers that come out after short service that are too lazy to work.

20708. Or cannot get employment?—They would not follow at; they will find some ways—trick of the loop business, or following men, or singing ballads, and what they get they drink, knowing they have a sure bed in the union.

20709. You would be inclined to close the casual ward?—I would.

20710. There are enough of hospitals you say in your union?—I think so, because if you multiply the hospitals you will multiply the expense.

20711. And you don't hear of any complaint that another hospital was required?—I did not; you will have to find a horse and ambulance for each hospital, and a stretcher.

20712. There is no demand for such a thing in your union?—There is not.

20713. How would you reduce the expenditure if you would not back up your union; do you see any way by which you might reduce the expenditure?—When you have lunatics and these women in one union it entails that you have to have an official over each department, and that official may have in charge only four or five patients. If they were concentrated in one place one person could take charge of fifty or sixty; the officials are multiplying every year, consequently the expenses are going up. As regards payments or contributions by persons who are able to pay something I think they should pay.

20714. Do you think that governing bodies of hospitals and infirmaries of all kinds should be empowered to come to a decision how much people could afford to pay?—I think they should; they should have discretion in that.

20715. And give them legal power to recover that?—Yes; it is necessary, because we find treatment upon 5s. or 6s. a day will go for a red ticket and get the doctor's services, and I think they should be bound to contribute something; their children go to the hospital even though they are in receipt of 5s. or 6s. a day; they go in and never pay anything, and I think they are better able to pay than the small farmers having only four or five cows, and I think, too, it is a hardship on farmers having only two or three acres to say that they are deprived of out-door relief.

20716. Would you repeal the quarter-acre clause?—I would; and I would leave it in the discretion of the board, for sometimes a man with seven or eight acres of land is more destitute than a man who has a labourer's cottage.

20717. You would not put any restriction about land at all into the Act of Parliament?—I think with a man having a big tract of land it should be his own fault, or there should be something wrong, if he was not able to pay a little.

20718. It be had to come for relief?—Yes.

20719. Where would you draw the limit?—If it is not drawn it will be very hard for a man who has any influence will try and work it and get the services of the doctor from the board.

20720. I am not talking of the services of the doctor, but in the case of out-door relief?—I think it should be left in the discretion of the board; the board is democratic; you have a representation from every place and the majority should rule, because I find on the County Council or District Council the majority are always right, as a rule.

Mr. MICHAEL MCGRAVE, Limerick, examined.

20721. CHAIRMAN.—You know these replies; the Chairman has just gone over them with me. Is there anything that occurs to you to mention specially or to

amplify among these hearings?—The only point is, I Mr. Michael would be in favour of a central institution for all the children brought up in unions.

June 21, 1904.

Mr. Michael
McGrath.

20722. You don't agree with your colleague that boarding-out is the best method?—I do; I would approve of it.

20723. Would you approve of changing the law so as to enable the Guardians to board out all children who are in their charge?—Well, I would, provided they get a place that would be suitable for the children.

20724. Of course there are some children that could not be boarded out, that would come in for a very short period, and it was suggested by some of the witnesses that children of that kind, instead of being put temporarily into a workhouse, should be put into some other institution for the fortnight or month, or whatever the time would be, say an industrial school, if the managers would accept them, so as to close the workhouse altogether to children?—I would be in favour of closing it altogether for children and to have a central institution for them.

20725. Do you think you would require another institution if you board out all your children nearly, and only had a few; don't you think some existing industrial school or refuge would be sufficient?—If they could be boarded out, but it is not feasible; at all events suitable places cannot be got to board out all the children.

20726. Do you find much difficulty in boarding out children in your union?—There is a difficulty in getting suitable persons to take these children.

20727. Have you many boarded out at present?

Mr. O'Gorman.—Seven or eight.

20728. That would be very few for such a large union as Lismore; how much do you give for the children?

Mr. Healy, Clerk.—45 a year and a suit of clothes and two pairs of boots.

Witness.—They would be boarded out if there were applications from suitable places for bringing up these children.

20729. You would prefer the boarding-out system?—Yes.

20730. You heard the very strong remarks your Chairman made about how well these children do as after-birth?—I knew they do a great deal better than being boarded out, and I would be in favour of the system.

20731. Is there any other matter you would like to dwell on?—For women of indolent character, I would be in favour of an institution—a maternity home or the like.

20732. A refuge?—A refuge where they would get an opportunity of being reformed, where home industries—sewing and plain cooking—would be taught.

20733. I suppose you would not look forward to them remaining there as inmates for any considerable time, but that they should be taken in there, and after a few months, or whenever time necessary, they should be allowed to go out, and their child be boarded out, so that they could go back to ordinary life?—They could not well go from the child.

20734. If they had to look after the child they could not get a good place?—They could scarcely leave the child until twelve months old, and they would have to remain in the home, and there would be a better opportunity of their keeping reformed.

20735. They might perhaps be better in a shorter time; they might more readily go back to ordinary life. However it is a matter for the judgment of the managers of the institution, I suppose?—Yes.

Mr. J. C. O'Brian, A.P., Chairman Lismore Rural District Council, examined.

Mr. J. C.
O'Brien.

20736. CHAIRMAN.—Were your views practically identical with those of the Board of Guardians?—I quite concurred with them.

20737. Do you not think Lismore should be broken up?—I do not.

20738. But you would be willing that these different classes—lunatics and mothers of illegitimate children and the children—should be put out?—Yes; I am in favour of that.

20739. Would you be in favour of a central pauper institution for aged and infirm if it were found more economical and better?—No; I don't think I would. I would rather keep the old and the infirm and the sick at Lismore.

20740. The whole of your union is in the County Waterford?—Yes.

20741. So that your Rural District is coterminous with the union?—Quite so.

20742. Except for the Urban District of Lismore?—Yes.

Mr. O'Gorman.—We have not an Urban Council in Lismore; we act under the Town Improvement Act.

20743. Is there anything you would like to mention?—No, there is nothing; we have gone through the query

sheet, and the whole Board was in favour of the reply I have given.

20744. You seem to have been fairly unanimous, except on the question of chargeability; were you in the majority or minority?—I happened to be in the majority; there are a few of the burning element who are always very narrow against the town, and so pointed out where the injustice came to us under the Government grant, and we considered it was the fairest course, and our clerk also demonstrated and did his best to show what was the proper course.

20745. Still they held their opinions?—Yes; but the majority was against them. I happened to be at a meeting of the Town Commissioners yesterday, and this matter was discussed, and they were in favour of not amalgamating, fearing that part of our union perhaps might be amalgamated with Dungarvan and another portion with Fermoy, and taking the chargeability into account and the fair way we were opposed, and how economically it was worked, we decided against it. We have spent about £5,000 recently in construction and improvement, and extension up-to-date, so that we would not at all be pleased to amalgamate.

Mr. MAURICE HEALY, Clerk of the Lismore Union, examined.

Mr. Maurice
Healy.

20746. CHAIRMAN.—Was there anything you wish to add to the Guardians' evidence?—I don't know, except I would be in favour of a larger distribution of out-door relief. Instead of sending the aged and infirm to the central institution I would give them out-door relief.

20747. You really think it would be kinder and more economical?—I think it would be more humane and equally economical to retain them in their own unions and give them out-door relief.

20748. Do you see any safeguard as a security against over-expenditure?—On the whole, my experience is that the Guardians are very careful in the matter of expenditure, and they are not given to extravagance.

20749. There has not been any remarkable growth in the amount of out-door relief since the Local Government Act came into operation?—The number of aged and infirm is increasing, and there is a tendency to increase, and as the able-bodied people leave the country they leave behind their aged relatives. I think some little employment might be got for a large number of those; if they got a little out-door relief they could go and mind the children for their daughters and sons-in-law, and a small expenditure there would

support them rather than send them up to the workhouse, where they are no use, and they idle their time.

20750. Mr. MAURICE HEALY.—You think they would be happier and better off in the country if they were more or less within their own districts, and the cost would not be more?—I don't think so.

20751. They would be satisfied with two or three shillings a week?—They don't get that. If out-door relief is given the contribution is rather small.

20752. CHAIRMAN.—Two shillings?—Not quite, on an average.

20753. One and sixpence?—Yes; if they should not supplement that by begging, and if they were sent out I think they ought to get enough to support them reasonably; I think 2s. 6d. would be ample, and not quite so much in some cases, because most of these people have some shopkeepers about the town partial to them, and they help them, giving them on occasional article of clothes and giving them something to support them.

20754. Mr. MAURICE HEALY.—In your own workhouse how would out-door relief on a wide scale work; are there many inmates at the present to whom out-door

might safely be given?—They could all get out-door relief; there are a large number of aged and infirm people there.

20735. There are sixty on the infirm list?—Well, you know, if they were sent—some to their own friends at Oppenheim, and others to Tallow and Ballybeg.

20736. CHAIRMAN.—Are they chiefly from villages?—The towns supply a large amount, and I think all these children ought to be boarded out; I don't think they ought to be sent to a central institution at all. When these who are boarded out become of age they are absorbed into the rural population.

20737. They don't come back as paupers?—No; they support themselves fairly. These children boarded out in the country do not get as good a literary education as would be given in a school, but they become more self-reliant. I would not be in favour of giving these people trades at the expense of the ratepayers. I don't think it is suitable that the public should contribute to give them trades; they would be suited for the agricultural community; they are wanted there, and can get employment at any time; in fact the demand is greater than the supply, but I would not be in favour of sending children at all to a central institution; you would have the same disadvantages increased in extent.

20738. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you see any difficulty in carrying into practice the boarding-out of all supported children; for instance it has been said there would be a certain number for whom no homes could be found. Do you think that would occur?—I can only speak for Limerick; if the Guardians only increased by a small amount, which I really think they ought to do—made an increase in the annual payments—there would be no difficulty in getting homes; some of these people would find an extra £1 a year a magnificent sum; I think if they gave £10 a month and a suit of clothes, and they give a second pair of boots according to the first is worn out—the suit of clothes includes two inner garments, two pairs of socks, and only one coat, trousers, and vest.

20739. So you think if they would do that there would be no difficulty in providing homes for all the children of Limerick Union?—No, Sir. There are only eight of them at present boarded out. There were a large number, but the Lady Inspector who came down some time ago brought under notice what had escaped notice—that one or two of these cases were not legitimate cases for boarding out. They had the sanction of the Local Government Board, or thought they had, but she discovered the facts and made representations and induced the Guardians to take back those children; there were only two of them, but her report established the fact that a better class of nurses was desirable; in one case it was a woman who was herself getting out-door relief, who really was very kind to the children.

20740. She was a good foster mother?—She was.

20741. CHAIRMAN.—She could not give them milk?—She had contrived to give them milk, but some could be kinder, and when there was a probability of her being deprived of the child her Parish Priest wrote strongly in her favour, and said he had often seen the children, and they were well cared.

20742. Mr. MURKIN.—What would you do in the case of truants?—I declare I would be inclined to share the views of the Guardians that as far as possible they should be refused admission to the workhouse in nearly every case.

20743. Perhaps if the casual ward were closed and a penitentiary in its place the numbers would dwindle?—If they believed the law would enable the Guardians or police to send them to jail for a couple of months you would not have half of them coming around, and the people who do go round for these people who can very well afford to pay for their lodgings; there are three little towns—Limerick, Cappagh, and Tallow—and going from one place to another these fellows pick up more than is sufficient to lodge them, but I am bound to say the lodging-house business in a great number of places are not willing to give them lodgings.

20744. You think the short-service system contributes largely to the trouble?—The militia community contribute a great number to them, and the worst class of them. A master of a workhouse usually knows a ruffian when he goes to the workhouse, and I suppose they are the most regular customers the master has got. The ballad singers, however, are worse; they come with a woman—I suppose their wife—and a couple of children. They have an idea, some of them, that if they have a wife or a couple of children they

will have a better time in the workhouse; it is not an unusual thing to pick up a woman and say "I will represent you as my wife," and then enter themselves on the books as being married—I don't mean to impute any immorality to them. The tramp mistresses could easily be exposed if they were given to understand that there was a law passed which gave the power of confining them; you would not have them then at all; some of these fellows pick up 15d. or 18d. a day in the course of their tramps through the towns; they have ample means to support themselves and pay for their lodgings.

20745. Could you give a suggestion as to what should be done in the case of unscrupled mothers?—I don't think I can. I must say we have not very many of these in Limerick.

20746. I think there were twelve in the workhouse about a month ago?—There are none like professional prostitutes, none of that class, but it is very difficult to deal with them. I can hardly make a judicious suggestion.

20747. CHAIRMAN.—Do you see any objection to the refuge idea—the Current of Good Shepherd for Catholic girls?—These places are more intended for professional prostitutes.

20748. Are there not some of these institutions that take first cases only?—I don't know, Sir.

20749. There are some institutions in the country that take first lapses only with a view to permanent reformation?—I think a poor girl that has had one illegitimate child can easily get employment again, and in a good many cases it is a sufficient lesson for her.

20750. Don't you know that in the workhouses, when a girl comes in to have a child, in the large number of cases that poor girl stays there, and perhaps goes out again and has another child?—That is, unfortunately, the case; but I really think the persons who are responsible for their fall should be punished. The present state of the law requiring corroborative evidence makes it impossible to convict.

20751. On the other hand you might make it too easy for them to impose penalties to any one they wish?—There is no doubt without credit; there are not many cases in which a girl would select a man who was not more or less responsible; I think the idea of requiring what is called corroborative evidence to the satisfaction of the County Court makes it impossible to prove, except perhaps one case in fifty. I don't think the Guardians succeed, although they have brought several cases.

Mr. O'CONNOR.—Two is all we succeeded in.

20752. Mr. MURKIN.—Could you suggest any improvement in the law?—Let the party who is accused prove that they are not responsible when the girl avers they are.

20753. CHAIRMAN.—And if he swore he was not you would let him off?—I suppose you must, but they would retire with additional crime and penalty on their head.

20754. Mr. MURKIN.—In any case you think something more is needed in order to bring home responsibility to the father?—I do; and the present requirement is a failure, because the offence is necessarily one committed in secret.

20755. Dr. HOSKIN.—Have you considered the question of providing for consumptive patients at all?—The Guardians in Limerick were in favour of having some central institution to which consumptives could be sent. I would be in favour myself of empowering the Guardians to send cases of ordinary delicate health that might develop into consumption to some well-ventilated place to give them a chance; if a doctor saw a patient was likely to develop into a consumptive, if he made recommendations to the Board of Guardians that the person be sent, supposing, to Youghal for a month or any other health resort, I think the Guardians might be empowered with advantage to avail of that discretion, and I think it would be a great charity; it might restore a man or a poor woman to their health.

20756. Quite so, but these that are already affected with consumption, would your district be willing to pay for their keep in a sanatorium?—Certainly.

20757. Or would you pay portion of the establishment charges, joining with other districts?—I don't think my board would handle at all about the cost. The general question of dealing with consumptives was considered, and what suggested itself to them was a sanatorium. If there was a building for their treatment in another union the Guardians at Limerick would have no hesitation in contributing what they thought

June 21, 1904

Mr. Maurice
Healy

June 28, 1904.
Mr. Macneil
Bosby.

fair. I think the restriction of out-door relief to the quarter-acre class is one that ought to be abolished. Cases of extreme hardship have occurred in Limerick where a man with a labourer's cottage and one acre was debarred from getting out-door relief—a most deserving case; so much so that the Guardians said if they were overhauled they would pay themselves.

20778 CHAIRMAN.—Would you put a limit at all, or simply repeal the section?—If it was easier to get it repealed I would get it repealed some way or other, but if Parliament would insist on some limit I would acquiesce, provided they enabled the occupants of labourers' cottages to get out-door relief in suitable cases.

Mr. Patrick
McCarthy.

20781 CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the Danganree Board of Guardians?—Yes, sir.

20782. What is your view as regards the Danganree Union; are you in favour of keeping it open or closing it?—I would be in favour of the Danganree Union being continued.

20783. As regards the unions on both sides?—They could be dispensed with.

20784. Kilmacshamus and Youghall?—Yes.

20785. If you dispensed with Youghall would you also dispense with Limerick?—Yes; I think Limerick and Cappoquin at both sides of Danganree could be dispensed with.

20786. Where would you put Limerick town?—I suppose that would be a matter of arrangement.

20787. How would you arrange it?—It is nearer to Fermoy than Danganree.

20788. Who would take from Cappoquin east, and let Fermoy take from that west?—Yes.

20789. What would you use these workhouses for?—I think as regards Kilmacshamus it might be rather late in the day now to speak of it, because there is great expense being incurred at present in extending the buildings of the lunatic asylum; it would be very useful for an auxiliary asylum, such as they have in Youghall.

20790. Have you any idea, as regards Limerick?—I take it that the hospital should be continued at Limerick.

20791. The fever hospital and the infirmary?—Yes.

20792. Then the rest of the buildings?—Perhaps it could be devoted to technical purposes.

20793. Or commercial?—There might be some industry started that the building could be utilised for. I may tell you that I did not weigh that point in my mind at all.

20794. About the disposition of the building?—Yes.

20795. It does not concern you so much because you propose your workhouse should be maintained, and it does not immediately concern you what is done with the outside unions?—Quite so.

20796. You answer queries 3 and 4 with a single affirmative, and say yes to all the questions. Is there anything you wish to add to that answer?—Well, with your experience, I prefer answering any questions you put to me on the spot.

20797. You don't require any additional hospital accommodation in your union?—I think not. Our medical officer is here and the clerk, and they will be more competent witnesses than myself.

20798. You have not used the hospital at the other side?—Not for a length of time.

20799. That was built originally for fever?—Quite so.

20800. I suppose it might be fitted up for fever again if it was needed?—That is the reason we kept it there.

20801. Dr. Brown.—There is a very nice fever hospital at the workhouse?—Oh, yes, lately built; good site, too. The establishment itself was built to accommodate 500 inmates, and there are now 200 in it at present, so there should be ample accommodation for an increased number of patients.

20802. CHAIRMAN.—You approve strongly of any

Mr. PATRICK MCCARTHY examined.

20779. At all events up to an Irish acre?—I think that might be.

20780. Mr. MURPHY.—In 1900 the Poor Law Relief Act removed that restriction as regards inmates and children?—And as regards maintenance in the workhouse too. However, the members of the Board of Guardians are sufficiently careful. I don't think they would abuse it if the restriction was altogether repealed. Certainly the occupants of labourers' cottages with their acre plot ought not to be debarred from getting outdoor relief when stricken down by sickness or accident; one poor man broke his leg, and the neighbouring friends had to contribute to the poor man's support.

person who is able to contribute or pay their cost being required to do it?—Certainly.

20803. You would be in favour of the governing bodies of hospitals throughout the country being given discretionary power to fix the amount and recover it at law?—Certainly.

20804. As regards tramps?—I would be in favour of a labour colony for tramps; it is a good idea, I think.

20805. That would be with a view to removing them altogether from the roads?—Yes.

20806. Take the whole class into street on an appointed day?—And they would pay for their own maintenance.

20807. In Belgium they are self-supporting, but one could hardly hope?—That they would do that here, though they might go a long way towards supporting themselves. There is a large tract of land acquired by Captain Stuart, and they could be set to work there planting trees, and there is a large building formerly intended for an industrial school that could be used for them.

20808. Is it not used now?—It is not; it is empty.

20809. As regards women that come into the workhouse to have illegitimate children?—I would be in favour of sending them after the first offence into a penitentiary, and while there they may earn perhaps as much as would partly pay for the maintenance of their illegitimate child.

20810. That is done now, I believe?—I would keep them there at all events for two years.

20811. I suppose you would let that depend on the discretion of the managers? It would depend on the disposition of the women; some women might be let out sooner than others?—That is quite so, but as things are at present it is really a great temptation to these poor women to go wrong when they have the workhouse as refuge to go into. If they knew they would not be received there they would mind themselves better.

20812. Are you in favour of the boarding out of children?—Certainly.

20813. You would rather have that than keep them in an institution?—Certainly. It is better for the children themselves and better for the community at large, because ultimately they become very useful when they are reared up and trained up in a country atmosphere. As a rule, not only is the air pure in one sense but it is also purer in a moral sense as compared with towns or large institutions, and they will turn themselves to anything they are asked in after-life; whereas, if you keep them in a union until twelve or fourteen years old, they are fit for nothing—they get discontented. If they go out to service they will return to the union again.

20814. You have noticed that?—Frequently. I took some children from the workhouse myself.

20815. To see how they would turn out?—Well, I took them to be useful.

20816. Were they satisfactory?—They were not; but I think the children who are sent out to nurse amongst poor people in the country, provided they are honest and decent, will ultimately be very useful members of society. They become good labourers after a time; they are willing to work.

Mr. DENIS RYAN examined.

20817. CHAIRMAN.—We have had the views of Mr. McCarthy. Have you heard a good deal of his evidence?—No, sir, I heard none of it. I regret I missed that.

20818. He went through the queries that your Board has answered. It will be unnecessary for us to go through them again, but if there was anything you

wished specially to mention under any of these heads?—Personally I would be against amalgamation.

20819. Of your own union; but you were in favour of the amalgamation of other unions with yours?—No, sir, personally I would not be.

20820. You would let every union remain as it is?—I would.

Mr. Denis
Ryan.

20321. You are satisfied with the Poor Law and its administration at present?—As far as the Dungarvan Union is concerned, I am perfectly satisfied with it.

20322. You would not touch it elsewhere either?—I personally would not wish to search any of the unions outside with Dungarvan, for this reason, that I think it might not be to the advantage of the Dungarvan Union to have any of these other unions taken in and united with the Dungarvan Union.

20323. Are they troublesome lands outside?—Not exactly that, but the rates would be higher, I fancy, and that would raise ours. And if they would not be higher, if it would be an advantage to Dungarvan to take over some of these outlying unions, it would be a disadvantage to those people, and I would not willingly grow rich at the expense of my neighbours.

20324. You would not like to disturb the present financial balance?—No.

20325. That would put you against any change whatever in the Poor Law if you follow it out?—I don't think it would.

20326. Where money is involved?—Where money is involved, I believe it would.

20327. There are very few changes in which money is not involved?—Of course, money would be involved in almost every detail of the working, but there are certain changes I would wish to have made even in the Dungarvan Union.

20328. What are they?—First with reference to the boarded-out children. I would wish all the children in the house would be boarded out. I think it would be an advantage to the children themselves to have them away from the contamination of the union.

20329. Do you think they are better men and women in after-life if they have outdoor rearing up?—I think they are, and even if everything was not desirable in their rearing outside the union, yet it would be better than rearing them in the union. With regard to the mothers of illegitimate children, it would be better to send them to a penitentiary such as we have in Waterford at the expense of the union.

20330. That is for such a short time as would put them into a position to earn their livelihood again?—Yes, and being reformed under religious influences. With regard to tramps, I would have those who might be called professional tramps, who make it the object of their lives to tramp about from place to place, the only thing they do; I would have those sent to the institution suggested here already—a labour colony. Of course, there may be found amongst the tramps some men who deserve to be treated well—some men who have to go from place to place to seek employment, or go from a place where they have been employed and for some reasons have to be on the road for a short time—I would treat those as kindly as I could.

20331. You would like the relieving officer to be empowered by law to put them in a decent lodging-house, and give them a breakfast if they had satisfactory documentary evidence about them that they were bona-fide labouring men looking for a job?—Yes, or tramps; I would treat them very kindly.

20332. Mr. MURKIN.—Have you many tramps at Dungarvan?—We have not very many; we used to have a great number.

20333. Do they have women or children with them?—They do.

20334. What would you do with the women?—I suppose the women would require some place similar to the men—a labour colony, too.

20335. CHAIRMAN.—A different branch of the same institution?—A different branch of the same institution. Most of the children I would have taken from these people altogether. It is pitiable to see some of these children going about with their parents.

20336. Without any education, sex, or religion?—Some. They can be seen peeping from the union in the morning fairly well-off after the night. They are fat and somewhat clean, and they feel somewhat happy, but towards evening the change is most awful. It is a pity to see these little children dragged about like that.

20337. Mr. MURKIN.—When you take the children out of your workhouses and the unmarried mothers, would you not be aggravating the cost per head of the inmates by still retaining the staff, the house containing so much fewer inmates?—You would.

20338. How would you get over that?—You could not well get over that for the present. The treatment of the people would be better and wiser, I suppose.

20339. CHAIRMAN.—Worth the difference, I suppose?—I think it would.

20340. Mr. MURKIN.—How would it be improved? Do you not treat the sick well now?—The sick, undoubtedly, are treated well. The sick in Dungarvan Union are treated equal to if not better than in any union in Ireland.

20341. Then how could it be improved?—I think this gentleman and I are not exactly on the same point, I am referring to healthy people with children. This gentleman is referring to sick.

20342. You say you would not approve of amalgamation in the case of Dungarvan, but still you would approve of taking the twenty-one children you had there a month ago and boarding them out, and the eight mothers you had there a month ago and boarding them out. That is reducing the number in the house by thirty. When you do that and make no corresponding reduction in the staff, you only add to the cost instead of lowering it per head of the inmates. How would you get over that?

20343. CHAIRMAN.—You would diminish the total cost of money expended, although you might increase it per head on those that remained?—First of all, as far as the children are concerned, you dispense with the cost of the teacher. Of course, you would have to give superannuation, and the benefit would not be immediate; it would come later on. But with regard to the mothers and fathers of these children, it would be an improvement to them and the country generally that a reformation would take place, and the expenditure would be worth the cost.

20344. Mr. MURKIN.—I suppose, in addition to the unmarried mothers and the children, you would put out the eleven bastards you had there a month ago and send them to the asylum?—Yes, sir, but not to the asylum. Unfortunately the asylums we have at present are overcrowded. I would classify those people. There is a certain class even of these individuals who would, by proper treatment, be able to make themselves creditable somewhat.

20345. You don't think the workhouse is a good place for the lunatic class?—The workhouse at Dungarvan is not a good place. I would wish to say, too, that I would like to have Dungarvan made a centre for hospital treatment, because we have a very efficient staff for that purpose in Dungarvan.

20346. CHAIRMAN.—You are a centre for hospital treatment?—Only in so far as Dungarvan Union.

20347. You could not ask people to come greater distances than the length of the present Dungarvan Union. You would not like to bring the Waterford people there?—No, but there are others not in Waterford who might like to avail of it.

20348. You have got a very good area for the sick?—We have, but we have more facilities for the sick.

20349. If you leave Kilmacross and Lismore, how could you take their sick away from them?—You could not take them away, but you could have cases of operations carried on in Dungarvan.

20350. You think the Kilmacross and Lismore and Youghal people would send you their operation cases?—I think they would if they knew the advantages to be derived.

20351. Do you think they would not be likely to send them to the County Infirmary in Waterford?—We have not availed of the infirmary in Waterford sufficiently up to the present. I don't know why it is.

20352. Do you think you have an up-to-date hospital for major operations? Are you informed to that effect?—I am, and I believe it because the operations that have been carried on there for some time have been most successful, and the patients after operations are a very short time on hands in Dungarvan, so efficient is the staff of that department.

Mr. J. E. DOWEN, Clerk of the Dungarvan Union, examined.

20353. CHAIRMAN.—Is there anything else you would like to add to the evidence? We don't want to put you to opinions?—No, there is nothing I have to say.

I think the boarding-out system in our union has worked remarkably well; none of the children have ever come back.

Mr. J. E. DOWEN.

June 21, 1904.
Mr. J. E.
Down.

20354. Is the general impression that the boarding-out system works better than the home?—That would be my view based on experience.
20355. Have you seen the home children coming back again?—Sometimes.
20356. Coming back to be mothers—the girls?—In some cases; very few.
20357. Having been illegitimate children themselves?—Very few cases; but under the boarding-out system I have hardly ever seen them coming back.
20358. Have you ever seen them coming back?—One case.
20359. Under what circumstances did that case

come back?—The party went away to America, and they came back to the home.

20360. Was the child of the Guardians' hands?—Yes.

20361. And the foster-parent went away to America?—The foster-parent died, and then the child came in.

20362. At what age was it boarded out?—Eight.

20363. At what age did it come in?—Twenty-four, I think.

20364. Were there any special circumstances in the case—a young man or a young woman?—A young woman.

Mr. WILLIAM STACK, J.P., examined.

Mr. William
Stack.

20365. CHAIRMAN.—You are Chairman of the Rural District Council of Dungarvan?—Yes.

20366. Are you a member of the Board of Guardians besides?—Yes.

20367. You have heard the evidence of the other gentlemen?—Yes, I have heard all the evidence.

20368. Is there anything you wish to add or qualify?—I am for amalgamation.

20369. What unions in the county would you amalgamate?—I think Lismore, Kilmacrossman, and Trough. I think one would be quite sufficient.

20370. You think Dungarvan and Waterford would be enough?—Quite enough, and even if you could do with one it would be much better; but I think Dungarvan, being a centre, must remain.

20371. Would you leave hospitals in all those places?—Certainly.

20372. But for the ordinary healthy inmates you would be quite satisfied if everything could be managed with only one union—Waterford?—I believe it.

20373. You think it would be more economical?—The more you take into a house the less expense of one kind.

20374. You looked into it, I suppose, from that point of view?—Yes, I have a pretty fair experience of things. Of course, I am not as well able to account for things as the gentlemen we have heard here, but I think one house would be quite sufficient in the centre of the county.

20375. And with Waterford you have rail from all the others for the able-bodied?—Yes.

20376. If you leave accommodation at each of those places for the sick, you think the county could get on well enough?—I believe so. I have always favoured the tramps.

20377. You have had a kindly feeling for them?—Yes, for if I take myself and the two gentlemen with you and you got stranded and had no money—

Mr. THOMAS POWERS, Dungarvan Urban Council, examined.

Mr. Thomas
Powers.

20381. CHAIRMAN.—Are the views of the Urban Council in favour of amalgamation?—They did not go into the matter as a body, but they referred the query alert to me and my colleagues to give evidence.

20382. What is your view?—I would leave Dungarvan open or close it. I would leave Dungarvan intact. When workhouses were established in 1841 or so, we had a population of 150,000 in the County Waterford. That population has gone down about 50 per cent. I therefore think on reasonable grounds, and in the interests of economy and efficiency, that the workhouses at present might be fairly reduced by half—that is, dissolve two and retain two.

20383. Which would you dissolve?—For the convenience and accommodation of the people that resort to them generally, I would say Waterford ought to stand, Dungarvan being the centre of the county ought

to stand, Lismore and Kilmacrossman ought to be dissolved.

20384. Close up every second one?—Yes. I approve of what has been said with regard to the boarding-out system. And another matter that I would like to bring under your notice. Three years ago the County Council had a committee on the amalgamation of unions, and they went so far as having a report made out at that time, but the representatives of Kilmacrossman could not agree, and the committee dissolved. This (produced) is the report. I am in favour of a central sanatorium for consumptives in Munster.

20385. Or for each county as might be sufficient to require one?—Quite so. I would separate Cork County, as it has taken up the matter for its own area. I would have one for all the other counties in Munster.

Mr. CHARLES J. CURRAN examined.

Mr. Charles J.
Curran.

I am sorry I don't agree with my chairman as regards the treatment of tramps. I think I would agree more with your own suggestion that something should be done to put down the tramps.

20386. CHAIRMAN.—That is, tramps who are doing nothing else but tramping and don't intend to get work?—One way of doing away with tramps is to board

out our children. I think a great many of the tramps on the roads are the children of workhouses.

20387. Do you think so?—I do.

20388. We have not heard that mentioned before?—I saw one or two that I knew before at the workhouse.

20389. And you have seen them come back as tramps?—No, but at one time I had six or seven at

want boys from the union. I was a contractor for milk, and two or three of those boys went to England and joined their families, and some of them wrote asking me if I would pay their passage to Waterford, and they would come back and work, as they had lost their jobs and had nothing to do, so I assume they went on tramp in England. I think the other children in workhouses could not be boarded out. There should be some institution where they would be sent.

20890. That is the present race?—Yes.

20891. That would be a comparatively small number?—I think so.

20892. Just children between twelve and sixteen?—Yes, and there is an important question now with regard to rating. The chairman of our County Council suggested at the last meeting of the County Council that Clonmel No. 2 should be amalgamated with Dungarvan. The valuation of Clonmel No. 2 is only £14,000, and I think the rates there are pretty stiff, particularly the rural rates, and if that portion of the County Waterford was tacked on to Dungarvan with its small valuation and Clonmel No. 2, as a whole certainly the rates in Dungarvan would be raised considerably.

20893. You have a chain of hills between you and that district?—Most of the hills are in the Dungarvan district. Clonmel is a pretty important town, and we have half the mail-car road from Clonmel to Waterford in that £14,000 valuation. That one road is a heavy expense. That question of main roads—

20894. That is a little off our track?—Is there not a possibility that the whole district would be transferred?

20895. We are only dealing with it as a union. I

Dr. HACKETT examined.

20896. CHAIRMAN.—Now, we are not going to trouble you with any questions about amalgamation, but if you have any evidence you would like to give us about the hospitals and infirmaries?—I quite agree with having lunatics changed from the workhouse hospitals; it is not the proper place for them. Then it is very important that consumptives should be removed. It is not fair to themselves or the other patients.

20897. As far as your knowledge goes from private and public practice, is there much phthisis in this district?—Yes, a good deal. A great number come from time to time to the workhouse hospital, and of course you do no good for them.

20898. Have you observed at all whether the disease is fairly stationary or increasing?—I don't think it is increasing in my district.

20899. Is it largely confined to particular families?—I would not think that. What I wish to say is this, that I think the classification in workhouse hospitals at present is not good. You have the hospitals proper and infirm wards. Then in the infirm wards you have old people that are not able to take care of themselves, and they are not properly taken care of. They are under the matron and paupers. A great number of these inmates are helpless.

20900. Are any of them bedridden?—They are.

20901. And you have not space to take them into the hospital, or do you arrange them purposely?—I want exclude them.

20902. If you had room would you bring them in?—I think you should have a hospital proper, that is a hospital for the treatment of cases; then I think you should have a chronic hospital or infirmary for old people, people that simply require domestic care, and that would do very well under a Sister and attendants.

20903. What class of disease would you put under domestic care?—Senile cases—simply old people.

20904. People that could not attend themselves in any way?—Yes.

20905. Not requiring medical treatment, but requiring nursing—do you think they would not require more than that?—Very simple senile cases. If they had any disease like scrofula, they would be taken into the hospital.

20906. Is not this the very class of persons who would be liable to bed-sores?—If they are kept clean they would not.

20907. Do you think the ordinary domestic attendant would ever keep them clean?—I think she would. We have attendants in the hospital, and I think these at-

ten the force of what you say?—With regard to the amalgamation of Kilmacshann, when the County Council first took off the committee of the County Council, three or four representatives, including myself, took up the question of amalgamating Kilmacshann for the purpose of an auxiliary asylum. We studied the question very carefully, but had to abandon the idea on the ground that we were starting a new building at the Waterford asylum for lunatics, and that the time was rather inopportune for the consideration of amalgamating it as an auxiliary asylum.

20908. Are you a member of the asylum committee?—Yes.

20909. For how many inmates is the new building intended?—Sixty females, and I think the same number of males—120.

20910. That would just take in the workhouse inmates. Was that what it was intended for?—Oh, no; it was intended for real lunatics, dangerous lunatics—that class that is growing.

20911. Where are they at present?—They are in the asylum at present; they have not enough room at all.

20912. They are overcrowded to the extent of 120?—The certified rooms in the asylum is for 450, and at present there are about 540 patients.

20913. Dr. BROOKS.—Then you will have no more additional accommodation there at all?—No additional accommodation.

20914. CHAIRMAN.—Do you know how much you are spending on the building?—The present contract is £10,000. We have taken up only one section of it. There are three or four sections—about £40,000.

20915. Dr. BROOKS.—The cases that are confined to bed continually would require some nursing to prevent bed-sores?—If they are kept clean and bathed.

20916. Well, that is nursing?—But it is not skilled nursing. You cannot get skilled nursing for that number of patients in Dungarvan. You would have sixty or eighty of that class.

20917. If you had this classification, would your fever hospital be large enough to accommodate all your acute cases?—It would.

20918. CHAIRMAN.—And you would rig up the Abbotside hospital for a fever hospital?—Yes.

20919. Dr. BROOKS.—Then you could separate the other cases. Would it tend to economy and efficiency?—It would not tend to economy. You would have two staffs.

20920. CHAIRMAN.—Did you not wish to have an acute staff?—Yes, but I have that in the lower wards. I would have that block for acute cases. I would have the upper block for the chronic cases.

20921. You would have two staffs still. You would have your staff for the acute, and call them what you will, domestic attendants. You would have your second staff there?—Yes, but the chronic hospital would be in connection with the acute one, and I could take my cases up and down as I thought necessary.

20922. Would not that be equally so with the present fever hospital?—It would, but then I have quite room enough where I am for the acute hospital, and for the chronic.

20923. You would not have as good classification if you had them in a separate building?—They are separate buildings practically; you have a yard between.

20924. Dr. BROOKS.—They are not so well cut off as in the other building, but would it not be much better for people of a class above what you have at present?—It would, but at present they come in freely to the Dungarvan hospital.

20925. CHAIRMAN.—You don't notice any prejudice against it?—No, that prejudice is dying out.

20926. Dr. BROOKS.—Do many paying patients go in?—A good number.

20927. Is that class increasing?—Very much.

20928. We have heard you did a large number of operations?—A great number.

- June 21, 1904.
Dr. Hackett.
200329. What about the assistance in nursing these cases?—They are nursed by Sisters, and I am very pleased with the way they are nursed.
200330. I am talking about the medical and surgical cases—I get in the local men. I am perfectly satisfied with the nursing in the hospital.
200331. CHAIRMAN.—Are you satisfied with the conditions under which you operate?—If I had an operating room it would be very much more convenient.
200332. You would not go as far as the Guardians who said the present conditions were entirely up-to-date for surgical operations?—I think it is if I am to judge by results. We practically never see a case of sepsis.
200333. Are the conditions sought?—They are not up-to-date. I have two small wards and I operate there and keep the patient there for two or three days and put him into the other wards.
200334. Ordinary rooms and ordinary furniture?—Yes.
200335. Ordinary window light?—Yes, but I have got light in the ceiling.
200336. Dr. BROWN.—You do have some supposition?—Practically none. I was very sorry I did not meet you at Dungarvan and show you the shape of some important cases. The results are excellent as to the healing of wounds.
200337. Still, would you not like to have things that there would not be the risk. You cannot say that your arrangements are up-to-date; there is always a

- risk?—I think if you take the ordinary precautions, I don't know. I think our arrangements are very good there. You cannot sterilise the walls.
200338. Or the air?—If you take other precautions as to your instruments and hands, I think—
200339. CHAIRMAN.—You would avoid a good deal of danger, but not all?—Not all. If there was an operating room built there, but you cannot do that, because you could not have one operating room for the two sides, because the convent comes between.
200340. How many beds would the upper hospital contain?—Thirty.
200341. How many acute cases would you have altogether?—Twenty or forty sometimes.
200342. There was not anything like that when we were there?—But you must remember this is common.
200343. What is your total number of cases?—It would average 100 or 150.
200344. We have the census for one of the fullest weeks in the year, and you have 115?—At present I have seventy. There are a good many of those that don't require treatment practically, but if I put them out, they would be put into the infirm wards.
200345. Dr. BROWN.—And you have no nursing there or supervision, and for that reason you have to keep them in your sick ward?—Yes.
200346. You did try to get some of these out?—Yes, and they came back again. You send them out for a week and they come back practically dying.

Mr. DAVID GLANCEY, Chairman, Kilmacshamus Union, examined.

- Mr. David Glancey.
200347. CHAIRMAN.—Are you in favour of the maintenance of Kilmacshamus?—Yes, sir.
200348. Is your Board practically unanimous on that question?—Yes, sir.
200349. If the hospital were left there, and if it were shown to you that a good deal of economy would result from transferring the rest of the inmates elsewhere, do you think you and your colleagues would approve of such a change?—I think so; I would.
200350. You would be willing to have the transfer if the sick wards were left and you could be shown a distinct economy by the change?—Yes, but there is one thing that I would like to have clearly pointed out to me. Those gentlemen who have spoken to-day in favour of having Kilmacshamus amalgamated with Waterford and Dungarvan did not give us any idea at all whether it would be for the benefit of the sick poor of Kilmacshamus or the ratepayers. These were the two points we went on. I hold a Guardian's first duty is to look after the poor. I don't think Captain Coughlan gave you any reasons or proved to you conclusively that it would be for the benefit of the sick poor of Kilmacshamus to be sent to Waterford or Dungarvan. I hold myself it would not, and we discussed the thing between us, and I am under the impression it would be the greatest inconvenience to them to have them removed from Kilmacshamus.
200351. I don't think anyone proposed that the sick wards should be disturbed in Kilmacshamus?—Captain Coughlan did.
200352. As regards tramps, have you many of them?—We have a great many of them, sir; I won't go into statistics at all.
200353. Would you be disposed to take strong steps with them, such as putting any men who would not give an account of themselves into a workhouse—call it a labour colony or whatever you like?—A labour colony by all means.
200354. Take their children from them and board them out?—I don't know about the children; I would not give an opinion about that.

Mr. MICHAEL BYRNE, Vice-Chairman, Kilmacshamus Union, examined.

- Mr. Michael Byrne.
200355. CHAIRMAN.—What is your view? Do you agree with the chairman pretty well, or is there any point in which you differ from him?—I don't think there is any point on which I differ from the chairman of the Board of Guardians. I don't believe in amalgamation from any point of view. As regards the tramp question, I think this business should be left in the hands of the police.
200356. That would necessarily be the case if it were made a labour colony business?—The population of

our union is about 7,000, with 50,000 acres of land, and I would like to say that I and my colleagues representing the Kilmacshamus Union here to-day did not come made up in any kind of energetic body, but merely to try and improve our town in any shape or form, and what we said in the boardroom when looking at these queries that you sent down we are going to say the same to-day. Probably the matter may not have escaped your notice any more than mine.

—Are you in favour of amalgamation? Yes, if you

don't amalgamate my own union." We know our union is a great accommodation to the poor people, after the lapse of the mines in Barmahall brought a great many chronic cases into our hospital. We find our sick poor are very well done for there, and on several occasions, as a member of the committee, I turned back and asked some of these poor people had they any complaints, after the committee left the room, and they always told me they had not. As regards the two classes of children, we have only one boarded out, because Miss Fitzgerald Kerney was sent round by the Local Government Board, and her report of the children was not very satisfactory at all.

20965. On the child?—More especially on the hired-out children; she had not much to say on the boarded-out child. The Board would be in favour of boarding out the children instead of hiring out, but the fact of the matter is we know from our experience that for the small amount that is paid during the year,

which does not amount to more than 2s. or 2s. 6d. per week, you won't get anybody to take proper care of the children.

20966. You would be rather in favour of increasing the amount?—Of keeping the child. I find from the report of the religious inspector and of the Local Government inspectors that the school children are doing very well. I find so myself. It fits them to be very good children, and I find some that have gone out not to be so well done for. Seven children left us about May last, and they are all nice little boys, all earning their bread. I would not be at all in favour of keeping such children as those in, but from the treatment I did see of the boarded-out children I would prefer keeping them in, but if they were any way well done for I would be in favour of boarding them out.

Mr. T. F. Walsh, Clerk.—The Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the District Council are here.

June 21, 1894.

Mr. Michael Hyman.

Mr. JOHN KIRKNEY examined.

I agree with what has been said by the others. As to the tramps, I would be in favour of having them sent to colonies.

Mr. Walsh.—Captain Conaghan, when giving evidence, spoke of the amount of land that is round Kilmacshamus Workhouse.

CHAIRMAN.—You may remember we went over it very carefully with the master.

Mr. John Kirkney.

Mr. Mackey, Clerk of the Union, Waterford.—The Board of Guardians named Mr. Murphy, and Mr. Murphy said he had no evidence to tender.

Mr. JAMES MURPHY examined.

I have no evidence to give, but only, if you allow me, to give my opinion. I am only a short time a Guardian. I cannot see any benefit by amalgamating Waterford with any other union. There were close on a thousand inmates in the workhouse last winter—most part of them are in the healthy portion of the house—and consequently I cannot see how it would be any advantage to the ratepayers and poor to amalgamate the place; in other words, there would have to be additional buildings; there are some already in contemplation.

20965. CHAIRMAN.—You did not go into figures?—If the law could be altered in this way, that the Guardians should have power—because these able-bodied people make it a constant practice of coming into the Waterford Union—if we had power to judge for ourselves the persons who should be admitted and discharged, and give the same power to the relieving officers, so that they would not have blame. This is the way the danger comes in, if he refused a ticket the relieving officer would be brought up. A great many of these people are tramps. They don't belong to the county or city at all. If you could make any alteration in the law that way.

20966. To enlarge your discretion?—Yes; but I cannot see any other way. Waterford Union is in the most perfect order, and I cannot see a benefit to the

ratepayers or the poor by amalgamating. I hope you will concur with my views on that subject.

20967. If it were shown clearly that some financial benefit would result, then you would be prepared to reconsider the matter?—Of course I would, but I cannot see how there could be anything in that way done at present, at all events. About these illegitimate children, that is another thing I brought forward myself, but they seem to tell me it could not be done; but I know it is done in England; the putative father can be found out in many instances.

20968. Would you be in favour of making the law the same here as in England?—Undoubtedly; it prevents this demonstration in a great many districts in England. And especially in Ireland, where we are looked upon as one of the most moral countries in the world, it ought to be stopped. That is my opinion, and I think I am right too.

20969. I think every one would agree with your motive at all events?—Yes, it is not hard to be done; it is done in England, and Scotland, and Wales, and according to the means of the reputed father he has to pay. Then there won't be so many; but when they are shielded here it more encourages them than anything else—examining in the union and going out and coming in with another child. That work is not right; it should be ended.

Mr. James Murphy.

Mr. DAVID HYLAND, Chairman, Waterford Union, examined.

20970. CHAIRMAN.—You were kind enough to give me a statement here, which we will have on the notes?—From my experience as a Guardian of the Waterford Union for the past twelve years, I am of opinion in advantage, from a ratepayer's point of view, not in the interest of the aged destitute poor, will accrue from amalgamation of workhouses in this district. Old people do not wish to be brought long distances from their native localities. Being obliged to enter the workhouse is sufficiently humiliating to them, without adding to it by placing them beyond the reach of a visit from their relations or their friends. With regard to the children in workhouses, I believe no institution, no matter how well managed, can compensate for the loss of home associations, such as the nursing-out system secures. The Guardians of the Waterford Union have unanimously approved of this system and adopted it as far as possible. I am of opinion that same discipline should be kept apart from the inmates. The tramp nuisance requires to be vigorously dealt with. The demand for manual labour at the present day leaves no excuse for any able-bodied man or woman to remain idle. I certainly approve of a penal colony or reformatory for such people.

20971. You think it would be a hardship on the poor to be brought from their former home and neighbourhood?—I do.

Mr. David Hyland.

20972. That is necessary, even in the present system in a very large number of the cases where people go to workhouses. For instance, take Kilmacshamus. There are a very large number of people in the Kilmacshamus Union who come from a long distance from Kilmacshamus. They would have to come further if they came to Waterford. You would be against that?—I would, that they would be obliged to enter workhouses in remote parts of the country.

20973. Would you be in favour of an extension of the nursing-out system so as to enable you to board out all children that are in your charge as far as possible?—Really, I would.

Mr. Mackey.—Our difficulty is not in the matter of approving of the system of boarding out, but our difficulty is getting suitable foster-parents. We cannot get them.

20974. CHAIRMAN.—What is the amount you give?—Mr. Mackey.—Practically the same as the other Boards.—3s. a week.

20975. You have thirty boarded out at present?

4 X 2

June 21, 1904.
Mr. David
Hyland.

Mr. Mosley.—Twenty. I have written to every parish priest within the limits of the union asking him to assist us in the way of recommending suitable foster-parents. We have advertised over and over. No person in occupation of land of any quantity, personally speaking, will apply for these children at all. 20075. It would be more economical to give a larger sum?

Mr. Mosley.—Those who apply at present apply for the sake of what they make of the children, either money earning or utilizing their labour.

Chairman.—No one will take them except very poor people.

20077. What would you do with the tramps? Would you approve of the labour colony idea?—I have mentioned that. I would approve of something where they would be made work, because they go from union to union.

20078. Without giving it a name, you would approve of some such system?—Yes, they go from union to union and are the terror of the people of the country, and they won't work.

20079. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you think the sentiment of the country would approve of any steps so advanced as to send people to a colony of the kind without having committed any offence?—Well, I would like really to have them compelled so as to make them work, something that would get them out of the lazy habit of leeching from union to union.

20080. If there was a county workhouse where those people could get employment and pay and make them go there?—I don't know how you would manage to get them to pay—how could you make their labour pay.

20081. If they are strong men they could do some work, and surely a day of the work would bring in some pay?—I am afraid it would be a loss to the management.

20082. Is it not a loss at present?—I am afraid it would be adding to the loss; it is so hard to make them work.

20083. If you send them to the colony would it not be the same thing?

Chairman.—It would, but you would take them off finally?—Yes, take them off finally. I would be anxious even to have a loss if we could train them and educate them into the habit of working. Of course, there is labour enough in the country if they could be made to do it.

20084. There is plenty of employment for them if they would take it, but they are not disposed to work?—No, they don't believe in doing anything. Even in Waterford Union we had to increase the rate this year on account of the amount of able-bodied men going through the country—those tramps.

20085. Are you a member of the Corporation also?

20086. Have the Corporation discussed this matter at all?—No, they have not.

20087. They are not giving any opinion on the matter?—No, no opinion whatever. This does not interfere with the Corporation very much. It is more for the unions.

20088. It is altogether, except as a public body, they might have an opinion?—They have not offered any opinion.

Miss Thomas examined.

Miss Thomas.

20089. Dr. BROOKER.—You have had a large experience of the nursing of the sick in workhouse infirmaries. Would you explain to us the system in the Waterford Workhouse?—It is now done under the nurse, who have a set of probationers working under them.

20090. CHAIRMAN.—You are the training sister?—Yes.

20091. You work in conjunction with the county infirmary, the old leper hospital?—Yes.

20092. And your probationers are interchangeable?—Yes, our probationers go to them for six months and then come to us for six months.

20093. What is the period of training for your probationers?—Two years.

20094. Then they have lectures and examinations?—Yes, at the end of the time.

20095. Have you turned out any after a two years' training?—No, the two years will not be up until the end of September.

20096. So you cannot give us the result of your first examination yet?—No.

20097. Dr. BROOKER.—In connection with the county infirmary, you have trained a number of other nurses also?—Yes.

20098. Does the system work very well?—It works excellently.

20099. You have no friction whatever?—No friction at all.

21000. Do the governors of the county infirmary look upon it with favour?—I think so.

21001. Do you know if it is inclined to increase the number of probationers seeking appointments—the fact that they can get the certificate of a fully-trained nurse?—I think it does.

21002. What class of young girls are applying?—Mostly farmers' daughters.

21003. Are they fairly well educated?—They have to pass a preliminary examination before they are accepted.

21004. Is that fairly stiff?—Fair.

21005. CHAIRMAN.—After September next, about how many a year will you turn out? Will you certify each year? What is your total number?—Fourteen.

21006. Will you turn out fourteen a year?—No, seven a year.

21007. You will finish seven next September and each succeeding September unless there are cases where a girl may leave her work?—We shall not finish seven next September, because we have two or three who were qualified nurses. They had an examination in the first year.

21008. Dr. BROOKER.—In fact, that will suit you better because it brings in applicants at different times?—Yes, but we have had no more applications.

21009. CHAIRMAN.—Seven a year you will turn out?—Yes, that is supposing nothing happens to take them away from their work.

21010. Mr. MURKIN.—Are there many applications?—Not a great many, but quite enough.

21011. Dr. BROOKER.—What are the terms under which they serve?—They receive no payment at all.

21012. CHAIRMAN.—Neither year?—No.

21013. Do they make any payment on coming in?—No, they find their own uniforms.

21014. And they get their food?—Their food and their lodgings. They get everything found for them.

21015. And you have taken a nice house for them?—We have a nice house.

21016. Dr. BROOKER.—The Guardians practically get two years' service and those fourteen probationers for nothing, but the cost of their food?—Yes, and the extra training. You have to pay for their lectures.

21017. They have nothing to give them in the way of salaries at all, and they get the services of fourteen very competent young ladies?—They are fairly competent after a time. At first they are not very much so.

21018. You don't take in too many at any one time, do you get a number that are fairly well trained?—Half of them are very useful.

21019. Do you think that would be a good system if it could be extended to other workhouses?—I do.

21020. Have you much experience of other workhouses?—I have been in certain workhouses, but have not studied any time in any of them.

21021. CHAIRMAN.—Have you been in Limerick?—No.

21022. Or Galway?—No, I have been in Dungannon, Kilmacshannon, and Wexford.

21023. You consider it a very great advantage to have a county infirmary in conjunction with the workhouse?—Well, I would rather have the nurses all trained in the one institution.

21024. But they will get there the experience they could not get at an ordinary workhouse?—Yes, but I think it would make a better training school to have one of the large workhouse infirmaries which would fulfil all the conditions necessary.

21025. Where they would have operations?—Yes, and a resident medical officer. I think that would make a still better training school than having the two.

June 21, 1904

Miss Thomas.

21035. But where you cannot get that?—The other is a very good substitute.

21037. Dr. BIGGER.—That would only apply to five of our workhouses in Ireland?—There would be Limerick, Dublin, and Cork.

21038. There is no training in Limerick. There would not be more than five or six. You see, there is an interchange, and the girls must get a very large amount of experience in the county infirmary in the way of operations?—Yes, which they could not possibly have in the workhouse.

21039. CHAIRMAN.—And they see the ways of a large number of doctors and surgeons, so that they are not trained altogether on one gentleman's practice?—But it unites them every time they make a change.

21040. Slightly?—That is the one disadvantage.

21041. What do they do for fever?—We have no nursing in fever.

21042. Dr. BIGGER.—Could you get the same advantage at the county infirmary in the way of fever nursing? They send their nurses to Liverpool?—I know they do, but they keep their nurses for three years, and then I think they have to pay something for sending them; but it is an advantage to them if they keep them for use for private work in connection with their hospital.

21043. They are called upon so much to nurse fever. It is essential they should be trained in fever?—And the advantage would be only to the nurses, not to the union, if they were trained in fever.

21044. Are you not able to give them training to some extent by the connection with the fever hospital?—They have not had enough cases there.

21045. CHAIRMAN.—Is there a trained fever nurse at present?—No, there is not.

21046. Dr. BIGGER.—Does the system of having probationers on duty and doing nursing in the wards under the men in charge work very well?—Very well indeed. She acts as a sort of Sister, the same way as in St. Vincent's or the Mater. She is responsible for her time as many patients as the nurse.

21047. And therefore she just supervises?—She supervises.

21048. And the probationers do the work?—Yes.

21049. Do you go round and instruct them at the bedside?—I do.

21050. All through the hospital?—All through the hospital.

21051. You have no restrictions at all?—No restrictions.

21052. I mean to say at any time or in a severe case, and can you change the nurse from one portion of the infirmary to another, according to the class of disease?—Yes.

21053. CHAIRMAN.—Are they put on night duty in their first year?—Yes, after they have been there three months sometimes.

21054. Dr. BIGGER.—You would not do it if you could help it?—As a rule I like to leave it a little longer.

21055. As a rule do they get good appointments on leaving the infirmary?—Three or four have had appointments—two in Cork, one in Rathkeale, and one is nursing in the union at present.

21056. I suppose you are a firm believer in the efficiency of training them in the way of nursing?—Yes.

21057. CHAIRMAN.—Does anything occur to you that you would like to say?—Nothing that has not been already said except that I think it would be a very good thing to discontinue the hospital from the house. Take away the name of the workhouse hospital.

21058. Dr. BIGGER.—Do you find some patients dislike the idea of coming into the workhouse?—Yes, and I think it would be better for the nurses, too.

21059. CHAIRMAN.—Have you ever had any experience of district nursing?—Very little; I have never done any district nursing.

21060. Have you seen anything of the homes of the poor in Waterford Union?—Not in Waterford; I have in Kilkenny.

21061. What did you find where there was sickness in the homes? Did you find the homes fairly sanitary?—Some of them were not very.

21062. Were there many one-roomed dwelling-houses?—Generally two, I think.

21063. Would that be in the city?—No, in the country near Castlecomer.

21064. Have you had any experience at all of any of the Irish towns or cities?—No, I have not.

The Sitting terminated.

June 22, 1904

FORTY-SECOND PUBLIC SITTING.—WEDNESDAY, JUNE 22nd, 1904.

At the Courthouse, Clonmel.

Present:—Mr. WICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. COFFY BROSSE.

Dr. J. F. O'BRYEN EXAMINED.

Dr. J. F.
O'BRYEN.

22055. CHAIRMAN.—You have been deputed to represent the County Council?—Yes, sir.

22056. Have you your own notes?—No, I have no copy of them.

22057. You mentioned there are nine unions in the County Tipperary?—Yes.

22058. What are the views of the County Council as to whether these unions should be reduced in number or not?—I don't think that they went largely into the question at any meeting, but there was a conference that was attended by members deputed by the County Council the year before, and members representing the rural districts, or some of them, in the unions; no definite conclusion was come to. Of course there was a difficulty in the way that the local men wished to preserve their unions as a rule, but I understand that, generally, their views were in accordance with ours, because I had previously given my views more than once, and in appointing me they for the most part adopted the views I put forward. The resolution adopted by the two County Councils was—"That the representatives appointed by the North and South Tipperary County Councils are of opinion that the principle of amalgamation should be carried out having regard to the unions of the entire county."

22059. In some of the papers I read—I don't know whether it was your view or not—one statement was made that three unions would be sufficient?—That was my opinion, and I think that originated with me.

22060. Clonmel was one of the unions?—Clonmel was one of them, on account of its position.

22061. The second?—Thurles, and the third Nenagh. They are almost equi-distant, and they are in very nearly a straight line across the county. There is a drawback in the case of Nenagh that it has practically no communication from the South, except a very roundabout one.

22062. How would you apportion the various unions. I suppose Carrick-on-Suir and Clongheen into Clonmel?—Yes; there is only a small part of the Carrick-on-Suir Union in this county, a valuation of about £20,000 odd.

22063. Did you contemplate the closing up of that workhouse?—Closing it up as a workhouse unless it served as a workhouse for part of Kilkenny or Waterford.

22064. I suppose you contemplate leaving some place there for the treatment of the sick?—I think they made Carrick into a district hospital some time ago.

22065. Do you think the entire workhouse might be closed at Carrick, and no hardship would result to the sick of Carrick and the district if they had to go either to Clonmel or Waterford?—I think there would be no hardship in it.

22066. What would the distance be?—About fourteen miles to Waterford, and about the same or a little less to Clonmel.

22067. And you think that really the entire establishment at Carrick-on-Suir might be closed?—I think so; certainly as regards the County Tipperary.

22068. There is a fever hospital there. What would you do with that?—I think fever hospitals, if not utilized for any of the other purposes, ought to be maintained in suitable situations. I cannot speak, of course, with regard to the accommodation, whether there is a fever hospital within sufficiently easy reach of Carrick on the other side; that is to say in the part of the County Kilkenny which is within two miles of it, or Waterford, which is across the river.

22069. The nearest union to Carrick on the Kilkenny side would be—?—Kilkenny itself, I think, comes down very close to it. Thomastown is in Kilkenny.

22070. Callan would be the nearest?—Callan is one of those which is partly in the County Kilkenny and partly in the County Tipperary.

22071. That raises the question, did the County Council consider that the entire county of Tipperary should be self-contained and exclusive for Poor Law purposes?—I think that was the view, and with regard to that union, the portion of the County Tipperary that is in it is practically cut off by a chain of mountains from the Kilkenny side.

22072. So you would give up to Waterford the parts of Clonmel and Carrick that are in Waterford?—Oh, certainly.

22073. But you would take them the parts of Callan and other unions that are in Tipperary?—Yes, of course. There is another question later on, which might supply the answer to that, that is the presence of certain unions or portions of counties. In that case, of course, half of the County Waterford might be served by Clonmel Union.

22074. Did you go on the lines of dealing with the Poor Law according to counties or unions?—According to counties, if even a larger area could not be established.

22075. You make a statement that all the workhouses should be utilized; that that is the root of the matter, and the source of local opposition, so that wherever you would close a workhouse you would turn it to some useful purpose?—Yes, I think there is scope for that all.

22076. What would you do with the various workhouses?—I suggested Clongheen as one suited for an industrial school.

22077. That would not be under the Poor Law?—No, perhaps not, but these unions were grouped in the County Kilkenny for that purpose.

22078. That was for a Poor Law school?—Yes, I meant under the Poor Law.

22079. Have you considered the relative advantage of such an institution system of bringing up children, as compared with boarding out?—I have not compared it with or set it against boarding out; if boarding out could be carried out on a thorough scale, I think it would be more advantageous, but boarding out is not resorted to to any great extent.

22080. It is increasing very largely, I suppose you are aware?—In some places I believe it is, and in other I think it is rather dropping back.

22081. We have had almost universally evidence given to us in favour of the boarding-out system as opposed to the system of bringing up children in institutions?—I prefer the boarding-out system, of course very much if proper houses could be got, and I expect labourers' cottages, but I don't know that that has ever been tried.

22082. It has, but it is hardly an ideal place to put a child, where it cannot get a certain supply of milk, for instance?—In many of them they have quite a sufficient supply of milk; in point of fact I think the labourers' cottages, the condition of the people in them, and their general tone and standing, has been very much improved. I have been lately doing dispensary duty in the west of the county—the Ennis district—which brought me into a great many of those cottages, and I think the people are becoming improved very much.

22083. They are getting more employment?—Not only that, but they are getting to have a better feeling, and the building of cottages has had the effect it was intended to produce, and therefore they would be suited for children.

22084. The Guardians nearly all represented to us the desirableness of having additional powers given to them to board out. At present they can only board

June 22, 1904

Dr. J. F.
O'Regan.

out orphans and deserted children that come to their charge, or to have a discretion of doing so, at all events—I am very much in favour of it. I think the workhouse is very undesirable.

21285. One of those workhouses you would like to turn into a house for a home for aged people?—One of last.

21286. You suggest Tipperary would make a good centre for a hospital?—Yes, because it has been more improved in that respect than, I think, any other. I have been in most of the union workhouses in the county, almost all but two, though not of late years so much as formerly, but I am of opinion that the Tipperary hospital is very superior to any other I know.

21287. Except Clonmel and all the others that are left?—I would retain Clonmel as a workhouse, not as a hospital.

21288. Of course the hospital would remain still, could it not. There would be a place for treating the sick in such a town as Clonmel. You would not oblige the people of Clonmel to go to Tipperary to be treated for their diseases?—I think that would be minimised as much as possible.

21289. You mean you would send as many as possible?—As many as possible. I don't see the advantage of keeping up any one place as a district hospital if the other hospitals are to be kept up.

21290. That is rather an unusual view to get. Nearly all the witnesses think that in each place a small hospital for acute cases ought to remain?—I don't take exception to that view either; it was on that ground I mentioned the possible retention of the fever hospital at Carrick, that some small accommodation must be provided for acute cases or persons seriously injured. But I refer now to the cases of those chronically sick. Of course the actual practice is that persons remain so long in their homes; it is difficult to get them to go into hospital, and if they were removed somewhat earlier they would bear the journey better, even if it appeared to be a little longer. In Tipperary they have two very fine ambulances, and the distance of the furthest part of the union is sixteen or seventeen Irish miles at present, and no place almost would be further by road than that.

21291. Under your contemplated system you would have a workhouse at Clonmel, another at Thurles, and another at Nenagh; into these buildings you would receive pretty much all the present class of inmates that go, would you?—Of course the view I take is that the number of paupers should be diminished as much as possible. I mean the class of people who prefer to go into a workhouse and spend their lives there rather than do any work outside.

21292. There are hardly any able-bodied people in all Ireland in workhouses?—I am afraid there are a good many.

21293. We have the numbers here in every workhouse, and the total is very small?—I am not sure I rely entirely on those figures, because I think a great many people are retained who are able-bodied and ought to be out of the workhouses.

21294. They would be very old?—Not very old at all. I think the number is rather understated for various reasons.

21295. I think you may rely on those figures, that there are about 4,000 able-bodied in all the workhouses, and that includes the large cities of Dublin, Belfast, Cork, and Limerick?—I am still inclined to believe that there are a great many more who are perfectly competent to work, and any man going into any workhouse can see them there in numbers.

21296. We have done that in all the workhouses up to the present in twenty-three counties, and we find the number of able-bodied, properly so-called, are very few?—Then I will say no more on that.

21297. But that is apart from the question we are discussing, that is, you would receive into these workhouses pretty well all the classes that now go in?—Yes.

21298. There is an alternative suggestion made to us that instead of trying to amalgamate unions and continue the same classification in any workhouse, that we should instead recommend taking as many classes out of the workhouses as possible, and disposing of them elsewhere?—That is in my view with regard to old people.

21299. You would like one workhouse, say, for the county?—Yes.

21300. Supposing you took a workhouse, we will say as we have been, supposing you took Clonmel for all the aged and infirm of the county or of the South Riding?—In mentioning Clonmel, Thurles, and Nenagh I

merely mentioned those that appeared to be particularly well situated. I have no very strong view.

21301. It was the railway lines of communication that suggested themselves to you?—Yes. I have a return showing the amount of accommodation, prepared some years ago. I was a member of a committee appointed by the General Council, of which Sir Thomas Stansfeld is chairman. This return was made out by Mr. Donoghue, of Ennisceorthy. It shows that Thurles was built to contain over a thousand. At that day they were more tightly packed than they are now, and that it would contain as many inmates as there are in the entire county at present.

21302. If we go through that process of exclusion for a minute and take all the classes in the workhouse. We spoke just now of children?—I would take them out altogether, and all that could not be boarded out should be put into schools such as I spoke of.

21303. As a medical man, what do you think of the policy of keeping lunatics and mental cases in workhouses?—I am opposed to it very much indeed.

21304. You would approve of removing them to an asylum or auxiliary asylum?—To an auxiliary asylum. I think there are also in the lunatic asylum a large number who might very well be sent there, thus diminishing the expense. The expense for auxiliary asylums is calculated at 2s. 6d. per head, the capitation grant being 2s.; and the expense in the Clonmel Asylum is 12s. or 11s. 6d.

21305. That is under all heads and without allowing for the sum refunded from the Government?—That is the total, and the Government grant is 4s. out of that; so that it is 7s. or 7s. 6d.

21306. Did you ever calculate the cost of a lunatic in the workhouse?—Not as they are at present.

21307. Because the difference would be very small as compared with the lunatic asylum, when you take into consideration the grant. The lunatic asylum charge is made up by taking the entire expenditure and dividing the number of patients into it?—Yes, including the loans.

21308. The only thing given in the 'Guardian's' return is the cost of the food, and it does not include salaries or establishment charges, which are included in the lunatic asylum returns, so if you take all into consideration, including the grant from the Government, you will find that the lunatics in the workhouse cost very nearly as much as in the asylum?—No, but I look upon it that the workhouse is not a proper place for them; the cost I have not considered at all.

21309. But as a reliever you would like to have them as economically treated as could be done with reason and efficiency?—Yes.

21310. Then the lunatics would go?—I think you would require two workhouses to provide accommodation for the number. There are about 250 in the various workhouses in the county, and there are certainly nearly 200 in the asylum here who could be put out, and they would require the accommodation of two workhouses.

21311. Would the asylum here hold the additional 250 that are in the workhouses?—No, it is overcrowded at present. I am on the asylum committee here, and we have plans for building three additional blocks—two of them as hospital blocks undoubtedly, but still to give further accommodation. There is no doubt that if matters go on as they are there will require to be very large additional buildings.

21312. A third class are criminals and tramps?—My opinion, derived from experience from travelling about a good deal, is that a tramp does not wish to do more than ten or twelve miles at the outside, and this county is a Paradise for tramps. There is a workhouse about every ten miles.

21313. Did you think of any direct method for repressing the tramp evil, or would you be satisfied with that indirect method?—I think there is a great deal of laxity in the imposition of tests—the amount of work they have to do in some places. I see by this return, three years ago, that the number of criminals relieved annually in Nenagh is 500; Thurles, 2,300; Roscrea, 1,853; Mounscloane, 1,111; Clonmel, 936; and Callan, 250. That looks as if some places were made a little more attractive to them, that is to say that a more severe labour test is imposed on others.

21314. They have a regular road, these men?—I know they have. The great influx takes place on Saturday night. They go out on Sunday morning because no labour test is imposed on them. They should be kept over until Monday and made do a double task.

June 22, 1904.

Th. J. F.
O'Ryan.

21115. The English law gives authority to the Guardians, according to the number of times the tramp visits the house, to retain them for a longer period?—I would rather get rid of them if possible.

21116. It would be with a view of making the place unattractive for them?—I think they are an evil class.

21117. Would you go the length of some witnesses we had yesterday, who thought they should be dealt with by the police and sent to labour colonies, to be detained for one, two, three, or four years, whichever might be thought right?—I have not gone into that.

21118. There is another class you have in the workhouse, that is the girls who come in to have children?—I think they should be in one institution and not scattered through the workhouse. It is the greatest evil I know.

21119. Would you have in view a county institution?—A county institution.

21120. Or would you have in view an independent institution under religious management where the Poor Law authorities could pay so much a head for the people they send?—I am dealing with it altogether from the Poor Law side.

21121. Taking it as a Poor Law Guardian, would you be in favour of paying so much per head for each case you send, or keeping up an institution with a staff?—I think I would keep up the institution.

21122. Don't you think that would be far more expensive?—It may, but I have perhaps some knowledge of how that would work. I don't know how the other would work. I don't know that there are any such institutions.

21123. There are a good many institutions—whether they would receive this particular class or not is not quite certain—but there are a number of institutions under Catholic and Protestant management where efforts are made to reform girls?—These are mainly in large cities. There were small institutions established in the country a good many years ago, but they all failed or were closed up.

21124. Would you be in favour of sending a girl to such an institution as that under religious influence, where she could be reclaimed, if possible, and given a fresh start in life?—If such an institution were established, I have no doubt it would have a good influence, but as I say I have considered it only from the point of view of dealing with them as a class who go into workhouses.

21125. Are you aware of the result at present to those girls who enter such institutions as workhouses. Are you aware when a girl enters a workhouse she very often remains there off and on for life?—Yes, returns again and again.

21126. The suggestion that was made to us with a view of stopping that was, that an endeavour should be made to reclaim the girl on the occasion of her first lapse, and having perhaps the child boarded out, she contributing to the support of the child when she got a situation?—I would still, I think, prefer an institution under lay management. Of course the members of the religious community could be there, as they are at present in workhouses. On the whole, I think that may work better.

21127. So that if you had an institution you would like to have it under the management of the local bodies, but with religious superintendents and managers if they so wished?—Oh, certainly; just as they are in the workhouse.

21128. If you get all these classes out of the workhouse you would only have the aged, and infirm, and sick left. The aged and infirm you have already suggested should be in one or two institutions; now the sick you would divide into two classes, the acute and the chronic?—Yes, the acute to be treated locally, if necessary, and if the acute stage passed off they could be passed on to the district hospital.

21129. Or take their discharge?—Or take their discharge. Of course if the case became chronic they would need to go into hospital for further treatment.

21130. Are you aware a good many people make their first entrance into the workhouse as sick, and remain by being transferred to the chronic wards?—They do.

21131. Would you be rather in favour of discouraging that by admitting them to the acute wards and discharging them altogether from the workhouse when cured?—As soon as it could be done; just as in a general hospital.

21132. Did you anticipate converting any of these closed workhouses into a sanatorium for consumptives?—No, I did not entertain that idea. I am doubtful

if it would succeed. I don't know that the situation of any one of them is favourable. Perhaps Clonsilla in one sense is more favourable than the others; but all buildings which have been used for so long a time for what I may call, without objection, as workhouses for kind of people, would not be suitable. The opinion is that small buildings are better.

21133. And even temporary buildings?—I am afraid the temporary system would be very expensive, and there would not be a sufficient amount of shelter. I don't go so far as to think that open air altogether in this country would be suitable.

21134. You would be in favour of a sanatorium of some sort, but would not approve of an old workhouse?—No. I would actually sooner take an old fever hospital which had only one kind of infection in it, whereas the workhouse would have every class. You could disinfect a fever hospital, but you would find it very hard to do it with a workhouse.

21135. Have you any knowledge of the working of the boarding-out system?—No, I have not. General Massey is here, and I think he has the figures with regard to that.

21136. Mr. MURPHY—You spoke, in regard to the labour test, that these granges have been informed that the labour test in Tipperary Workhouse was a little more stringent than in other workhouses in the county?—I know they get a large quantity of stone broken, and can dispose of them very well.

21137. Do you know what effect it has had on the tramps, whether they avoid that workhouse?—No, I have not the returns with regard to Tipperary on this, and I did not wish in any way to trespass on the province of other witnesses, who were more conversant with that part of the subject. I have no information with regard to the effect of the labour test, but I have seen the result of the working. They break large quantities of stones, which can be easily sold, and both the county authority and the Urban Council have bought them.

21138. In regard to the lunatics at present in the workhouse, you are in favour of transferring them to another place?—Into an auxiliary asylum.

21139. Have you a preference for an auxiliary asylum over an ordinary asylum?—Very much; that would be more economical, and I do not think that the crowding of such very large numbers together is beneficial.

21140. Then you think it has the double advantage of being more economical and more suitable?—Yes, and more beautiful and wholesome for them, because in a central asylum like Clonsilla there is a fearful amount of noise and uproar going on, and patients who are tolerably quiet themselves get upset by it. I think only the severe cases should be retained in the central high-class asylum, and all who are peacefully harmless should be removed to auxiliary asylums. Of course that does not meet the views of the officers of the asylums generally, who have naturally a tendency to have a larger institution under their management.

21141. You being a professional man and having professional evidence so much on the other side, I would like to hear you on the subject?—That is my opinion. I have been a member of the General Lunatic Committee for the last five years, and I have put there as often as I practically could, but I have not gone round the ground and gone into different parts of the building, and I formed a very strong opinion about it.

21142. You think it is not a good thing to have too large a number of lunatics segregated in one institution?—I think not; they have a very bad influence on each other when in that condition.

21143. And you think if there was an auxiliary asylum there would be some opportunity for these harmless lunatics to get recreation, and some light occupation more than they have at present?—I think so.

21144. Dr. BROOKS—You mentioned about having small acute hospitals in each of these places where you closed your present workhouses?—Yes, a wing of the workhouse, or any separate building they may have. In Thurles or Cashel they have separate fever hospitals and probably in other places.

21145. Thurles has a very good fever hospital, which would make a very good small hospital, but you intend to keep a workhouse there?—I merely suggested that on account of its central position. I take enough with reluctance, because I think it is badly situated.

21146. Supposing the workhouse are closed and there is a small hospital for acute cases in different unions, as at present?—A very much smaller space

than is afforded by either of these fever hospitals would suit. A small portion of a ward in a workhouse might be set apart, for there are seldom fever cases unless there is a local outbreak, which brings a number in together. I think the amount of accommodation required if a district hospital were set up would be very much smaller than either of these buildings I have spoken of would afford.

21147. I was not very clear about what you meant when you spoke about the fever hospital in Clonmel being used for fever and acute cases?—I did not say that. I said there were buildings, such as the fever hospitals at present at Cashel and Thurles, and I have no doubt there are separate buildings in other unions, for instance, in Carrick, and they might be retained for acute cases as well, clearing fever under acute cases; but much less accommodation than is now afforded by any of them I know would do, therefore it is not essential to get a separate building put up as large as that.

21148. Do you propose that you should treat acute cases and fever cases in the same building?—There may be parts of the workhouse, I mean merely wards in them. I am not of course intimately familiar with the subject, but as far as I know the amount of accommodation really required for many years past is not very great—half a dozen cases of fever perhaps, possibly not as many acute cases.

21149. If the workhouses were used for other purposes, would you propose that they should still retain portions of the workhouses for hospital purposes?—I don't know intimately the construction of all workhouses. There may be small portions that could be retained for the purpose, if a better one could be found for the larger, but if there is no such thing I would retain the other buildings.

21150. How would you propose that these small institutions should be managed?—I have not quite gone into that, because it is only a tentative part of my view.

21151. CHAIRMAN.—The doctor means what would be the governing body?—The public body that governed all in common, I think, could govern this, as there would be a central body with, I suppose, local committees probably.

21152. Would it be by the county?—A county rate. I am very strongly in favour of having a similar rate for all purposes over the entire county for all Poor Law purposes. Without wishing to say anything that may offend anybody, I think those small local ideas that the rate is lower with us than with you, and so on, I don't attach any importance to that, because amalgamation should produce a general lowering, and all being placed on the same footing would really pay less under efficient management than any one pays now.

21153. Dr. BROWN.—Do you think having a county rate and county sanatoriums there might be more harmony?—And more efficiency.

21154. And more uniformity?—And more uniformity.

21155. And possibly some of the staff might be transferred from one institution to another in case of sickness?—I have not entertained that idea.

21156. In the case of nursing?—Oh, yes, if they required aid in any case, they might be transferred from one to another.

21157. The same would apply to the fever hospitals of the county?—Yes, but I think it would be a great advantage, for the provision of nurses has been a very serious tax on the various unions. Nurses are brought down specially and often obtained with difficulty.

21158. Whereas if the county had them available in some central institution they could be drafted off to a smaller place when required?—Yes.

21159. You said something about 3s. 6d. being the cost of luncheon in the auxiliary asylum?—That is as contemplated in the Act, of which the grant is 2s.

21160. There is no institution in Ireland where they can be maintained for 3s. 6d.?—I don't think they can, but it is mentioned in the clause that provides the 3s.

21161. It is merely the food that that refers to. You are comparing 3s. 6d. with 11s. in asylums; the 11s.

includes every cost, even interest and sinking fund; that is quite a different basis from the 3s. 6d.—Undoubtedly. I don't of course think they could be kept up for 3s. 6d., but I merely quote that as the sum that is mentioned in the clause.

21162. Mr. MURPHY.—Can they be kept for 6s. a week?—Yes, I think so, or less.

21163. And if you take 2s. off that it brings it down to 4s., and it would still mean a saving of £4 to £5?—Yes; in this case there might be some interest on account of improvements and alterations necessary, but I think they ought to be maintained for 2s.

21164. Dr. BROWN.—You said something about some of the institutions being too large. Have you any practical experience of this? You said some of the patients suffer from noises. Would that not apply if there were only twenty patients as well as 500?—It may occur, but there would not be so many within hearing. I have been spoken to about it, and on that account I strongly urged the erection of a hospital block, on the ground that no patient suffering from a bodily illness had a chance of recovering.

21165. Could they not be kept in different parts of the institution, and so far away that they could not be annoyed by them?—They are not kept in a separate part at present, for we are about to put up a block to enable us to do that. Some improvements have been made in the asylums here by which they are less exposed to disturbance.

21166. Mr. MURPHY.—You have expressed the view that you are in favour of changing the method of administration from the present system, that is taking the management of the Poor Law out of the hands of the Poor Law Guardians and placing it in the hands of the County Councils through committees?—I am not prepared to say too much on that, on this ground, that I don't know that the County Council could manage the entire of it; it would take up too much time. Their meetings at present are rather numerous, and their hands are pretty well occupied. The central control I think ought to be in the hands of the County Councils. I mentioned local committees. I cannot say that I have gone further than that, smaller bodies. The creation of the present Board of Guardians, so enormously enlarged from what they were, has been, I think, the greatest blot on the Poor Law system. The numbers of them ought to be reduced to one-half of what they were before rather than doubled.

21167. Can you give any instance of any harm the present Poor Law Boards have done?—I am not prepared to mention them.

21168. Is the management any worse than it formerly was?—There are seventy-eight members in Tipperary, and there is not much less than that elsewhere.

21169. Then the only thing you advocate, I am to suppose, is the reduction by one-half in the number of the Guardians?—I think the business is very much better done by a very much smaller number; that the number is too great.

21170. You only go so far as to say that the number of representatives is too large, and that it ought to be reduced?—It ought to be reduced, because I think it prevents business being done as efficiently. I am quite certain of it, that there are too large a number of people to be heard.

21171. CHAIRMAN.—That is so in every matter?—In every matter.

21172. Mr. MURPHY.—I suppose you are aware that it is the general experience that by the widening of the area you lessen the supervision, and consequently if you give to the hands of the County Council the duties now performed by the Guardians you would be going in the opposite direction to economy?—I am not aware you would. I have not entertained the question so far as to be prepared with any scheme for the administration. I think that would require greater knowledge considerably than I possess. I don't know that the entire thing could be managed by the County Council, but the general government of it I think might be done by the Council.

June 21, 1904.

Dr J. E.
O'Ryan.

June 22, 1904.

Mr. John Butler.

Mr. JOHN BUTLER, J.P., examined.

21173. CHAIRMAN.—You have a copy of the notes you were kind enough to let us have?—Yes. The following are the notes I have made, which have been adopted by the Children Board of Guardians:—

AMALGAMATION OF UNDOES, OR ABOLITION OF WORKHOUSES.

In view of the Commission at present taking evidence on the question of amalgamation of unwholes in Ireland, it appears an opportune time to discuss the feasibility of abolishing the workhouse system, which is admitted to be a gross abuse of public funds, and a cruel wrong on the deserving poor, whom it attempts to relieve.

The subject is a very wide and important one, including, as it does, a necessary reform in the nursing of our sick poor, as well as providing better accommodation for the treatment of ordinary diseases for the general public in our hospitals and infirmaries, and making suitable provision for our laborers when incapacitated from age or infirmity.

The question then arises: Has the present workhouse system answered its time, the circumstances under which it was established having changed? There are now no able-bodied in the average workhouse in the provinces; the inmates are confined to hospital and infirmary patients, children, and the overflow from the lunatic asylums, for the latter of whom no provision worthy of the lowest grade of civilization exists in workhouses.

Where, then is the suitability of the present system, which insists on the breaking up of all family ties—divorcing the parents, and relieving them of the care and responsibility of their children, and wresting the children from the natural protection and control of their parents?

It is then a question of re-creating the entire system to meet existing circumstances; and in the consequent readjustment, we have at our disposal the workhouse buildings, which can be made available for district hospitals and infirmaries, to be supplied with such appliances and comfortable surroundings as are consistent with the needs of every class requiring medical or surgical treatment, and where duly qualified nurses will be in constant attendance.

Assuming, then, that the workhouse as we know it at present, is to be abolished, the question presents itself: How are the inmates at present sheltered there to be disposed of, who are not already receiving medical treatment in the hospital or infirmary attached?

Take, first, the able-bodied males, who exist only in name, as, with very rare exceptions, this class in our workhouses is composed of men over sixty years of age, "who have borne the burden and heat of the day," and whom, worn out, and generally suffering from some physical disability, are compelled, under existing circumstances, to enter the workhouse, "to husband out life's latter at the close."

These should be relieved from this imprisonment and enforced idleness, and receive a weekly allowance, enabling them to live amongst their relatives and friends, and assist in agricultural and other work for the greater part of the year, so far as may be.

The females answering the above description to be similarly provided for in the country, where they could assist in child nursing, poultry feeding, etc., etc. But apart from such, the mothers of illegitimate children have to be dealt with, and might be provided for in a portion of the workhouse buildings, isolated altogether from the grounds of the hospital and infirmary, and having a separate entrance from the public road. These women to be discharged on the medical officer's certificate, or compelled to do laundry work for the hospital or infirmary, and the public, and not be allowed to assist in idleness at the expense of the ratepayers, or, preferably, to a penitentiary, specially provided for first offenders, and, on probation, be provided with suitable situations, and to contribute to support of child.

The children at present in the workhouse to be put out to nurse, or apprenticed, with fair remuneration,

to respectable foster-parents in the county, under suitable inspection, for which provision is suggested later on.

It appears to be generally agreed that heretics lunatics, epileptics, and others, more or less similarly affected, should receive special treatment in a separate institution, for one or more counties, where a district workhouse building may be available.

The workhouse hotel and the absence of uniformity in the administration of the Vagrancy Acts have developed the professional tramp. With the disappearance of the workhouse, and the uniform application of these Acts, this itinerant school of vice must yield, if not altogether disappear, to the immense relief of the community at large, and in particular to those householders living within their sphere of influence, near all main roads leading from one workhouse to another.

Having formulated our plans for the disposal of the present inmates of workhouses so far, the administration of the new arrangement has to be considered.

A Board to be formed for the management of the district infirmary and hospital, to consist of from twelve to twenty members, half to be nominated by the District Council, and half by the County Council. Ladies to be eligible. To meet weekly, and appoint visitors, inside or outside their body, to look after children boarded out, and also each of the aged and infirm as may be in receipt of a weekly stipend out of the rates; and to report to the Board of Guardians—now District Councils—on the merits of applicants for outdoor relief, as aged and infirm.

District Councils to act as Board of Guardians. To be formed of one elected representative for each Poor Law electoral division, and in most cases such electoral divisions to be formed by the amalgamation of two or more of the present electoral divisions, according to area, population, and value. This Board to have administration of outdoor relief, and the funds for the support of the district hospital to be dispersed by the Board of Management. The cost of the district hospital to be a distinct charge, as at present constituted for District Councils. Outdoor relief, including children boarded out, to be an electoral division charge; lunatics, epileptics, etc., to be county-at-large charges.

Where the present union is formed out of different counties, the hospitals and infirmaries to be controlled by a joint Board of Management for general purposes, the members of such Board of Management to be in charge of the children, and aged and infirm boarded out, each in its own county, and subject to the District Council of its respective county.

The district hospitals and infirmaries to be placed in charge of a secular or religious community, with a duly qualified staff of trained nurses, with a medical officer specially in charge, to be appointed by the District Council.

If, out of these suggestions, and such as may appear feasible on further examination of the subject, a scheme be formed, the question of the disappearance of the demoralising and extravagant system of workhouse administration may be regarded as practical.

To some, this may appear a dangerous upheaval, and that amalgamation would, under existing circumstances, be more desirable.

Let us then suppose that one workhouse in each county be allotted to the able-bodied, one for lunatics and epileptics, and one for workhouse children as an industrial school.

In this case it must be borne in mind that 80 per cent. of those females classed as able-bodied are the mothers of illegitimate children; the greater number habituals, with a few first offenders—possibly betrayers. Can it be contended that the collection of this class from all parts of the county, and their enforced cohabitation, will improve the moral tone, or even lead to economy?

The economic side, as well as the social, moral, and charitable, will necessarily come up for discussion; and the question will be asked: Where does the economy appear in the proposed abolition of workhouses?

In the first place, the workhouse master, matron, schoolmaster, and schoolmistress can be dispensed with, as well as a host of Local Government Inspectors, whose occupations as Inspectors of Workhouses will disappear; but this retrenchment, though the most visible to outsiders, is, to the Poor Law Guardian of operations, but a small item compared to the extravagant waste, mismanagement, and cost, attendant on the upkeep of the present huge establishments, now containing but a fraction of the number of inmates for which they were built.

The defence of the present system, where the administration costs between 30 and 50 per cent. of the annual sum levied and intended for the relief of the poor, will not bear the light.

Doubtless, like every institution that topples from its very shores, it will have ardent supporters and defenders in those who profit by its weakness; but here, the employers' interests and those of the poor should be paramount, and brought to light before the Commission at present engaged in considering the general question.

Having dealt with the question in the general aspect as regards the classes of inmates who have hitherto resided of the workhouse, it may seem to bring more clearly into view the feasibility of the abolition scheme by applying it to Callan Union, of which I have been a Guardian for very many years.

The Callan Workhouse at present contains:—

Able-bodied males, ...	2
Do. females, ...	2
Do. females with illegitimate children, ...	6
Old and infirm males and females, ...	50
Children, ...	38
Hospital and infirmary patients, ...	72
Total, ...	176

The last class remains as at present under medical care. The children to be apprenticed and boarded out; the 50 infirm to get outdoor relief with their relatives or friends in the county, where the majority can be of assistance in various ways, and where they can be maintained at less than half what goes to keep them in the workhouse, where they cost at present 5s. 3d. per week each—£209 per year.

Comparing these figures with the cost of outdoor relief as at present administered, amounting in the year to £1,450, distributed to 200 households, relieving at the very lowest 950 individuals, which works out at 5s. 12s. per head, instead of 2s. 12s. per head for the same class in the workhouse.

The only objection to the extension of outdoor relief is the allegation generally made that almshouses may creep in by extending it to persons not in need, and that a larger weekly allowance must be made when the present check of admission to the workhouse no longer exists.

The figures I have quoted should, I submit, at once dispose of these objections, showing that even if the present rate of outdoor relief per head be doubled, it will still be less than half the cost of indoor maintenance per head. In other words, if those 50 infirm at present in the workhouse be placed on outdoor relief at double the present rate, they will cost the ratepayers 4s. 12s. per head per annum, instead of £13 12s., their present cost in the workhouse.

The tramp question can be regarded only from the moral point of view, as their cost amounts only to 4d. per head per day for food and lodging; but though the 3,400 tramps who pass through the Callan Workhouse in the year cost but £45, it must be admitted that the presence of this wandering horde of idlers, mostly criminals, is a danger to the well-being of the town and district, and should not be tolerated in any well-governed community.

It may be necessary in the large cities and towns to have some shelter for waifs and strays, but such houses come within the province of the municipal authorities of those cities, and do not affect the applicability of the abolition scheme to the county-at-large.

The tramps whose workhouses at present exist should be put in charge of the Royal Irish Constabulary, to whom they should apply for night shelter, with an allowance of 1 lb. of bread.

The Royal Irish Constabulary to enter particulars of each applicant, and to prosecute on second application of any person within twelve months, or on proof that such person had applied for, and received shelter, at any other station.

21174. Would you just give your views in your own way from your notes. I think in your notes you follow the lines of our queries very closely?—In going into the question it appeared to me that the abolition of the workhouse would be much preferable to any patching up. The word may appear a strong one, but when we come to the several classes of inmates, and dispose of them, such as are fit to go out, we have then left the sick and infirm in the workhouse, which workhouse on each case might be used as a district hospital.

21175. Portion of it, I suppose?—Yes.

21176. Take your own workhouse at Callan, do you think the entire of that large building would be at all necessary?—I don't know that it would, but I think it would be a mistake to do away with the district hospital having the ground in Callan, as it is, even if you have a portion of the building, never used.

21177. Would you be in favour of treating there more than what you might call the acute sick?—Oh, yes; I would have a home there for those old people to whom out-door relief might not apply.

21178. As far as possible you would relieve such people out of the workhouse?—Out of the workhouse.

21179. Then the old people who could not be dealt with by giving them out-door relief, you would like to bring them to Callan?—Those belonging to the Union of Callan.

21180. Would not that make necessary a very large and expensive institution still?—Oh, I think not.

21181. I would be afraid that if you keep up a number of homes for the aged in that form that you still would have a large cost for officials?—I think the percentage, as far as I know of the country, would be very very small; it would not be 1 or 2 per cent. of the lot.

21182. The aged and infirm, oh, they are very large; the total sick in Callan is 30, and infirm 55—that is a very large number?—But those should remain under medical care.

21183. The fifty-one are not under medical care, and a great many of the eighty don't need any medical attention at all, but only domestic attention and nursing?—Yes are taking the infirm as distinct from those under medical treatment?

21184. Yes?—I think the outdoor relief would apply to the vast majority of those.

21185. There are a great many of those sick who are really not sick as far as regarding the doctor's attention; if you had twenty-five out of that number it would probably be all?—My estimate would be that the old people if offered the chance of out-door relief would go and they would be of use in the country where they would go, no matter how old.

21186. Then you do not contemplate the keeping of a large number of old or sick people at Callan?—No.

21187. Men who could not get out-door relief and the acute sick?—People who would have no friends in the country to go to. I take it that an old man or woman would be of great use in the country, particularly where they are known, and there might be some friends to harbour them, and with a weekly stipend of 5s. or 6s. they would be very welcome guests in small farmers' homes, and be useful for many purposes.

21188. That is a high amount?—Well, even at that or 4s. itself.

21189. Would you not contemplate the removal of any who could be removed to a central institution, say in Kilkenny, from the Kilkenny part of your union, and from the Tipperary part to whatever would be the central place for Tipperary?—I cannot see the advantage.

June 22, 1904.

Mr John
Butler.

21190. The advantage would be of course the abolition of the numbers of local staffs and officials for looking after the people?—I don't think there would be much economy.

21191. If you only left the acutely sick you would only need a doctor and a couple of nurses; everybody else might go, the master, matron, and all officials for the healthy?—I don't see the necessity of keeping a matron or master where you would have half a dozen old people, as would be remaining at the home at Callan.

21192. If there were so few in Callan, might they not be sent to Kilkenny?—Quite so, but I am against amalgamation.

21193. But it is not amalgamation. The suggestion is on the basis of abolition. Abolish the workhouses and have a central home or almshouse in Kilkenny, and another in Tipperary, for the sick of these portions of Callan Union respectively which are in those counties?—For those who could not be boarded out?

21194. Quite so?—I am not against that view. The first view of the matter I put forward here is what we are to do if we came to the conclusion that the workhouses as workhouses should disappear—first you have the buildings of the workhouse to be made available for a district hospital and infirmary, to be supplied with such appliances and comfortable surroundings as are consistent with the needs of every class requiring medical and surgical treatment, and where duly qualified nurses will be in attendance.

21195. That is the institution we are just speaking of?—That is the Callan institution. When we discharge the ordinary able-bodied pauper I contemplate that people from the unwork-at-large will have recourse to such a hospital where you take away the character of the pauper from it, and there should be a good staff there for the safety of the people generally, that every one should have recourse to the public hospital properly kept. Then I go to dispose of the several classes that are at present in the workhouse. First, take the able-bodied males, who exist only in name, as, with very rare exceptions, this class in our workhouses is composed of men over sixty years of age, those should be relieved from their imprisonment and enforced idleness, and receive a weekly allowance enabling them to live amongst their friends, and assist in agriculture and other work for the greater part.

21196. Those who could not be dealt with in such a way, you would send them to that central county home?—I am rather divided between the feasibility of a county home or having them attached to the infirmary.

21197. I think all the medical men are very much against mixing up the sick and the half-sick in that way. Any evidence we have got so far is opposed to that. The doctors like to have the acute sick under their charge, and they don't like to have wards, or beds in wards, occupied by people who are not proper subjects for medical treatment?—At present you have very separate portions.

21198. They are very largely mixed up at present?—Well, I am not against the central county home for that purpose solely.

21199. Then the females?—I would dispose of them like the males—give them out-door relief and send them to the country amongst their friends, where they would be of use.

21200. We discussed just now with the last witness the question you go to next, about mothers of illegitimate children. You have heard his evidence and the discussion that took place—what is your view of that?—My view is that the best place to treat them is in the local hospital—have a separate ward, a separate place, and a separate entrance from the public road.

21201. In the local hospital, or grounds of the local hospital, that would be for maternity purposes only, or do you mean after? Supposing a woman stays in while nursing her child for about a year, would you keep her all the time in the local institution?—I think she could be made use of.

21202. But would she ever be likely to get on her feet socially and morally again?—I have not quite decided the question whether it would be better to discharge them immediately on the doctor's certificate, or retain them for the purpose of establishing a laundry.

21203. Would you be in favour of letting them go to a place to be reclaimed under religious management?—I think it is a very good thing, but I don't quite see that the bringing of people of that class from all parts of the country, some very old hands—

21204. You are considering those who are at present in workhouses?—Yes.

21205. If legislation takes place following this report in a year or two, then it would apply to all future cases. No doubt the present people who are there would be an embarrassment. You would have to deal with them in some exceptional way, but all future cases of first lapses, do you think it would be a good thing to send them to some place where they would be kept apart from evil influences and be put under good influences?—One for each county.

21206. Not necessarily. You might send them to Waterford from here, or to Cork, as the case may be. There are already in existence some of these institutions, if they would receive, at so much a week, people from various?—I think sending a person like that away to an institution branded with these surroundings, it would be rather against throwing the clock around them. I think it would be better leave her at home.

21207. So many said it hard to be kept at home among their own friends?—When I speak of at home, I mean in the local hospital.

21208. Then would you not drop into the present evil that exists in workhouses, that is that a girl who comes in for the first time would meet hardened offenders, and the possibility of her coming right after being with one, two, or three, or four other women of the same kind, would be very small?—But you would increase that danger if you sent them to the larger institutions. That is exactly the point I am against.

21209. The view of the witnesses who have put forward the matter was that girls who go in there are kept for a comparatively short time, and the managers of such institutions find situations for them, and out of the earnings of the situation if they cannot get anything from the father of the child, they contribute towards the support of the child who a boarded out?—I was not considering reclamation so much as the present disposition of the classes in the workhouse. I think an institution would have a good effect on these people if they are treated as you describe.

21210. Mr. McNEAGHAN.—Do you not think there would be some danger in sending girls to large ones from country places?—I do. I think the worse ones they are left the greater probability of reclamation, at least after first or second offences.

21211. When one talks of sending them to a city, they may be in a city, they would not be of the city; they would be well looked after; and on their discharge would, no doubt, find proper employment?—I have an idea that the larger you make an institution the greater the danger.

21212. Even when managed with strictness by a religious order?—Oh, yes, the communication is not entirely influenced by the religious.

21213. But still they have great influence over them?—I have no doubt about their influence.

21214. They classify these people, and then set very strict rules of silence imposed on them?—I think they would be very clever people if they did carry it out.

21215. That might be, but there is a determined attempt made to carry out such reformation?—Not I think there is no association so dangerous as the one these people are likely to indulge in, and old hands are mixed with first and second cases from the institutions.

21216. That is what we want to avoid. They won't keep old hands in these institutions. There are some institutions for the abandoned, but I am referring to institutions kept for first lapses?—Then you would have institutions according to the degree of the fallow.

21217. There are already two. There are three supported by charitable contributions, and then what the witnesses proposed was that the Guardians or other bodies who send these people there should pay for them so much a week?—I think if you apply the same

sing that you are contending for at home in the district hospital in a separate institution where there may be five or six. You can have them under a religious community. They are now nearly all through the south in charge of hospitals and infirmaries.

21223. I have spoken to ladies in charge of such institutions, and they consider the present system hopeless where girls are mixed together—I cannot see how it would improve them.

21224. You are so strongly here against the workhouse system that I thought you would see that at once the objection to the different classes herded together—what you point out yourself. You have actually in the same sitting room, day room, and sleeping room women with five or six illegitimate children, with a girl who has come in a couple of months before her confinement!—That may be so.

21225. There is no such want of classification in penitentiaries!—That may be so.

CHAIRMAN.—I think that is so. If it were not so, I would never consider the suggestions we get as worth a moment's attention.

21226. Mr. MURKIN.—Perhaps what Mr. Butler means is that under this new reform scheme these classes will be out of the workhouse and there will be nobody in the workhouse but the sick. When these girls go they won't find the class there they find now. There will be nobody in the infirmary but sick people!—Except the occasional fallen woman.

21227. The presence of these unmarried mothers, don't you think, causes a good deal of the objection to the workhouse!—Of course, they are objectionable, but you cannot get rid of them.

21228. But supposing you close the workhouse and do not admit them, I am taking that as the starting point, that in future no woman be admitted into the institution we know as a workhouse, but that the governing body should give her a note of admission, having arranged for it, to some penitentiary?—I am not contending against the penitentiary so managed, but I am against amalgamation and putting them together in one house in a county under the present management.

21229. Oh, certainly, I don't think that idea was ever suggested?—I think it would follow amalgamation.

21230. I am not thinking of amalgamation. I am following your line of abolition, and instead of a workhouse where all classes are received as at present, having merely a small institution for the acute sick, and a few people of the semi-sick class possibly, so that the workhouse of Dublin, we will say, would be inhabited by nobody except the acute sick!—But my argument goes altogether in the direction of repudiating the amalgamation scheme as applied to the several classes of inmates. I am not arguing against institutions where these women might be disposed of, but I am against collecting them together in one county house.

CHAIRMAN.—I think you are arguing against a question that has not been raised by any witness before us.

21231. Mr. MURKIN.—I understand Mr. Butler conceives that if these new institutions grow up there will be a large number of women in these institutions, and then the danger is that they will mix with these other cases. The Chairman pointed out before that these girls would remain a short period in the penitentiaries. They would be drafted off into institutions, and it is to be hoped got a fresh start, and then the number of women in that position in Ireland is relatively very small compared to the number in England and Scotland, and the number of illegitimate children in Ireland is largely made up of workhouse births owing to the same girl not having been reclaimed, and having three, four, or five children afterwards, whereas if she were reclaimed at first it is to be hoped she would be put into a proper position in life and do well—I will concede all the reasons you put forward in favour of an institution, but in disposing of these women in the local hospitals it was to get rid of the danger of the central one, and I cannot see how you will have amalgamation in the county. For instance, if you take my county, Kilkenny would be the one. It is central in every sense of the word, and if you bring there sixty of these people it would be a very bad atmosphere.

21232. I think everybody will agree with you in that!—I am not against disposing of them in a better way, but it is one of my arguments against amalgamation, if amalgamation is carried out in the whole.

21233. Then children?—Yes, the children to be boarded out. The number of children in workhouses is so very small that there is no opening at all for having a school there. I see that in thirty unions there are only ten children.

Mr. MURKIN.—There are fifty-two in the small union, Clonsilla.

21234. CHAIRMAN.—And I think eighty-two here in Clonsilla?—I prefer the boarding out to any other. I think that is the proper thing.

21235. As to these any observations you would like to offer about the boarding-out system? You suggest that in the reply, without any detail?—I suggest later on that they be put under the inspection of the board of management for the district hospital, which is supposed to be nominated by the District Council and County Council.

21236. A local body with some ladies on it?—With some ladies on it. Lunatics and epileptics are quite unfitted for workhouses.

21237. Would you be in favour of giving local bodies power to board out all children who come into their charge?—Board out all children.

21238. Take the extreme case of tramps and casuals, lads and cuts—people who need do any regular, steady work. Would you be in favour of taking away children from such parents?—But they are no longer in the workhouse, and children won't come under your charge.

21239. I am talking of children who sometimes come in as tramps—children of strolling parents. Would you be in favour of giving the Guardians discretionary power to separate these children from their parents?—I am entirely against the reception of tramps. I think they should be placed under police supervision.

21240. Then what would you do about their children?—I have not an idea.

21241. It has been suggested that the children, in the public interest, ought to be separated from these unworthy parents, and the parents who are thus relieved of their children should be incarcerated as long as the parents of the children were maintained at the public expense?—It would entail the question of taking hold of the parents.

21242. You would certainly take the parents if you took the children from them?—Yes.

21243. It has been suggested that tramps and such people should, instead of being allowed to go at large, they should in satisfactory proof before a legal body before Sessions, that they should be committed to the labour colony or workhouse—a place where they would be kept under order of the court—I think with the disappearance of the workhouse as a hotel for tramps he will be a rare article.

21244. A great many would sleep out and manage to get enough earnings to pay a low-priced lodging?—I think the police should have power to stop every tramp and inquire into his surroundings.

21245. It has been suggested that any man bonafide on the road looking for work should carry with him a certificate testifying in regular form who the man is and what he is doing?—That would become necessary if you stop the "flop of tramps. Lunatics, epileptics and all that class should be disposed of in a suitable institution, and ought to be collected in any county or two counties into one institution.

21246. If the county or district lunatic asylums were large enough to accommodate all the lunatics in the workhouse, would you put them into the central asylum?—I don't think so, and I think the supposition is a great improbability.

21247. You think the asylums are so full?—So full they have been spending hundreds or thousands of pounds in every county I know enlarging the lunatic asylums, and I don't think an institution is ever served by growing too large.

June 22, 1904

Mr. John Butler

June 22, 1904.
Mr. John
Butler.

21243. You would rather have than a county auxiliary asylum?—Quite, for the very harmless.

21244. And if they develop dangerous symptoms, send them to the asylum?—In fact, my suggestion is simply for the treatment of such lunatics as are at present sent from the lunatic asylums to the workhouses.

21245. There are a great many persons in the workhouses without having been found out to be lunatics. They come in as destitute persons, and have been put without any due order into the lunatic wards?—Quite so; it happens again and again.

21246. Do you think it is wrong that people should be put into lunatic wards without a formal order?—As needed at present, I see no grievance.

21247. Do you think a family might not object to have one of their number put into a lunatic ward without anything except a transfer by one of the officials of the workhouse, no two doctors finding?—I think it is always done under medical supervision—the doctor of the institution.

21248. No lunatic goes into a lunatic asylum in such a way?—But these are harmless people.

21249. It is very hard to say when a man with mental disease is harmless and when he may be dangerous?—Yes, you have only to await events.

21250. You have not considered that point about how a man ought to be put into the lunatic ward?—He first becomes a pauper, and then if he is seen not to be able to take care of himself, he is put in charge of a man who is nominally a keeper of lunatics and epileptics and idiots.

21251. You don't object to that?—I think these people ought to be put into a separate institution from the ordinary county asylum.

21252. You were going to speak about District Councils acting as Boards of Guardians?—Take, for instance, our workhouse. We have eight divisions in Tipperary and twelve in Kilkenny. I would not disturb the present arrangements as far as the receipt of people into the district hospital is concerned. I would not disturb the audit at all; keep it where it is, and have the board of management formed out of both counties, nominated by the District Council and nominated by the County Council.

21253. You would place the district hospital and infirmaries under the charge of a mixture of a religious community, with a duly qualified staff of trained nurses, the medical officer being appointed by the District Council—would you say the dispensary medical officer?—I did not decide for myself whether it ought to be given to the dispensary doctor.

21254. If you had only one doctor in the place?—He would naturally be the man. In going into the management I suggest that the District Councils act as Boards of Guardians and be immediately under the County Council, strike their rates and estimates, and submit them to the County Council, and have the administration of the place in the hands of the local Board, and for that purpose I suggest that there should be one representative for each electoral division.

21255. That is practically halving the present number?—Much more, and that each electoral division be formed by the amalgamation of two or more of the present electoral divisions, according to area and valuation. I would lessen the representation. As a Guardian of thirty-five or forty years' standing, I find that the accumulation of members on a Board takes away from its efficiency. A certain percentage of the Board are the working body, and if any little thing goes wrong that is unpleasant to an outsider they come in from all quarters and actually upset your three or four or six months' work.

21256. Mr. MURPHY.—There is some disparity at present in the question of representation. For instance, some electoral divisions have a very small valuation, perhaps £2,000; other electoral divisions have a large valuation, perhaps £5,000 or £6,000. Would you think some change in that respect ought to be made?—I would resent the whole thing according to

area, population, and valuation. I am not speaking now of towns but of the country electoral divisions. That I think the representation is entirely too large. It is no advantage to the people outside.

21257. CHIEFMAN.—It hinders work?—They would be better represented by much fewer people. And then the cost of the district hospital to be a district charge. You cannot make separate charges for people going to the hospital.

21258. You would make the cost of the persons in the district hospital?—You may call it a union—large charge.

21259. You are not in favour, are you, of making it a county unit for Poor Law management, of making it a comprehensive unit? You have part of the union in Kilkenny and part in Tipperary. Your hospital would become, according to the boundaries of the county, a County Kilkenny District Hospital—for practical purposes, hospital purposes, the Union would be undisturbed, but for no other purposes.

21260. Then you would have the County Tipperary in some way striking a rate for your Kilkenny hospital?—For the lunatics for its own district.

21261. As far as the present union is in the County Tipperary you are not in favour of having separate bodies for Poor Law management?—Yes.

21262. For instance, that your Callan district hospital should only be supported by a rate on persons of the County Kilkenny, or on the whole of the County Kilkenny?—No, that is not my idea, that the union should remain for hospital purposes, but the administration and funds and estimates—

21263. You would have to have a Tipperary rate, then, struck for your hospital at Callan?—Yes; I would have the estimates sent forward according to the number received from the Tipperary portion of the union. I would have the estimates sent forward to the Tipperary County Council.

21264. Would you be willing to have the Callan hospital maintained by a rate on the County Kilkenny, and give power to any persons who find in the adjoining Tipperary district to come in at so much a head, payable by the County Tipperary?—That is practically it.

21265. Well, not quite. It would get over the difficulty of a rate, if you pay so much a head?—The rate per head will be made out of the weekly expenditure, and you put down your estimate according to the number of people coming in from Tipperary.

21266. In the old rate per head you would not have any rate struck for establishment charges. You would charge for so much in the rough way, representing their share of the establishment charges and maintenance. I cannot see the difficulty. You have the estimates from the two counties. Your entire establishment charges come to a certain thing. You apportion it according to the number of lunatics. Supposing it was £1,000. You apportion it, £400 to Tipperary and £600 to Kilkenny. If you struck a rate to meet the £600 and then charged the Tipperary district so much a head for those coming in, you may be at a slight loss. They may not come in in sufficient numbers to pay you the £600?—I cannot see how the difficulty comes in. The idea is to charge Tipperary for the people in the district hospital and Kilkenny for the people in the general fund. We make out our estimate, and the regulation is sent forward to the Tipperary County Council and another to the Kilkenny County Council for both union purposes and District Council purposes. I would preserve that.

21267. Now, as regards the outdoor relief, you say the only objection to the extension of outdoor relief is the allegation generally made that abuses may creep in?—That is the argument in public; I don't set my value on it.

21268. You don't see that in your practical experience?—No.

21269. Is your outdoor relief increased in Callan?—Yes, since it became a union charge.

21270. Is it still increasing, or do you think it has reached its limit?—I doubt if it has reached its limit; I think the tendency is to increase.

21271. And you think that is right?—No.

21272. How would you check it?—I would check it by making the outdoor relief an electoral division charge when you have the electoral division increased and recast.

21273. That is, the new electoral division, which would be something not much less than the present dispensary division?—Something less—about one-third. There is no doubt about the freedom with which outdoor relief has increased since it has become a union charge.

21274. Would you put the whole of that on, or would you say, as one witness suggested, that we might ascertain what the present amount is and fix that, something that, and so let that be a union charge, and say any increase on that should be an electoral charge?—The new administration of that would require that it should be an electoral division charge. My idea is that the outdoor relief would increase. You would have a good many applicants, and to my mind entitled to receive outdoor relief, who at present are too shy to go to the workhouse.

21275. You would trust to the check of the electoral rate?—Yes, I would trust to the local knowledge and that very useful test of a man's own pocket.

21276. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you not think that might work some hardship in regard to towns?—I have not considered the towns. My evidence must be taken as far as I know to apply to the county.

21277. There are small towns in the country. Take Callan. It is a town?—I think a town like Callan should get the relief given to it some years ago, and the way I suggest in outdoor relief coming up to a certain amount. Any surplus I would distribute on the county divisions, because the tendency of the people is to come into towns and settle down there.

21278. In regard to the county infirmary, do you see any inequality in regard to that? It is situated in such a way that only the adjoining area can benefit by it. Could you suggest anything to equalise matters in that respect?—I cannot. The benefit of the institution must accrue to the town.

21279. A large portion of the people of your county cannot take advantage of the benefit of the county infirmary, still they have to pay for its upkeep?—I think they will become perfectly useless under the new arrangement. If you have district hospitals for each union, I cannot see the good of a county infirmary. You will have the best medical assistance with nursing quite as good as it can be hoped for in the county infirmary.

21280. We found, for instance, in Waterford a very fine county infirmary, and within a few paces of it we found also a very good district hospital or workhouse hospital. It does seem that these two institutions are very close together, and that all the advantages that are would expect cannot be got out of them. Do you think it is necessary to have a district hospital in any locality where there is a county infirmary?—I think you cannot do without a district hospital. The county infirmary in most places that I know it has not the accommodation at all required. The county infirmary belongs to another age, and it was not disposed of when the union hospitals were brought into working order.

21281. Then you think the district hospital should be enlarged and extended?—And made infinitely better than it is.

21282. And the county infirmary got?—Yes. My idea is that it should be brought up to the standard, that a respectable man's family who require treatment would have recourse to it as they would to hospitals in Dublin.

21283. Dr. ENGLISH.—How do you propose these hospitals should be provided?—The funds, by the County Council, as at present.

21284. You have no such hospital in Callan?—The district hospital I allude to is the present workhouse turned into a district hospital.

21285. The infirmary in Callan was never constructed as a hospital for the admission of cases from outside at all?—I cannot see the difficulty. There are the buildings there.

21286. CHAIRMAN.—Without any of the modern appliances or fittings for a hospital.

Dr. ROBERTS.—The stonework and all that sort of thing are not in keeping with a hospital such as you speak of?—I don't see any difficulty in remodeling our institution.

21287. It would practically mean gutting it out and building it all over again except the walls. Have you contemplated such an expenditure?—I don't see it.

21288. Have you contemplated what it would mean to provide enough wards for the treatment of every class of disease?—I think they would be more than amply sufficient. I think the number of wards would be entirely in excess of the requirements if you take the Callan one.

21289. That is the whole workhouse?—Yes.

21290. Would not that be very expensive?—I cannot see it.

21291. To convert the Callan Workhouse into one large hospital?—It would not be a large hospital; it would simply meet the requirements of twenty electoral divisions that at present constitute the union.

21292. Have you formed any idea of the nursing staff you would require?—I think it should not be very large. I think your nursing staff should be in proportion to the number of patients you would receive.

21293. You would have to start it on a certain basis to begin with?—The basis with us is the number at present in charge of the doctor of the house.

21294. That would be very small if you take acute cases?—The number is not very large.

21295. To provide all the modern requirements for a surgical hospital and all that sort of thing is very considerable?—I think there is plenty of accommodation for any amount of appliances.

21296. Do you not think a better arrangement would be to have a small hospital in these districts for acute cases, and draft any cases requiring major operations to the central place?—I am entirely against multiplying buildings or erecting new ones.

21297. But the county infirmary is already in existence?—Well, I don't know about other counties; ours has been very useful for a certain class.

21298. There are so many difficulties in what you mention. First of all there is the building and arrangement and proper equipment, and then the most important thing is the medical staff. In very few districts in Ireland is the medical officer capable of performing major operations, and another point would be that he would have so few operations to perform that he would not be as well able to do it, nor would private cases that could afford to pay be likely to go into the district hospital. They would much prefer going to an institution where they would get a doctor of larger experience?—But there are such facilities for sending patients to Dublin to the principal hospitals of the name that I have experienced no trouble on that head. Where there are special cases for treatment in the Dublin hospitals we are empowered to send them forward, and where you have a local case you have five or six dispensary doctors belonging to the union, and they can be summoned if there is an amputation to be carried out.

21299. If you ask the ordinary dispensary doctor you will find that he is not very keen on doing major operations?—I have never experienced any difficulty on that head, and I am a very close attendant for a long time at the Callan Workhouse. We have no trouble with our doctors.

21300. Would you tell me how many major operations have been performed in the Callan Workhouse?—I cannot. I know hands to be blown off, and shot off, and cut off, and right well done.

21301. The operations were done in three cases before they went in?—Where there is the treatment of the eye we send them to Dublin.

CHAIRMAN.—You always would send these special eye cases to Dublin.

21302. Dr. ROBERTS.—If you send eye cases you might as well send persons for the removal of an internal tumour to Dublin?—And we send every difficult case to Dublin when recommended by the doctor.

June 22, 1904.

Mr John
Baker.

June 22, 1904.

Mr. John
Butler.

21303. Would it not be better to have an institution in the county for these particular cases?—You would have to provide an institution in a great many cases in our county. The county infirmary is a very small thing.

CHAIRMAN.—We have seen it. Of course, it does need expenditure on it.

21304. Dr. Bigger.—But there has been very good work in it, and where a surgeon devotes himself to surgery he is better qualified to perform operations at the shortest possible moment—he has instruments and dressings and surgical nurses—whereas you could not expect that in every district hospital!—It is rather an invidious thing to be talking about the character of any professional man; I see no difference between Killybeg and Callan.

Dr. Bigger.—I don't know the professional men. 21305. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—But from a ratepayer's point of view, don't you see the inequality or unfairness of any people who don't get any benefit from this institution having to pay for its upkeep?—Decidedly I have always had that objection.

21306. And you think these district hospitals, being improved to a certain standard, would take the place of the county infirmaries?—Yes.

21307. And let the county infirmaries be done away with except in special cases, and then let them go to Dublin?—That is my idea in fact.

21308. Dr. Bigger.—Would it not be less expensive to do it on the other system—to have a small hospital for acute cases, and the large hospital for which the whole county pays at present to have the large operation cases drafted there?—We never complain of the expense of removing patients to Dublin.

21309. CHAIRMAN.—It is rather a hardship to poor persons to have to go so far from their friends to a distant place like Dublin?—It is generally on their own application.

21310. I suppose it is a case of Hobson's choice!—They are free to go to the county infirmary.

21311. Dr. Bigger's idea was the improvement of the county infirmary a little to make it adequate for dealing with all major operations in the county if the county infirmary occupies a central position.

Dr. Bigger.—Because it costs so much to put one of these small hospitals into a proper state of equipment. You would require to spend £1,000 or £2,000 on some of them, and would not have a very efficient institution then. The difficulty is with the medical staff and nursing staff!—It appears to me there is no structural difficulty; you can have lifts to take patients up and down.

21312. You cannot put lifts in without spending money?—Oh, no.

Mr. J. J. FENNELLY examined.

21313. CHAIRMAN.—You have heard Mr. Butler's evidence?—Yes.

21314. When he went into the Callan question at considerable length?—I am in the Tipperary portion of the Callan Union. I am in favour of amalgamation with some of the Tipperary unions.

21315. You would rather throw in your lot with Thurles?—With South Tipperary; we prefer Cashel, but our District Council, St. Lawrence, passed a resolution in favour of amalgamating with the Tipperary unions.

21316. How far is the extreme bounds of Tipperary in your union from Cashel?—Nine Irish miles.

Mr. PATRICK KEATING examined.

21317. CHAIRMAN.—In what part of the union do you live?—In St. Lawrence.

21318. You agree with the last witness that you would rather go to Cashel than remain with Callan?—Yes, sir.

21319. What are your grounds for that opinion? Are they financial?—Yes.

21320. You think you would have a lower rate in Cashel?—Yes; it is always lower—considerably lower.

21317. That is the extreme edge of the county!—That would be twelve or fourteen miles.

21318. That is below near Callan town?—Yes.

21319. Is that very populous?—No, there are very few people, but the district near Cashel is where all the poor are—a mountain district.

21320. Your view is to go to Cashel and cut off all communication with Callan?—Yes.

21321. So you differ in that way from Mr. Butler. You would not wish to have it maintained as a district hospital, but to come in and deal with Cashel and cease to have any connection with Callan?—Yes.

21322. Is there anything else you would like to say?—No.

I suppose you would like me to be as short as possible?

21323. CHAIRMAN.—I am sure you naturally will be!—Well, I heard Dr. O'Ryan's evidence, and I don't at all agree with him. At all events, as regards the doing away with Tipperary Union.

21324. His proposal about Tipperary was to make it a sort of infirmary for the county—I know, but I would not approve of that. I think it ought to be kept as it is. It is at the far end of the county. I don't see how we could send people to Clonmel. It is twenty-five miles away; Cashel is thirteen or fourteen miles away, and we also take in a large portion of the County Limerick. One-fifth of our valuation comes from the County Limerick. That again is beyond Tipperary another thirteen or fourteen miles, so how we could send into Clonmel or even Cashel I fail to see.

21325. What class of poor people have you in your mind when you talk about sending them? You don't mean sick, of course! They would be still treated locally?—There was an idea of a central hospital.

21326. That was just suggested by one witness?—I was thinking of that.

Lieutenant-General MARRY, C.B., D.L., examined.

21327. If you had a central hospital at Tipperary you would have the best medical and surgical treatment on the spot?—Yes.

21328. So you would not have to send your sick any distance?—That, no doubt, would be. How would it then be proposed to do with our Guardians. Would they be supposed to come into Clonmel? What would happen to the Guardians?

21329. The evidence that we got from Dr. O'Ryan was a particular suggestion. I think it would be much better, perhaps, if you gave your own views, and as far as you remember his and dissent from them you should say so!—My own view is that amalgamation is a very good thing if it can be carried out with a regard to economy, but if we are going to amalgamate and at the same time keep up every existing building, I fail to see the economy. There may be efficiency, but there would be no economy, and I understand one of the great objects you have is to see could there be economy without loss of efficiency. By keeping up existing places there would be no economy. If some of them could be done away with absolutely there would be economy, and then I would be strongly in favour of it.

Mr. Patrick
KeatingLieut.-General
Marry.

June 22, 1904.

Lieut.-General
Mans.

21336. Or if you could do away with the healthy portions of the greater number of workhouses and keep only the doctors and nurses for looking after the sick?—That would be very good; that would be economy. There is no doubt they have a very fine workhouse in Clonmel, and they would have room here for pretty well all the paupers of the county, but I think Tipperary is so situated locally, and having regard to the fact that they have got a great portion of the County Limerick in their bounds, I think Tipperary could not be done away with. I would say keep Tipperary and Clonmel for the South Riding, but I don't want to go into that question; I only want to point out the importance of Tipperary and the inappropriateness of interfering with it unless in the direction you say. Our population is 32,000, our area is 180,000 acres, our valuation is £144,500, it is about one-fourth of the valuation of the whole South Riding, and the weekly average of persons in the workhouse is 440.

21337. Can you tell me the annual amount you pay for outdoor relief?—I am sorry to say it is very high, much higher than I myself approve or would like to see continued. We pay about £3,600 a year for outdoor relief.

21338. That is a great reduction from the time when I was an inspector here?—I will read you the expenditure for ten years:—1895, £3,374; 1896, £3,333; 1897, £2,978; 1898, £2,454; 1899, £2,324; 1900, £2,300. Now we come on to the new system under which we were popularly elected and outdoor relief became a union charge:—March, 1902, £3,470; 1903, £3,566; 1904, £3,472. Our total expenditure for the union is £35,500, so the outdoor relief comes to considerably more than one-fourth of our charges. It is a thing I have been trying to keep down ever since I was on the Board, and I have not been able to do much. I attribute it to union rating, which I think is a great mistake.

21339. But you heard one of the witnesses suggest that outdoor relief might be increased considerably with a check that it should be made an electoral division charge?—I quite approve of that, and also what he said about towns. There is a great tendency to come from districts into towns, especially of late years. And in the town of Tipperary, near which I live, they would be very much injured indeed if outdoor relief was made an electoral division charge, but I think that might be met in some way such as you suggest—to fix a certain limit, and beyond that limit it should go on the division that wants the relief. But at present it seems to me that all at once in our union it is an enormous charge, and to a great extent an unnecessary one. Another thing I quite agree with Mr. Butler about, there being too many members in these Councils and Boards of Guardians. In Tipperary we have 38; that is a perfectly ridiculous number.

21340. In some unions like Tralee they go up to 100?—Do they? I thought we were about the largest. It is perfectly ridiculous any chairman trying to keep seventy-five men in order.

21341. A few ladies thrown in might improve matters?—We should be very glad to have them, and they would divide things exceedingly. If it comes within your province, I hope you will recommend the reduction of the numbers. I am aware when the Act was being passed it was intended only to have one member for each division, and I am sorry to say the clause to which I belong, the landlord class, asked for the second member and got it, and have not benefited by it. The class of men you want in these councils has his own business to attend to. He is a sensible man, and says, "I won't go into Tipperary," and he won't come, and we get another class of men who are not so good.

21342. You could do better with a smaller number?—Far better, and even if we put two electoral divisions in some cases into one, and gave only one member for the two, it would be better still. The division I myself represent we have only got about sixty voters altogether. We don't have any contests because they know it would not be any use to oppose me. The other point is about towns. That, of course, as you know, and have been saying, is a great evil, and I should be very glad indeed if something was done to check it. I would suggest there should be a police shelter in each town where there was a union, instead of leaving them to go into the unions.

21343. Would you give that power to the constabulary to send deserving cases to a registered lodging-house without going to the expense of additional build-

ings?—Certainly, I would be satisfied with anything that would put them under the control or supervision of the police, because at present it is a great evil.

21344. I think I heard you say that Tipperary had adopted some course and checked them?

Mr. MURPHY.—I made that remark. I understand an effort was made to compel them to break a large quantity of stones some years ago?—We are always making efforts and doing the best we can to keep them down.

21345. It was told that that effort had been very successful, but not as successful as it might have been because the adjoining unions did not follow their example?—There may be some truth in that, but I will read the list of stones admitted in the month of June:—£112, or an average of 62 per week. It seems a large number.

21346. Have you the numbers for five years before?

—No.
21346a. That is not a very large number for your union—about six a day?—Well, we certainly do our best. I have seen it suggested somewhere that the most effective way is to make them take a bath. We have not tried that yet.

CHAIRMAN.—It has been tried, but it is not generally approved of.

Witness.—They don't approve of that at all.
CHAIRMAN.—It would not do to give an exhausted man a cold bath after a hard day's work.

21347. Mr. MURPHY.—In England there is the power of detaining up to seven days, and also of compelling them to give seventy-two hours' notice of their discharge. What would you think of such a change as that?—I think it would be very good. There is another suggestion to keep them over Sunday. Saturday is a favourite day of theirs to come in. Keep them over Sunday and make them do double work on Monday.

21348. CHAIRMAN.—Would you be in favour of locking them up in an institution under a magistrate's warrant if it was proved they were habitual vagrants?—Would that come on the rates?

21349. It might come on the criminal expenditure of the country at large?—I think that would be very good. Anything would be very good that would try and stop that class.

21350. How you had large experience of the boarding-out of children?—We don't do much in that way. In our union there is a great difficulty. People don't seem to want to take them. Practically those who are boarded out are only taken by their relatives, grandmothers, and people like that. Seventeen children were boarded out during this last year, and the cost was £3 0s 2d per head, including clothing. We have in the workhouse seventy-four children, and they cost an average of £9 3s per head.

21351. That is for their food merely and clothing. You don't give them their share of the establishment charges?—No; in all the houses I have here I don't mention that. For instance, I heard some talk about lunatics. We put them at 6s 6d each; that is purely their food, nothing whatever to say to the establishment charges. The same way with the children. We give their total cost as £9 3s of those we maintain in the workhouse, so that they cost rather more than £1 a head than the boarded-out children. We would be only too glad if we could board out the other children on the same terms. I had recently just talks with the relieving officers on the subject, and they said that they thought it would be impossible in our union. I believe in Clonmel it is possible, and has been done. They have a different class of country. They have mountains where there are sheep and the children could be utilised. With us there is no particular way of utilising them; therefore I don't see how we could carry out to any large extent the system of boarding them out, but if it could be done I would very highly approve of it—anything to get them out of the workhouse. I think a suggestion I heard made by you to have them all in one building would be even better if there were such a thing as a diurnal workhouse.

21352. It was suggested by one of the witnesses that there should be a central school such as there is at Glins?—Then they would be taught trades and things there, would they?

21353. That was suggested, but the balance of opinion we have received is very strongly in favour of boarding out against any institution?—Supposing, as in our case, you cannot board out?

21354. That is a matter well worth considering. I will ask the inspector who has special charge of that

June 22, 1896.
 Genl-Mr. J. Fitzgerald.
 Mary.

branch of the work to look into it and give us the benefit of her opinion?—The advantage I see in the school over boarding out is that they would be taught trades.

21355. Do you think it desirable that the waste and strays should be turned into tradesmen in a country where agricultural labour is so much required?—I don't mean exactly tradesmen, but certain things such as carpentry, or with the women, laundry work.

21356. They are more likely to be turned into both tradesmen than regular tradesmen?—I was only thinking they should be given some means of living. A tradesman can get better wages than a labourer.

21357. A boy who goes out registered as a tradesman?—He is not much use, and on the other hand it might lead to greater emigration. If they knew their trades and did not get work they would probably emigrate.

21358. Your district is one of the districts in Ireland where the least agricultural labour is wanted?—Yes; it is mostly pastoral, very little tillage.

21359. That might be a reason why boarding out is more difficult. Are you aware you have power to board out in the Connell Union or any other union you like?—I was not aware; we would be very glad to board out if we could.

21360. Many of the Dublin children are boarded out in the County Wicklow?—There is one advantage in boarding them out—they get much more open air, and lead a healthier life, and are useful for agricultural work.

21361. But you are in favour of boarding out. It is only in your own union you find a difficulty in getting suitable homes?—Quite so.

21362. Have you heard of any cases of neglect of these children?—No; they are mostly taken by their own relatives, who practically use the money we give them as an addition to their own earnings. My view about auxiliary asylums is—I am a member of the Connell Lunatic Asylum—and I would prefer to see them tucked on to that.

21363. You would rather have one institution than two?—Yes; but I think a very large institution would be objectionable.

21364. What are your total numbers?—250.

21365. If you had them all in it would come to a thousand?—Yes. I have been talking to the superintendent of the asylum to-day, and he says up to a thousand could be managed quite easily. Beyond that limit it might not be advisable.

Mr. JAMES J. FITZGERALD examined.

Mr. James J. Fitzgerald.

I am Chairman of the Tipperary Union. I don't know that there is anything that I have to add, considering that there are so many other witnesses to be heard.

21374. CHAIRMAN.—Do you agree generally with General Manly's evidence?—I do to a great extent. I differ only in the recommendation for the abolition of union rating. That would be a serious matter for the towns.

General Manly.—Mr. Fitzgerald is a representative of the town.

Witness.—He does not exactly recommend the abolition of union rating, but, as you suggest, a certain

21366. He has an assistant?—Yes, he has one. I believe in most other asylums of the same size they have two. We have a young man very competent, and we are getting on all right with the one assistant. Of course, if you brought in these other people we probably would have to appoint a second, but even then I don't know that it would not be an economy. At present inmates in the workhouse are very badly treated. They are more like wild beasts caged up than anything I know. We do our best for them, as do the other unions do, but are very cramped.

21367. They have no good exercise yard?—They have one yard, not very large, but they have no means of getting out like they have in the asylum where they have acres of land in which to walk about and land to till.

21368. The general evidence we have is that the workhouse is no place for them?—It is not, but I would rather have them tucked on to the asylum here than have an auxiliary asylum established. I think they would be better looked after by people who know their wants.

21369. Which do you think would be the more economical?—I don't think if there would be any difference. I assume that if they were put into the asylum we would get the full capitation grant, and in the other we would only get 2s.

21370. Unless the law were changed to give them 4s?—The law might be changed, but my opinion is that they would be better here than in an auxiliary asylum, and they would be better either in the pauper or auxiliary than in the workhouse at present. About consumptive cases, it has been suggested to turn some workhouses into hospitals, but I don't think there would be enough consumptives to fill any large portion. We have only ten in our large union.

21371. Have you any idea of the recorded number of deaths in your union last year from phthisis alone?—I don't know, but I have no doubt it is heavy.

21372. They don't come to you because you have no proper place to treat them?—We have no proper place. It is one of the objections made by the Inspector. We put them into a ward in the fever hospital, but at all events we have only ten, and we being the largest union in the county, I suppose the others would not have more than twenty or thirty between them.

21373. That is not really the way to look at it. The question is, how many cases are outside, and the record of deaths from it is one indication, looking over it for a number of years.

Mr. FRANCIS HEFFERNAN examined.

Mr. Francis Heffernan.

21376. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the Board of Guardians?—I am a member of the Board of Guardians, and have been deputed to give evidence.

21377. You had under consideration the question of the breaking up of your union?—Yes. The view of the Guardians was that it would be a most objectionable proceeding to break up our union or any other union. Work them up to any standard you like, but let the unions remain, and let the area of expenditure within that union remain a union charge. Keep the union charges and district charges and county charges entirely distinct.

21378. As they are?—Yes, and localise responsibility for the maintenance of the poor and the amount contributed by that particular district.

21379. Then the Guardians are not in favour of a

change of the present system?—Entirely opposed to any change, and they think it is entirely against the principles of local self-government to extend the area, but localise control and responsibility for the maintenance of the poor within the district. Improve the hospital if you wish, improve the treatment of the sick, but by all means leave the whole control and the responsibility in the hands of the people of the union.

21380. Would you allow all the different classes to remain in the workhouse as they do at present?—The only people that our Board consider should be removed from the workhouse are the insane and epileptic, and those they consider should be treated in an asylum controlled and financed by the County Council—never in the workhouse. We have had a good

deal of trouble in these cases in conveying these people when they become refractory into the central asylum.

21381. With that exception, you are in favour of a continuance of the present system as it exists?—As it exists, and it is the unanimous wish of every member of our Board, and I believe every person in the district.

21382. There is a strong feeling on the subject?—Yes, that they should be left to control and manage their own affairs. We have done our best as far as possible to centralise the management of the business of the district and improve the conditions existing at present. We have improved our hospital, and it is in charge of a practitioner second to none in the country, and when operations have to be performed he has the assistance of the local practitioners, one or the other, as the case comes from the particular dispensary districts embraced within our union.

21383. And you have good nursing there?—Yes, our nursing staff has been increased since the passing of the Local Government Act. We have got in six extra wardmen, and in addition to the three men nurses that have been there, we have a trained nurse. We are building apartments for that trained nurse, and have all arrangements made for the building of an additional fever hospital for males and converting the old fever hospital into a consumptive ward. We have gone to a great deal of expense both as regards the in-

crease of the nursing staff and as regards the general maintenance and treatment, and we find that we have been able by carefully attending to the business of the union to keep the rates within the limits of the standard rate. This year it has gone just a halfpenny in the £ over the standard rate.

21384. Have you a lower rate than Clonsilla?—Considerably lower.

21385. And of any other adjacent union?—It is not lower than Cashel, but with the exception of Cashel our rate is lower than the general average.

21386. Compare well with Mitchelstown and Lisnacrogha?—We don't mind them; we want to keep the County Tipperary distinct.

21387. But your rates are lower in Clonsilla?—It is in the present rate for union charges, and I think if you go in for some proposals I have heard here and amalgamate rates and make a county-at-large rate, you will do away with the efficiency of local management. Centralisation inevitably leads to extravagance. The only little departure I would have is giving the control and management of epidemic relief to members representing dispensary districts.

21388. Would you put the charge on that district or the union at large?—The charge of expenditure by committees should be borne by the districts those committees represent.

MR. THOMAS RYAN EXAMINED.

I am Chairman of the Poor Law Guardians of Thurles.

21389. CHAIRMAN.—What is the view of your Guardians?—They are for amalgamation.

21390. Would they wish to break up Thurles, or keep on Thurles and break up some other union?—Certainly, they wish to keep on Thurles.

21391. And break up Cashel?—Borrisokane, Urtingford, and Roscrea.

21392. What do you think about Cashel?—You have heard a good deal about Cashel already.

21393. You would rather say nothing about Cashel, but if Cashel or Thurles had to go, which would you wish to stay?—I would prefer Cashel to go.

21394. But your Board is in favour of a general system of amalgamation which would provide a better system of classification?—Certainly.

21395. And you think diseased workhouses could be used as auxiliary asylums or industrial schools or factories for industrial purposes?—Yes, that is the conclusion.

21396. You don't think any further accommodation is necessary in the way of hospitals? You are well hospitalised in Thurles. As regards the system of contribution or payment by the sick when they go into hospital, you say "We consider it would be desirable to introduce a system of payment by which the sick poor in fever hospitals or infirmaries should be made to contribute the full cost of their treatment when they can afford it"?—Yes.

21397. Would you think it much better, perhaps, if you gave the discretion to the Board of Guardians to charge each an amount as the patient or his friends could afford to pay?—I think the difference would not be much.

21398. It would. If a patient could afford, or the parents of a child could afford, to pay £d. a week, that would be something. Would you wish to have power to charge that and recover it at law if disputed?—I would.

MR. JAMES HACKETT EXAMINED.

I am Chairman of the Rural District Council. My views are contained exactly in the documents sent to you.

Mr. James Hackett.

MR. JAMES J. RYAN EXAMINED.

I am Chairman of the Thurles Urban Council. Their view is they are in favour of amalgamation for the purpose of classification. One of the workhouses could be utilised for children as in Glin, another for old and infirm, and another for sick, and one as an auxiliary asylum.

21405. CHAIRMAN.—You might have the sick treated

21406. You say the Guardians can suggest no better system than the present for dealing with tramps. Do you find you have a good many?—We do. They have to break a certain amount of stones before getting away in the morning, and they find that pretty hard; but when we have the amalgamation they will have a little further additional work and we won't have so many. For instance, Urtingford is only eight English miles from Thurles; they have only a short day's journey there.

21407. Would you be in favour of some plan of abolishing them altogether if you could do it—take them off the road and put them in some place where they should work?—I would. I would be in favour of what you have heard already, to have police supervision over them. We adopted the boarding-out system some years ago, and pretty extensively, too, and we found it was not working very well, and we had a ladies' committee appointed, and while they had control of it it worked fairly well.

21408. Why did you take it away from the ladies?—The ladies left us.

21409. Do you think you could not get them to go back again?—I believe it is impossible to get some of them back. We have at present only three boarded-out children. We consider they are better done for inside. When we send them out those who apply for them only want to make money of them, and they don't send them to school, and they apply for clothes and let them drag about.

21410. Is that what you heard, or do you know it to be the case?—I know it to be the case; the relieving officer brings me in returns.

21411. Would you mind getting me a few of the reports from the relieving officers mentioning the want of interest these people have in the children and their anxiety to pull what they can out of the Guardians? I would be very glad to get these reports and look into them?—It is easy to get them.

Mr. James J. Ryan.

June 22, 1904.

Mr. James J. Ryan.

21406. You could get all the chronic cases into one and keep the acute cases locally?—Certainly.

21407. You agree with that view?—I do.

21408. Is there anything else specially about Thunders?—I think the children ought to be boarded out. The system is a good one, but liable to grave abuses.

21409. It wants good inspection?—More inspection.

21410. The last Guardian told us that the ladies' committee had ceased to act?—That is easily got over. I think when children are sixteen or fourteen they ought to be sent to a school like Glm, where they would be taught trades.

21411. When we want agricultural labourers in the country, why would we teach them trades?—We could teach some of them farming. When children grow up to a certain age they get beyond the control of the people who have them.

21412. All our children do that at a certain age?—I think this class of children do more than any others.

21413. What good would it do to make a carpenter of an unruly chimp?—You are trying to make tradesmen of them at present in the workhouse, and it is a failure.

21414. Do you think it would be a proper thing to make tradesmen of these waifs and strays and put them in a better position than the children of small ratepayers?—Many a waif made a good tradesman.

21415. Let him work into it himself. Don't pro-

vide for him by public money?—I would facilitate him.

21416. Don't you think it is better to facilitate him to live the life of an agricultural labourer, which is most wanted in the country?—I certainly think so. I would not send tramps to workhouses at all; I would have a ward in town for them. I think a workhouse is not a proper place in which to send them.

21417. Who would manage that ward?—The same as they do in England—have a man in charge of it.

21418. Under the Poor Law?—Under the Poor Law.

21419. A separate building, where they would be kept severely to labour?—Yes.

21420. You would have a small number in it?—We always have a small number; they don't average more than six.

21421. And having a highly-paid body of men to look after them? Would it not be a waste of labour? You would want someone to clean it up?—You would have the satisfaction of keeping them isolated.

21422. Supposing you put them into one big institution for lunatics?—That is when you use restrictive measures.

21423. Would you approve of that?—Yes, with those that were confirmed tramps.

21424. Those that a court of justice would find were no use for anybody but living on society?—They do live on society.

Dr. KENNEDY examined.

Dr. Kennedy.

21425. CHAIRMAN.—We would be very glad to hear your views. The chief subject on which you wish to give evidence is the boarding out of children?—The boarding out of children and increasing the outdoor relief of aged people.

21426. What are your views?—My union, Clogheen, is opposed to the boarding out of children, and I am more or less substantially in agreement with them. I have my views on the fact that the people to whom these children would be entrusted are in very many cases unfit to take care of them. First, they have unsanitary houses, and, secondly, I am not quite satisfied with the way they take care of their own children as regards cleanliness of their dressed person, and you cannot expect that they will take better care of other children than of their own, and though I say this of my own union, I don't think it is inferior in any way to any other union. Visiting the houses of the poor, I have great experience of their condition. I have found the clothes of the children anything but clean, and the sanitary surroundings very poor again and again. We have made a great improvement since the Labourers' Acts. There could be no greater blessing, and I am of opinion that phthisis has lessened since the Labourers' Acts. I won't find the same number of cases in labourers' cottages as in the mountain huts.

21427. This unsanitary, dirty, and venereal condition you find equally among the ordinary children and the boarded-out children? You don't find it exceptionally in the case any more than in the other class?—I would not say so, that they would neglect the boarded-out children any more, but they won't take more care of them than of their own.

21428. But their own are in that condition?—Generally speaking, very often.

21429. The tendency is to improve?—Yes.

21430. Of course, we would all like the children to be clean and free from vermin, but would you ask it for the boarded-out children more than for the children of the small ratepayers?—I would in this way: I would like to do my best for these children, and by doing my best for them I think I would be keeping them in the workhouse. They are kept scrupulously clean and are regularly bathed, and they have very reliable people to take care of them, who have leisure and the necessary training to instil good manners and morals into these children, and I don't see why they should not have as good air in the workhouse as out of it. They can be walked out in the evening.

21431. What do you think about their after-care in life? Would they get on as well outside as the boarded-out children? They will not for farm purposes, if you want them as agricultural labourers. If a child commences little jobs at the beginning he will grow gradually familiar with farm work. My idea

would be to rear him to a certain age in the workhouse and then send him to an industrial school to learn a trade. It may be objected that that would put him in a better condition. It is open to that, but still I think we should do the best for them, as they have been entrusted to our care.

21432. Mr. MURPHY.—Do you say the manners and morals of children reared in the workhouse are better than those of the children reared outside?—I would not say that, but there are better opportunities for cultivating these manners in a workhouse than outside.

21433. How are these opportunities better?—I consider a school teacher, let him be male or female, must be a man or woman of character, high character, and you cannot guarantee that for the people to whom you will entrust these children.

21434. Is not the school teacher outside a man of equally high character?—Certainly, but the children will not always be under the care of the teacher outside, whereas in the workhouse they are always under his care.

21435. Don't they get associating with other inmates?—If a proper classification is carried out, they cannot.

21436. Can it always be maintained?—I don't see why it should not. It is luxury on the part of the master or mistress if they don't maintain proper classification.

21437. Have you looked into the after-life of these children?—I have. It may be said in after-life they are well-to-do and criminals, but you must bear in mind that these are children of a tainted inheritance, and that counts for a good deal; you cannot ignore it.

21438. That only partly affects the question I put. Have you ever traced the history of children reared in workhouses and traced the history of children born in the workhouse and boarded outside, and how their careers compare?—Boarding out is in its infancy; it is rather early to make these comparisons. So far as I am concerned, I cannot give an opinion.

21439. Dr. BAKER.—Therefore you only know the one side?—I just know the side I have spoken about.

21440. Is that a proper thing to give evidence upon if you only know one side and are comparing it with another side that you don't know?—I am not comparing it; I am only comparing it generally with the children of the poor outside and how they are kept.

21441. Do not the poor outside follow useful lives?—Oh, certainly, as well as they can.

21442. Do you get many of that class afterwards drifting into the workhouses or the same proportion?—I am told by the clerk of the union that very few find their way back into the Clogheen Workhouse.

21443. That is not our experience?—I asked that because I have heard it alleged that they found their way back, and I asked about Cloughen Union. My experience is only about Cloughen.

21444. You seem to be taking the part of those brought up in the workhouse, and say their heredity accounts for a good deal?—I certainly said that.

21445. Therefore you are making an excuse for them?—I am not. Don't take me as saying that they develop into very excellent characters, but I say when they become criminals their tainted inheritances may account for it, not their training.

21446. CHAIRMAN.—Would you not rely more on association than heredity?—I would not; in some cases I would, but their associations in the workhouse are chiefly with the schoolmaster and schoolmistress, therefore on the ground of association they ought to be excellent, but I account for their not being by the question of their tainted inheritances.

21447. Are they not also with the children of tramps and criminals and are and cove?—We have not a good deal of those children in Cloughen. I would make better classification altogether. I would have them as a ward to themselves if possible, and not let them mix with the children born there.

21448. At present they do mix with them?—As far as they come in.

21449. Dr. BIGGS.—How many children have you followed in their after-life after being reared in the workhouse?—I cannot follow them very far. Some have gone to America, and, judging from the accounts, have done very well.

21450. Have you taken any list, and gone through the list and followed as far as you were able?—I never did that; it was not possible to do it.

21451. If you took a list of those boarded out and did that you would be surprised to find how well they have done. Would your opinion be altered if you knew from some person of experience what happened to the boarded-out children and found most of them did well and merged into the general population?—If I had an account of how the children indoors did I would compare one with another, and all things being equal, my mind is open on it.

21452. Mr. MURRAY.—There are we to understand you have really no personal experience as to the

relative value of boarding out children or keeping them in the workhouse?—I have not any very great experience, and I think very few people have, because I believe it is thoroughly impossible to gain that experience, because most of them emigrate.

21453. We have found witnesses who said they did keep a record of children passing through their hands for twenty years, and the inevitable report was that the children boarded out had done much better than the children kept in the institution?—I should be glad to hear that, but I think it is extremely difficult to follow up their careers. With the few children who will remain at home you can do it.

21454. Do you think if the Guardians at Cloughen decided on boarding out children could they find homes in the locality?—That is a great difficulty, and they would want to have a perfect system of inspection.

21455. A ladies' committee has been found useful in other unions in the country?—I don't know how it would work in Cloughen—whether there would be ladies who would sympathetically pursue the matter. I know of committees that were appointed and they never did much afterwards. A lot of the poor people in the case of amalgamation would not like to have this union amalgamated with Clonmel simply because they consider their friends would not have access to them. And again, about the boarding out of these poor people. A lot of the outdoor relief goes to pay rack-rents for old unsuitable houses. I think if these people were better classified inside of the workhouse, and if we tried to make it more of a home for them than a workhouse, they would frequent it much more. They do frequent it now, because there is often friction between the mother-in-law and the daughter-in-law, and the mother-in-law goes to the workhouse.

Mr. M. F. ROSE-LEWIS, Clerk.—The Cloughen Guardians have never adopted the boarding-out system. It was simply hiring out the children reared in the workhouse, and as far as my experience of the Cloughen Union is concerned, none have ever returned except a few of the boys who enlisted in the army and have returned for a few days.

21456. Dr. BIGGS.—You are only speaking for the Cloughen Workhouse. We don't know how many have gone into other workhouses.

Mr. ROSE-LEWIS.—Yes.

Mr. JAMES GALVIN, Vice-Chairman, Cloughen Union.

I must say, as representing the extreme West, that hardship on the destitute poor.

amalgamation in whole or in part, would be a great

Mr. James Galvin.

Mr. RICHARD CHADWICK examined.

21457. CHAIRMAN.—You are the Vice-Chairman of the Central Board of Guardians?—Yes.

21458. Tell us generally the views of your Board on the question of the amalgamation of unions?—Our Board would not be for amalgamation with other unions because our rates are so much lower than in the adjoining unions.

21459. You think you would have to pay more if you took in adjoining territory?—No, but if we were amalgamated with another union, our rate is so much less than in all the other unions, and, besides, we are paying 5s. in the £, which is included in that rate for the railway from Clonmel to Thurles.

Mr. W. PHOEN, Clerk.—There are only a few years more to run.

21460. What is your present rate for union purposes?—1s. 9d. for all purposes.

Mr. PHOEN.—About 1s. 8d. for union purposes.

Witness.—I think we would all like to see the imbecile taken from the union.

21461. And put into better quarters?—Yes.

21462. Is there any other class you would remove from the workhouse?—We are going to try to board out the children now.

21463. And appoint a ladies' committee?—I suppose they will.

21464. You will find that a great help to you. They will look into matters that a man would not think of?—Cash is so central between Thurles, Clonmel, and Tipperary that we get all the tramps from the three places, and if they were put under police control it would be a great help to the unions.

21465. Would you put them under police supervision or under restraint in a place where they would have to work for their food?—I think if they were put somewhere where they had to work for their food it would be far better. They do that in Germany, and if the children were taken away from there, for the children follow on the same lines. It is something awful with us.

21466. What would you think about the girls who come in to have children?—I would not like the present system to continue, because when they go out they come back again. I think I would take your suggestion on that.

21467. That is a penitentiary?—Yes, they come back again.

21468. What class would you continue to keep in the workhouse?—I would keep the sick there certainly, and the aged and infirm.

21469. That would be nearly all your inmates?—We have very few able-bodied.

21470. Is there anything that occurs to you that I have not asked about?—I don't think there is; but that is our objection altogether to amalgamation—our rates are so much lower, and our outdoor relief has decreased.

21471. If by any change we could suggest your rates were diminished, would you be in favour of the change then? If by sending your aged and infirm, for instance, to a general county institution, would you be in favour of such a move, if you found you had to pay a lower rate?—Certainly I would if I found we had to pay a lower rate.

Mr. Richard Chadwick.

Mr. James Galvin.

June 22, 1904.

Dr. Thomas Wood.

Dr. THOMAS WOOD EXAMINED.

I represent the Urban District Council of Cashel.
21472. CHAIRMAN.—What is the view of the Urban Council about the continuance of the workhouse in Cashel?—They would not like to have it done away with.

21473. Why would they wish it to remain?—It is an institution that is working very well and giving a good deal of satisfaction, and the people of the district are pleased with the way things are done there.

21474. If you found you would save money by closing it to all except the sick would you be in favour of that?—That would have to be shown to them very clearly.

21475. Certainly, I am not talking of a mere speculation, but if it could be established, would you be in favour of closing the house except for the sick?—That is a question they have not gone into. I could not give you an answer on that.

21476. Why do you hesitate to give an answer on that?—That is a question we have not considered. Our Union is working very well, and our rates are so low we don't think you could make them less than they are.

21477. But if it could be made lower and you had less to contribute to officers' salaries, assuming you could have a substantial saving?—Of course, that

would be a very important matter. I would not altogether agree with General Maugham about reducing the number of members. I was a member of the old Board and I am a member of the present, and I think the present system works very well, at all events in Cashel.

21478. How many Guardians have you?—Fifty-four.

21479. How many had you under the old system?—Mr. Phelan.—Forty-eight.

Witness.—The ex-officio need not to attend except occasionally. I would be inclined to give the board-out system a chance, but I am not very sanguine about its success.

21480. If the lady Inspector of the district visits you and explains it more thoroughly, I am sure you will then be willing to try it?—The difficulty is the class of people who would take these children in charge. I am afraid they would not do it through motives of philanthropy.

21481. There are a great many things we do that are very good, and we don't all do it through philanthropy. It is a great thing for these poor people to get 25 of dry money in the year?—Yes, but some of these children are talented, and respectable, poor people would not like to take them, but I would be very much inclined all the same to give it a chance.

Very Rev. Dean WHITE, B.A., EXAMINED.

Very Rev. Dean White.

I have a letter here from Dean Kinane:—

"Cashel, June 22nd, 1904.

"Gentlemen,—I am sorry that important and sudden parochial duties prevent me from going to Clonmel to-day. From long experience I am most happy to testify that the county infirmary is doing splendid work, and that the officials are giving general satisfaction to the public.—I remain, gentlemen, yours truly,

"T. H. KINANE, P.P., V.C., Dean, &c."

I endorse everything Dean Kinane has said. It has been an old institution, and for years and years has done splendid work, and in the neighbourhood of Cashel and all round it is a most popular institution. The only objections I have heard to it are that the people who live in the North Riding don't get value for the money they are paying.

21482. That is obvious?—I suppose it is. We cannot deny that that is the objection, but as far as Clonmel and all round Cashel, so far as that part of the country is concerned, they are all delighted with it. We often get cases from Clonmel and near Clonmel and Thurles, and the beds are very well filled.

21483. Multumhane?—Yes, we get them from there, and I don't think an institution could do better work than it is doing.

21484. I suppose the state of uncertainty you are in just now about the continuance of various institutions in the county would account for your not having done something towards putting it in a more up-to-date condition structurally?—Yes, but still it is very fair. A good deal has been done and new beds put in.

21485. Well, a good deal would be necessary if you thought it wise to incur the expenditure?—I am strongly of opinion that that should be an institution kept for acute diseases. A good deal has been said lately about levelling up the workhouse hospitals. Well, at the same time, there is a certain class of people who never like to go to the workhouses. There is no such objection to the infirmaries, and I don't believe in levelling up, because it would be the workhouse all through.

21486. If one got out all the various objectionable classes now in the workhouse, I think you would find

that that feeling would disappear, though there might be a certain amount of objection?—That institution has done wonderful work ever since it began.

21487. You seem to be a most harmonious and active committee?—We are active, but we are not so harmonious as that always, but otherwise, you know, as the life of trade, and I think we are all a good deal better for having little discussions on subjects in which we don't all hold the same opinions.

21488. Doctors differ occasionally?—So it appears.

21489. What is your income for the infirmary?

Dr. Wood.—There is £200 from the South Riding and £200 from the North—that is £400.

Witness.—The subscriptions are about £70.

21490. So it is under £1,200?—Yes.

21491. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you not see a hardship on these districts that get no benefit for the money they give?—Did I not mention that as an objection at the commencement?

21492. Can you see any way of getting over that?—No, I do not.

21493. Would you think it fair that that should continue?—I would, for although they are very distant, still a good many come from the North Riding.

21494. Is there not something really sound in what has been said about these workhouse infirmaries—that they are being brought up to a standard now almost equal to what the infirmary standard was ten years ago?—Possibly.

21495. Do you agree with the statement that the county infirmary might be done away with?—No, I would keep it for acute cases and cases of operations.

21496. The local hospital would treat surgical and acute cases?—It has not up to the present. Cases of cutting off legs and serious operations always came to the county infirmary.

21497. Dr. BROOKS.—Do you know the average number of inmates?—Dr. Russell can tell you.

21498. The only thing that would strike one is that you would require a large sum to make some modern improvements in the infirmary. Is there any chance of getting that?—We had a bazaar and raised a good deal. I think there is quite a chance. We might get up a bazaar and entertainment.

21499. It is worked as economically, I suppose, as possible?—I think so.

21500. But it is rather limited in funds?—It is.

Dr. GEORGE RUSSELL, Surgeon, County Infirmary, examined.

Dr. George Russell.

21501. Dr. BROOKS.—Can you tell me how many inmates there are on an average?—I have taken it for the past five years. In the year 1899-1900 there were 474 intern patients and 2,735 extern patients.

21502. What would be the average daily number in hospital?—The average daily number is not kept, but I should say it would be about 38 to 40.

21503. Then that would run down your average cost

is nearly £30 a year for each inmate.—The yearly average is not kept.

21534. That is very cheap.—We don't expend £1,300. Our total income is £1,000 from the county, £1,300, and the amount of money from private sale, £1,300 last year amounted to £300 ft. 6d. This sum I don't know what it is. It is not anything like what I don't know what it is. It is about £1,100 a year. Then last year there were 483 intern patients and 2,531 extern. 1903-04, there were 505 intern and 2,885 extern, and last year 443 intern and 2,892 extern patients.

21535. Do these patients come from all over the county?—Yes, they come from all parts, but of course the larger number naturally come from near at hand.

21536. But you do get cases from Clonsilla and Clonsilla?—Yes, we get them sometimes from the banks of the Shannon opposite Kilsbane.

21537. Templemore?—A good many from Templemore, but now that railway communication will be established with Clonsilla in a few months' time, I expect there will be a great many more coming from places that were almost inaccessible before.

21538. Have you thought of any system whereby there might be more co-operation between the county infirmary and other hospitals in the county?—I have a very strong feeling on the subject of consumption.

I certainly think there ought to be no admittance for consumptives into general hospitals; there ought to be an hospital set apart entirely for the consumptives of the county.

21539. You don't take these cases in at present?—I have to sometimes when patients come a long way—seven or eight or sixteen miles—and are in a pretty bad state. The mere fact of telling them to go home might be the cause of their death. You have to make provision for them some way or other, but we have as few as possible.

21540. If with Tipperary or Clonsilla or Clonsilla there was some arrangement whereby you might get the major operation cases transferred to the county infirmary?—That would be a very excellent idea.

21541. Instead of sending those cases to Dublin if you could treat them in the county infirmary, I don't know whether you would not require some alterations in the infirmary?—I am trying to get an operating room with modern up-to-date furniture, and we want certain other alterations carried out, but while we are in uncertainty we don't like laying out money.

21542. Is there any chance of the county subscribing more than £1,000 a year?—There might be possibly. I would not like to offer an opinion on that point; they have never been asked for it.

Mrs Rebecca Green examined.

21543. CHAIRMAN.—What are your views about the amalgamation of unions?—I give evidence on behalf of the Women's Suffrage and Local Government Association, of which I am a member.

21544. That is a Dublin body?—Yes, but it has members throughout Ireland.

21545. What do you think in Carrick?—I approve of amalgamation to a certain extent. Our workhouse was built for nearly 600 people. We are down now to about 150, and it is a great waste to be keeping up an establishment for such a small quantity.

21546. Would you be satisfied yourself personally with a hospital in Carrick that would provide sufficient accommodation for treating the acute sick?—Yes, certainly, because our Board at present represents three counties—Kilkenny, Tipperary, and Waterford—and I consider the Kilkenny people might be sent to the workhouse in Kilkenny, the Waterford members to some place in Waterford, and the Tipperary to some place in Tipperary; but I would retain the hospital.

21547. And Carrick-on-Suir might be broken up as a workhouse?—We should retain a hospital of some kind.

21548. But as a workhouse it would disappear?—Certainly.

21549. Is that the opinion of the majority of your Guardians?—I was not present at the meeting when the questions were answered. You have their answers, and I believe they approved of amalgamation because they considered we are so reduced in numbers.

21550. They say the Guardians are in favour of amalgamation, feeling satisfied that ample provision can be made for the sick in the fever hospital of the workhouse so long vacant, added by district hospitals?—I could not agree in that about the fever hospital, because it is in a bad situation—too low.

21551. But it is not damp?—It would take an immense amount of money to put it into repair and make officers' apartments. As long as we have it as a hospital we get it at a very low rate.

21552. You cannot use it for any other purpose?—I am not sure whether you would call an auxiliary as an hospital. I suppose you might, but it is in a very bad situation, and is very much disliked by the townspeople.

21553. You don't think that could be converted with the approval of the townspeople into a general hospital?—I think it would be very expensive to improve it properly and make a proper hospital of it.

21554. In looking over it we saw certain possibilities about it?—Yes, if we were prepared to spend money on it.

21555. But you tell us there is a hostile feeling towards it amongst the people of Carrick?—Well, it is in a bad situation; it is on the river bank; it would be hard to drain.

21556. Is it ever flooded?—The grounds in front are flooded, and the dispensary is flooded by back-water. I would be inclined though to remove the

fever patients to the block of the present hospital or a part of the workhouse, and have the one nursing staff. It is perfectly absurd to keep a second nursing staff and pay them for doing nothing.

21557. You have only one woman acting as a nurse in the fever hospital?—We have two. We do get a trained nurse whenever a case of fever comes in. The person we have is not a trained nurse.

21558. No, she is a woman of a very long experience?—Of very ancient history. She is a very capable woman to take charge of the place.

21559. The Guardians would be in favour of using the workhouse as a district auxiliary infantic asylum?—Yes, if it could be suitably arranged.

21560. If they did that you would be in favour of keeping over a couple of blocks of it for the sick and infectious diseases?—We have plenty of room at present for the sick if we take our chronic cases out of it. I would keep a small block for fever patients, and would give up the remainder for anything else that was wanted. I would rather give the inmates the fever hospital.

21561. It would hardly be suitable for the inmates—people who are going about on their feet?—Beautiful ground—there is a good expanse of ground. I don't think any harm could come to them.

21562. It would hold very few feet?—It would. I quite agree about making it into a hospital if it could be properly made, but I think the expenditure would be great. There is no sanitary system there now.

21563. There is plenty of ground?—Yes.

21564. The Guardians say greater facilities might be given to Boards of Guardians as to the administration of outdoor relief under certain conditions and restrictions to be fully defined. That is in favour of enabling Guardians to give relief to some classes that don't at present get it?—I don't know what the Guardians meant by putting that in. I believe it was that some older people might get a larger amount of outdoor relief to keep them out.

21565. One of the classes that cannot get relief now is the case of a widow with one child. Would you be in favour of including her?—I think the system of outdoor relief is very much abused, and I think it requires inspection, which it does not get.

21566. Do the Guardians not inspect it at all themselves?—At the Board we look through the list, but why should not an inspector inspect some of the cases personally?

21567. I think he would if you called his attention to it?—It would be much better to have it a divisional charge.

21568. That would be hardly fair to the towns?—Yes, but there are people in the country who get a certain number of townspeople to come and vote outdoor relief for them where perhaps they don't want it. On the question of giving old people outdoor relief, my opinion is that if some of the children of these old people could be made contribute, that is to say, we would give so much if they gave so much; it

June 22, 1904.

Dr. George Russell.

Mrs Rebecca Green.

June 22, 1901.
 Miss Mabel
 Gresham.

is rather increasing at present. When children are grown up and married, and perhaps not married but working, they are very ready to relieve their parents on the union when many of them could support them or give something towards their support.

21539. You say all deserted children should be boarded out, and all children are eligible for boarding out should be sent to local day-schools. Would you be in favour of a still wider extension of that and give the Guardians power to board out every child they had control over?—I feel rather strongly on that point, that parents should not be relieved of the responsibility of their children.

21540. It would not be a question of relieving them so much as of depriving them of the society of their children?—Some of them would be very glad to be deprived of the society of their children.

21541. If they were deprived on account of bad character would you be in favour of locking them up as long as these children were supported at the public expense?—I would not lock them up, but I would keep them so, so that they could not go away when they had got rid of their children.

21542. In a labour colony?—Oh, yes, certainly. I would not take children away from tramps or casuals and let them go free.

21543. No, that would not do. Then as regards getting situations for children, what is your experience?—It is exceedingly difficult to get situations for children that have been reared in the workhouse.

21544. Do you find it necessary to look at all about the boarded-out children, or do they manage to get situations and a living for themselves?—They get on very much better. Of course, they require supervision.

21545. You find it hard to get situations for children who are ready to go out of the workhouse?—Exceedingly hard.

21546. Do they come back to you again?—Yes, some of them find fault with the situations they have been in because they are too lazy to work.

21547. Are there many cases of which you have personal knowledge?—I have personal knowledge of one case sent out to two good situations, and absolutely refused to work in either of them. Personally I know them to be good situations, and her own determination was to remain in the workhouse or to be allowed to go out and do as she liked.

21548. Have you other cases?—You must remember I have only been five years a Guardian. There are other cases of children who have been troublesome about leaving their situations. That case was before my mind; I had a great deal of trouble over it. But by the boarding-out system, there is no doubt they get absorbed into the population. A board-out child from the workhouse is not always well treated, and even the very best of them are branded with the workhouse practically all their lives. They have the taint of the workhouse about them.

21549. Who have?—The children that have been reared in the workhouse.

21550. Do you mean to say they are not handy and useful?—They are not handy and useful, and another thing is that their manners and morals have more the taint of the workhouse.

21551. What do you mean by the taint of the workhouse?—They use bad language and mix with bad company.

21552. How do you think they pick up their bad language?—They mix with their parents and there are peeper assistants, and they get in communication with the peepers.

21553. And you think their language is not edifying or proper?—It is most improper. In some of the cases mentioned here to-day, perhaps, the difficulty has been that not enough has been paid for the children.

21554. The case that General Maury mentioned—28 10s. 1.—I think that is plenty; but perhaps General Maury did not know, as he said he did not, that you could board them outside the union; but there is a difficulty about that on account of supervision.

21555. That is not insensible?—Then you mentioned about the committee—that is practically a dead letter.

21556. Have you a ladies' committee in Carrick?—We have on paper.

21557. Are you on paper there?—Well, I am not on paper.

21558. What do your committee do?—Nothing, except that their names are read out once a year.

21559. Don't you meet and go round and inspect?—I have tried a good many and none of them would come.

21560. There are some children boarded out within a reasonable distance of your own home—say within three or four miles?—That is the very nearest. It would take four hours of a journey to see some, and it is pretty stiff, uphill. Our expenses are not allowed, which is the difficulty.

21561. On a cycle?—Our bicycles wear out, and we are not allowed a new one.

21562. If you had children near you, you could inspect a few children yourself?—I do inspect a few; I tried to inspect them all.

21563. Tell us about your inspection; how do you find them?—Very well cared indeed as a rule and very satisfactory, and I do find that what are called our children are better cared than they care their own children, because they are afraid of our inspection. I have seen them better dressed and better washed than their own children owing to not knowing when to wash and when to dress.

21564. Then the inspection is not so bad in Carrick?—It is very bad, because it is all on paper except the inspection. The visiting committee, generally speaking, is an unsatisfactory system, because you cannot get ladies in many country districts.

21565. To agree to meet at some hour?—Or spend their time inspecting.

21566. I have always found the difficulty was fixing the hour of meeting?—No, many of them are afraid of what would be said to them if they gave their opinion honestly and truly, and others are careless. I know in the North they have excellent visiting committees, but I consider the question of inspection is absolutely necessary.

21567. The following officer, of course, immediately. Well, I won't say anything about that. I think a female relieving officer should be appointed. If that is a system of amalgamation is carried out, and hospitals near the country dispensaries—

21568. You mean practically a dispensary hospital?—Yes, under the dispensary doctor.

21569. That would be a great number?—I would not put one in every dispensary until we saw how it would work.

21570. Take your own union. Do you think any dispensary district hospital would be desirable there?—I think Carrick would be within reasonable distance of all.

21571. I think you will find that will be the case in most unions. There are some unions in the West of Ireland where the distances are very great, but a Guardian here pointed out that nearly all the unions were ten miles from each other?—Yes, but if you dropped some of the unions.

21572. But you would still keep up the accommodation for the sick in all these?—I could not answer for the others. I only propose having a small plot if there was not a district hospital within easy reach.

21573. But if the district hospital were kept up where the old workhouse was?—Then there would be no occasion.

21574. You are in favour of a district nursing system for sick and urgent cases?—I consider, in the first instance, that all the midwives should be under inspection.

21575. They all are?—They are not under formal inspection?—I mean to say that trained nurses don't go round and inspect them at their own.

21576. But the doctor of the district?—The doctor of the district under the present system very often never sees the case, because a blue ticket is issued, and the doctor now may never see the case.

21577. But still he is responsible; I am sure he feels himself responsible for the success of these cases, and he sees the midwife very often. Don't you think he would bring anything forward?—A great many cases he never sees nor hears of on account of the blue ticket system.

21578. You know, it is the duty of the midwife to send for him if she thinks he is required?—Yes, but that is not inspecting her at work in an ordinary case.

21579. I don't see what better inspection you could have than the inspection of the dispensary doctor, who would see her at a great many cases?—Oh, no; in cases where the doctor is called in, but not where he is not called in.

June 22, 1944

Miss Rebecca
Grubb.

2598. But he would see her and have a very good knowledge of her way, and if she was not a good woman the probability is the doctor would be called in a good deal—I have seen where inspection did such good, and if there was inspection a great deal of good would be done because we would get a better class of midwife.

2599. Yes, say all cases suitable for treatment in the county infirmary should be sent there?—We do send all our cases periodically to the county infirmary and send to Dublin.

2600. How do they go?—By train to Waterford and to Dublin.

2601. Not to Cashel?—No; Waterford is the nearest to us.

2602. The insane—you would not have these retained in workhouses?—No; the insane and epileptic ought not to be retained in workhouses.

2603. As regards recompense for contributions from patients, you would be in favour of giving the Guardians power to fix rates of payment and proceed for them?—Yes.

2604. Now about tramps?—I think our Irish law ought to be made practically the same as the English law, and give these power of detention; but I also don't think that is an effective case. In England they propose to put these who work into labour colonies. I also think that work ought to be made more compulsory in workhouses than it is. Ours are not asked to work.

2605. If this new system was put in force tramps would not go to workhouses?—No, I agree they ought to be under police supervision. There is no doubt a consumption hospital is very much wanted in the south. It is almost impossible to get a vacancy in the present Newcastle hospital. You generally have to wait until your patient is dead.

2606. The increase of consumption is very great, and people now are more willing to be treated in a regular sanatorium?—Yes, much more willing and more anxious.

2607. Dr. Brogan.—What suggestion do you offer regarding the treatment of consumptives?—That they should be treated in a consumption hospital.

2608. For what district?—One for the south if you can get a suitable one.

2609. There is one at Cork or going to be?—But it is not yet, and I don't think that would take all the cases from the south. It is something appalling the increase with us.

2610. I think the statistics have shown that there has been an increase all over Ireland. Would you propose that there should be one for a county or a combination of counties?—One for two counties, I think, would do. I don't know the statistics sufficiently.

2611. But you would have to consider the cost. Perhaps one for two or three counties to start with?—We have power at present to build. We could get a provisional order from the County Council. Then about women who come in with children, I think that there ought certainly not to be kept in the workhouse, because the time before and after is the time they get

so much babies mixing with others, and I think the suggestion to send them to other places would be the best, provided there was supervision and they were not allowed to remain there. Then there are some of these institutions mentioned where they do not take them.

2612. CHAIRMAN. Where they are really only for abandoned characters?—Yes, and where they won't take the children.

2613. I don't think they will take the child in any of them?—Then what becomes of the child?—There is the difficulty. There is, no doubt, a great many of these cases do get harm by being in the workhouses. And I also think the law ought to be altered. At present the Irish law is most difficult.

2614. You would have the same bastardy law as in England?—Yes, I think that is very important.

2615. Dr. Brogan.—You don't propose in the small village hospitals that they should do all the operations and treat all the cases?—Oh, no, certainly not; I would send any operation I could away.

2616. Where?—I would send operations to Dublin or to the county infirmary.

2617. You would not approve of the system of interchange of nurses?—Yes, I think there ought to be trained nurses, not qualified nurses. If you have a nurse trained at all she should be properly trained and finished, not what is called qualified.

2618. Some of the qualified nurses are very well trained?—But they have not finished their three years' course.

2619. CHAIRMAN.—Two years is considered enough by a great many people who know better than we in England, Ireland, and Scotland?—I know it is, but I would like to see a nurse go through a large hospital, not through an ordinary country workhouse.

2620. They are not recognised from ordinary workhouses?—Cork and Waterford are recognised.

2621. CHAIRMAN.—Waterford is recognised for full training.

Dr. Brogan.—That is the workhouse and county infirmary joined?—That is only now. I think no nurse should be called qualified if she is not finished entirely.

Dr. Brogan.—In the Dublin hospitals, where they are required to stay for four years, you get very few trained.

2622. CHAIRMAN.—You have to work up by degrees to the best, not get it all at once?—I would not take a qualified nurse.

2623. We are all agreed on that, but cannot get it?—Because the system was intended of admitting qualified nurses. I am very strong on the question of the children, and I hope everything possibly that can be done will be done to eradicate all the children from all the workhouses. As long as we have them in the workhouses we shall be rearing paupers for Ireland. If they had to be kept, I would keep them away from the workhouses. I very much approve of sending children to day schools instead of having them educated in the workhouses.

Hon. Mrs. DE LA POSE examined.

2624. CHAIRMAN.—You are the Chairmen of the County Board of Guardians. The Guardians have not given their views on paper. Could you tell us generally whether they are in favour of reducing the

number of workhouses in the county?—Mr. Maloney, Hon. Mrs. De La Pose, and I think, could better answer that than I. He is the late chairman, and understands it much better than I do.

Mr. J. P. MURPHY examined.

2625. CHAIRMAN.—Will you kindly tell us the views of the County Board of Guardians on the question of reducing or amalgamating the unions?—They have not considered the question at all.

2626. Do you know what their sentiment is?—They think that amalgamation ought to come in some shape or other. At least one or two unions might be closed.

2627. They are not prepared to offer any plan of their own?—They did not, but they think that the unions all over the county could be put into one of these unions if it was dissolved, and they think they might be able to get a capitulation grant.

2628. And there would be a saving?—Yes, 2s. per bed per week, if I remember rightly.

2629. And that would be a saving to the rates. Is Mr. J. P. Maloney.

2630. Is there anything else that occurred to you personally on that question of amalgamation? You have nine unions in the county. Did you take a wide view of the county?—No, we were thinking more of South Tipperary.

2631. What would you do in South Tipperary?—I think if you dissolve a couple of unions it could be managed. I think Clonmel would be one and Cashel. Of course, the difficulty would arise with regard to the dispensing of outdoor relief.

2632. Would you also dissolve Carrick-on-Swift?—I think so.

June 22, 1904. 21615. Would you close the wards of this workhouse for the accommodation of the sick, or would you only close what might be called the healthy part? You would like to keep the hospitals on in each place?—Yes; in the Clonmel Union we board out all the children as far as we can, and I believe it is generally satisfactory.

21616. You have a great many children in the workhouse here—seventy-five?—Yes.

21617. Are some of these eligible for being boarded out?—I think all we have eligible for boarding out we have boarded out.

21618. Would you be in favour of extending the powers to board out all children that might be in your charge?—I would, but I would not take a child from the mother, as it might be a premium on misconduct.

21619. Supposing a mother and child were in the house, you would not separate them?—No. If a mother came in with a child and that child was boarded out, she might go away and come back again.

21620. Take the case of a girl falling for the first time. If she were sent to a penitentiary or place of that sort, and her child were boarded out from her, and the girl was put back in a situation, herself again, is being the belief of the managers of the penitentiary that she might safely be tried again at work or employment, would you then see any objection to separating the mother from the child?—There is an objection all the time; I don't see where you could draw the line.

21621. You would leave that to the discretion of the managers of the penitentiary, if they thought a girl could be trusted to go out and lead a steady life and giving portion of her earnings towards the maintenance of the child—you would be in favour of doing that in the interests of the girl?—It might be tried. We have cases in Clonmel where people have come to the house three or four times.

21622. Is it not the case that they are free to go at any time?—Yes.

21623. And it is because of that that some witnesses have come forward and urged that that system should cease and efforts should be made to reclaim these girls at the start?—I think it would be a good thing. I agree with what Miss Grubb said, that there is a disinclination on the part of people who have been reared in the workhouse to leave it. In Clonmel there is one chap that cannot be got out.

21624. What age is he?—He got married in the house. They sent him to America before the new Act came in force. He came back and married an inmate in the house.

21625. And they went back to their respective parts of the house?—Yes, and still the family grew. We had some cases of girls before our Board who were over the age to go to work, and refused to go, and had to be transferred to the able-bodied side of the house, where they found the conversation more interesting than in the laundry. That proves that the boarding-out system would be the best—to board them out as soon as possible.

21626. Do you find tramps trouble you here?—Yes, a fair share before the rains.

21627. Do you live in the country or in the town?—In the country.

21628. Do you find many about the country?—No many; perhaps one or two a week might call.

21629. Of course you have in every district worsted poor old people who would get charity from the neighbours?—Those are the worst. There is the travelling tramp who goes from one union to another, comes in load, and goes to the next union before a fair or a hen. All these people bring their lady friends with them, and send them into the union to get their night's lodging. If a man who went in there had to break a half set of stones in the morning that would be an annoyance to him, but the ladies are not asked to break anything; the gardeners wait outside to receive the ladies.

Dr. CROGAN, Medical Officer, Clonmel Workhouse, examined.

Dr. CROGAN. 21630. CHAIRMAN.—You have a pretty large number of sick in your hospital here?—On an average about 110 in the infirmary; our average in the fever hospital is rather low.

21631. In winter it goes up even higher?—It has gone up to 180.

21632. You might take 120 as a fair winter average?—That would be a fair average for the winter.

21633. You have got a good staff of nurses for that number?—Yes, and I think though the greater number of our nurses are qualified, they are excellent nurses, fully equal to the trained.

21634. You do train qualified nurses at Clonmel?—Yes.

21635. Dr. BROOKER.—What is your length of service for qualified nurse?—They must be at least two years, all that time spent in the wards; they assist at operations, excisions, amputations, hernia, lithotomy, removal of tumours, in fact all the capital operations. And it is not merely in the Clonmel Workhouse Hospital that these operations are performed; they are also performed in other workhouse hospitals in the county.

21636. Where do you operate?—We have not an operating theatre.

21637. Where do you operate?—In the surgery.

21638. Do you think that is a proper place?—I do not think it is, but I do not wish to call upon the Guardians to go to too much expense.

21639. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose you would be very glad if the Chairman suggested a new operating theatre?—I would. We have a number of paying patients. At least one of the Guardians objects to the number of paying patients.

21640. Dr. BROOKER.—Don't you think a good operating room is essential for the training of nurses?—I should say it is almost essential, if not quite.

21641. How can a nurse know if she has never been shown what arrangements should be made?—If not quite essential, it is almost essential.

21642. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose as soon as this Commission removes any uncertainty from your mind about your continued existence, the Guardians would be willing to consider the provision of a suitable operating room?—I find the Guardians disposed to be very liberal; they have been doing a great deal.

21643. The cost would not be much; just fitting up one room with proper appliances, and water laid on?—No, the expense would not be much.

21644. Mr. MURPHY.—Except in the matter of the operating room, is there anything in your hospital that will not compare favourably with the county infirmaries?—I should say not; and not only in mine, but in some of the other workhouse hospitals.

21645. Dr. BROOKER.—You have a system of training. How many probationers have you?—Eight.

21646. How do they get lectures?—I give them a lecture once a week, my colleagues, Dr. O'Flynn, lecture once a week also, and the trained nurse once a week.

21647. What about the bedside teaching?—We now lose an opportunity of giving these instructions by the bedside, I and my colleague. The trained nurse has been doing it; we have not had her long.

21648. That is essential, too?—Quite essential.

21649. Whether with nurses or medical students, the bedside teaching is really most essential?—It is most important.

21650. CHAIRMAN.—No scheme of amalgamation would, in your opinion, make it feasible that Clonmel Union Infirmary should be touched?—I should say it could not be touched. A large hospital is necessary here. Our population is over 10,000, with a good country round, and the average number of admissions in the year is about 600, not including those from the workhouse; that would be about 75 in the year.

21651. Would you be in favour of making it as hospital more for the acute cases, aged and infirm, and those that require less nursing, and the chronic cases being separated?—I think they should be sent to a separate institution, where they would receive proper care and be looked after when sick.

21652. Could you and your nursing staff do sent justice to the acutely sick if you had those only who were acutely sick?—We do separate them, and they are sent to it frequently, and I think the Local Government Board have received complaints of our sending them from time to time. Some of the Guardians that they know better than the medical men who should be under treatment and who should not.

21653. Mr. MURPHY.—Do you think that the people of Clonmel get any benefit from the county infirmary at Cashel corresponding to the amount of money

they have to pay to it—I really cannot say. I don't know of any people from Clonmel who have been there. They may have gone without my knowledge.

21664. Do you think if union hospitals were brought up to a high standard there would be any need for a county infirmary?—I don't like to say a word against any medical institution, but it does seem to me that Cashel is getting the special benefit.

21665. At the expense of other portions of the county?—If you were to press me, I am afraid I should have to agree with you.

21666. Dr. BROCKE.—Of course you are the workhouse medical officer?—I have been for a longer number of years than I would wish to tell.

21667. Have you any views to offer regarding the treatment of consumption?—I think there should be a sanatorium for consumption cases. We have a great many cases of consumption in Clonmel. About one-seventh of the deaths that occur in the workhouse hospital are caused by consumption, and about one-twelfth of the cases treated are cases of phthisis.

21668. CHAIRMAN.—Do you happen to remember the death-rate in the dispensary district?—I am not able to give that.

21669. Dr. BROCKE.—Would you suggest the site of the district the sanatorium might serve?—Two or three corners. I am afraid we would send a great many

from Clonmel. All along the valley of the Suir consumption is very prevalent.

21670. Have any means been taken to enlighten the people regarding the prevention of it?—Oh, yes, these posters are to be found everywhere. With regard to the young girls who have fallen for the first time, I think it is a sin and pity that an effort is not made to rescue them from their downward course.

21671. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose you do observe in your long workhouse experience that these girls remain there practically for their lives, in and out increasing their families?—If they spend one year in the workhouse they are lost to all sense of decency and shame, and come in again and again with illegitimate children.

21672. Mr. MURKIN.—Have you any suggestion to make in that respect?—I would send these girls to penitentiaries, but I would have them classified.

21673. CHAIRMAN.—These penitentiaries would be classified. They would only take one class of girls. The classes that take first offenders would not take depraved women.

21674. Mr. MURKIN.—Would you take the children from such mothers?—Those who have fallen only for the first time. I would be very much disposed to bring up their children at the expense of the State.

21675. CHAIRMAN.—Taking contributions from them?—Yes, when recoverable; not relieve them of all responsibility.

Mr. JOSEPH H. GUNN examined.

21676. CHAIRMAN.—You are a Guardian of the Clonmel Union?—Yes, I have been so for a long time.

21677. You have heard the conversation about Clonmel workhouses. Have you any opinion of your own to express on the question of amalgamation?—I think it would be an advantage if there was amalgamation; certain districts might be added to the unions.

21678. To the chief unions?—Yes.

21679. Would you be in favour of diminishing the number of places where the sick are treated in hospitals in the county?—There might be some reduction in the number of places.

21680. Mention any union infirmary that might possibly be closed in the South Riding of Tipperary without hardship?—I could not tell; I am not acquainted with the other ones.

21681. Now Carrick, for instance?—I don't know that it could be done without.

21682. Clonmel itself, Cashel, Thurles, Tipperary, all these places are centres of population. Do you think any of them could be done without?—It is hard to say, indeed.

21683. As regards lunatics, would you be in favour of leaving them in the workhouse?—No, I think not; it is not at all desirable. I think they should be put into proper asylums.

21684. Have you ever heard it proposed to board out lunatics?—No.

21685. In Scotland they board out their lunatics in a great many cases with advantage, they say, but you would at all events remove them from the workhouse and put them either in a county or district asylum, or an auxiliary asylum?—Yes.

21686. Have you considered the relative merits of district asylums and auxiliary asylums?—Not particularly.

Hon. Mrs. DE LA POER examined.

I was just going to say a word or two about paying patients. It strikes me as absurd that people well-to-do should only pay 4s. 6d. or 4s. 2d. a week for doctors and nurses and everything they get in the hospital, and the suggestion was made that there should be power given to the Guardians, with the guidance of the medical officer, to put on a certain charge. It would make respectable people who come into the hospital feel much more independent; it would put them in a different position, and take away the terrible prejudice

that at present exists towards going into the hospital. If the Guardians were given discretion to charge a certain amount I think it would do away very much with the feeling there is at present. About the boarding-out of children, I think the great thing is to get the children out of the workhouse as much as possible, and those children that we are not at present allowed to board out, it would be a great thing if the Guardians were empowered to do so, and get all the children we can out of the house into a better atmosphere.

Alderman POSE, Clonmel, examined.

21687. CHAIRMAN.—Are you also a Guardian?—Yes.

21688. What is your view about the proposed amalgamation of unions in the southern riding of Tipperary?—I don't agree with amalgamation.

21689. You prefer letting the unions remain as they are?—There would be a grievance for the people of Cashel and Thurles. They believe the Union of Clonmel owes a large amount of money and is paying a big

5 A

June 25, 1884.

Dr. COME.

Mr. JOSEPH H. GUNN.

Hon. Mrs. DE LA POER.

Alderman POSE.

June 22, 1904
Chairman
Pope.

percentage on it, and these people will be asked for it afterwards; it is to be repaid in twenty-five years. The gentleman who gave his evidence last is in receipt of interest for it, and I don't know that his evidence could be relied upon. In the second place, as to the matter of paying patients, that is a matter that should be very much taken up. I am at it for years. I find big farmers, with fifty or sixty acres of land, make their way into the union. They get in at the average cost of 4s. 1d. I wrote last night to the clerk of the union to produce the separate register and the medical returns, and I would show the different treatment the poor man entitled to the union by law and this big farmer is in receipt of. That should be done every week.

21687. What would you suggest as the best means?—To let them stop outside and let their own doctor attend to them. They seem all to be clients of one particular doctor.

21688. Look here, Mr. Pope, we would be very much obliged to you if you avoid personal allusions, which are not relevant to an inquiry like this—I want to make things as plain as possible.

21689. You are only making things as offensive as possible?—Then on the point of tramps coming in and out, I believe this tramp nuisance is more or less encouraged by ourselves, because in harvest time a man comes in, and he is fully entitled to come into the union. His intentions are next morning to look for work, but if he is kept in the house until 10 or 11 no man wants him for work that day. He may be a desirable workman, but he is classed with the bad characters and men who have just come out of jail. There is very little supervision or difference made between the bad character and the deserving poor person who has been benefited.

21690. How would you discriminate between the two classes?—He ought to know them by this time; they are long enough going in and out.

21691. You would leave them to the discretion of the master?—Yes.

21692. Have you ever brought forward any resolution at the Board of Guardians to give such instructions to the master?—Yes; and I think we carried it, where tramps were not to be allowed in any more, but some places were burnt and they allowed the tramps in again.

Mr. Maurice
Scally.

I am the workhouse master. I merely wish to mention about the boarding-out system. From my experience for the last seven years, and for years before I came to the workhouse, it has been a great success, and the children who have been boarded out never return,

Mr. MAURICE SCALLY examined.

while the children resided in the workhouse return regularly with the mothers or fathers.

21703. CHAIRMAN.—Do those leaving the workhouse at the age of fifteen come back in after life at all?—Some of them do.

Dr. Thomas
Lefan.

Dr. THOMAS LEFAN, Medical Officer, Cashel Workhouse, examined.

21704. CHAIRMAN.—You wanted to supplement a little the evidence you were kind enough to give in Dublin?—Yes, and add some more. I think I said something about the Colaba scheme in Dublin, but with the additional experience and the great mass of evidence you have had since, I think there can be no doubt now that the conversion of the workhouse hospital into a district hospital must be made compulsory. The whole trend of the evidence before you, as well as my modest views, were all in favour of that conversion, and after the length of time that now has elapsed, nearly two or three years, and the very few cases, if there be any, where the conversion has been carried out—

21705. None?—I think the law will have to be made compulsory. There are plenty of people who can pass patriotic resolutions, but when it comes to a question of practical help to the poor, they find a difficulty in giving that effect.

21706. It was a difficult section to work; a real effort was made in Rathfriland, for instance?—If that conversion took place all the objectionable features about the hospital would disappear. The sick cannot be removed indefinite distances, and the very sick must have a hospital within a circuit of a few miles. They cannot be moved twenty or thirty miles, and at present when they have to pass under the Claudine Parks of the workhouse, many of the decent poor decline and prefer to remain out under an imperfect system of treatment. The treatment must be imperfect, because it would in-

volve an amount of attendance on the part of the dispensary doctor which would be impossible. These cases must be sent into hospital, they don't go into hospitals because they are objectionable, and they should cease to be made objectionable by carrying Sir John Colaba's scheme into effect. It is greatly to the honour of an English Member of Parliament to introduce a section productive of comfort to the Irish sick.

21707. Is he not a Kerry man?—Well, he is an English Member of Parliament; it was not one of our own Members of Parliament who made an effort to do it.

21708. Mr. MYNAGHAN.—It was at the expense of the Irish ratepayers?—Even so, they might show more interest than they did.

21709. I resisted it!—Oh, worse and worse. Then with regard to charges. I entered into that matter before your Commission, and I have only to repeat that there are two classes to be taken into consideration in connection with paying patients in hospitals. I have the same objection to the admission of paying patients into my hospital as I have to their admission to the county infirmary. I myself am paid for attending the poor, and so are the whole of the profession to which I belong connected with Poor Law hospitals. We are not paid for attending to the rich, and I object to their quartering themselves upon the ratepayers and obtaining the services of the medical faculty for nothing. If these people were asked for a load of hay, or a bucket, or a milk cow, they would look queer if you did not

produce the price on the spot, or if they were of the landed class, and you asked them for an acre of land, their looks would not be pleasant.

21720. You say that the hospitals should not be open to people of means?—No, I say there should be a graduated scale. Let me repeat that the poor, the pauper and the policeman are the only people admissible to a workhouse hospital or fever hospital. In the town of Tipperary, from which witnesses were examined to-day—and there was loud talking done by some of them—they have drawn up a schedule of charges for pay patients. They had no power to do so. The sanitary authorities should be invested with the administration of the fever hospital. The Guardians have no power to admit to the fever hospital any pay patients. I brought this matter before the auditor, and only my legal friend did not serve me in time, I would have brought Mr. Cyril Browne into court for not surcharging in a particular case. There was not a word about the robbery of the doctors in the neighbourhood.

21721. CHAIRMAN.—How would you meet that?—I would have a graduated scale, and make the well-to-do patient pay not only all the expenses the hospital was put to, but I would make him pay the doctor as well.

21722. That would not remedy the defect. If he came from ten miles off you would be robbing the doctor from the price off of his patient?—If the case was one that could be treated in his own house, I would not admit him at all.

21723. He might die before you all made up your minds?—So he might.

21724. Dr. BROOKS.—Have you any experience of hospitals that allow the medical officer to charge fees?—No, I have not.

21725. Did you ever hear that it did not work satisfactorily?—No, on the contrary, the Maison de Santé in Dublin works very satisfactorily.

21726. It is a small private hospital?—It is not a small one. The patients go in there and are under the care of the individual doctor whom they select. Their own doctor outside can follow them and attend them.

21727. In this case the doctor outside could not follow his patient?—If the case is only one that could be treated in the hospital, it is only legitimate and proper that he should be removed to hospital, and the doctor who would have the trouble and whose skill would be exercised in the treatment of the patient, should naturally and justly treat him and be paid for it.

21728. Your argument seems in favour of doctors holding appointments in institutions only. It is no benefit to the ratepayers, and it is no benefit to the private medical doctor who sent the patient in. He is deprived of his patient?—He is only deprived in cases where the patient could not be treated at home.

21729. The supposition is that he would not come into hospital at all if he could be treated at home. The ratepayers who support that institution should be anxious to find out. Could you not do it easily by saying the doctor in charge of the institution should do all the duties in connection with the institution and get a fair payment for his work?—It would imply that the ratepayers should pay for the rich as well as for the poor. A decent man, who will pay for his wife or daughter at home and engage his own doctor, should enjoy the luxury of paying for the mean skulking wretch who sends his wife or daughter into a public institution.

21730. When a patient pays a guinea or two guineas to an institution, won't the ratepayers get the benefit of it?—Yes, but the doctor will not. Now with regard to male nurses, I state here that no hospital can be carried on without a male nurse; the Local Government Board appear to think it so. I got this to the Commissioner of the Commission: are there not forty and one things about a man that cannot be done by a woman, and if you have forty-one patients, as I have, some of them with inflammation of different parts, if you don't want to convert the doctor to the hospital into a nurse as well, you must have a male nurse; and the attempts made by the Local Government Board to have nobody but what they are pleased to call an attendant is a complete breakdown. I fail to see why the doctor cannot train an intelligent man and convert him into a nurse adequate enough to meet all emergencies; that is the point which the Local Government Board, in my particular case, deny me. They say we cannot train a young man to put on a ponicle or apply a leech. There are 156 hospitals without a male nurse.

21731. Dr. BROOKS.—You are training a male nurse?—I am not allowed by the Local Government Board to train him; they say I am not competent.

21732. Your hospital is small?—It has 100 beds, and there are eighty patients; there are at least forty bad patients.

21733. Have you not a male attendant?—We have; but if he did anything and it came to the knowledge of the Inspector of the Local Government Board—anything under the head of nursing—he and the doctor would be dismissed.

21734. What was he doing before he was appointed to the hospital?—A farm servant.

21735. Up to what age?—I don't think he is over twenty.

21736. He looked thirty?—You refer to the female who was a nurse in a New York hospital, and his Irish tendency towards the drop terminated the connection between the hospital and himself.

21737. Would you propose there should be a male nurse where there are not twenty patients?—I would. The male attendant we have at present would be quite willing for an additional £8 to discharge the duties.

21738. You spoke of 169 hospitals; a large number of them have not more than thirty or forty patients, and, perhaps, only fifteen male patients?—I would not propose a male nurse for fifteen males.

21739. CHAIRMAN.—How many hospitals in Dublin have male nurses?—They have; the resident students are male nurses. I had a case sent into me where the patient could not be attended except by a male nurse. We had at the time a male nurse that the Local Government Board did not raise any objection to. I called your attention to the distressing business—of course, the conversion of the hospital into a district hospital, everything would follow from that. With regard to those beds, I think you showed me up in Dublin on that point—the list of medicine and medical appliances that have been latterly drawn up by the Local Government Board in restriction of the right of the doctor to prescribe for his patients.

21740. We have nothing to do with that?—I propose merely to say that precisely the same course has been adopted in the army, and the result has been such that it would be well worth while to pursue the evidence before the South African Commission; and although the results are not exactly due to the interference with initiative and independence of prescribing of the Army Medical Officer, one of the elements most active at work and which has produced the most deleterious result, has been the very thing the Local Government Board has introduced into Ireland—interference with our initiative, and, I believe, our legal rights; because paragraph three of the Regulations puts upon the responsibility of directing the treatment of the sick. I don't know what the meaning of the English language is if it does not invest in him power to prescribe what he thinks proper for the sick.

21741. Dr. BROOKS.—Has he not power to order?—What is the use of ordering if you cannot get it.

21742. The Guardians can order it?—Yes, and then they have to pay the whole of the money out of the pockets of the ratepayers. You have to come before the board, and fight with the board; they say they don't see why this medicine should be got, that it is some new-fangled thing, and they oppose you tooth and nail. You are wasting your time, and some of the intelligent public say, "This is a fighting man." I now come to my friend, the county infirmary. I am a member of the governing body of that interesting institution.

21743. CHAIRMAN.—And medical officer of the adjoining?—Medical officer of the rival shop.

21744. Dr. BROOKS.—Were you elected to that position?—Yes, under the old system. I was elected by their worship, the County Council for the South Riding of Tipperary; they sent me there, and I hope they are satisfied with the amount of talk I indulge in. The first thing I have to say is this: The hospital was established under the Act of 6 Geo. III., when there was no hospital in the county from the Shannon to the Suir; now there is a hospital in every town, and the reason of this is entirely different. The original Act gave to the subscribers the power of nominating or recommending patients, and so careful was the Act to secure justice between the different statements that the parties were to be admitted in the order in which their tickets were presented. The surgeon was ordered to file them, so that if questions arose afterwards as to whether he acted equitably between the governors or not he would be in a position to prove that he did. Whenever I ask that some measure should be taken to ascertain that the parties recommended by the governors are desirable parties, I am always met by

June 22, 1904.

Dr. Thomas
Lefter.

the statement that nobody can be refused who comes with a governor's token. On the tickets issued by the institution there is this statement, that it is recommended and requested that no person who is able to pay for medicine or advice shall be recommended. That determines the charitable character of the institution—that it is for the poor, not for the rich. That being so, the question is, how is the staff to be wooded from the wheat. Now, what objects in Cashel are there. A number of people who don't want their neighbours to know that they are going to get treated for nothing, don't go near the local man; they come into the town, and get tickets, and one gentleman, who is very well known to some of our Grand Jury officials, Mr. Thomas Walsh—the newspaper of October 22nd, 1902, which, together with three other *Chronicles*, I will lodge with your Secretary, as they contain very important matter, indeed, Mr. Walsh says: "I gave as many tickets as any member, and I must say that when I question the parties looking for them they tell a number of lies." Then, Mr. Molloy said he knew other cases where persons applying for treatment tried to conceal their poverty, and would say they had land. It shows that the parties who had land are the whitewashed boys, who are wanted by the institution, whereas the poor people who have poverty stamped on their brows, and no arse to correct the bad impression, are not wanted at all. And that is the interpretation to put on the statement of Mr. Molloy, who is Chairman of the Board of Guardians.

21734. CHAIRMAN.—It is, at all events, an ingenious inference? Of course, there is another inference; but as it would be uncharitable to put the other inference, being a man of considerable amount of charity, I won't draw that inference. The result of that is this: That the parties coming from a distance go into three or four shops, or other places in the town of Cashel and get tickets. I have driven over and over again to correct that. I have suggested that the parties coming ought to bring a letter. If Protestant, from their minister, and if Catholic, from the parish priest, and I might have added, from the clerk of the union as regards arse, and from the dispensary doctor as to their ailments.

21735. Dr. Baggot.—Would it not be very cumbersome to compel a person going for relief to bring these certificates?—The other point is this: That by the Local Government Act, 1896, the Governing Committee were invested with the control of admissions; apparently that repealed the previous and ancient Act, but you will not attempt to get the Governing Committee to exercise their legal powers, and, consequently, legal obligations completely broke down. On one occasion, in March, 1903, I even toned down to the very mild performance of asking that the names of the admissions should be read out. You know, in the union the chairman has to sign the admission books. I asked that the names should be read out.

21736. Was that with the object of getting these publicity?—Exactly.

21737. That is not done anywhere else?—But it ought to be.

21738. CHAIRMAN.—Did you any second?—Oh, yes, Dr. Coyle; and by a majority of eight to two they refused as much as ever to read the names.

21739. Dr. BIGGER.—Did you arrange for your second beforehand?—Oh, yes. Then they manipulated the minutes, so that the fact that that resolution was proposed was not entered on the minutes. I called the auditor's attention to the fact, and Mr. Brown stated that when a resolution was proposed or a protest handed in, it was the duty of the officers of the place to enter that on the minutes. The auditor's report was not dry when an identical case occurred again, and the presiding chairman refused to put a motion or take a protest. Here is a report of the committee:—

"We beg to report that the finances cannot be balanced by reducing the number or salaries of the staff, and it can only be accomplished either by a material reduction in the number of patients or by charging those able to pay. This latter method made the Limerick County Infirmary self-supporting when the Grand Jury grant was entirely withdrawn. The difficulty will be, to ascertain those who are able to pay, for at present this latter class, by avoiding their neighbours, and seeking tickets from those who do not know even their names, obtain a ready

entrance. As a matter of fact, the medical officer was bound by the original Act to admit every person in the order in which the parties presented the tickets, and he was bound to preserve those tickets, numbered, for the purpose of verification. Only a case of accident was any discretion left him. Under the Act of 1898, however, this purely mechanical process was abolished, and the committee, as a body, were appointed to control the admissions. It is obvious that it is only by the exercise of such control that improper patients can either be screened or charged. Patients, therefore, could only be admitted provisionally, and it will be for you to examine into their circumstances subsequently, in the hands of other poor-rate supported institutions do, and to prevent abuse, each applicant should be obliged to sign, before admission to either ward or dispensary, a paper binding himself or herself to pay in the event of being found able to do so.—Signed, Thomas Lefter, Michael Coyle, the other member of committee (Colonel Murphy dissenting). That was the report of the committee appointed by the county infirmary, and that report was not acted upon; and that is all I have to say about the institution, except that the medical officers of the various unions have exactly the same qualifications that the medical officers of any county infirmary possess, and there exists the same means of treating the patients there as in a Dublin hospital, except, perhaps, in special cases, or some of those rare cases, when a conscientious man will not operate, because they occur only once in a lifetime, and these only fall into the hands of parties who have a reasonable amount of practice in them. The medical men connected with the workhouse hospitals have the same diplomas; and, as far as my hospital is concerned, all the operations in surgery, except operations on the brain, which have not been performed in the city of Dublin itself half-a-dozen times, have been performed. And I distinctly question the right of anyone to say that in a hospital where we have first-class nursing and everything money can supply, that surgery cannot be attended to there as well as elsewhere.

21740. Laparotomy?—Yes, that has been successfully performed. I have only had two cases; they make their way to Dublin.

21741. What other major operations?—We have had amputations of the thigh, an excision of the hip joint, a successful case.

21742. One case?—Only one; excisions of the hip are not very numerous. We have had several radical operations for the cure of hernia.

21743. Where do you operate?—There is a ward in which there is only one patient, a convalescent patient; but the board are about taking a contract for an operating room.

21744. Are you well supplied with instruments?—Yes, by fighting for them. That is where the Local Government Board comes in. The other day I had to look for a Thomson's splint, and in looking into this list that article was not on it, though the list was drawn up by a committee of the College of Surgeons. And I say they must have been over their wine when they made that list. I wrote to Sir Christopher Nixon, an old pupil of mine, to find out the name, and I intend to give them a dressing. I have been put to a world of trouble by them. It is necessary to fight occasionally, and as long as I have the fighting stuff in me it will come out.

21745. Have you a sterilizer?—We have everything and a beautiful operating table, and I got a present of £50 worth of Montague Ray apparatus.

21746. Do you use it?—We use it occasionally, and it often gets out of order. I have a competent person to assist, Mr. Bourke, of Grove, who charges it for me whenever we require it. Mr. Webb, of Egham, charged it for me more than once; but as thanks to the Local Government people, they throw every obstacle in the way.

21747. Have you ordered all the necessary instruments that a hospital requires that are on the list?—Oh, yes, and a great deal more.

21748. I am sorry to say we did not see them all. You did not put into the process sufficiently close; if you come there another day I will have them exhibited, for I am very proud of showing them.

The Sitting terminated.

FORTY-THIRD PUBLIC SITTING.—THURSDAY, JUNE 23RD, 1904.

June 23, 1904.

At the Courthouse, Nenagh.

Present:—Mr. MIDDS (Chairman), Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. COET RIDGER.

Mr. ARNOLD POWER, Solicitor, appeared for the North Riding of Tipperary County Council.

Mr. M. GLEESON, Solicitor, appeared for the Nenagh Board of Guardians.

Mr. G. CORBETT, Solicitor, appeared for the Bonmahone Board of Guardians.

Mr. THOMAS CONNORAN, J.P., Chairman, County Council, Tipperary North Riding, examined.

21760. CHAIRMAN.—The County Council of the North Riding have considered the queries that were sent by the Commission?—Yes; but I did not see the answers sent to them.

21761. The first query is, what is the view of the County Council on the question of the breaking up of any unions in the county, or closing any workhouse?—It is from the Board of Guardians the first answer that I wish to give, carrying their views as Chairman of the Board of Guardians of the Bonmahone Union.

21762. We are taking first the County Council?—Then it is from another point of view I have to answer that.

21763. But your opinions are the same, I suppose?—Yes, I may say, all the same.

21764. What do the County Council think first?—My own personal opinion is in favour of amalgamation, if that is a general amalgamation for the county—that is if I can see the figures—but I certainly say, and have said in Council, that unless I could see the figures laid before me I could not come to a conclusion, for I have only the knowledge of my own little union in Bonmahone.

21765. But it occurs to you that if there were fewer workhouses there would be less expense?—Yes; that is the general thing.

21766. In closing the workhouses, would you retain some place for treating the acutely sick of each district?—I have not gone into that part; that should be in the general scheme.

21767. If you were closing up any workhouse do you think it would be desirable to leave some premises in the district where those people who become acutely sick could be looked after?—I would look on that as part and parcel of the general amalgamation.

21768. Your general opinion would be in favour of amalgamation?—If it could be done with economy.

21769. And without hardship to the sick?—Certainly.

21770. If any workhouses were closed up in the county could you suggest any use that the vacated buildings might be put to?—No; I have not gone into that.

21771. The question we put in the next query is as regards boarding out the workhouse inmates; have you formed any opinion about the boarding out of inmates?—No, I have not; I could not see any way in that.

21772. Or children?—I can only speak from personal knowledge of Bonmahone Union.

21773. How you tried it there to any extent?—There is one in Bonmahone Union, that is all that is out, and there is another thing I have to say in regard to that. I am not speaking for Bonmahone now.

21774. For yourself, what do you think yourself?—In regard to the boarding out of children, that is a point that strikes me as having a great deal underlying it. In our unions we have no occasion for boarding out children.

21775. You have twenty-seven children in the workhouse, though?—There are, but we have not a single inmate in the union that has been a child there.

21776. Do you think the children are as brought up and reared in the workhouse as are good citizens in after life as the children brought up outside?—Taking Bonmahone as an example—I am only speaking for Bonmahone—there is not a single inmate there that was reared in the workhouse.

21777. Do you happen to know how they have turned out?—No; how would we follow them. They are all taken out by farmers, and unless women come back sick they never return.

21778. Are there any men or women in your neighbourhood who were workhouse children?—I have not followed them; but then, coming to that point, it is a question that I have made a calculation on, and it strikes me it is one of the very serious questions underlying the whole of this business. If you board out the children won't the teachers be done away with?

21779. Yes!—And I see that the teachers' salaries, according to the report of this year, amount to nearly £9,500; that is a serious item; that is for the year ending 31st March, 1903.

21780. What will be the value of their salaries?—If that saving is made, what recompense will the ratepayers of the county have for that?

21781. Get off the ration for one thing?—Certainly; but so the large amount the Government will get of that; would that money come back to us in grants or be wiped out entirely.

21782. That I cannot say?—It is a difficulty I see.

21783. Even looking at it from the children's point of view, you have not formed an opinion whether it would be better for the children to be brought up in the workhouse or outside?—As far as Bonmahone, I give you my experience of that; I don't know the workhouse of any other union; I have been thirty-three years in Bonmahone.

21784. How much do your teachers cost a year?—The male teacher £25 and the female £20.

21785. You would not like to lose the patronage—£25 a year—unless you got some equivalent for it?—No; what I would like to see, instead of my giving evidence, is to have a scheme laid down, and that I could see it.

21786. That is what we have to do, and to assist us in making such a scheme we come round to get the opinion of men, like yourself, experienced in Poor Law administration?—The difficulty I see is that the Government may reap a great benefit and the ratepayers receive very little; indeed they may be put in a worse position. My mind generally is that there may be a saving, and I should expect it would be a saving if there was a general amalgamation over the county; I think three unions sufficient for the entire county.

21787. What three unions would you keep?—We agreed to that at the conference between North and South—Nenagh, Thurles, and Chinnel. I am not exactly binding myself to Thurles, but the southern members seemed to think that Thurles was the most central. I said at that conference, and say it still, that unless I could see a scheme showing that there was a saving, and a good saving, that would make up for the discomfort the poor would have to go through—

21788. What would be the discomfort?—The long distances they would have to travel, though, certainly in Bonmahone, some of our poor have to come very nearly from Berrisoleigh, near Thurles, but there are discomforts, and there is a lot of the sentimental feeling of not wishing to go away from their own place; the poorest may have friends and connections that would not wish to see them going.

21789. Would what you say under that head apply to both sick and aged and infirm?—In regard to the sick—

Mr. Thomas Connoran.

June 25, 1904.

Mr. Thomas
Crosnan.

21779. I mean about visitors?—I am telling you that we have very long distances to travel to Roscrea.

21780. Take the people from the town of Roscrea itself, which is just close beside the workhouse, the sick who are from there would get visitors?—Certainly.

21781. Have you made any inquiries about the number of visitors that the aged and infirm receive?—I have not.

21782. We have made a good many inquiries on that point, and we find that the visits that the sick receive are numerous and the visits that the aged and infirm receive are very few indeed; you have not made any inquiries on that?—I have not.

21783. Do you think that the people from Roscrea might have to come too far to a hospital?—No; I say they have to do that at present. What I mean by speaking of the distance is that the people complain that the poor in the amalgamation will have to travel a long distance. I say that at present in our union we have people that have to travel a long distance, still there are very few in that case.

21784. Then you don't think it would be necessary to establish a cottage hospital there, or anything of that sort?—I do not.

21785. Are there any administrative or financial changes that occur to you that would be desirable in order to secure a more economical system for the relief of the sick of poor?—There is the question of out-door relief. Although I am not representing the Board of Guardians at present, I don't agree with the way it is going.

21786. What do you object to, and what do you think would be a better system?—I will have to go back to explain what I mean. I am thirty-three years a Guardian of Roscrea, and it is over twenty years since I formed the opinion, and have stood to it since, that never union rating was the proper thing; that was never done until the Local Government Act. And the reason I formed that opinion was, I myself live six miles from Roscrea, and represent a country division, and I found there were divisions too lowly rated, and had no poor either inside or outside, and, undoubtedly, that was because the poor had left the country and gone into the towns, and my honest opinion was that union rating was required at that time to equalise the taxation, because more of the divisions who were poorer were bearing the burden of the up-keep of the establishment. But since the Local Government Act began and things were equalised then the wrong side of the question began to turn up, and we find at present in Roscrea Union that we have the electoral division of Roscrea swamping us with out-door relief. Naturally as you will say that is the fault of the Guardians, as there is a natural shrinkage on the part of the Guardians from refusing out-door relief, and once things were equalised there should be divisional rating, once you had relieved the burdens of the past; there is no poor coming in from country districts now, and therefore there should not be an extra amount of out-door relief to be given to towns.

21787. What relief would you give to the towns?—The out-door relief that is granted is all in the towns.

21788. You were just telling us that all the poor of the country go into the towns?—Have gone in in the past, are not going in now.

21789. I suppose a few of them would go in now?—No. I have said I would defy them to show me a country case that has gone in that is at present on out-door relief.

21790. Are there not healthy people that go from the country into Roscrea looking for work?—No; because they have too much work to get outside.

21791. At all events people have gone into Roscrea in the past times?—That is what I am saying. My mind was for union rating to make up for the past times, and once that union rating was done and the thing equalised all over then I say it should be divisional rating. I would make them hold to that level, and anything extra that they gave they are to make themselves responsible for it.

21792. Would you not be going back to the old system?—No; because the poor are not going in now from the country.

21793. If you merely made all out-door relief in towns a divisional charge—do you mean the present cases on out-door relief should be divisional charges?—I would you make the support of the out-door paupers of the Roscrea electoral division a divisional charge for

the future?—Starting on the basis of the level rate, anything over that?—

21794. You would leave all the people who are on at present a union charge?—No; I would go back to the time we began union rating, exactly where we got it.

21795. Go back to 1838 and take the amount spent on out-door relief then, and anything in excess of that?—I would agree to union rating and the equalising of the rate and bringing it up, and to allow the cost of the average to Roscrea.

21796. Mr. MURPHY.—You say that in the past divisional rating was unfair as regards the towns?—Certainly.

21797. Because the poor flocked from the country into the towns and that put an unfair burden on the towns?—Certainly.

21798. Now you say that things have changed from what they were in the past, and they are so equalised that a balance has been reached; is that what you say?—Yes; it is out of proportion entirely now.

21799. You say the towns have no grievances now in the matter of out-door relief; do you say that?—The saving is in the country places; the town has increased out-door relief.

21800. And you say the tide is turning now from the town and going into the country?—I did not say that; I said there are no cases going in from the country now.

21801. And what you would wish to do is to strike a balance at present, and in future have out-door relief a divisional charge?—Yes.

21802. But you would be willing to start at the present condition of things?—I suppose I would, but I would sooner go back to the beginning. I don't exactly see how the thing can be done, but I have it in my mind. I want to have the country divisions bear the burden of the out-door relief and in-door relief of the towns up to the day the Act of 1896 passed, but I want them to mind themselves after that.

21803. You admit the towns did receive the people from the country?—Yes.

21804. You admit the towns had a grievance; do you want to continue that grievance, or are you willing to do away with the grievance by starting now as the present condition of things, and in future have out-door relief a divisional charge?—If I start on the present condition of things it means an increase of 30s. a week on the relief that is in Roscrea district, whereas in the country places outside there is very nearly that much of a saving.

21805. You admit the towns had a grievance?—They had up to the beginning of the Act.

21806. Don't you want to redress that grievance?—I want to equalise it.

21807. CHAIRMAN.—How much did you pay in Roscrea in 1888 for out-door relief before the Act passed?—I have not the figures.

Mr. Dooly.—Something about £1 a week.

21808. CHAIRMAN.—And now it is £2 10s. a week? What you would like to do would be to make the £1 a union charge and to make the 30s., or anything above £1, an electoral division charge?—That is the way thing; now you have my point. I want to equalise in the country places the out-door relief up to the Act.

21809. Are you in favour of moving the houses out of the workhouse?—There are some houses in our workhouse, and I don't think it would be beneficial to remove them.

21810. Would you be in favour of claiming contributions, that is getting people who came in sick and who could pay a certain amount; would you be in favour of giving the Guardians discretion to charge for the relief?—There is not much of that in our union; I have not much experience.

21811. And you would not care to offer an opinion?—No. We have some cases that come in—polio—where you pay, but we have very few others.

21812. Take the case of a man in employment in Roscrea, who would be making 15s. to £1 a week, if one of his sons or daughters came in sick to the workhouse there would be a certain saving in the best bed and everything else, and it would not much cost to pay 6d. or 1s. for the maintenance of his child in the workhouse; would you be in favour of getting power to enable you to charge?—I did not take that into consideration; we have not felt any grievance.

21813. What do you think about transport?—I have my own mind about transport; they are people that it will be very hard to get shut off, but if there are any

three workhouses in Tipperary their lodging-houses would be taken away; it is the best means of getting rid of them.

21814. Don't you think they would get quarters outside the workhouses?—I don't know; the cost is not very much. We had over 1,200 tramps in the last twelve months, and the cost of them is very small. It

is not the cost of the tramps, but the damage they do going through the country. If we had only a few women we would stop their lodgings.

21815. Do you think they would not keep on going round and put up at cheap lodgings where they could get them, or put up in out-houses?—I know they are on evil in the country, but I cannot see a remedy.

June 23, 1896.
Mr. Thomas
Cormican.

Mr. CHARLES C. C. WISE, J.P., examined.

21816. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the County Council?—Yes.

21817. And the County Council have not answered our queries precisely, but have left you pretty much free to express your own opinion?—Yes.

21818. First, about amalgamation?—I was down at Chinnel with Mr. Cormican, where we met the representatives of the South Riding, and we were all unanimous in considering that a scheme of amalgamation as broad lines would be a great economy in the general working of the county.

21819. And you indicate three unions that you thought would be enough?—Yes.

21820. I asked Mr. Cormican whether it would be wise, if you did close up the unions except these, whether it would be wise to leave at each union centre a place for the sick?—I have no instructions from the County Council with regard to that, but my own opinion is that it would be well to have a place for the acute sick. I think the chronic sick might all be lodged, as at present, in the unions.

21821. Would you leave these acute sick under the visiting workhouse medical officer as long as he lived, and then hand them over to the dispensary doctor?—If that was the most economical way of working, I would. I think myself if there were a hospital of that description—a small cottage hospital—it might be well to have beds for pay patients there. I am aware myself that there are many people, small farmers in the country, whose relatives sometimes get sick or infirm, that have no means themselves and could not afford to employ a trained nurse to come to their houses and look after them, and I think it would be a great boon to many of these people if there was a hospital of that sort, and that they could, by paying, have their friends properly looked after.

21822. And you think, perhaps, their present condition is a little worse than that of those who are poorer?—Indeed, yes.

21823. In closing up these workhouses one would come to consider how to dispose of the various classes of inmates in the workhouses at present; you have told us what you would do with the sick, and the aged and infirm would also go, would you say, to a central institution?—I think the aged and infirm might stay in the workhouses, as at present.

21824. Now the children, do you think it would be desirable to get all the children out of workhouses?—I certainly do, from all I know about it. I think all the children should be taken out and either boarded on—some people are in favour of boarding out; I cannot say myself personally that I have any experience of it, but if it could be done I think it would be a right thing to do—otherwise I should say that the only course open would be to turn one of these district workhouses into an establishment for keeping these children, not necessarily for the children of one county if it were more economical to take them in from others at a per capita rate; that would be a good idea if boarding out could not be managed. Then with regard to lunatics, I think on no account should they be kept in workhouses.

21825. You would move these to a district asylum or an auxiliary asylum?—I think an auxiliary asylum would be the cheapest, taking into consideration that I think we would be entitled to a capitation grant of 2s. a head. I belong to the asylum committee at Chinnel.

21826. Would there be room in the present asylum to receive any considerable number?—No; we are overcrowded at present; in fact we are making additional buildings this summer.

21827. Would these buildings be sufficient to take in any additional, or it is merely for the over-crowding of the house?—At the present time I think we are sixty or seventy over the number.

21828. But you are making accommodation for about that number?—For a few more, but what I would fear

would be that if you were to run all these in it might still leave us overcrowded. I was looking through statistics furnished to me with regard to the Unions of Nenagh, Berrisokane, Roscrea, and Thurles; on May 28 there were 449 harmless lunatics, imbeciles, etc. I cannot say the numbers there are in the union workhouses at the South.

21829. There are fifty-eight in Tipperary alone?—Would it not be advisable that one of the district workhouses should be turned into an institution for them, not necessarily for the County Tipperary alone, if it were more economical to take them in from a larger area.

21830. Passing to another class, that is the girls who come in to have illegitimate children, have you thought of any way by which that class could be dealt with in a better way than it is dealt with at present?—I have not thought much about it.

21831. The suggestion which I saw made here by the Nenagh Board of Guardians is that these girls should be sent to penitentiaries?—Yes, or Magdalen asylums, a course which would be highly beneficial to the community, as it often happens that the woman, in consequence of losing her virtue on one occasion, is obliged to enter a workhouse.

21832. What do you think of that suggestion?—I think there is a good deal in it.

21833. Do you think it would be likely to lessen the number of illegitimate children in the country if you could detain a girl after her first lapse?—I think so.

21834. Some people say it might have a bad effect if girls could get rid of their children so easily, but you would be willing to try the experiment?—I think so.

21835. Have you had any experience of boarding out?—No, I have not. I saw some suggestion with regard to boarding-out the old and infirm. I don't think I would approve of that.

21836. Would you approve of trying to reduce the number of aged and infirm in workhouses by giving them out-door relief, with the object of having as few in the institution as possible, or would you be afraid that that might lead to extravagance?—I would rather be afraid that there might be collusion—getting their friends supported.

21837. Do you think Mr. Cormican's idea would operate as a check on that if any future cases were made electoral division charges, leaving only the old amount as a union charge, if it were brought home to the people that they themselves over a narrow area would have to pay the cost of any additional relief that was being given?—It would tend to check it.

21838. Do you think it would be a sufficient check?—Well, it is hard to say; however, I suppose something must be done, and it might be more economical. I could not really offer an opinion on that.

21839. Is there any other use to which you would put the district workhouses except making one an institution for children, if you retained such a one, or an auxiliary asylum for lunatics?—No, not that I have thought of.

21840. The treatment of consumptives, for instance. Have you had your attention called much to the very high death-rate from consumption that exists in the country, and the desirableness of having means taken to stamp out this disease, which is infectious?—I certainly think it would be well if there was some such institution, but I would say one for all Ireland would be sufficient.

21841. I am afraid that would not meet it; say for a province?—Perhaps so.

21842. Do you happen to know, in the ordinary general way, whether many people are suffering from consumption?—I am not informed. I don't know.

Mr. Charles
C. C. Wise.

June 24, 1896.
Mr. Charles
C. C. Webb.

21843. Dr. Baggan.—When you spoke of an auxiliary asylum, was it on account of using a diseased workhouse?—Not on account of using it, but as they are there I think it would be a suitable place.

21844. Did you consider the difference in the cost of management in a new institution compared with an addition to the existing institution?—I think that it stands to reason that if you have to build in the new it would cost more than utilizing a building already there, though I have no doubt there would have to be alterations in the existing building.

21845. Taking into consideration the amount you would spend on alterations, and the amount you would spend on the additional staff, and additional kitchens and stables—I think I see what your point is. You think it would be better that they were all sent to the district asylum?

21846. I am not offering an opinion at all. I was only wondering if, when you made your recommendation, you had worked it out—I don't know what place you mean to add it to.

21847. Of course for Tipperary it would be Clonmel Asylum?—As far as I know, you cannot send anybody to that except dangerous lunatics.

21848. Oh, certainly; all the lunatics in Clonmel are not dangerous, any more than all the lunatics might be in the workhouse, perhaps, as dangerous. The lunatics in the workhouse are very much the same class as those in the asylums, and the lunatics that are sent into the work-

house at present are sent in very often because they are poor, and their friends don't want to have them sent to the asylum. They are not certified as insane, although they are treated when once in the workhouse as lunatics?—Yes.

21849. Then if you establish an auxiliary asylum, unless it is in connection with the county asylum, their friends might say afterwards:—"If they are to go into any asylum at all, we might as well send them into the county asylum, where they would be best treated," and send them into the county asylum, for if there is to be a difference in the two places there will be a difference in the treatment. This will make a provision for those in the workhouse, but how are you to keep it up when people would cease sending their friends to an auxiliary asylum?—I did not think of that; there is a good deal in that.

21850. As regards the management of the small district hospitals, the acute hospitals, how do you think they should be managed?—I think a very small staff would be necessary, as the chairman stated; the dispensary doctor could manage it.

21851. But under what body would they be?—I suppose it would be the same as the Guardians are at present. I should think it would be under the Board of Guardians.

21852. You did not consider it, perhaps?—No, I did not.

Mr. HUGH DELANEY, Chairman.

21853. CHAIRMAN.—Are you a member of the Berrisokane Board?—I am chairman of the Board.

21854. I know from your statement here the view of the Guardians; you are strongly and unanimously against any amalgamation?—Certainly; and so are the ratepayers, and here is evidence of their opposition (producing document).

21855. That is the objection?—From the several electoral divisions of the union. "We, the undersigned ratepayers, object to the amalgamation of the union with any of the adjoining ones, as we would derive no benefit or advantage by dissolving Berrisokane Union; on the contrary, our rates would become higher than they are at present."

21856. About how many ratepayers have signed this?—Over seven or eight hundred.

Mr. Liffey.—Ninety-nine out of every 100 ratepayers of Berrisokane Union could be got to sign it.

21857. CHAIRMAN.—We may take it that Berrisokane is solid?—Yes. There was no pressure used in getting these signatures. It was voluntary by the people in each electoral division. The Tipperary Council have struck the following rates:—Burr No. 2, on land 2s. 11d., on buildings 3s. 6d.; Berrisokane, on land 1s. 6d., on buildings 2s. 10d.; Nenagh, on land 2s. 5d., on buildings 4s. 4d.; Berris, on land 1s. 6d., on buildings 3s.; Tharles, on land 2s. 1d., on buildings 3s. 10d.

21858. Mr. MORRISMAN.—Is that for Poor Law purposes only?—For maintenance and clothing, 5d.; outdoor relief, 2d.; establishment and salaries, 2d., and rations for officers, 3d. That will compare very favourably with any other union.

21859. CHAIRMAN.—You spend much less?—The ratepayers built that union without any help from any outside union, and I cannot see for the life of me why Nenagh or Burr should come in and say "We will annex that union." What right have they to that?

21860. Do you think that if the union was not broken up the workhouse would be long standing? Is it not in a rapidly crumbling condition?—No; we will paint it in a short time.

21861. You must remember that we were ruined it very lately?—I know you were. You saw two bad doors there, and they would have been taken down only for one of your inspectors.

21862. The whole place was in a most ruinous condition?—Were you in Nenagh, sir. You surprise me a little. You have heard explicit evidence from two of the County Council. I hope you won't follow it up. Here is now an extraordinary case that would surprise you. The death-rate in the Nenagh Workhouse was forty-five in six months—one-sixth of the whole population of the workhouse.

21863. You think they are killing them off?—They are bringing back a recurrence of the Fenian years again.

21864. You have taken a very short period?—You

Berrisokane Union, examined.

have great experience and you have served a good name. I hope you will maintain it, and will treat these poor people fairly. We have had an instance of overcrowding in the asylum in Dublin.

21855. Do you think there is hot-bed at Nenagh?—You will have sickness, no doubt. One of your inspectors has laid down 60 square feet for each person. How will they get that room in Nenagh if they fill it up with half the county. In the Burr Union, another heavy spot, there is a cesspoo there that would poison the whole town.

21856. It is a very beautiful workhouse?—You did not see the cesspoo.

21857. There is litigation about it. You know they are arranging about drainage there?—That will be a long time. It will cost them thousands of pounds. In our union the death-rate for the last year was 14, and three of those were over 50 years of age—a fine age—two were over 80, and seven were over 90.

21858. You don't turn them out when you see them getting very bad?—No, as long as Providence allows them, we let them die easily. In the house we have 60, twenty-three over 70, thirteen over 80, and eight over 90; that shows a healthy workhouse. Owing to the sanitary condition of the place, our death-rate for a number of years was very low—in 1901, 14; 1902, 14; 1903, 16; and 1904, 14.

21859. How many were children?—We have very few children in the house.

The Clerk.—I don't think we had the death of a child. Witness.—There was one child. We commenced it about seventeen years ago, and we boarded out those two classes of children, orphans and deserted, and in that way we cleared out the workhouse all the children that might be there for years.

21860. How many have you boarded out?—Over 70. Clerk.—At present only two.

Witness.—We have boarded out for the last seventeen years. We gave the foster-parents 25 a year and two pairs of clothes for the children. They are bound to send them to school regularly, and the children get as fond of their foster-parents that when their time was up they remained with them.

21861. Are you strongly in favour of boarding-out?—I consider that it is far better for the Guardians and ratepayers than sending them to any school. For if you keep them at a school they remain there until sixteen, and then go out with a little education, but are unfit to work.

21862. I suppose most of the children you have are illegitimate?—Yes, and orphans.

21863. Would you be in favour of a law enabling the Guardians to board out all the children who come to them?—Certainly; that would be a better training for them than sending them to school, for they won't be used to country life, and you will only convert them

into traps. We had no trouble with the children only one. He was a troublesome boy, and broke away from his foster-parents.

21874. What age was he when put out?—Eight or nine. His father was an itinerant something, and he got bad training. There is no decrease in the pauper; there is an increase. In 1845 we had 125 paupers; there is an increase. In 1845 we had 125 paupers in Ireland, and the numbers were 50,300 in those workhouses. According to the last report of your Board, we have 41,300 in daily attendance, and 20,000 daily on out-door relief.

21875. There was no out-door relief in 1846?—No.

21876. So that of that number in 1846 they were all in-door?—Yes. There was a pauper then for every 24 of the population; to-day there is 1 in 64. No one who ever saw a workhouse in those days would care to witness the appalling death-rate that took place then; hundreds of thousands of the finest men and women I ever saw died, and that was due partly to overcrowding, not to say for want of food. If you amalgamate half a dozen unions, don't you believe that the salaries will be increased in proportion, and those you extinguish, and Guardians of the dissolved unions will have to superintend their own offices, and get no relief from the unions they join. If we were to join Nenagh and take up a share of their loans, £46,000, would not that be a great injustice to the ratepayers of Berrinokane. They have got no benefit from the building of those cottages or from the labourers in them.

21877. That would not come in at all, that is under the Labourers Act?—But it would be the same thing. It would come on the District Council, who are the same ratepayers.

21878. We are only dealing with the Poor Law Guardians?—But that would be the outcome of the amalgamation.

21879. Not the necessary outcome. The unions would be increased with, but not the District Councils?—The out-door relief would come on us; that is £30 a week in Nenagh.

21880. Then all you sensible men from Berrinokane would come in here and put things right?—The establishment charges, and the salaries are higher in Nenagh, and we would have to take our share of all these things.

21881. You think some of the County Tipperary at present in the Birr Union might be transferred to Berrinokane?—Yes, six divisions.

21882. Those divisions you think would wish to come to you?—They memorialised your Board for that purpose, and the County Council passed a resolution in favour of that.

21883. What will the Birr people say to that?—It is not their country; it is outside their bounds; they would be opposed to it, because they would lose on a valuation of £12,000 a year.

21884. You would not let any little consideration of that kind stop a useful change like this?—It was the wish of the ratepayers themselves. They suggested to have this transfer made; it came from them. They will come in for a lower rate than in Birr.

21885. Now you consider the existing arrangements for administering indoor and out-door relief are working very satisfactorily, and require no change. Is that what the various inspectors who have visited your union have been telling you?—I don't know that they do.

21886. Are you quoting from their reports when you say that, or are you expressing an opinion diametrically opposed to theirs?—I was expressing my own opinion, but I was thinking since I wrote that, that if out-door relief was confined to dispensary districts it would be better. When cases come before the Board seldom a Guardian would interfere, because it is a union charge, and the chairman has not power to go against a whole Board, but if you put it on the dispensary district, seven or eight Guardians would be more concerned, and they would discuss the case better.

21887. What do you think of the arrangements of the workhouses. Do you think they are all satisfactory?—I don't think so.

21888. But you say here they are?—Well, what I would refer to would be, if there is an inquiry into the management of the workhouse, there would be more economy carried out, because there is a great want of management in workhouses, and a great waste in clothing, food, and fuel.

21889. In Berrinokane?—In every union.

21890. Certainly in Berrinokane?—Not more than any other.

21891. But you are aware of it there?—When taking stock some years ago, I went through the house, and went to the piggery, and found lots of white bread there. I asked the master the reason of the waste, and he said the inmates could not use it. I asked why he did not curtail the allowance, and he said he could not.

21892. I suppose you proposed the cutting down of the allowance?—No, I did not. I think the cause of it is there is too much sweetness in the dietary; cold milk and bread every day; if that waste bread was made into a bread pudding. But that cannot be done until you have lady inspectors to go round the workhouses and teach them domestic economy and cooking.

21893. Have you any lady Guardians in Berrinokane?—No, they would not give the time to it. You would want lady inspectors appointed by your Board, and to spend a week at each union. Then in the clothing—if that was given to people in the world it would last four times as long. And the fuel consumption would be reduced.

21894. You have not modern grates there?—No, we are using turf. It was proposed, at the time we were making the change, which was delayed, that all these grates would be altered, and we had plans and specifications, and we were to borrow money to make these alterations, and if the union lives that will be carried on.

21895. The next point you allude to in the petition is that the Berrinokane people have to contribute to the county infirmary at Cashel, on the ground that you get no benefit from it?—I think we only sent two patients there during my time, twenty-eight years.

21896. And you think it hard to have to pay for an institution that you get no benefit from?—It is.

21897. You say the arrangements for the sick are as good as in any other workhouse in the county?—That is what I believe.

21898. Are you saying that from your friendly disposition towards Berrinokane. What other workhouse have you visited. Did you ever come up to Nenagh?—No, I would not visit it at all; the death-rate is too high.

21899. You did not see some of the hospital wards there?—No; but we provided everything the inspectors pointed out—beds bedstead and hair mattresses—for these poor people. There are fewer in the wards, as Dr. Smyth recommended 60 beds to every patient; in that way they are healthy and clean. I see them nearly every week.

21900. Do you really think now that the arrangements for the sick are as good with you as in any other workhouse in the county?—I think they are very fair.

21901. I would be afraid we would give you the last place; we visited them all?—When I spoke of Nenagh, an inspector said to me: "Don't speak of Nenagh; don't mention it."

21902. He was getting on the soft side of you when he said that. How far do you think it would be possible to get contributions from the people who come into the workhouse?—I don't believe there would be any, or a very few would come in, because the people who are any way well off would not care to come into a workhouse hospital.

21903. You heard Mr. Webb's evidence on the subject. He would be rather inclined to have pay wards, where people who could not be nursed properly at home would be treated?—I don't believe they would go in. People who could afford it would get a doctor and nurse. Any connection with the workhouse is very objectionable. If you frescoed the walls, and used any amount of hygienic aid, it would still be a workhouse, and to compare those with Dublin hospitals would be a mistake.

21904. What do you think about the tramp?—I think they are a remnant of an old wandering race.

21905. Have you not two classes of wanderers, the person who begs round the parish and neighbourhood, and is more or less welcome in all the houses to a bit of a sup, and the tramp who goes about from union to union all over the country?—They existed in larger proportions before the workhouses were established.

21906. Were they of the same class?—No, there are ex-soldiers and militiamen now; some of them are tradesmen going from town to town; it would be a hardship to send those to jail.

21907. Do you think it would be a hardship to require a man who was on tramp for work to carry a certificate?—Mr. Nicholls, the English Poor Law Commissioner, when he came to Ireland to make a report on the state of this country, said a law "You shall not steal or beg, you shall starve," would be opposed to natural justice.

June 23, 1906.

Mr. Hugh Dalrymple.

June 25, 1904.

Mr. Hugh Delany.

The Poor Law Commissioners in the early stage of the Commission gave directions that any one, whether he belonged to the union or outside the union, should be accommodated in the workhouse.

21903. That is the law?—These tramps come here and demand admission, and how can you refuse them?

21904. Do you think the workhouse has not been an indirect means of fostering a kind of habitual tramp?—I am afraid if they were refused more harm would be done to the ratepayers of the country. Now their cost after all is not so very large, 2s. 6d. and 2s. 6d. for a woman, and 2s. 6d. for a child.

21905. Do you think it is a good education for a child tramping over the country?—You cannot take the child from the parents.

21906. That is just the question I was going to ask you. Don't you think it would be a Christian and proper act to take these children from these wandering people. If you were with Mr. Murnaghan in the House of Commons, would you put your name on the back of a bill for taking away their children from them?—It would be very hard to get Parliament to pass such a law.

21907. There was a more severe law sixty years ago in Belgium, where people were taken up and put into the house until they showed signs of repentance, and then they were let out, and if they were again they were put back to that house for life!—We deal with our tramps in a reasonable way, requiring them to break 5 out of stone every day before they leave the house. The value of their labour would be about 6s., and the cost for the time, including women and children and Saturday nights, would be 11s., leaving about 6s. loss on the ratepayers. If we took one of those and sent him to Lancaster Jail it would cost 12s.; that would support seventy tramps, and would it not be wiser and more humane to support seventy tramps than to send that man to jail?

21908. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—But while the question of money is an important one, there is something still more important. Do you think it is a good thing to have such a class confined in the country and grow?—I am afraid you cannot put a stop to them, for this generation will not see the last of them. And if that man came back from jail and got licensed with the Guardians, what would prevent him doing more harm to the union than forty tramps?

21909. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think a man of that kind ought to have his liberty at all?—They are human beings, and there is no use in going to experiments with them; they have them in all countries; they have them in England.

21910. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—In order to take away the children from these tramps, the English Parliament has passed such a law four years ago. The Board of Guardians, by resolution, can place themselves in the position of parents of these children, and send the children out to board. Do you think that ought to be done in regard to the children of tramps here?—If it can be done legally; it is very hard to deprive a parent of his child.

21911. If he does not take care of the child!—He says he is going to look for labour throughout the country.

21912. CHAIRMAN.—Don't you know very well he is not?—These belong to some union originally that they could establish their chargeability to and make themselves a burden on that union, whereas if they divide their patronage among different unions it makes it lighter.

21913. Do you think that is a thing to be encouraged, a wandering life?—With some classes I object to it, but not with the class of tramps.

21914. Oh, with the honest tradesman looking for work, that is different?—I think tradesmen are the largest proportion of tramps.

21915. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—Have you ever been to Roscrea?—No.

Mr. MURNAGHAN.—If you were there you would find them on the streets at night.

CHAIRMAN.—Thinkers, and all sorts of wanderers.

Witness.—Well, unless you pass a law as in Belgium or Denmark.

21916. CHAIRMAN.—That is the point—would you approve of such a law?—It would be very serious to put a man into a house of correction for life.

21917. No, not for life, but to put him in to try and get him to learn honest industries. If you put him in there the first time for six months or a year, then let him have a fresh chance out again, always giving the governor or managing body of that institution power

to let him out on a ticket-of-leave, if they thought he was likely to mend his ways and work honestly. Do you think that might not be a useful thing—not to punish the man, so much as to reclaim him and make an honest workman of him instead of a strolling vagabond?—I am afraid, like all criminals you let out of jail, he would go back to his old habits.

21918. Would you be in favour of keeping him locked up?—If he was locked up it should be for a long period; I don't think a short period would have any effect.

21919. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—Don't you think the opportunity for passing his occupation being made a little more difficult is more likely to deter him from following it?—I don't think it would.

21920. CHAIRMAN.—Is there anything we have not asked you that you would like to mention?—With regard to the lunatics, we have only forty-eight in the North Riding, and I don't know why the County Council would go out of their own administrative county. We have eight of those in Berwickshire, and the Inspector in Lunacy visited that place lately. Here is his report on the six:—"None of these are epileptic or of mad habits; one man was in bed"—one old-bodied man who lost his hearing—"the other appears to be fairly healthy and was walking about the yard; two women were clean and tidy, and two did some little work." These are not hard cases at all, and it is to equip an auxiliary asylum would cost a great deal of money. I think if those who have something on the brain with regard to lunacy agreed to take a union workhouse, and appropriate that for these people, and put these forty-eight people into it under a different system, they could be treated there as well as in any auxiliary. Taking away from the parent house would be a great mistake, because you relieve the Treasury of a part of the capital grant.

21921. Have you ever had any troublesome lunatics there?—Never.

21922. If you had I suppose you would send them to the asylum?—Yes.

21923. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—But you get no capital grant for lunatics in the workhouse?—Yes, but they would require special treatment and higher class officers, and to equip the place to please the Inspector in Lunacy.

21924. You say they are well treated in your house. They cannot ask for more than that wherever they go?—The lunatics of course are better treated and have a higher class of staff than the inmates of the workhouse.

21925. Do you think it is a humane thing to keep these poor afflicted people there?—No, I would give them a wing in the workhouse where there is room, and put them under different treatment altogether. On one occasion we sent the children from Berwickshire to Roscrea to avoid expense, and the appointment of a teacher, and after the Guardians got a bill from Roscrea they found they had to pay more than they had at home; there will be great trouble in mixing up different counties like that.

Mr. GLEASON.—I suppose it would not be allowable for any representative of the Neneah Guardians to ask any questions of Mr. Delany?

CHAIRMAN.—I think it would be a very fair thing. I am sure Mr. Delany has no objection to say over again what he said about the Neneah Union.

21926. Mr. GLEASON.—As regards the building, you were making a comparison between the Neneah Union and in favour of your own. Do you think a dilapidated building is a more healthy and satisfactory place than a well-equipped house; you don't think that?—No.

21927. You think the best-equipped and best-built house would be the best place for the inmates to live in?—Taking into consideration the healthfulness of the situation and the sanitary conditions.

21928. I am not comparing Berwickshire for the world. You made the allegation that in the Neneah Union there was a very large death-rate. Would you be surprised to hear the majority of those people were over eighty years?—I took it from the report, and one of the Guardians said he was surprised at it.

21929. But you never came here to ascertain the state of affairs?—I did not, the deaths are there. (I got the matter in 1903).

21930. You did not inquire to see what the condition of it was?—The report of the Board of Guardians for six months only.

21931. CHAIRMAN.—Why did you take such a short period?

Mr. GLEASON.—It happened to suit.

Witness.—It was not in the winter season.

2237. Mr. Glendon.—Do you think it is far the advantage of the poor to have a poorer class of diet as compared with the other workhouses, and to have less cramped bed and bedding?—I would like to see the two scales before me.

2238. Do you think it is a proper thing for the Guardians, for the sake of not having to buy blankets, to give only one blanket to the poor in winter?—That is not the case in Berriestown; our bills for clothing are large.

2239. Is it not a fact you get all your stuff at Berriestown, and it turns out to be very wasteful; you spend your contracts locally?—We spend the money where it is collected, and that is the proper thing to do.

2240. CHAIRMAN.—Shorter carriage?—Yes; if we came to Nenagh we could not get turf, and we get milk cheaper.

2241. Mr. Glendon.—You are Ed. a head more expensive than in Nenagh?—Because our old people are infirm.

2242. What was your rate in the Berriestown Electoral Division before the Act of 1868?—I have all the figures. From my recollection, for the last twenty-eight years we were always lower than Nenagh.

2243. Some idea of this amalgamation was in the air for the last two or three years?—Yes.

2244. And did you not make a nice little plan, or scheme, by which you would look as if you were reducing your rates every year. You made an estimate in 1903-04 of £2,567, and you did not spend that money, and you had money to your credit; next year it was the same thing, so that this year you were able to make a low rate, in comparison with previous years. Had you a little plan of that description?—That is not so. There was an item of expenditure included in that estimate; there was no desire on the part of any of the Guardians whatsoever; but the clerk of the union made out and submitted his account to me for the workhouse, and he included in that a large sum for pumps, which were not carried out, and that went back to the credit of the accounts. We got on two occasions a couple of hundred pounds interest on our money from the bank, and when we closed our account in 1899 we had £400 to our credit in bank.

2245. CHAIRMAN.—I am sorry you did not spend a little on paint?—We practised economy in every possible way. We are not like the County Council, increasing the salaries. We keep the salaries of our officers down.

2246. Mr. Glendon.—You did everything beautifully and well for the purpose of making the rates look small. About the tramps. That is a general matter that affects all the unions. Do you mean to say that it is a proper thing to have tramps moving about like this, with their wives and a crew of children?—It is better and safer for the community to have them under lock and key.

2247. CHAIRMAN.—You mean in the workhouse, under lock and key at night?—Yes; we have no control over them during the day.

2248. Mr. Glendon.—Last May you had thirty-six tramps accommodated in your workhouse, and there were only seven in Nenagh. I suppose they know you have a safe berth?—No, that is not so; but always on the eve of a fair we have larger numbers than at other times; and even on the approach of the fair of Nenagh we have these cattle-drivers and others.

2249. How did they come through Berriestown?—

That is the direct road between Galway and Tipperary.

2250. Do you think the aged and infirm of the respectable class that have, through no fault of their own, to go to workhouses, should be compelled to mix with the ordinary, common inmates of a workhouse?—Why should they come there at all?

2251. Say, you had an aged couple, husband and wife, they are separated in the ordinary circumstances at present?—They are.

2252. Do you think that a proper thing to do?—That is the Poor Law discipline.

2253. I am asking you your opinion?—I suppose for the purpose of classification.

2254. Don't you think that really it would be a proper thing to have an institution in the country, belonging to the country, where the respectable aged could be segregated from the lower class of inmates, and pass their declining days in peace and comfort?—We have not many families of that kind in our workhouses.

2255. Suppose you had several workhouses combined?—I am not going to offer an opinion on that.

2256. Would it not be a proper thing to do?—It would entail considerable expense.

2257. I am putting a general question?—Like the inmates, it would depend on the number you would find.

2258. If it turned out on investigation that there were a sufficient number in the country to be kept in a special house or home for themselves, would it not be a proper thing to make a home for them?—You can give them a ward to themselves in any workhouse. Would not that do?

2259. No, it would not?—You could do it. They would have a separate ward and separate bedroom accommodation.

2260. You think, for the purpose of avoiding amalgamation, each union could provide for its own imbeciles and aged and infirm separately?—Yes.

2261. CHAIRMAN.—They have so few inmates in Berriestown that they could do it?—Here is a wealthy union of grass land and cattle trade taking from a poor tillage district of small farmers, and increasing their taxes; that would be contrary to justice and humanity.

2262. Would you be surprised to learn you did form portion of the Nenagh Union once?—That was at a time when the population was large.

2263. The reason you were allowed to form a union at all was that in the former times there was such a number of poor that Nenagh could not accommodate them, and you had to put the auxiliary workhouse?—We got a divorce, and did not get either bed or board. We had to build a house ourselves; and now, after fifty-three years, like a repenting husband, they say you must come back and pay one-third of our expenses. You must allow that?—Would you allow me to give my experience of amalgamation with Nenagh District Council. The four districts agreed to take up the maintenance of main roads in the country, and the result is, Berriestown is paying £200 a year more than it should pay.

2264. I am afraid you are too soft to have the management of your own affairs?—I put the facts before Mr. Cooke, and said—"If you cannot deal with these questions will you put a note before your board?" He did not do either. We are at a loss of £1,000 in five years. Why, with that experience, should we join with Nenagh?

2265. And now you are only five miles from Berriestown?—I am more than five English miles.

2270. If a hospital for the same sick were left at Berriestown, do you think there would be any hardship in closing the union, so far as it is a refuge for the healthy?—I would think it is a hardship; and why, there are so many urgent cases. Are the Guardians going to attend here when an urgent case turns up in Nenagh?

2271. What kind of an urgent case?—I mean, supposing where there is a family with fever.

2272. That is not by what I say. If you leave at Berriestown sick wards for treating the sick, would you be in favour of closing the house to all the able-bodied?—I would not.

2273. Why would you be against that?—Because of

Mr. P. O'Donoghue examined.

Mr. P. O'Donoghue.

2266. CHAIRMAN.—I am sure you are pleased with the way in which Mr. Delany put the case for your union forward?—I would agree, only for certain things he left out. He spoke nothing about the hardship and misfortune on the poor of the district if amalgamation was to take place; but from beginning to end I was most heartily in accord with him; but to remove the poor of the district would be a terrible thing.

2266. How far are you at Berriestown from Nenagh?—I live five miles below Berriestown, fifteen miles from Nenagh.

2267. Where was your part; before the Berriestown Union was formed, to what union did it belong?

Mr. Delany.—It was in Nenagh.

2268. CHAIRMAN.—You would have fifteen miles to come?—Yes.

June 26, 1904.

Mr. P.
O'Donoghue.

the great economy. With regard to the ratepayers, I think we are living very safe. We represent the ratepayers of the district, and trust the people respectfully and honestly; but to come so many miles into Nenagh Union, very few farmers would like to undertake the business.

21974. Mr. MURPHY.—Would you not get over that difficulty if the management continued the same, and the Guardians still looked after the finances of their union, and only paid to the Nenagh Guardians, or some other Guardians, the cost per head of the inmates they sent there; you would get over that difficulty; you would still provide accommodation for the sick, and you would considerably reduce the cost to the ratepayers by such a method?—Do you mean to tell me they would reduce the rates down to the standard we have at present?

21975. And why not; you would get rid of the staff you are paying for there; you would only have to pay a share of the staff of the Nenagh Guardians?—It would be a large staff, and we would have to increase the salaries in Nenagh.

21976. I don't think you would have to increase the salaries commensurate with the saving that you would make by the amalgamation. You say there is a large house at Nenagh, it has to be kept up anyway; there is a great deal of expense in connection with the heating and lighting, and there will be no more expense in the future than in the present; you will get rid of the cost of the firing of your institution, of the staff and of the repairs, all three things, so it is possible really by a system of amalgamation, without interfering at all with the present management, to make improvement and bring economy?—I don't see my way in that line. I see myself we are working with the greatest economy possible. It differs from the other parts of the country. Nenagh is not a tillage country, and all my part of the country is all tillage land, and there is more poor there in a square of five or ten acres than in 2,000 acres in Nenagh.

21977. You cannot have very many poor when you have only seven in the house?—It is the smallest union in the county, it is not in the country; but we have a great deal of poor people on out-door relief. It would be a great hardship to bring the poor people to Nenagh.

Mr. Stephen
Lilly

Mr. STEPHEN LILLY examined.

21993. CHAIRMAN.—Have you anything to add to the evidence of Mr. Delany and Mr. O'Donoghue?—Very little, and I have no documents prepared.

21994. We have had the view of Berrisokane very fully from both those gentlemen, but I thought you might wish to add something to what they said. What part of the union do you live in?—Ballygarry.

21995. How far is that from Berrisokane?—Four miles.

21996. And from Nenagh?—Eleven or twelve miles.

21997. And from Berr?—About eight.

21998. Would you object to go to Berr and the people in your district?—Certainly; I would prefer to remain as I am.

21999. For what reason?—Financially, we can do better where we are; that is the most important; and then going long distances. As a rule, I find the Guardians won't go long distances to look after the relief of the poor, and the out-door relief would not be properly administered under the present system.

22000. Do you think there are too many meetings of the Guardians held?—No, I don't think so.

22001. How often do you meet in Berrisokane?—Once a week.

22002. If Berrisokane was broken up you would go to Berr?—Probably; but as Mr. Delany and Mr. O'Donoghue said, I would prefer to remain as I am for many reasons. The Guardians won't go long distances to look after the interests of the poor, and, consequently, the management is likely to develop

21978. Still, if you were satisfied there was no increase, but, on the contrary, there would be a reduction, in the rates, would you then still have the objection you have now?—I would; in consequence of the poor of the district. Who is going to look after their interests only the Guardians of the district?

21979. Why not look after them in the future as you do now; you would have the management of your own concerns?—I don't understand.

21980. CHAIRMAN.—You think you would not like to entrust your sick to the Nenagh people?—I would not, honestly; I think they are better cared where they are.

21981. Mr. Glavin.—How far are you away from Berr?—I suppose about fourteen miles English or eleven Irish.

21982. How far are you from Berrisokane?—Five.

21983. If you were amalgamated with Berr—your division did belong to Berr once, it did not belong to Nenagh as all—you would not think eleven miles was a distance to travel to attend at Berr Union?—Indeed I would think it too much.

21984. You, a man who takes such an interest in the poor; an extra five miles would not prevent you going to Berr?—Indeed, I do take an interest in them.

21985. Would you object to an extra five or six miles to go to Berr?—I would object to go regularly, and he is no Guardian who does that so regularly. I am not a very strong man to go that distance.

21986. Would you be surprised to learn that the Guardians have to come sixteen or seventeen Irish miles, some of them, into Nenagh to attend to their work?—I am not a bit surprised, because very few you have from that part of the country; it is not a village country.

21987. Take all the Newport district up to the County Limerick bounds, away to Killeale and west to Monrogh, the Guardians don't object to come to Nenagh?—Is that a village country?

21988. You have seventy in your workhouse, thirty-two in your infirmary, and the rest are poor in these great tillage districts—that is all you have got?—How many are getting out-door relief?

Mr. Delany.—That division, Terryglass, belonged to Nenagh.

Witness.—It did; but I would be very far from going to Nenagh.

into a ring around the vicinity. Certainly, if it was divisional relief, I would not object to it so much, but the present system of union relief I would object to.

21999. Does any other point of view occur to you?—No. But so far as auxiliary workhouses are concerned, I would prefer to have a whole general asylum in Clonmel and send them all there; not to establish an auxiliary asylum at all, because, as a matter of fact, I believe it would be expensive, and not equipped in as good a manner as one for the whole county.

22000. Did you calculate how much it would cost, for instance, to enlarge the asylum at Clonmel?—Yes; there is a question of enlargement at present.

22001. That is only to meet the overcrowding within the asylum?—It would meet the objection, I think, from the different workhouses; it would have ample accommodation for the few extra that might go from the several workhouses. So far as the noise and means that are quiet, they do very well in the workhouses; those quiet people, that don't get wholly overworked and inclined to do harm to themselves or anybody else, I think they would do very well in the workhouses, a small proportion; but any dangerous cases, that would develop dangerous symptoms, the proper place is where there would be a proper asylum. (Mr. Delany's answer produces return of rates.)

CHAIRMAN.—Business is really lower.

Mr. Power.—Last year Nenagh came to nearly the same rate as Berrisokane.

Mr. MICHAEL M'KENNA examined.

Mr. Michael
M'Kenna.

22002. CHAIRMAN.—Is there anything you would like to add to the evidence of your colleagues?—I have not much to say, but I would just like to explain a few reasons why the amalgamation should not take place. First, I think there is ample accommodation

for all classes requiring in-door relief, viz.—the able-bodied, the infirm, and the sick; second, the sick in the hospital at present express their desire not strongly to be left as they are in their own union, where their friends outside can conveniently visit them

who is town. It is a great thing for the poor patients to receive visits from their friends.

22003. I think we would agree with you there?—All the inmates express themselves fully satisfied with the diet they get in there, and their treatment also, consequently all have a strong hatred to the removal to any other union. Fifth, I think the drainage system is good, having a sufficient fall from the house to keep the place free from any foul air, as frequently found in other workhouses. We had no disease there for a great many years, and by very little improvement it can be made very suitable. A very small outlay would make the Barrickane Workhouse second to none in Ireland.

22004. That is a very big statement, and I would be more inclined to differ with you on that than on anything else you have stated?—I say if there is a sufficient outlay, which we intend to lay out, and would have laid out before this only for some delays. With regard to the fever hospital, it would be better to convert the present infirmary into a fever hospital; you would thus save £8 a year, and transfer patients from the present infirmary to the front block of the buildings. We intend doing away with that fever hospital.

Mr. GEORGE HACKETT, Barr, examined.

22011. CHAIRMAN.—Do you wish to add anything to the Tallamore expression of opinion which you have already given?—Just a few observations. I heard Mr. Delany's evidence, in which he said that Barr No. 2 would be in favour of amalgamation with Borrickane, and the people also; I deny that. I am Chairman of No. 2, and Vice-Chairman of the Barr Board of Guardians, and I deny Mr. Delany's statement; and I say, from the state of the Borrickane Workhouse—I believe it is in a very dilapidated state, and only contains about seventy inmates, and they have to keep up a large staff—I think it would be for the interests of the ratepayers that it would be amalgamated with Nenagh and Birr. You are aware that several electoral divisions of Borrickane originally belonged to Birr, and if we had those back it would satisfy us.

22012. And if Nenagh had theirs back it would satisfy them?—Yes; and I don't see what earthly good Borrickane is there. We have ample accommodation, and could take in the county. We had out about 21,000 in the last two years in enlarging and improving the hospital, and I think it will bear favourable comparison with any workhouse hospital in Ireland.

22013. It is a very good one?—We would be quite satisfied if we got back the divisions originally belonging to us and now attached to Borrickane. A large portion of Borrickane lies near Birr; one point is not more than four Irish miles; about Gurteen and Shadoo is about five Irish miles from Birr. Our union at present stretches down very close to Athlone, Ballinacorney, and we never want a fair attendance of Guardians. Some of the Guardians seem to think it a great hardship to have to attend Birr, ten or eleven miles away from them.

22014. They don't think anything of that from Birr? No, we have a fair attendance always. I don't think there is anything more I have to add to my evidence at Tallamore.

A Guardian.—You have no right to say Borrickane Union is in a dilapidated state. Have you ever been in it?

CHAIRMAN.—I am afraid he was quoting me.

Witness.—I think I have very good authority for it.

22015. Mr. Corbett.—I represent the Borrickane

22005. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Do you want to sell the fever hospital?—Yes; we think the other would be more suitable. As far as the tramps, we don't suffer any loss by them.

22006. You have a good many of them there?—We have, most unfortunately.

22007. CHAIRMAN.—It comes to £4 or £5 a year on you?—No, I think not. They are nearly able to pay for their maintenance. We had 327, and they broke seventy-one tons of stones from July to May.

22008. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—The women broke no stones?—No.

22009. You have a good many women?—We have.

22010. And make nothing by them?—No. We had fourteen deaths; three of them were over seventy years, two over eighty, and six over seventy, and two over sixty, and one child. In the house altogether, at present we have six over eighty, twenty-three over seventy, thirteen over sixty, eight over fifty, four over forty, and we have only five children; so I think it would be a great hardship on the ratepayers and upon the poor inmates to be amalgamated with any other union.

Guardians. You say it would be in the interests of Mr. George the ratepayers to have this amalgamation?—I say so. Hackett

22016. I assume you mean the Birr ratepayers?—Yes; and I think it would be to the advantage of the ratepayers of Borrickane. They have a large amount of salaries to pay at present; a small increase to the officials at Birr would meet the thing.

22017. Assuming this amalgamation was carried through, almost all the officials in Borrickane are young men but Mr. Ralph?—Yes.

22018. All these would have to be superannuated?—Being young men, the scale would be small, except in Mr. Ralph's case.

22019. You have made absolutely no calculation as regards the saving to the ratepayers?—I did, to a certain extent.

22020. Did you make a calculation as to whether it would or would not be a saving to the ratepayers?

CHAIRMAN.—It would be very difficult for him to make calculations that way when he did not know what scheme would be adopted.

Witness.—I just took a simple view of the matter—the doing away with the big staff.

22021. Mr. Corbett.—You were not here when Mr. Crooman was giving his evidence. Would you agree with him, that only the poor come to the unions from the towns and very few from the country?

Mr. Crooman.—I said no such thing.

22022. Mr. Corbett.—Would you say that most of them come from the towns to the unions?—Of course, a good deal will depend on the town.

22023. Would you not say that the large majority of the seventy inmates in Borrickane come from the town of Borrickane?—From my personal knowledge I cannot say.

22024. Would there not be a hardship on the poor people of the town to have to go to Birr?—It is only ten miles. They have to go long distances to Birr.

22025. What is the furthest distance from Birr if you get this amalgamation; would not Portlanna be the extreme point?—The town of Portlanna is in Galway, and the ferry is a mile and a half on the Birr side of Portlanna. It is counted ten miles to the town; it would be about nine miles to the Tipperary side of the Shannon.

Mr. HENRY DOOLEY, Barr, examined.

22026. CHAIRMAN.—Did you wish to hand in some figures?—Nothing, sir; but I was just asked by the Guardians to attend in case Mr. Hackett should want some figures.

CHAIRMAN.—We will be asking Mr. Lowry to furnish us with statistics later on.

Mr. Hackett.—I just wish to mention that No. 2 District, the Tipperary portion of the Birr Union, adjoins the town of Borrickane, and the Urban District of Birr comes to the bridge of Riverstown.

Mr. Barry Dooley.

June 23, 1904.

Mr. James Maher.

Mr. JAMES MAHER, Chairman, Nenagh Union, examined.

22037. CHAIRMAN.—Are you Chairman of the Nenagh Board?—Yes. We had a copy of your queries, and considered and discussed them, and sent in a reply.

22038. You could afford accommodation for 300 additional inmates?—Yes.

22039. And your Board of Guardians think that it "ought" to be for the general advantage if the Borrisokane Union was broken up, and divided among Nenagh and Burren?—We would just go in for the broad question of reform, in carrying out a great scheme of reform, if it was considered expedient that there should be amalgamation with other unions, I don't say whether Borrisokane should be amalgamated with Nenagh or Nenagh should be amalgamated, whichever it was considered expedient.

22040. Would you be in favour of breaking up the Borrisokane Union?—It is a very small union. It was formed after the Famine years, in the year 1850, and the reason for which it was formed has disappeared long since.

22041. There is not the population in the country now, and there was not room then in Nenagh and Burren?—Yes, sir.

22042. You say you think the poor of that district could be more liberally and generously treated than the Borrisokane Board could afford?—Yes, sir.

22043. To meet the argument against the removal of people from a distance, you refer to the town of Newport, how far is it?—Fifteen miles from Nenagh. It is a district of country far more difficult of access than Borrisokane.

22044. They have to come over the Silvermines Hill from the valley?—Yes, it is very mountainous; and the seven divisions proposed to be annexed to Nenagh from Borrisokane are a level country.

22045. Did you express any opinion at your Board of Guardians as to what might be done with Borrisokane Workhouse if it were closed?—That it should be converted into an institution for harmless lunatics, idiots, and epileptics, or into an industrial school for children.

22046. Are you in favour of keeping children in institutions or boarding them out?—I think the institution would be preferable.

22047. Have you had any experience of the success of children in after life who were boarded out?—Well, no, sir.

22048. You are not acquainted with any cases in which boarding out was tried?—No, sir.

22049. You are only acquainted with the system of rearing children in the workhouse?—Yes, sir. I think they should be taught some habits of industry when they come to the use of reason, between that and fourteen; they should be taught habits of industry and self-reliance as well as to read and write.

22050. Do you think it would be a good way to have

children taught industry by having them boarded out with people in houses where they would be doing whatever came to hand, for little children, according to their strength?—I would; but there would be obstacles in the way of that. The only children we had boarded out were orphans.

22051. You think it would be an obstacle if the parent objected?—Yes.

22052. Most of these children would be illegitimate children?—Yes.

22053. Do you think it would be much hardship if the parent could not support the child, and the child had to be supported out of the rates, do you think it would be much of a hardship to board out the child instead of keeping it in the workhouse?—I would prefer to have the child boarded out.

22054. What is your view about relief?—The expenditure under the head of outdoor relief has gone up.

22055. Your board says: "The board think it would tend to both advantage and economy if the system of divisional rating, if not for both indoor and outdoor relief expenditure, certainly for outdoor relief expenditure alone, were restored, as more care and supervision would be exercised in those districts where the expenditure is rather high." Do you agree with that?—I do; because it was increased since the Local Government Act came into operation.

22056. And you think the county infirmary at Coolish should be maintained without calling on your board for a subscription?—I do; because we get no value; it is only in the immediate neighbourhood road.

22057. I see your board is in favour of having only those who are really sick and in need of medical attendance and skilled nursing kept in hospital?—Yes.

22058. You can go on to say that a large percentage of the paupers consist of feeble, aged, and infirm, who merely require attendance, and are not subjects for medical attendance?—Yes; we are in favour of having the able-bodied boarded out.

22059. Your board is also of opinion that the insane should not be kept in workhouses; where would you put them?—Harmless lunatics might be kept in a special workhouse.

22060. As regards tramps?—If you had fewer workhouses you would have fewer tramps, in my opinion.

22061. Do you think they would not manage to get up at night at some place between the workhouses; supposing Borrisokane was closed and they wanted to go to Burren, do you think they would not get put up somewhere at Borrisokane?—The inducement to travel through the country would not be so great if the workhouses were fewer.

22062. Mr. MURKIN.—You think the distress would help to do away with some of them?—Yes.

Mr. THOMAS BURKE examined.

Mr. Thomas Burke.

22063. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the Nenagh Board of Guardians?—Yes, for twenty-three years.

22064. Are you a country member?—A country member.

22065. What are your views about the area of charge question?—My view is decidedly in favour of electoral division charges, and for various reasons. I think the system has been very much abused since we got union rating, because I know from experience that Guardians come in from a distance, Newport, and so on, and tell us that certain parties want outdoor relief, and they increase the amount. We have not an increase in numbers, but the amount has increased since we got union rating.

22066. You think the amounts are unnecessarily increased?—I think they are; and we, the local Guardians, are not able to check the statements made to us from outside Guardians.

22067. Is most of the relief given in the town of Nenagh?—Not at all. There is a good deal given in Newport. A good deal is given in Nenagh, but that was not the case when Nenagh had to pay for its own relief; but since it was made a union-at-large charge Nenagh became more prosperous and so did Newport.

22068. Mr. MURKIN.—You think the Guardians who decide the question don't have a knowledge of the merits of the case, because they have only to listen

to the relieving officer's report and the statements of the Guardians who advocate the relief?—That is so.

22069. CHAIRMAN.—Do the relieving officers tell you fairly what they consider?—As a rule they do; but the relieving officer has to be guided in a measure by the opinion of local Guardians. Take my own division. When it was an electoral charge I was accountable to the ratepayers of the district, and I looked closely into what I was doing; and now, if I increase relief to any individual, and when I go back a respectable farmer asks me why I increased the relief, I say, "Don't you know it is on the union-at-large."—Oh, that is all right.

22070. What would you suggest as a proper means to limit any excess of grant?—You would be in favour of giving outdoor relief, and not subject poor people to come into the house, if it could be done without abuse?—It is about the best thing connected with Poor Law relief if it was kept within proper bounds.

22071. How would you keep it within bounds?—To make it a public charge. I heard Mr. Curwen's evidence, but I don't think you understood him. What I would suggest would be, that a certain amount of money, or at least a certain rate, Old or Old in the S., would be levied on the union-at-large for outdoor relief, and if it exceeded that amount I would make each division pay the extra.

22072. You would have a union contribution to

start with, and then, if there was anything extra over that to pay it?—Kearney.

22062. Dr. BARNES.—Would that lead the Guardians in each of the districts to find out how many persons they could relieve out of the general rate?—It would be a check.

22063. If you limited it to 50s. or 60s. in the £ for the whole union, that would bring in so much for out-door relief; would not each of the Guardians be still as anxious to get as many as they could on the general rate?—They would, as far as that amount went; but when that was exceeded the Guardians would be very careful in giving any more relief.

22064. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—You want to relieve the pauperism of the towns, and having got rid of that pauperism, you want to begin on the square, and let every electoral division look after its own particular poor?—Quite so; because at present, if you strike a general rate for out-door relief in the union, there are some divisions that their out-door relief would not reach that amount at all, consequently that amount would go to the relief of other divisions.

22065. Dr. BARNES.—Would not every Guardian in every division see that he would get his fair share of it?—Some Guardians would not require it at all, because the number on the relief list would not come up to the 50s. in the £.

22066. The same argument you are applying against the union raising would apply to that 50s. £.—The very same to a limited extent.

22067. The town Guardians might, in a body, try to get a whole number on out of the 50s. £.

22068. CHAIRMAN.—Am I right in thinking that this is a fact that each division would have its pull out of its own penny in the £ at first?—Yes.

Dr. BARNES.—Then you might as well start on divisional relief.

22069. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—How would this appear to you? Suppose the rate was taken as it exists at present, and in future anything in excess of what it is should be an electoral division charge?—It is better than the present system.

22070. Don't you think it would be even better than you suggest?—I don't know; it may be.

22071. It might be possible the town would get no benefit at all, because every electoral division would, naturally, want to get up to the amount it was paying, a penny in the £, and no relief at all would be given to the towns, whereas, under the other system, the towns would start on an equality?—I understand; but at the same time you cannot look out for clients for out-door relief in any one division.

22072. But you will admit that in the past a great many people came from the country into the towns and lived there?—Yes.

22073. And it would be unfair for the towns to have to support these people then?—Yes.

22074. Now, having reached a fair adjustment of the system, do you not think in the future the proper share to do would be to start from this, and after this make all the money for out-door relief a divisional charge?—I think it would be an improvement on the present system.

22075. CHAIRMAN.—What do you think about township?—Of course, I endorse all the statements

there. With regard to women and illegitimates, I think any woman that goes in more than once should be sent to some asylum and sequestered.

22076. Don't you think it might be better to send her to a reformatory or refuge before she had the second; send her there after the first, to give her a good start under religious influence?—I know from experience that a good many girls that fall once, and only once, very often become useful members of society; but when they fall a second time they are gone, and do a lot of harm in the workhouse, and I would send those to a central institution.

22077. That is as regards the present people, but for the future people, the girls who fall for the first time, would you send them to a penitentiary?—I think I would give them a chance; I often see them to get on fairly well. The girls who come in a second time have a corrupting influence, and they often take out young girls for bad purposes; coax them into the towns.

22078. What do you think about the tramp question?—I would not prescribe a cure for the tramp nuisance. I think emigration of unions would have a very good effect on the tramp system; the number of workhouses in the country making it a convenient refuge for these tramps has encouraged the tramp system; and I think it would be a very good thing to take away the children from the tramps, because these children will become tramps later on.

22079. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Do you think it would be enough to compel these tramps to go to the police offices to look for relief?—I don't know. It is very hard for a policeman to define who should get relief and who should not.

22080. Would he not have as good an opportunity of knowing as the relieving officer?—I would say the relieving officer would have just as good an opportunity.

22081. Would it not have a deterrent effect?—On criminal tramps it would. I would expect to find the police just as generous as the relieving officer.

22082. Do you think it would be any hardship to ask a man looking for shelter at the public expense to go to a magistrate and ask for some certificate of character in his own district that would entitle him to support?—That might be a very good thing, but I am sure the magistrate would not like to undertake that duty.

22083. CHAIRMAN.—Or a stipendiary magistrate?—I don't think any magistrate would care to discharge that duty.

22084. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Still, we are trying to cure an evil?—Yes.

22085. CHAIRMAN.—Or the police officer could, on the statement of people of position—clergy or Guardians?—I don't know; I could not recommend any such thing; in fact, I have not studied the question.

22086. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Do you think the power of detention for a continued period would be any check?—I think if they were liable to prosecution in some shape or form it would have a very good effect on them.

22087. Is England they can keep there up to a week?—That might be a very good thing to try here.

Mr. LAWRENCE BULLER examined.

22088. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the Nether Board of Guardians?—Yes.

22089. You have heard the evidence of both the gentlemen who have gone before you?—Kearney.

22090. Is there anything you would like to add to what they have said?—No, nothing.

22091. You agree with them generally?—Yes.

22092. The statement I have been quoting from has been submitted to you all, and you approved of it before you came?—Yes.

June 23, 1894

Mr. Thomas
Scries.

Mr. LAWRENCE
Buller.

Mr. THOMAS COCHRAN, J.P., further examined.

I am appearing now for the Union of Roscrea.

22093. CHAIRMAN.—Now, you have had the advantage of hearing a good deal of the evidence from Guardians of the different unions; is there anything now you would wish to add to it with reference to the Roscrea Union?—I only want to voice the opinion of the Roscrea Guardians.

22094. They don't consider it expedient to dissolve the Roscrea Union?—Yes, that is their opinion.

22095. And you don't like to offer a definite opinion regarding any other union?—No.

22096. You are opposed to any arrangement, you say, whereby the poor of this union would be sent away to be maintained at your expense to some other workhouse in another town; this, in your opinion, tends towards the restriction of the liberty and freedom of the poor; an arrangement of this kind should only be made for persons of unsound mind and criminals; the former have no feelings in matters of this kind, and the latter, of course, are completely dethroned in jail; compulsion should not be made on the poor—use these your views?—They are not exactly my own views. I gave my views before.

Mr. Thomas
Cochran.

June 23, 1904.

Mr Thomas
Conoran.

22007. What are your views as to the removal of the poor to a distance?—There is a feeling—and a natural feeling—against being taken away from their own place; and if I saw a good saving that would be a recompense for that, I would be in favour of it; but that is only my own personal opinion.

22008. The Board of Guardians are disposed to think that a boarding-out system would not work satisfactorily; is that for grown-up people or children?—It is for the elderly people, I think.

22009. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you give much outdoor relief in Roscrea?—It is in or about the same that we began with at the Local Government Act, but the saving effected in the country parts is run away with in the towns.

22010. Do you think it ought to be extended?—On the lines I spoke of to-day. What I meant to say was that there should be a levelling of the out-door relief at the time of the Local Government Act; anything that would go over that each division should bear it, and the towns would have the benefit up to the levelling point.

22011. But they had no benefit at all. You admitted there was a grievance up to 1846?—I would give them the benefit of the levelling amount. There are a good many divisions had no rate at all. I would give them the credit of the whole thing; that much money should go into the out-door relief fund.

22012. Would you not give them the benefit up to now, and start fresh?—They have gone ahead a great deal since 35c. a week in Roscrea, and we have about that saving in the country districts.

22013. Do you think the quarter-acre clause might be done away with?—I think so. I think at present the thing is too small with the quarter acre. There are people over that amount of land as poor as can be, and I believe in out-door relief as the most beneficial way of relieving the poor.

22014. The only thing you are afraid of is that it would spread too much, and a division would get an undue share?—When the Guardians meet there is a natural disinclination to refuse out-door relief, whether the case is deserving or not. The case is brought forward by the relieving officer belonging to the town, and the country Guardians won't refuse.

22015. In other words, they are not doing their duty?—I think, by having it a divisional charge, they will have to mind their own business.

22016. And if they let the rates get too high on the division the people will put them out?—They are in the hands of their own people there.

22017. Dr. BRUCE.—What do you mean by levelling up?—Whatever the out-door relief cost in Roscrea it costs so much in the £.

Mr. Deasy.—Say, £500 a year, roughly.

22018. CHAIRMAN.—We want to find out what Mr. Conoran means by levelling up?—I would say, dividing that money all over.

Mr. Deasy.—£545 was your last year's out-door relief. £592 is £4. in the £; 13d. would meet the out-door relief expenditure at the present day.

22019. Mr. MURKIN.—Would you be willing to start there?—Yes, that is the very thing I am putting; then each division if it goes over that, let it bear its own cost.

22020. Dr. BRUCE.—Won't there be a number of persons at present on or off inside six months, and won't other people go on; do you want to get each division strike as much as they are getting at present out of the £500?—I would leave that £500 to equalise everything.

22021. Do you want the 13d. to be put into a common fund?—Yes.

22022. And any addition to the £500?—Should be charged to the place it is coming off.

22023. Don't you see these people are constantly varying—some there might be ten, and another twelve; would you start with ten as a basis?—There are a lot of divisions with no one at all on out-door relief.

22024. Do you mean if they put another as they would have to pay the local cost of the one they put on?—Yes.

Mr. MURKIN.—His point is—he would allow each electoral division 13d. in the £, and after that he would make them responsible for anything in excess.

Mr. Deasy.—He would propose to apply to the out-door relief the same provision as was applied to indoor relief under the Poor Law Relief Act of 1876. He wants a standard out-door relief at a stated time, and anything over and above that standard should be assessed on the divisions itself.

Witness.—Yes, whatever would be the difference between 13d. and what Roscrea costs.

22025. Dr. BRUCE.—You year there might be no person in a certain district and next year there might be three or four; would they have to pay the entire cost of those three or four?—Yes; give the heavily-laden places the difference between the position they stood in and the levelling rate.

Mr. Deasy.—I think Mr. Conoran means the same thing as myself.

Mr. Liffey.—If there was an accumulated fund, everyone would be rushing to do away with the accumulated fund.

22026. CHAIRMAN.—It would not be an accumulated fund; you would not strike a rate until you wanted it. I understand up to 13d. for divisional out-door relief would come out of the union-at-large rate, and anything over that would be divisional rating. What else have you to say?—There was a feeling of dislike over the whole Board of Guardians as to the expense that would be incurred for amalgamation in a general way, without going into figures, myself among the number. What I spoke about the teachers is one thing; another man, and a very serious item, is the medicines and medical appliances. Up to the time the Local Government Act began we had no costs, only the costs of the medicines, and we had to take them on the standard price, but since that, I find that, allowing for the dispensary districts in Ireland and the unions in Ireland, that the amount of cost that a medical comes to nearly £2,800, and all the benefit that we reap is about £415, and the Government pays as much more; so that, accordingly, to get about £200 we have to go to the cost of nearly £2,800. I am speaking of all Ireland. We have to start each year, and to send up a list of medicines for every dispensary district.

22027. We have nothing to do with dispensary districts any more than with Grand Jury roads?—I am not saying you have; but what I want to say is, the doubt that is on us, that even doing away with a lot of unions itself, the cost that will come on afterwards will more than counterbalance all the advantages. I take one case, over these medicines, and I am sure we are upwards of £3,000 out of pocket.

CHAIRMAN.—I don't know what you mean. If you be kind enough to write out your statement about the out-door relief and send it to the Secretary, we will consider it; but we cannot understand it as you have put it now. We have nothing to do with dispensary districts; keep to the Poor Law.

Witness.—Is not that part of the Poor Law CHAIRMAN.—No, it is the Medical Charities Act.

The Sitting terminated.

FORTY-FOURTH PUBLIC SITTING—TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20TH, 1904. Sept. 20, 1904.

At the Courthouse, Sligo.

Present:—Mr. MICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. COSEY BUDGER.

CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Vernon, are there any witnesses here from the County Council?

Mr. W. T. FERRON.—There were three named by the County Council—Mr. John O'Dowd (the Chairman), Mr. James HANSON, and Mr. John McLaughlin. I received a telegram from Mr. O'Dowd this morning—"Cannot possibly leave; kindly explain." Mr. John McLaughlin is the only witness present now on behalf of the County Council.

CHAIRMAN.—I see Mr. Colliery present; he is also one of the County Council.

Mr. FERRON.—He is also one of the members of the County Council. You have also another County Councillor present, but I think he is giving evidence on behalf of Droemore Union, Mr. Mitchell.

CHAIRMAN.—The County Council have not deputed you to give evidence on their behalf?

Mr. FERRON.—No, sir, they have not.

Mr. JOHN McLAUGHLIN, M.O.C., examined.

Mr. John McLaughlin.

22118. CHAIRMAN.—Perhaps you would, in your own words, give us briefly an outline of your views on the questions that have been referred to us. You have the question, have you?—Oh, yes, I have seen them. Well, the only point that I would be very anxious to give evidence on is, that I would be strongly in favour of the amalgamation of the workhouses, particularly owing to the overcrowding that we have in the Sligo District Lunatic Asylum.

22119. You have in your county the Droemore West, Tobacurry, and part of Boyle Unions?—Yes; Boyle No. 2 and Sligo.

22120. Have you any idea of what changes you would suggest?—I had an interview with our chairman, Mr. O'Dowd, and he always informed me that Tobacurry was built to accommodate between 300 and 350 inmates, and that money is about the average that they have there.

22121. Both Tobacurry and Droemore West are comparatively recently-built unions?—I could not say that.

22122. They were made after the famine times?—Oh, I believe that. And if we could amalgamate, and have a closed one, that we could turn into an auxiliary asylum for the accommodation of the harmless lunatics, it would relieve the overcrowding. At all our late meetings of the County Council repeated demands were made by the authority of the Lord Lieutenant that we should see and relieve this overcrowding in the asylum; and I think the only course open to us presently, as representing the ratepayers, would be if we could carry out this amalgamation.

22123. What workhouse or workhouses would you close?—I would say whichever one has the smallest number of patients.

22124. Either Tobacurry or Droemore West, according as may be thought best?—Yes.

22125. You would not propose to close both—you would close one for the purposes of an auxiliary asylum?—I would be anxious to see one closed so long as it would give accommodation for the harmless lunatics, and let the others stand. I represent the twenty electoral division of Keshmarron, which has a valuation of £14,000; the ratepayers there are generally against additional buildings, so long as we could use some of the workhouses we have already built. There was a resolution to build two additional wings to the asylum at a cost of £40,000, not including rates.

22126. Having regard to the long distance by road from Sligo to Droemore West, do you think it would be possible or convenient to make Droemore West an auxiliary asylum?—I think Tobacurry would be more suitable.

22127. On account of the railway?—Yes.

22128. From what counties have you lunatics in the Sligo Asylum?—From Sligo and Leitrim.

22129. Are you aware that some of the Leitrim people think that it would be fairer, from their point of view, that one of their workhouses should be closed and made into an auxiliary asylum—say, Manerhamstown?—I would not be against that.

22130. They think, I understand, that you have the spending of all the money in Sligo at present for the lunatics of both counties, and if a workhouse is set apart as an auxiliary, they suggest it would be fair that one of the Leitrim workhouses should be taken, such as Manerhamstown, which is convenient by rail, that it should be taken rather than one of the Sligo workhouses?—Well, if it would prove beneficial to all parties and relieve the overcrowding here I would be satisfied.

22131. What would you suggest as regards the two Sligo workhouses, Droemore West and Tobacurry, if a Leitrim workhouse were taken instead of a Sligo workhouse?—I would have no complaint.

22132. Let them stand as they are?—Let them stand as they are. It is a peculiar difficulty with regard to the overcrowding of the asylum that I am giving evidence about here; we must relieve that overcrowding one way or another.

22133. Did you look into it at all from the point of view of economy, trying to reduce the expenditure all over the county, and to see whether you could, without hardship, close either or both of these workhouses?—The only point of view of economy that I looked to was to save £50,000 or £60,000 in building additional wings at the asylum. I saw a former building that was carried on there, there were £12,000 expended, it was the late Grand Jury that gave out that contract, and it took eight years to complete it. If we are to spend £40,000 or £50,000, it is likely it may take fifteen or twenty years to build, and where would those unfortunate patients be all that time; but if we amalgamated workhouses we could relieve them at once.

22134. Or as soon as some little changes could be made?—Yes.

22135. You did not consider the question apart altogether from the lunacy question; you did not consider whether it would be possible, without any hardship to the poor or not, to close either or both of the other workhouses—Tobacurry or Droemore West?—No.

22136. And you have no view on that subject?—I have no view on that subject.

22137. Your constituency is in the Sligo Union?—In the Sligo Union.

22138. You act as a Poor Law Guardian as well as a County Councillor?—No, sir.

22139. Then you cannot offer any evidence as regards the administration of Poor Law relief from your own knowledge?—No.

Mr. JAMES HANSON, M.O.C., examined.

Mr. James Hanson.

I don't know that I have anything to add to Mr. McLaughlin's evidence.

22140. CHAIRMAN.—Are you a Poor Law Guardian?—I am a County Councillor; I am not a Poor Law Guardian.

22141. But you don't think you could add anything to Mr. McLaughlin. Was your evidence from the same point of view?—Yes.

22142. Having regard to the question of providing extra accommodation for lunatics?—Yes, we would like, if we could economise in the way of lowering the rates by amalgamation; but I really think it would be necessary to have experts to go into that matter very fully and carefully.

22143. Mr. Colliery is both a Poor Law Guardian and a Councillor?—And an expert.

Mr. RICHARD COLLEY, J.P., M.C., examined.

Sept. 30, 1904.
Mr. Richard
Colley.

22144. CHAIRMAN.—The County Council did not pass any definite resolution on the question of amalgamation from a Poor Law point of view, they just deputed certain gentlemen to give evidence?—I think that is what they did.

22145. They did not offer any opinion themselves?—I think not. I think it never came before them in that way.

22146. Well, we went the quarter, and asked for their views; they did not offer any views, but named Mr. O'Dowd and the two other gentlemen to give evidence; they don't seem to have regarded it from a general point of view. You have been a Poor Law Guardian and Chairman of the Board of Guardians for a long time?—For some time. I was chairman under the old system.

22147. The Board of Guardians have considered the question from a Poor Law point of view?—Yes; it came before a meeting of the Guardians.

22148. Having regard to the extent and population of the county and the requirements of the sick and poor do you think any change might, with advantage, be made in reducing the number of unions in the county?—Well, I am inclined to think that amalgamation to a certain extent would be of use. I don't think you could very well centralise the hospital accommodation, so to speak, because it would be difficult, in my opinion, to drag the old and infirm people from, say, Tobercurry or Droimere West to Sligo; but I think the unions, as regards the other classes that are accommodated there, could well be amalgamated.

22149. That is, the people who could be removed without hardship?—Yes.

22150. Or, in a word, suppose you had a workhouse, properly called a workhouse, for one class and have a hospital in Tobercurry and another in Droimere West for the old and infirm, that could not well be removed, or for the acutely sick?—Yes, something of that kind. I think to have one central workhouse would be very inconvenient in parts of the county, although Sligo is a small county, yet I think it would be very hard, if a very old person took ill, to drag him from an extreme part of the county, and vice versa.

22151. From the borders of Ballina Union, that would be twenty-five or thirty miles?—It is forty miles from here to Ardara, in the Droimere Union.

Mr. Mitchell.—They took two parishes at the time of the Local Government Act and added them to Ballina Union from Droimere West.

22152. CHAIRMAN.—So that they don't come from Ardara?—Not quite; within a few miles of it.

22153. If it were found possible to break up some unions for certain purposes, say, for the people who could be removed, you think strongly that it would be injudicious or improper to require the sick to be removed such long distances, therefore, you would leave a hospital at Droimere West and Tobercurry?—I should think so, Droimere West particularly; because, unfortunately, we have no railway communication with it, and it would be a very difficult matter to bring a sudden emergency or sickness from there. With Tobercurry, of course, it would not be quite so bad, because we have railway communication.

22154. Except that the sick cannot be carried by train, if a man breaks his leg or it is a bad case of pneumonia or fever, they must be taken by van?—It would be certainly desirable to have a hospital in those places.

22155. You would not diminish the hospital facilities?—I don't think so.

22156. If a large portion of these workhouse buildings could be released from their present use, can you suggest any use they might be put to in the future?—I think the very suggestion made in the queries with regard to using them for an auxiliary asylum would be a most desirable thing, because I am inclined to think that the overcrowding of the asylum as well as the centralisation of it is rather inconvenient; and if Tobercurry, for instance, was turned into an auxiliary asylum, I think it would be a great use.

22157. You heard, perhaps, what I said just now about Manerhamilton. The Leitrim people think that if any auxiliary asylum is provided that it ought to be provided in the County Leitrim, so that they should have their share of the expenditure?—That would be my view also.

22158. You would not object to Manerhamilton being used for that purpose?—Not at all, provided

Manerhamilton was not used as a workhouse. The present asylum accommodates both Leitrim and Sligo, a joint asylum, and I think that Leitrim ought to have an auxiliary asylum, as well as Sligo; I think it would be a very convenient thing.

22159. Do you suggest there should be two auxiliary asylums—one in Sligo and one in Leitrim—or would you have one as an overflow from the Sligo Asylum?—My view would be, if convenient, to have one in Leitrim and one in Sligo.

22160. Do you think that would be necessary?—You might do with one; but I think it would be under to one county to have the whole thing in one, and not give accommodation in Leitrim. I think it would be only fair that Leitrim should have an auxiliary, as at Carrick-on-Shannon or Manerhamilton, wherever the workhouse would be established.

22161. But, then, if you had one at either Manerhamilton or Carrick-on-Shannon, would it be necessary to have another at Tobercurry, having the pauper houses here?—I regret to find that there is a great increase in cases of lunacy.

22162. Supposing they could provide for 200 inmates at Manerhamilton, would not that meet all your requirements?—I dare say it would. Well, I don't know, indeed, I cannot speak for the present asylum, but I have heard it is rather overcrowded, and I know they made a demand on the County Council for a very large sum of money to build an addition to it; and, instead of building an addition to it, I think it would be better to have these auxiliary asylums; but I certainly think there ought to be one on the upper part of the County Sligo. If you did away with the workhouse in Tobercurry, I certainly would be disposed to see it converted into something of that kind, that a, provided they could have hospital accommodation with it.

22163. If it were possible to remove the people who can travel from Tobercurry and Droimere West to Sligo Workhouse, would you approve of such a removal?—I would approve of the able-bodied portion of them.

22164. That is, people who can be removed easily?—Oh, certainly; I think I would approve of their being removed. Of course, I would not approve of the old and infirm, that are incapable of being removed, so to speak, or the sick.

22165. The sick, of course?—You mean the old and infirm, that it would be possible to remove.

22166. That are up every day?—I think there might be a discrimination made in that case.

22167. If the aged and infirm were left at a place there would be practically little or no distinction in the number of inmates, and you could not diminish the number of officers?—I don't mean by a hospital is those places that you should have the constant habitation of the workhouse; what I mean is the sick poor, and those who are really sick and incapable of being removed, and for sudden emergencies or cases of serious accident, and from time to time if an epidemic broke out.

22168. The really sick people?—Quite so.

22169. If that were so you would have an additional number to bring into Sligo, perhaps more than the Sligo Workhouse as at present administered would hold, so that the quarantine would come up for consideration what would you do with the classes that are in Sligo, if you take them in detail—first you have the sick, they would have to remain in Sligo?—You would have to keep the hospital in Sligo.

22170. Then the aged and infirm; if it were proposed to make Sligo a central place for the aged and infirm, they would have to stay, of course. Then as regards children, there are a fair number of children. Have your Board of Guardians considered much?—They have not acted very much on it—the boarding-out law?—Up to the present we have not, but it is a thing I hold strong views on, that we ought to take some action in the matter.

22171. It has been tried in a great many places, and there has not really been any voice raised against it where it has been tried, as far as the Commission have ascertained in their inquiries: all over the north, south, east, and west of Ireland we have found practically unanimous evidence in favour of the boarding-out system?—I am glad to hear that. I really was not aware of it before, but I had a sort of rooted prejudice, being

a number of the Board of Guardians twenty or thirty years ago, and we sent children out to nurse, young children, and my experience of that was not good.

22171. That was at too early an age, perhaps before they were two years old?—Yes, out to nurse.

22172. The evidence we have got is largely that these children ought not to be sent out until they have the use of their teeth and can see whatever is going on—I think that is a very good idea.

22173. The family that they are boarded out with are attached to them, they become members of the family, and the evidence we have received is that these children who are boarded out virtually become the children of the family and contribute to the support, and are looked upon as members of the family?—That may be the case; but another thing, I find that very often when children are sent out, and we do send them out at from twelve to fourteen—

22174. That is hard out; that is a commercial bargain, where they are not brought up in the family, and don't come into the family as little children and get the natural affection that little children get—I have no doubt the system you suggest will work well, but those reared in the workhouse return, like the hare to their form; if they get vexed or fall out with their master or mistress they always have in their mind's eye that the workhouse is waiting to receive them, and back they invariably come.

22175. That is the great argument put before us in favour of the boarding-out system, that the children, when they are conscious of anything, never have any experience of the workhouse; they are reared always in the family, and it never occurs to them to be anything else but members of the family, and they become agricultural labourers and are absorbed into the population—I have experience of the way in which it has been working in other places, we have none here; but I will be very glad to convey what you say, and I think the Board of Guardians ought in a great measure to adopt it.

22176. You would like that discretion should be given to the Board of Guardians by law to board out all children that come on the rates for the future, to give them the discretion?—I think they have that discretion.

22177. Only in the case of orphans and deserted children. Suppose the children of thriftless, objectionable people come in the Guardians have no power to board them out, they must retain them. Do you think it would be wise that they should have a discretion to board out all children that come into their hands?—I think it would be, but if they are the children of certain parents you cannot prevent the parents from having control, and very often that very thing arises when we would be sending out children to learn—the parents would object to let them go.

22178. Supposing a Board of Guardians passed a resolution, in the exercise of their discretion, that they would board out A and B, two children whose parents are living, then will come the question, what are you to do with those parents; are you to allow them to go off with a horse leg and start fresh families for the ratepayers to keep, or would you be in favour, if those people are people who cannot be extracted with the curing and rearing of children, would you be in favour, as some witnesses have suggested to us, of placing them to be detained compulsorily, in an institution until such time as they might be trusted out on what you might call a ticket-of-leave, to see whether they could become working members of the community before they could get their children back again?—I would not approve of that. I am afraid that would be too sweeping. To begin with, by such a system you would no doubt get hundreds of never-do-wells parents very willing for you to do that, but I think when you would come to the system, and you would send away the children, I would not approve of locking up the parents.

22179. Do you think it would be a wise thing to take the children and relieve the parents absolutely of the cost and charge of them?—I think there ought to be a great deal of discrimination in that too. Now, for instance, what occurs here is, children are taken up and sent to industrial schools; under the present system they are committed, and I must say on more than one occasion I was not satisfied that the children were sent and their parents relieved. I think it was unfair to the ratepayers that an able-bodied man who owns a family and could support them should throw those children as a burden upon his neighbours, so to speak, or on the rates, and let him start about free, probably to get married again.

22180. Or to raise a further family?—Perhaps so. I don't at all like it, and a case of it occurred which came under my knowledge, which strengthened my views in that direction.

22181. Would those people be thriftless, unsatisfactory members of the community, and perhaps lazy?—Well, in some cases they are, but in many cases they are people who are very anxious to get relieved of the children. A man, for instance, is working, an industrious man, working at the quay driving a horse; it is very inconvenient for him to have two or three young children.

22182. Do you mean a widower?—Being a widower it is very inconvenient for him to have two or three young children, and he very naturally goes about to see if he could get them into an industrial school. Of course it is a great relief to that man, and just enables him to turn back to what you say. I think it is not right that the ratepayers should have to pay for the children of that man.

22183. That man would not let his children go into the workhouse, would he?—I hardly think he would; in some cases it might occur. You state they pay so much. The magistrate is committing the children sometimes name a sum that the parent is supposed to pay; that is very indifferently, I think, collected; it sometimes is and sometimes is not. The parent goes away, does not remain within reach of the authorities, and all that sort of thing, and I don't think very much comes out of it.

22184. But do you think a man in constant work, such as you indicate, would be willing to let his children go to an ordinary Poor Law institution?—I don't think he would; of course there may be what you call never-do-wells.

22185. Take the never-do-wells, which is the greatest number perhaps?—I think it is a mercy to relieve him of the children.

22186. And what would you do with him?—That is a problem that has puzzled many men.

22187. Do you think it would not be a fair thing to put him into what might be called a labour colony, where you would put in the tramps, and criminals, and never-do-wells?—I don't think so. Do you mean to put him on the rates?

22188. Put him into an institution where really hard work will be done. There are a number of those institutions in Belgium and other places which are self-supporting, owing to the useful labour these people are employed at; and there they would be put in for a certain time; and as soon as they had been taught habits of industry, and it is thought they would be able to go back into the ordinary labouring classes again, then they would get their chance and see whether they could?—That would be a sort of reformatory for adults. I believe myself that would be a very excellent institution, and would be of great use, for I am quite sure that there are in every community men who would be the better of being set up against their own will, and who are the victims of their own passions, which they cannot control.

22189. That would virtually take all the children out of your workhouses?—Yes, but what would you do with the infants?

22190. We might consider these in connection with the mothers of the infants, that is the girls who come in there to have illegitimate children. It has been suggested to us by various witnesses that it would be a useful change, that a girl who is going to have an illegitimate child should in future never be sent to a workhouse at all to be confined, that she should be sent to an institution under Catholic or Protestant religious management, as the case might be, where efforts would be made for her reclamation on the occasion of her first lapse?—I think that is an admirable idea.

22191. And there the girl should be kept as short a time as it would be thought safe to keep her, and that she should be placed out in a situation again; that the child should be as far as possible supported by her out of her wages, and it should be kept in some place in connection with or visited by this institution until it could be boarded out at the age of two years old, and if the mother was not able to receive it, then it should be treated as an ordinary boarded-out child; that would keep away all women and children from the workhouse. You know, I am sure, Mr. Colley, from your long experience, how this works out, how the admission of women to the workhouse turns out. We have had it before us in evidence in a great many places, that a girl comes in with her first baby and is practically never reclaimed; she goes out again and comes in with another, and so on perhaps until she has

Sept. 26, 1904.

Mr. Bernard
Coburn.

six, seven, or eight children. That goes on, and you in that way start, maintain, and keep going a class of illegitimate, useless people. In one instance we met four generations in the workhouse at the same time?—I should not at all wonder.

22192. All illegitimate down, and we frequently meet three generations, so that virtually you have the workhouses operating as a place for the raising of these children?—There is no doubt of that, but I think the remedy you suggest would undoubtedly be an admirable one; and as an illustration of that, I think there is, even in our own workhouse at present, one or two of these reclaimed girls, if I mistake not, working in the hospital and retained there, perhaps against the will of some members of the Board, but retained there by the nurse as a sort of nurse; and, if I mistake not, they are retained purely because of the fear that if they returned to the world they would return to their evil ways, and I do think, if you had an institution of that description, it would be a very admirable idea.

22193. Take the workhouse now as it exists. If a girl of, say, 15 years of age falls, and if she is a decent respectable girl, except that she has met with one special wrong, and if she comes two or three months before her confinement, which is about the usual time—if she comes to the Sligo Workhouse, you admit her. Where do you put her? Are you not bound to put her in a ward practically where there are mothers of three, four, or five illegitimate children?—Well, no, I think not; there is a different ward; there is one for the mothers of one child, and I think there is a separate one for habitual offenders, so to speak; but there is this about it, that she goes in and, unfortunately, she does not improve her morals inside.

22194. Usually, from the day she goes in to be confined, she associates with people who have been through such experiences, and have come to be perhaps hardened and hardened?—I quite agree with you.

22195. So that it is an almost hopeless place to reclaim a young girl, except she could be detached for special duty, as you have told us, and that could not be done with many?—No.

22196. As regards the lunatics and idiots, would you do in favour of removing them from workhouses and putting them in auxiliary asylums or the parent asylum. You may say all cases of mental disease?—I think so; it is a very bad arrangement to have them in workhouses.

22197. You have not good machinery for maintaining them in workhouses?—No; still say that are there are fairly well kept. But there is a system by which the authorities at the asylums now, when they get patients what they call harmless, send them back to the workhouse, which I think is very bad. We had a case or two of that kind where they were returned, and when they became troublesome again they had to be sent back, and altogether it would be a great matter if they could be removed from the workhouses.

22198. Your experience agrees with the evidence of most of the experienced Guardians who have given evidence to us, that it is desirable that all cases of mental disease should be removed from the workhouses?—Decidedly; they ought to be in the asylum. I don't see any reason why the asylum should not accommodate and care those mentally unfit to care themselves, as well as those who are dangerous to others.

22199. And even cases that are considered at the present time perhaps harmless may become dangerous at any moment?—That has occurred more than once.

22200. Now as regards casuals and tramps. We already discussed those practically under the head of *ne-en-do-wells*, and you said you were in favour of what you would call a reformatory for the adult population?—I would, to a certain extent; but I don't know would tramps who make the workhouses beds now come under that head.

22201. I think they would be perhaps the chief?—Where would you catch them?

22202. Wherever they are going. Some witnesses say that the assistance of the Constabulary ought to come in here, and any man going tramping ought to be brought up to be brought up by them before the proper authority, and if he cannot satisfactorily explain himself—if he is only living on the alms and support, whether willing or forced, of other people—he should be detained and made work for his support?—I quite agree with you. I think that would be quite right.

22203. Some are *bona fide* people really looking for work?—A great many of them are.

22204. That class, it was suggested by some witnesses, should provide themselves with some testimonial in writing from some person in the town where they started, this document to state that so-and-so, mentioning his name, age, and appearance, is going looking for work to such-and-such a place?—I think that would be a good idea.

22205. And that would protect any man who was really a deserving man from any arrest or detention?—And be a passport for him for admission to the workhouse if he needed it.

22206. But supposing there was no workhouse, supposing you say "We will abolish the casual ward," a man who would have that passport, as you call it, to enable him to go along, he would come, say, to the relieving officer's place, and the relieving officer would be empowered to give a man with such a passport lodgings and food for the night?—Where.

22207. In the village or town where he would be?—He may pay for him in a lodging-house.

22208. Yes?—I don't think that would be a good arrangement.

22209. What would you suggest. Supposing a man comes to Drumore or Tollymore and there is no workhouse to receive him, and he is a man who has honestly started from some place, say Swindon, and is coming to Sligo to look for work, what would you do when he arrives at the end of the day, tired and hungry, in Tollymore?—I would have, as I before stated to you, I would have a hospital in Drumore West, for instance, and I would have a ward in that hospital where a really *bona fide* man, who would have the passport you describe, and who the authorities of the hospital would see would not be able to make his way to where his destination was could be accommodated, but I would not give carte blanche to the relieving officer to go through the town and find residences for tramps.

22210. Well, they would be very few?—I don't know that you would have them so few.

22211. The ordinary tramp would very soon be a section?—Yes, they would become less, certainly, if they knew they had not the workhouse without having a passport, but I would not like to have the relieving officer going looking for lodgings for these. I think there ought to be a ward in that case.

22212. The argument that one would be against that is this, that if you have in such a hospital a ward for tramps of that sort, you would want a staff to manage the ward, whereas if you only have the hospital at Tollymore you will have the doctor, the surgeon, and nurse, and nobody else?—I would expect that the men you describe would be very few, and I don't think it would be any additional expense if there was a ward and a bed or two in these hospitals where a casual man could be accommodated.

22213. You would require a male officer?—If you have a hospital you must have some one in control of it.

22214. You need not have a male officer?—You would have a matron and porter.

22215. You might have a porter, of course, but a great many of these small hospitals never dream of having a porter, and then the associations of the workhouse are continued if you give these men a ward?—At all events the tramp is a difficult problem.

22216. He is, but the ordinary tramp would not be so difficult as the *bona fide* under the workhouse?—I think the *bona fide* makers for work are few, those who are really *bona fide* tradesmen, some of them occasionally start out, but not often, and you will very often find that these will get work in a town. If a baker goes out or a man of any other trade to meet with failure in another town and I know they relieve him very often, or carpenters or men of any particular trade. As for labourers, I don't see why they should become tramps at all.

22217. We have found a great many in going round a great many manors and manors who as soon as a work stops in one town have to march on until they get other work?—Probably you would get that very often.

22218. And before them to be find of moving about for some reason?—Yes, but before them have associations in every town, and it is very seldom you will find an absolutely destitute.

22219. You will find them in the workhouse—very often in the tramp ward?—Yes.

22220. But you do see it would be an advantage from an economical point of view if you could close the tramp ward, and make it unnecessary to keep any male officers?—Where?

Sept. 25, 1904.
Mr. Bernard
Collier.

22221. In any workhouse, directed except for the purposes of the sick—I think if you could reduce the staff, but, unfortunately, it is the staff in a great measure that sets up a great part of the expense. It is necessary of course.

22222. And if you could do away with them it would be an economy?—Yes.

22223. Then the result of all that would be that the only inmates you would have, even in the central workhouse that remains—Sligo—the only class you would have there would be the sick in the hospital and the aged and infirm?—Yes.

22224. All the other classes would be provided for elsewhere. The children would be out, the women who came in with children would be elsewhere, the tramps would be elsewhere, and the lunatics would be elsewhere, so you would not have that congregation of classes that you have now that cause such difficulty in classification, and you would have merely an almshouse in Sligo with a hospital attached?—Quite so; that is what I would like to see.

22225. Mr. MURPHY.—What is your experience of out-door relief—would you wish to see it extended or otherwise?—I would; it is one of those things that can be abused, and it is very necessary to control it. I believe myself that out-door relief given to poor people prevents a lot of them from going to the workhouse. It really reaches them, while of the money spent on them in the workhouse nearly half of it is spent on establishment charges and officials.

22226. CHAIRMAN.—Say a quarter?—Well, I would be hardly inclined to agree with you there. However, you have the statistics, and I won't dispute it, but at all events if you give them 2s. 6d. or 3s. in out-door relief I would not give them much. I have made it a practice in most cases in giving out-door relief to limit it to a small amount and distribute it over many; instead of giving 4s. to one, to give 2s. a piece to two.

22227. Mr. MURPHY.—Do you think there is any tendency on the part of the Guardians to be lavish with money that way?—I don't think so. I think our out-door relief in Sligo has not very much increased from the old system. I think we used to have from £12 to £19 or £20 a week out-door relief under the old system if I mistake not. It might have increased £3 or £2.

22228. But not noticeably?—I don't think so.

22229. What is your view as regards the area of rating. Many of the Guardians, especially country Guardians, claim they ought to go back to the old system of electoral divisions?—Yes, that very matter cropped up before our board some time ago. I don't think it would be much relief to the country Guardians one way or another. I think in a great measure the object of that is that they consider the town allowances on a good deal of the rates, but I don't think that would be the case, because I have always held this opinion, that a great deal of the people who come into the town are people belonging to the country that make their way to town. That is the case everywhere.

22230. But from your knowledge of the cost of the Poor Law in Sligo before the change took place and the cost at present, do you think there is any marked difference in regard to it—has it gone up or come down?—Yes means the whole expense of the union. I think the whole expense of the union has gone up somewhat, but of course that is not so much the fault of the Guardians as it is of the Local Government Board, because the Local Government Board have compelled us, perhaps rightly, I would say rightly, to make changes and give further accommodation, and to better the condition of the people in hospitals and all that sort of thing, and consequently the expense of working the institution has increased.

22231. Is the annual rate now much more than it was in 1897?—I don't think it is very much more. Of course, as you are aware, we are getting the agricultural grant which relieves us considerably, but I think our rate is nearly back almost to what it was, or very little over it, notwithstanding the relief given by the Agricultural Grant.

22232. Would you yourself be in favour of a return to the old system of an electoral division charge?—I would not be in favour of it. I think the increase is in a great measure caused by bettering the condition of the poor, and they have been bettered in every way; from the smallest thing in the institution to the largest it has been improved.

22233. But still you must have noticed that when you confine the area the supervision is much keener and closer than if you extend it. Did not the Guardians take a closer and keener interest in the

granting of out-door relief under the old system than under the new?—Well, I don't know. Individual Guardians belonging to the union might do so. He might be more economical of his division than he would be of the union at large. That is what you mean, I suppose. I have seen no symptoms to that effect. My experience of the Guardians as a rule is that they are anxious to conserve the rates.

22234. But they don't take that active and keen interest in the question of out-door relief that they formerly did?—I think they do take a keen interest, and do not at all like to see extravagance, and I must say they very frequently rebel against the expenditure forced upon them by the Local Government Board.

22235. You think the Local Government Board is the chief offenders?—I don't think the chief offender. On the contrary, I think it is a very useful cog in the wheel, but there is no doubt they have gone in for changes in the condition of the poor and in the condition of the hospitals that probably the Guardians, if they were left to themselves, would be slow to adopt. That is my view of the matter. At the same time you must take me as believing that the changes are for the better. Individually that is my opinion, because I think the improvement of the condition of the hospitals and everything of that kind is decidedly in accordance with the times, and the improvement ought to have taken place.

22236. Now you stated in the beginning that you were in favour of amalgamation to a certain extent. How far would you go in relation to that matter. I think you have told the chairman that you would consider it a hardship to remove the old and infirm any distance from their own locality?—Yes, I would.

22237. There would be no intention of removing the sick if the infirm were retained where they are present, but what hardship would you see in sending a person in fair health, say fifty-five or sixty years of age, a distance of twenty-five to thirty miles to an institution where they could be classified better, and perhaps looked after better than they are at present. Could you see any hardship in that?—No, I would keep none in these hospitals but those who would be really fit for hospitals, and if a man of fifty-five or sixty or seventy was capable of being brought to a central hospital I see no reason why he should not.

22238. Some people object, and say the people would think it a great hardship to be taken from their home surroundings. Do you think that sentiment is well-founded, or not—do you think these people in the workhouse are visited by their friends regularly once they stay in a number of years. Don't you think they are deserted altogether by their friends as a rule?—I don't think that would tell so much once they enter the walls of an institution of that kind. I have no doubt their friends say from time to time wish to see them, but I don't think it would tell very much.

22239. You think there is not very much in that point?—I don't think so. Supposing you take a person from Tubercular to Sligo, or from Sligo up to Tubercular, I don't think their friends would rebel much in that respect against it, because, of course, very often the person whom you would take would have no friends at all. It might be one out of twenty that would have any person that would be interested about them.

22240. In regard to the asylum you say they return to the workhouse those people once they become quiet, and their reason for that is that they have not sufficient space?—I think it is in want of room and the great pressure and want of accommodation. I don't know who exercises the authority; I am not a member of the Asylum Board.

22241. I notice in the last report that the number of lunatics in the workhouse of Sligo is only sixteen in all the workhouses. That is a small number. Do you think there could not be accommodation for that sixteen in the asylum?—From what I am told the asylum is very full. The asylum is accommodating two counties, and there is a very large increase in the number of commitments. At first when the asylum was built the number in it (of course I talk from my recollection) would not have been more than 200 or 300. I am told there are over 600 there now.

22242. Have you ever considered the advantage or disadvantage of an auxiliary asylum as compared with an asylum itself. Some of the witnesses who came before us in other places advocated the establishment of an auxiliary asylum in preference to the asylum, while other witnesses insisted that the asylum itself was the better method. Have you any views in that respect?—If you had accommodation in the asylum here you might not require an auxiliary asylum, but

Sept. 30, 1906
Mr. Bennett
Colony.

if, for instance, you required an expenditure as was stated of £30,000 to increase the accommodation in Sligo, I think it would be much better to have an auxiliary asylum than to add such an enormous expenditure to the present establishment. At all events I think there is too much spent on the ornamentation of the present asylum.

22543. You think they are kept up at too high a standard?—I think a reedier building would be an advantage.

22544.—They have tried an alternative method in Cork at Youghal, an auxiliary asylum on a less permanent scale. I don't know what the results have been.—Cork has a very large population.

22545. On the whole, now, you would be in favour of getting the different classes out of the workhouse, keep sufficient accommodation for the sick of the locality, and board out the children where it was possible to do so?—I would be in favour of relieving the establishment, but there is a point which you have not, I think, touched on, and that is how we could get undesirable at present out of the workhouse. It is one of the difficulties that presents itself to every Board of Guardians. Take, for instance, now we have an annual training of militia here, and when the militia has been trained and the men disbanded whatever money they get they spend it, and then they present themselves at the workhouse and our relieving officer says he has no option but to give them a ticket. We pass a resolution and turn them out and in a day or two they return again to us.

22546. If this reformatory that was mentioned were established, would not that be the place to send these people to?—Yes. I think if you could capture some of them for that it would be very desirable.

22547. And if they were turned over to the attention of the police, altogether outside the scope of the Poor Law, would not that be desirable. Let it be the duty of the authorities rather than of the Poor Law Guardians to look after these people?—The authorities cannot take any cognizance of these unless they commit some crime.

22548. CHAIRMAN.—Unless the law was amended? Unless the law was amended.

22549. Mr. MRANAGHAN.—They are offenders to a certain extent, because they pay upon the public, not giving any value and getting a living for nothing either out of the kindness of the people, or simply because the people don't like to make enemies of them. If these people in future were turned over to the police, then that would relieve the Guardians of any trouble?—I daresay it would, and one then also of attempting to force themselves on the Guardians.

22550. And don't you think it would be a very suitable thing for the authorities to pay for the care of these people, just as they do for the care of the jailbirds?—I am sorry to say the authorities are inclined to throw too much upon the local rates, and many things that the Imperial Government ought to pay for are put on the local rates. In fact it is becoming a serious burden. That very thing you talk of, reformatories and industrial schools, we have to contribute to all these. For every child committed here to an industrial school the county has to pay 2s. 6d. I think all these ought to be kept up by the State.

22551. But, considering that this class is recruited largely from the militia, do you not think it is a good reason why the people should make a demand on the Government to provide for their maintenance without putting it on the local authorities?—But as the law exists there is no use in demanding from the Government, because they consider they have no responsibility once they disband them and give them 21s. or 30s. They go and spend that money on the spree or something of the kind and the next thing is they come to the workhouse. If we then apply to the authorities they tell us they have no responsibility.

22552. Don't you think it is a claim that is very strong; it is a claim that the people could advocate very strongly, on the ground that this class is recruited largely from the militia and their having done Governmental service?—I think so.

22553. And, therefore, the Government should look after their maintenance and not place it on the local authorities?—I think the Government should look after those and devote some means by which they would not be a burden on the rates, because the very fact of joining the militia gives them certain idle habits and makes them in a great measure habituate of the workhouse. I know some of them who live their whole life in the workhouse until the militia is called out and out they come and join the militia and use all the best they get and all the other good things, and then when they have it all gone they return back to us again. It is a crying hardship, and one of the things that the

Guardians have frequently tried to see how they could keep them out and they could not.

22554. Not under the existing law, but you think it is a thing that ought to be remedied if it could be remedied?—I think it ought to be remedied, and very necessary.

22555. They have a law in England that enables Guardians to take over the control of dissipated persons. Do you think that would be a proper thing for the Irish authorities to have that power?—What to do with them?

22556. They can take away from the parents their children if the parents are dissipated or rotten and refuse to support them and they can adopt the children and send them out to board; but then you go back to where you start, relieving the improvident parents of their children. Don't you think some punishment should be meted out to the parents of these children. If you take the children from the parents the parents—I think if that was adopted, it might be of some use, but very many of these misdoings are only glad to get rid of the children. If they are punished themselves severely they would not be so fond of the offence. At present there is no penalty unless it can be proved that they are neglecting them. There is a remedy if the parents are absolutely neglecting their children by which they can be brought before the magistrates and punishment awarded. We had a case of that in this town not long ago.

22557. What was the punishment?—The mother was the father was working—but the mother was sent to prison. The father was not so much to blame. I was not on the bench at the time, but my recollection of it is that the mother was sent to prison for the offence. The husband was working earning money and she was spending it in drink and otherwise, and she was brought up before the magistrates and got some severe punishment.

22558. Dr. BROWNE.—You are a member of the County Infirmary Committee?—Yes.

22559. And take a great interest in the County Infirmary. Do you know that we heard when we were visiting there that they are rather hampered for means. They could not take in all the cases that applied, and that might have been taken in if they had a large amount?—I think the County Infirmary, which is an admirable institution, is too small, and there is not accommodation for all that require to go into it.

22560. Would you be in favour of enlarging their income from the county?—I would be in favour of adding some means to it.

22561. Does it serve the whole county?—Oh, yes.

22562. Do persons come from all over the county?—All over the county, but what happens is this. For instance, several tickets are issued, they go back to the doctor, the doctor has not room for them. No doubt he prescribes for many of these and all that, but he has not room to take them all in. He does not take one out of every three tickets he gets. Mr. Vernon, who is the secretary of the institution, would tell you, but I don't think out of every three or four tickets issued to him he takes more than one into the institution, because he has not room for them.

22563. Is not that a great hardship for these people?—There are some cases where he might not require to take them in. A great many go to him because he is a very eminent man in order to get his opinion and perhaps do not want to remain in, but I know myself that the institution is too small, because it is a very popular institution for the whole county.

22564. You have known of cases that really did require treatment there being turned away owing to the beds being full or being hampered in the way of funds?—I am inclined to think so.

22565. I think the income from the county is £1,000 a year?—That is the amount the old Grand Jury paid and the amount the County Council still contributes.

22566. Would you be in favour of increasing that to whatever the necessary outlay on the epidemic would amount to?

22567. CHAIRMAN.—The same as the Guardians with their hospital?—Of course, to make an increase you would have to put a large addition to the rating. Is not that what you mean?

22568. Dr. BROWNE.—They might require that, to keep the beds full that are there. There are wards in which every bed was not occupied on account of not having the means to pay for them—I have not heard that any were kept out of it for want of means.

CHAIRMAN.—We rather formed that impression at the hospital.

Sept. 28, 1904.
Mr. Bernard
Celtory.

22260. Dr. BROSSE.—I thought that they were keeping down the number that were admitted, so as to keep within their limit?—No doubt we are trying, of course, to cut our cloth according to our measure; but I have not heard that for want of means any really deserving case was kept out of the institution. There is no doubt that if the institution was larger, and had more money to be expended on it, it is quite probable that the doctor would take in cases that at present he has to turn away.

22270. CHAIRMAN.—Do you see any reason why the chief hospital of the county should be limited in expenditure and all the other hospitals unlimited?—I believe under a recent Act of Parliament, the County Council can vote a larger sum under certain conditions.

22271. Would you approve personally of those conditions being complied with?—Most decidedly. I think I expressed that view at a public meeting more than once.

22272. That is rather a little bit clumsy, that method; that would be reimbursing the expenditure?—I think he was not the most brilliant fellow in the world that drafted it.

22273. Would it be simpler, in your opinion, if all funds were taken away, and if the County Infirmary, like any other hospital in the county supported out of public funds, were allowed its necessary touched and unfixed expenditure?—I think the County Council could be safely entrusted with the necessary expenditure as an institution like that without limiting it to £1,400; but I don't believe the present County Council, as it exists, of which I happen to be a member, would be willing to expend the necessary sum in enlarging the institution, because I know that they are all well pleased with the working of it, and see the necessity of it.

CHAIRMAN.—I think they have reason to be very proud of its appearance, so we all thought; it is a most creditable hospital.

22274. Dr. BROSSE.—With regard to the treatment of consumptive patients, you have no provision in the county for treating them, apart from the workhouse hospitals?—No, we have not.

22275. And they are very often not admitted for that purpose?—I believe so.

22276. Would you be in favour of making some provision for their treatment?—It is a great question in the county?—I don't know; it is for the doctors.

22277. Not for your own county alone but comprising two or three counties, and have a consumption hospital, pure and simple?—That is my view exactly. I think that is what ought to be done. There is one at present, to which I contribute a small sum myself annually, in the County Workhouse, Newcastle.

22278. Yes, that is a long way for patients to go.—Yes; I am told it does very admirable work. If there were central ones, something of that kind, it would be a great matter for three or four or five counties.

22279. CHAIRMAN.—According to the population and requirements?—Yes.

22280. Dr. BROSSE.—If Tisbury County Workhouse were done away with, and, say, Domesday West, you would be in favour of leaving a hospital at those places?—I would.

22281. But that would be a small hospital, perhaps, for the acutely sick, and some of those cases that cannot be removed; you would not think for operations of a large kind that that would be a suitable place for them, except in cases of emergency. They require an operating room and a large stock of implements and dressings?—I think, in cases of that kind, the county infirmary would be the central place; I would keep the county infirmary up in proper order, and I think most cases of that kind could be brought to it.

22282. You would rather bring into touch those small hospital with the county hospital to make them work more in unison, so that they could transfer a patient easily from Tisbury or Domesday West to the county infirmary?—I think that would be very useful. If there was a patient in Domesday West that it would be necessary to operate on, I think there ought to be a sort of combination between the central hospital and those outer ones.

22283. It would also bring the medical men more in touch with the infirmary; they could follow their patients?—Yes.

22284. Would you be in favour of those hospitals having wards that the poor of the district, not dentists, but small farmers and persons that could pay a small amount, should go into and pay?—That is the case at present.

22285. It is, but they can only pay according to the case charge. Would you be in favour of having different charges—20s or 3s, or 1s a week, according to their means?—I don't think so. I think there ought to be a ward or two, probably in the institution, where people should pay the cost. Now most people who fall sick are anxious to go into institutions of the kind where they could pay, but I think myself such what you call small farmers, or a moderate class of people in the county or towns, I would not have them to pay anything.

22286. CHAIRMAN.—At all events, would you see any hardship in giving the governing body of the hospital, the District Council, or whoever governs it, would you see any hardship in giving them the discretion to charge anything they pleased, from 5s. to 1s. a week up to the actual cost incurred, giving them power to recover that if they thought fit, leaving it open to them not to charge if they wished?—Without at all saying anything against the officers, which my answer does not imply, I would not approve of it.

22287. It would be the managing body, the Council. The position is this, that at present, in a great number of cases, people who are very well-to-do would come in, and, perhaps, an additional sum would have to be procured for the sole charge of one case. At present the Guardians have no power to recover anything but the average cost of maintenance, a few shillings a week, whereas they may be at an expense of some £2 or £3 a week?—Are you talking of the workhouse hospital? I was talking of the county infirmary.

22288. The workhouse at present, which would become district hospitals if all classes but the sick were removed. Would you be in favour of giving the governing body of those district hospitals power to charge such sum as, in their discretion, patients might be able to pay; say, from 5s., in the case of a labourer's family, up to the actual cost, £2 or £3 a week, that might be insured?—I think it would not work well; I am afraid it would not work well. It would be difficult for a County Council to define the different classes.

22289. It has worked wonderfully well at your neighbouring county, in the town of Emswiler; there the result has been remarkable. The committee of the county infirmary there, in conjunction with their medical officer, consider the circumstances of each person who is admitted, and they make a charge there, according to the means; they have no power to recover that; but really the amounts that are paid under that head at present are very large and considerable; and, as well as my recollection goes, more than enough to pay the doctor's salary, and the people like it better. They are paying their way there as well as they can, and the patients seem to prefer it?—I think that the governing body ought to have power to recover from people who are not absolutely able to pay, and I would fix that at a certain sum.

22290. Why would you not leave that to the discretion; as time goes on the price of commodities and everything else falls, and would it not be better to leave the discretion to the local body?—You mean for them to fix a tariff.

22291. No, to fix in each case how much a person ought to pay?—The County Council meets once a month—how would they regulate it?

22292. What happens in Emswiler is this, that the Governor or County Councillor who gives the ticket for admission indicates on it what he thinks would be a fair amount, does not say that it is definitely the amount, but suggests something; that is looked into by the doctor and officials of the place, and the committee then fix the amount, or the doctor, in some cases, is allowed to fix the amount; the man on coming in signs an undertaking to pay so much; that is generally the amount recommended by the person who gives the order for admission?—I have no doubt that works very well, but I am largely in favour of free hospitals, I must say.

22293. On you not see the advantage, on the other hand, of giving people something that they can pay for, and would value more?—Down from a certain standard I would have free hospitals, but a person who could pay £1 a week, for instance, I think they should be charged.

22294. Dr. BROSSE.—You need not force the obligation on them; they may want hospital treatment, but at the same time don't want it for nothing; they

Sept 30, 1904.

Mr. Bennett
Colley.

are willing to pay?—I think that should be done. The class that is able to pay £1 a week, I would make them pay, but I would not go under that.

22329. CHAIRMAN.—Take one of your quack-laborers. Suppose a child of his gets a harm, that child will, at all events, consume provisions to the amount of 6d. a week. He is a man earning 15s. a week; would there be any hardship in saying, "We will ask that man to pay what he would have to pay for the child if it were at home, 6d."?—I think it would be; I think either the State or the county should really provide for the relief of that man, and not alone of that man, but of the man who holds ten or twelve acres of land and has two or three cows. I think it is a hardship on them, if one of them got sick, to make them—it never was the case—the class I am talking of never paid to the county infirmary.

22330. No, but they way they slipped in for free treatment in the workhouse was by coming in as paupers; if that qualification was abolished, and they came into the district hospital?—You think they would be classed as paupers?

22331. They have been up to this; until 1860 they did come in actually as paupers?—Not in county infirmaries.

22332. Dr. BROWN.—If you take away the workhouse and make them district hospitals, it will increase the number seeking hospital treatment, why not, at the same time, take something in aid of the rates when a person has no objection to it, but would rather prefer it; a great many would rather pay something than have the idea of getting "off the rates"?—I would not be aware to any person who voluntarily wished to pay.

22333. CHAIRMAN.—But you would not be in favour of giving the governing body discretion to charge?—I would not approve of it; I would give the power to a certain extent and to a certain class, but beyond that I would not.

22334. Dr. BROWN.—It has been suggested to us that the county infirmary supplies the want of the immediate neighbourhood in excess of what it does for remote parts of the county—for instance, Tobarcurry does not get the same benefit from the county infirmary as Sligo itself may get?—I quite agree with you, because, of course, the centre of population is more about Sligo.

22335. And not only that, but on account of its being nearer, they will go there more readily?—There is the very reason why I would have a hospital at Tobarcurry.

22336. It has been suggested to us that the rate for the hospitals should be on one basis, out of one rate; that is, the county infirmary, Tobarcurry and Droemore West should be taken out of a county-at-large charge?—That is the case at present.

22337. That is not so, exactly; it is for the county infirmary, but not for the hospitals. Would you be inclined to put those hospitals on the county rate?—Sligo would be paying for Tobarcurry in the same way as Tobarcurry is paying for the county infirmary?—I would not object to it; but I fancy Tobarcurry and Droemore West would object to it.

22338. Why, it would be to their interest to get it?—If it was a county-at-large charge Droemore West would be paying for 50 per cent. of Sligo, while she had only ten of her own.

22339. She is doing that at present, and getting no relief for her tent?—I am talking after the change takes place.

22340. CHAIRMAN.—At present Droemore West, Tobarcurry, and Boyle No. 2 pay for the county infirmary?—They do, and at times very largely avail themselves of it. I frequently hear tickets from Boyle No. 2, Tobarcurry and Hollymont and all parts of the county very largely avail themselves of it.

22341. Not to the same extent as Sligo Union does?

—I should say not.

22342. Would you give them the sort-of making their district hospitals in the future supported out of a county-at-large rate in the same way as the county infirmary is, and, of course, your Sligo District Hospital would also be a county-at-large charge; would you make all public hospitals under the County Councils or District Councils county-at-large charges for the sick only?—I don't know. What would arise from your suggestion is, that each district of the county should pay for its own hospital.

22343. That is the present arrangement?—I know it is, and that it should continue.

22344. No, no, but that the county-at-large should pay for the future, instead of the district.

Dr. BROWN.—There would be another advantage from it; and that would be in case Droemore West wanted an extra nurse she might be supplied from the county infirmary instead of sending to Dublin and getting a nurse?—I think I started with saying that I would be in favour of a county-at-large charge for all hospitals. Let all be paid for out of a common fund.

22345. Mr. MURPHY.—Where do you see the advantage, because that is the place you and I would split?—I don't know exactly. You would have the people in Sligo paying for Droemore, and vice-versa. You would have the larger valuation in Sligo, and the larger number of ratepayers, but Sligo Union would be contributing much more than Droemore West, and that would be quite right, because Droemore West is not anything like the size of the Sligo Union.

22346. Sligo has 403 inmates in the workhouse, whereas the other two have only 174; you would be asking the outlying districts to share in the cost of Sligo?

CHAIRMAN.—It would not apply to the workhouse?—I am not referring to the workhouse, but to the county infirmaries.

22347. Mr. MURPHY.—Why should it not apply to the workhouse? Are you not aware that it is generally accepted as a fact, that by widening the area of charge you at once lessen supervision and discrimination, and there is never so careful an eye kept on expenditure if you extend the limits of charge?—Yes, I think that each district paying for its own institutions would be more conservative of its expenditure.

22348. Yes; because it would know the amount it needed and the relief that would be given; whereas, in the wider area, there would not be that knowledge at all?—You think they would be more extravagant. I would be hardly inclined to credit them with that, because I believe myself if we had a hospital in Tobarcurry the people managing that institution would not spend more on it in consequence of the county-at-large being paying for it than if their own district were paying for it.

22349. Is not that the outcry against union rating, that the Guardians don't care what a thing costs when the charge is union-at-large?—I think I did not state that.

22350. CHAIRMAN.—You hold the opposite opinion, I know, but it is put forward?—It may be, but I don't think there is much reality in it.

22351. Dr. BROWN.—You attribute any laxness to the better treatment of the inmates?—I do, entirely to the changed system. Take, for instance, in my young days, I remember the workhouse thirty years ago. I don't think there were three paid nurses in the whole institution, and if they were paid at all, they were pauper nurses, that got about 24 or 25 a year. I think all the nurses that were paid in the workhouse 220 a year would cover them. What happens now. We have an array of nurses, and you must bear in mind that that has been put on us by the changed times, and, of course, that has created expenditure.

22352. Mr. MURPHY.—While that may be the experience of Sligo it is not the experience of other places. Generally out-door relief is higher than in 1850, and in some places it is 50 per cent. higher?—That is not the case here.

22353. And it is stated, and, I believe, stated with very considerable truth, that this is due to the fact that nobody cares particularly now who is put on or who is put off. Formerly the Guardians used to scrutinise with the greatest care anybody that went on, and try to cut off anyone that was on as soon as it was possible for them to do so. Now, you see, if you adopt county rating in regard to infirmaries and district hospitals in the future you will begin and introduce the very same system with the danger that you increase the cost?—But you must bear in mind that I don't agree with you in that at all.

22354. You don't agree with me in what?—With the effect of having what is called union-at-large rating. I take it you say that union-at-large rating has caused the Guardians to be less conservative of the rates?—Is not that your theory?

22355. It is not my theory; that is the evidence we have had in other places, and, I may add, agrees with my own experience. When you advocate the adoption of that system to the infirmaries of the county, I want to put this before you, and ask you if you think it would be a wise thing after the experience of out-door relief?—Yes, based on the same

principle that the union-at-large charges have not at all increased our expenditure; that the union-at-large charge for our hospitals would not increase our expenditure either. Our expenditure, as I before stated, has increased owing to the changed times and the changed condition of the institutions.

22322. The change insisted on for the better nursing in hospitals, and the employment of paid labour, would hardly cause the increase?—I think it would.

22323. It would hardly be responsible for the whole increase?—I have not the statistics beside me, but if you take the Sligo Union alone and set the amount of money we pay for hospital arrangements and accommodation, and compare it with twenty or thirty years ago.

22324. Who would you leave to manage these district hospitals if you made the rate a county one; would you take it out of the hands of the Guardians, the management of the district hospitals, or put it in the hands of a committee appointed by the county?—I would have a committee, as a matter of course, in Tobaruary and a committee in Droemore West that would manage it, and make their suggestions and their demands on the County Council for the expenditure.

22325. Dr. BOOCAN.—And visit the hospitals?—As a matter of course.

22326. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—You would continue the local management and change the area of rating?—Oh, no, I did not suggest a change; it is a union rate at present.

22327. I thought you said it should be a county rate instead of a union rate?—Oh, yes, county expenditure.

22328. A county rate for hospitals instead of a union rate, as at present. At present the infirmaries are under a union rating, under the system suggested it would become a county rate. My question is, what advantage do you see in the change, because experience teaches me that the moment you widen the area you begin to expend far more money?—I don't know that there would be very much advantage in it, but I cannot quite agree with you that by widening the area we would expend more money. I think, taking all in all, the County Council that has to do with the funds is very anxious about these.

22329. You would still leave the management of the district hospitals to the local bodies?—I would leave the management to the local bodies, under the control of the County Council, who have to pay for it.

Mr. ROGER DAVY examined.

22330. CHAIRMAN.—I think there was one part of the evidence about the county infirmaries on which you were rather anxious to mention some facts within your own experience?—Yes; what I wanted to mention was that I think one of your Commissioners was asking questions of Mr. Colley about the state of the county infirmary, whether it required to be enlarged or not. I have known cases that applied for admission to the county infirmary, actually outpatients, and they were sent down to the union hospital; they were not admitted.

22331. What was the reason given?—I don't know the reason.

22332. Was it to keep down the expenses, or because there was no bed available?—I could not tell you what reason; I am not a member of the Infirmary Committee.

22333. You did not hear from the people what the reason given to them was?—No, I did not hear it.

22334. But you just know, as a matter of fact, whatever the reason may be, that some people do apply, hoping to get in and don't?—A number of outpatients apply, and they have either got no admittance or else go to the union hospital.

Mr. MURKAGHAN.—There are some classes of cases that will not be admitted to an infirmary.

CHAIRMAN.—It may have been a chronic case.

22335. Dr. BURGESS.—Do you know the nature of the case?—I did not know the nature of the case.

22336. Did you know of many cases like that?—Yes, I did know of some cases that had to go down to the workhouse hospital, and it was some kind of a chronic case—some affection of the toes or feet.

22337. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the Sligo Board of Guardians?—Yes.

22338. And the opinion of the Board of Guardians is that it would be desirable to amalgamate the Union

22339. The County Council have nothing to do with the Poor Law at present?—I think not.

22340. Why should the County Council come into the business at all, has it not enough on hands at present?—Of course they would have to provide the funds; and then, of course, they would have either less or more supervision over them. For instance, the County Council provides the funds for the asylums, and they have as much control over them that they appoint the committees.

22341. Have they not the supervision at present to the extent of having a representation on the Council in the Chairman of the District Council, who is a member of the Board of Guardians?—Quite so.

22342. Where do you see the advantage to be gained in the change?—I don't say that there is a very great advantage in the change, nor would I be very strongly in favour of it. I would have an open mind as to how these district hospitals would be managed, as far as that is concerned, whether they would be managed as union district hospitals or as county-at-large district hospitals; but I have this view, that I think that if they were amalgamated, so to speak, of the county infirmary it would be to their advantage.

22343. If they were run in conjunction with the county infirmary?—For instance, if there was a very bad case that needed special treatment, or something of that kind, the people of Droemore could remove it to the county infirmary, and have power also to pay the expense of the removal.

22344. Dr. BOOCAN.—And it would be a saving to have the instruments belonging to the county rather than having each hospital having a separate set of instruments?—I think so. It would not be an easy matter to get up an operating theatre in small hospitals.

22345. If there was a patient requiring a large operation that could not be removed from Tobaruary or Droemore West the county surgeon could be telegraphed to, and he would bring down his instruments from the county infirmary, and you would be saved keeping up stocks of instruments, and he might take a nurse with him, as a Dublin surgeon does when he is going to perform an operation. He takes his instruments with him to a country town, and brings back the instruments with him; the same thing would apply to your county infirmaries?—That is one of my reasons for being in favour of their being amalgamated.

22346. It would be a great saving and also of some service to those requiring them?—I think so.

of Droemore West and Tobaruary with the Sligo Union?—They have no objection to amalgamation.

22347. They have passed a resolution in favour of it?—Yes.

22348. And you agree with that resolution?—Yes.

22349. Are there any reasons you would like to give us in favour of that resolution?—I think the Guardians were under the opinion that it might be a saving to the ratepayers if they got amalgamated, and I think they were also of opinion that the sick poor and inmates would not suffer in any way; it would be no hardship.

22350. Do you think it would be desirable to keep a small hospital in those places if the big workhouse was closed?—Well, I am delicate in giving an opinion on that question; but I think if the workhouse was closed, and the Tobaruary Guardians and ratepayers were satisfied to amalgamate with Sligo, it could be turned into some more useful purpose than to have a hospital there.

22351. Do you think if you closed the Droemore West Workhouse it would not be a hardship to oblige sick people to be taken such long distances, people that were really sick—a man with pneumonia or inflammation of the lungs or a broken leg?—It would be a hardship, but they have to be removed in many cases. I don't think it would be a great hardship. There is a useful use for the purpose; except that there are actually not able to leave their bed. There are some harmless lunatics in Sligo Workhouse. I don't know whether there are any in Tobaruary; but if Tobaruary were made an auxiliary for harmless lunatics, and Droemore West people were satisfied to amalgamate with Sligo Union, that could be turned into something for children or young people.

22352. Were you here when we had a conversation with Mr. Colley about children?—I was.

Sept. 20, 1904

Mr. Bernard Colley

Mr. Roger Davy

Sept. 20, 1904.

Mr. Roger
Dwyer.

22353. Do you think it would be better to have them boarded out or put into a central institution?—I have some experience of boarding out children that are over two or three years old, and they made very good members of society after being boarded out and reared outside; but it is not so with children reared in the workhouse.

22354. You would be more in favour, on the whole, of the boarding out system?—I would, if it could be carried out properly. They have not the tendency to run to the workhouse after being boarded out.

22355. As regards tramps, what would you say about them?—They are a great nuisance in Sligo, and a great expense on the ratepayers. I think some remedy should be employed to prevent them having recourse to the workhouse.

22356. Would you be in favour of having them taken up and put into an institution, where they would be taught habits of industry?—If they could be improved in any way in the world to make them more industrious and possible members of society, it would be a good thing. If there was any remedy to prevent people running into a workhouse and coming out when they like, perhaps going back drunk, it is very demoralising to the rest of the inmates. Once they would go in I think they should be prevented running out and going back. If they are really destitute they ought to stay within.

22357. Would you be in favour of separating hospitals for the sick from the workhouses as much as possible, and establishing pay wards for those who could afford to pay?—Yes, I think I would leave a discretion in the hands of the local representatives. They will know every person who is able to pay and entitled to pay.

22358. And give them power to recover whatever they thought right?—Quite so. Give them power to assess whatever they think right and recover what they can.

22359. You heard our conversation about the rating. Have you formed any opinion about the union at large so distinguished from electoral division charges?—Yes, I have. My opinion is that divisional rating for divisional paupers and out-door relief would be more economical.

22360. Dr. BARNES.—Out-door relief?—Yes, and any other small items that would interest the division rather than the district.

Mr. DOMINGO HANCOCK, Chairman,

22361. Chairman.—What is the view of the Tobarcurry Guardians as regards amalgamation. You had a division on the question?—Yes, sir. There were only seventeen members present, and the majority voted for amalgamation.

22370. Were you in the majority?—No, sir, I was in the minority, although I am chairman of the Guardians.

22371. You would be in favour of keeping the house?—Yes, sir. I would be in favour of no change except divisional rating for out-door relief and maintenance.

22372. What is your reason for that?—I think there are abuses. We are a curiously constituted board in Tobarcurry. We have two different parties, you know.

22373. Most boards have only one party?—We have two different parties although we are all Nationalists.

22374. But of various complexion?—Yes, and I think there are abuses in the line of out-door relief.

22375. Is out-door relief under a party question at all?—Sometimes, and when a member of one party would be defeated on out-door relief to-day he would bring it on on the next Board day and might get a favourable majority. In my opinion a divisional charge would be the most economical and the most just.

22376. You heard the evidence given by Mr. O'Leary. Would you approve of the removal from the workhouse of the various classes there spoken of?—No, sir, I would not.

22377. Children?—I would be in favour of boarding out children. I don't like the atmosphere of the workhouse.

22378. What do you think of mothers of illegitimate children; do you think the workhouse is a suitable place for them?—I don't think it is; in some cases they cannot be reclaimed.

22379. Would you agree for the future to send all cases of first offenders?—Yes; but chronic cases I would not.

22380. As regards cases in the past, it would not be hopeful to deal with them in that way?—No, sir.

22381. But for future cases, would you be in favour of sending such cases in future to penitentiaries or reformatories?—I would; where they could be kept.

22361. CHAIRMAN.—Would you have the rating electoral for any other purpose?—I would. I would say the maintenance of divisional paupers. Of course the union establishment charges should remain as they are. I have had some experience of old inmates, and I always found the Guardians took more interest in them and things when it was divisional rating than they do now, and I think it would be a little saving also. I think it would be a saving in the way of out-door relief. There are a number of Guardians that might recommend out-door relief, but if they had to answer to their constituents for it they might be a little delicate in doing it. When it is a union charge they are not so particular.

22362. Mr. MURPHY.—Then there is the other advantage, that only the deserving would get the relief?—Quite so. I don't say there are any abuses in that way, but I think it would be some saving to the rates in general.

22363. CHAIRMAN.—If there is no abuse, would not that be an argument for keeping the present union-at-large charges?—I don't think there is any abuse. As far as I am aware there is not.

22364. Mr. MURPHY.—But still there is not that tendency to watch things that there was before?—There is not so much anxiety about taking an interest in those things. Of course the Guardians from the outside districts of the union do not know the actual deserving cases. They only go according to the Guardians that recommend it.

22365. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think there would be a saving if you went back to the electoral division rating?—I think there would.

22366. But if there is no abuse at present in the union-at-large rating, would you not have an abuse in the refusal of proper cases, if you put it back to the electoral division?—I don't think there would be an abuse in that way either. Every Guardian would be satisfied to give relief where it was really required.

22367. Do you think that relief is given in some cases now where it is more a question of charity than necessity?—I dare say. There is very little done in that way either. There might be a little generosity, that is all.

22368. Is there anything else you would like to add?—No. I think I agree with Mr. O'Leary's evidence except as far as I have mentioned.

Tobarcurry Union, examined.

22369. And reclaimed?—And not to meet the associates they meet in workhouses. You explained there about a girl of eighteen years; she may make a mistake, and it would send her from her home to a workhouse.

22370. Then, as regards lunatics and feeble-minded people, do you think the workhouse is the proper place for them?—I think for the class of those that are in Tobarcurry Workhouse it is a proper place; they can get on very well; there are some of these harmless lunatics; they work well.

22371. They are useful in the house?—Yes.

22372. Then you don't see that there would be any hardship in leaving them in Tobarcurry?—No, sir.

22373. As regards tramps and casuals?—We are infested with them.

22374. Would you be in favour of any legislation to stop that evil?—Yes; there has been a suggestion that there should be some place like a convict prison for them, to get a trade in.

22375. Well, some place, not so much of punishment as of detention?—Yes, if they got a trade. There is many a man knocking about the country, and if he could get employment—

22376. If he was employed on a building, and got his arms and hands and back accustomed to work?—And, more than that, if he was taught shoemaking.

22377. Do you think it would be a wise thing to give trades?—Yes, I would to the young tramps.

22378. Do you think it would be a wise thing to give these people trades, such as could not be obtained by the poorer ratepayers for their children; do you think it might not be better to bring them up as labourers?—I don't think there would be so much expense in giving them a trade, and it would not be any hardship on the ratepayers.

22379. Do you think it would not be putting these people into a better position than the children of a great many ratepayers could hope to be?—It would not.

22380. There are a good many honest labouring men who keep out of workhouses, who could not make their children shoemakers or tailors?—They could if they wished.

Mr. DOMINGO
HANCOCK

Sept. 20, 1904.
Mr. Donald
Heery.

22394. They could not pay a fee—No, but they would be generally taken without a fee.

22395. They could not afford to keep them when they were getting no wages?—Some of them could not.

22396. Is it not your experience that at present labour is very scarce for farming purposes?—Yes, but these cramps would not labour on a farm.

22397. Not unless they were trained to it?—Then I don't think they would work on a farm. They could, any moment, get labour on a farm.

22398. But they are going about with hands as fine as clerks; they have no muscles?—They have no muscles, it is true; and I don't think they would ever make farm labourers no matter how trained.

22399. You would be opposed to closing Tobacerry Workhouse except keeping the hospital open for the sick?—I think the present Poor Laws just as good a method as can be adopted. In Tobacerry, if a poor person gets his leg broken, would he not bleed to death before he got to Sligo.

22400. Such a case as that would go to the Tobacerry Hospital?—Then it is no economy in the work, because you would have to keep up a staff of officials in Tobacerry for the hospital.

22401. You would only have to keep up the doctor, nurse, and chaplain; you would have no master, matron, porter, or waste people?—Supposing you amalgamate Tobacerry and Sligo, won't you have to put up more buildings in Sligo.

22402. Hardly. I think if you took the children, lunatics, tramps, and mothers of illegitimate children out of Sligo Workhouse there ought to be room then for all other classes?—That is so; however, in my opinion, and I think it is the opinion of the body of ratepayers, there would be no economy as far as Tobacerry is concerned.

22403. They don't want to lose their little workhouse?—They don't want to mix with the Sligo people; we can steer our own little ship.

22404. You were in a minority on that question at the meeting held for the purpose?—I was.

22405. And we have not any of the majority here to express their views?—No, they fell back since.

22406. Do you think some of the ratepayers told them they made a mistake?—I believe that; and the whole body of ratepayers is against amalgamation with Sligo.

22407. Even if it was an economy?—Even if it was an economy, because I think it would be a hardship on some of the sick poor.

22408. The sick poor will be left there in any case, according to this idea that was suggested?—There are about 124 paupers in Tobacerry, and they are mostly all old and decrepit people, and it would be a very great hardship to remove them to Sligo; they are among their own people in Tobacerry, and are visited from time to time.

22409. That is, the sick are visited. Have you ever found out, as we have, that the number of visits paid to the aged and infirm is very small, indeed?—I know it is small, but the unfortunate old men of eighty-eight years of age, or eighty, or very old men like that, it is death to them to remove them from Tobacerry; it is their native place; they have a home made there, and it would not be any sort of charity at all to remove them; it would be a heartless evasion to take and cart them here to Sligo.

22410. Mr. MURKIN?—If the Guardians could give them out-door relief in their own locality, that hardship would be removed?—Some of them have no place of residence.

22411. It is a very cheerful thing for old people to be confined in the thick atmosphere of the workhouse day-room the greater part of the year. Better give 3s. or 4s. a week, and let them live outside?—I don't think it would be much economy, because no person stays, in my opinion, in Tobacerry Workhouse who has any other place to stay in. We generally give them out-door relief if they have any place to stay in.

22412. These old people cost the ratepayers about 7s. or 8s. a week in the best?—They don't cost that much; 3s. 6d. is the average in Tobacerry.

22413. That might be simply for the food, but when you take in all the other charges, you find they cost £17 to £19 a year. Those poor people could live nicely on 4s. a week; they would have some freedom and some little comfort, that they don't enjoy at present. Don't you think it would be a good thing if the Guardians had the power to board these people out on those conditions?—Certainly; no people would be a better judge than the Guardians; but I would say every decision should pay for itself, as in all times.

22414. Many witnesses agree with you in that?—Because no member of a Board of Guardians knows where the destitution comes in or where there is need more needed than the member elected for the division; he knows the amount that is required, and when he knows it is rated on the division he represents he will not recommend to the board to give any more than he thinks is necessary.

Mr. WILLIAM MITCHELL, J.P., examined.

22415. CHAIRMAN.—You are one of the Guardians of Drogheda West?—Yes, sir.

22416. What is the opinion of the Guardians on the question of the keeping up of their workhouse?—Well, I think the opinion of the majority of the Guardians is against amalgamation.

22417. Have there been any advocates of amalgamation there?—There have been some.

22418. Are there many?—They are in a very small minority.

22419. If a hospital for the treatment of the sick were left at Drogheda West, and if only those people who are able to travel or could be brought distances without risk to them, if only those people were removed to Sligo, do you think the Drogheda West people would still have the objection to closing the great part of their workhouse, leaving the provision for the treatment of the sick there still?—I think they would.

22420. What would the objection be?—The distance is very far from Drogheda West to the workhouse of Sligo, it is twenty-four miles; the union extends twelve or fourteen miles farther away, nearly forty miles, and I don't see myself how any poor or anybody could be benefited by bringing them so far into Sligo.

22421. What part of the union would be as much as forty miles away?—Ardrinnee.

22422. There are in Drogheda West Union?—They are not at present; you can take two miles off thirty-seven, thirty-five miles.

22423. Is Bannacree in your union?—It is.

22424. Moyview, I believe, is in Ballina?—That is in Ballina.

22425. Would the Devil River be the boundary?—I could not tell you. I am at the extreme Sligo end. I live only ten miles from here. I am the furthest

off Guardian from Drogheda West; I live at Ballina, part of Donard.

22426. There is very little population on the road between Drogheda West Workhouse and the main road to Ballina?—I am with you there; it is a small population, but from the workhouse to Sligo it is thickly populated.

22427. And there is a thick population between Keshmonee and Eskelley?—Very thick; it is congested.

22428. I suppose the most distant populous place if the Drogheda Union was broken up would be Keshmonee from Sligo?—And Castlesmonee.

22429. How far is Keshmonee?—Over thirty miles, that is the shortest road; in fact it is from there we are getting all our peapars, and all our out-door relief nearly comes from there.

22430. That is very largely a fishing population—a population that depends on summer earnings through visitors, and things of that sort?—Yes; it is a resort for people coming there for bathing.

22431. And help?—Yes, they make help along the shore.

22432. You have a good deal of poverty there?—There is a good deal of poverty; the holdings are small and the people are poor in consequence.

22433. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you wish to say anything as to out-door relief, or the question of using?—I have ready, sir, an objection against the present system, because cases come up there for relief; I know nothing at all about them; I don't know who they are; I am dependent upon the Guardian of that district; I will ask him: "Is this man entitled to relief?" That man may have a big heart, he does not like to refuse, he

Mr. William
Mitchell.

Sept. 20, 1905.

Mr. William
Wheeler.

cause he knows he will pay very little of it, it will all go on the union, and I would be for the smallest ratings area that could be made, because people take more interest. Like Mr. Callery, I am a long time a Guardian, about thirty years, and I am now Chairman of the District Council. I was in Sligo Union, too; rated for both unions. Mr. Callery's opinions represent the opinions of the Sligo people. Under the old system, when Sligo was 2s. or 3s. in the £, we were only 2d. or 3d.; and now that we are asked to help the Sligo people so, I don't wonder at Mr. Callery giving that evidence; it is good enough for the Sligo people.

22434. Mr. Callery said the increase in Sligo was not due to out-door relief, it was due to the system. I agree with him it is the system; it is the system of union rating that makes them richer and us poorer.

22435. You think, in any case, there is close supervision when the area of change is small?—I am perfectly aware of it; I know it for a fact.

22436. You have experience of both methods, and you think the advantages are on the side of the smaller area?—The smaller the area the more attentive he is to his business; that is my experience.

22437. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think there would be any hardship by the refusal of relief if the area was small?—I never knew of any hardship.

22438. We had a suggestion from a witness in another part of the country that it would be a fair thing to find out and ascertain, by inquiry or some formal way, what would be the average or fair out-door relief, and to fix that amount; say, for your electoral division £1 a week, or 10s., or whatever it would be, and then to say, "Well, now, we consider that is the fair thing," and that might be put on the union-at-large; but if you exceed that, anything that goes over 10s. or £1 a week, or whatever the fixed sum may be that will have to be paid by the electoral division, that would go part of the way to prevent any further abuses, would it not?—It would be a good thing for the purpose, I am sure, because they were sure of getting it whether we liked it or not.

22439. Oh, no, you would not be bound to give it, you could pay less—I thought it would be a sliding scale.

22440. You would not be bound to pay them anything?—We would have to pay them that or nothing. 22441. Supposing it was found out on inquiry that in your electoral division the people were getting 15s. a week, and supposing it were proved or established satisfactorily that 5s. of that 15s. was considered unnecessary, and 10s. a week would be ample, then what would happen would be the Guardians would know that they could not exceed 10s. a week for out-door relief on the union-at-large in that division; but if that division wanted any increase of the 10s., then they would have to pay 5s. or 10s. extra out of the pocket of the electoral division?—I would be for taking it all out of the electoral division. I believe it was the best system, and worked better than the system at present. It made Guardians be more particular; it made them attend our meetings better, and they took more interest in the working of the Poor Law Board than they do at present; that is my experience of matters, and I have been in the room all the time. 22442. You think there was a better attendance under the old system?—A better attendance. It is very hard to drum up a quorum at present. What is everybody's business is nobody's. I have been at Boardroom several times in the past year, but could not get a quorum—could not get three. In old times I never saw a board without a quorum.

22443. What would be your average attendance about, when there was not an appointment—what would be your average attendance at the present time for ordinary business?—We sometimes have a full board when there is something very exciting going on. 22444. I am not including the fixing of rate, or anything like that?—I would say four or five.

22445. How many Guardians have you on the board?—Thirty-seven. We require seven for a quorum in the District Council; I am only Chairman of the District Council; it is seldom I can get a quorum at all; we can get three for the Board of Guardians well enough.

Mr. JOHN CONWAY, Chairman, Drogheda West Union, examined.

Mr. John
Conway.

22446. CHAIRMAN.—You are Chairman of the Drogheda West Board of Guardians?—Yes.

22447. You have heard the evidence of the Chairman of the Rural District Council?—Yes.

22448. Do you agree with him generally in his evidence?—I do.

22449. Is there anything he said in which you would differ from him?—Scarcely anything.

22450. You think the union ought to stay as it is?—That is our belief; that is the feeling of the members of the board and of the ratepayers at large.

22451. You prefer electoral division rating to union rating?—I do, by all means.

22452. Is your board practically unanimous on that?—Practically; they passed a resolution the first time the matter came up before them, and were unanimous when the full board was summoned.

22453. Keshay and Rannicmore are the only places that are any approach to a town in your union?—Yes.

22454. Would the Guardians prefer union or divisional rating for these places?—I believe the bulk of them would prefer divisional rating. I am paying rates on a valuation of £60 in two divisions, Keshay and Killyglass; they were the two highest-rated divisions when it was divisional rating; consequently, when I am saying I would be in favour of divisional rating, I am speaking against my own interest.

22455. It would be against your own interest in Keshay?—It would, and in Killyglass, or rather Carteenmore West, where I am paying on another farm, and they were the two highest rated divisions almost in the union, but all the same I would be in favour of divisional rating.

22456. Do you think that the present union-at-large rating or expenditure is higher than under the old electoral division rating?—I don't see how I can answer that question very well; it is going up.

22457. Has the expenditure increased under the head of outdoor relief or any other head since the Act of 1882?—Very little under the head of outdoor relief.

22458. And you have not done much to your hospital to cause expenses there?—No, not so much indeed.

22459. So I suppose your expenses have not gone up very much?—Very little; the feeling of the members of the Board and of the ratepayers at large is that things should be left as they are.

22460. Even if there was a hospital left, you think it would be better to keep all the inmates?—That is the belief of the ratepayers and the representatives.

22461. Is there anything you would like to add?—No, except that with regard to the removal of the poor, it would be a great hardship if they had to be removed thirty miles; the bulk in the workhouse at present are in hospital.

22462. They are aged, and infirm, and chronic people?—Yes.

22463. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you board out any children?—Only two. I am a member of the Board for the last twenty-five years, and I have only known of two or three being boarded out.

22464. You have a number in the house just now?—A small number.

22465. Twelve or so?—Scarcely twelve.

22466. Do you not think they would be better out side?—Perhaps so, indeed.

22467. Learning the life of the ordinary farmer?—Yes. I am sure it would be a better life for them.

22468. There is a great need for domestic help in the country?—A great deal.

22469. It would benefit the ratepayers and give them some interest in the money they spend in the support of the house?—Yes, I would approve of it.

Sept. 29, 1896.

Dr. MacDowall, Surgeon, Co. Infirmary, examined.

Dr. MacDowall.

22476. CHAIRMAN.—You are the Surgeon of the County Sligo Infirmary?—I have been the surgeon since 1876.

22477. Would you kindly just mention, in your own way, any points you would like to bring before the Commission about the infirmary?—I have been surgeon since the year 1876; previously Dr. Little was the surgeon, and when I came here in 1876 it was a very popular institution. I think it has certainly kept up its popularity since—in fact, steadily gained in the confidence of the public. In recent years there have been an increasing number of patients; last year, for example, we treated over 600 intern patients.

22478. And how many externs?—They amounted to somewhere about 1,700. Of those 600 intern patients, the remarkable fact is that an enormous number come from outside of the ten-mile area; of the extern patients of the infirmary very nearly a half come from outside the five-mile area, and a larger proportion still come from outside the ten-mile area.

22479. Have you got any table in your annual report showing the results?—Yes, I could produce those. Of these 600 patients a large number are important surgical cases, accidents and a good many urgent medical cases. The infirmary, in my opinion, at present is in much too isolated a position. I think it does not occupy really the important position it should occupy in the county. We are governed by some twenty-six gentlemen, twenty-three of whom are selected by the County Council, and three of whom are chosen from the old governors every three years. We are under no scheme of inspection whatever; that is Governmental inspection; nor is there any central authority, so as to see that the hospital is thoroughly well-equipped, and able to look after sanitary matters.

22480. Would you be in favour of an inspection by the Local Government Board?—I certainly would; it would keep up the efficiency of the place. Our staff is also too small; a staff that does as much medical and surgical work as we do should have a resident medical surgeon, who would devote all his time to the hospital.

22481. A yearly appointment?—A yearly appointment. You would get perhaps a young man fresh from the schools, that would be a class of man we would want; they come from the metropolitan hospitals, and want a year's rest and study, and their help would be very valuable. I think in any scheme for the amalgamation of vestries and the creation of district hospitals, the infirmary should be considered in the first case. The infirmary is the most important unit in any well-considered scheme which aims at consolidation, and giving the poor man who suffers from disease or injury the best medical or surgical skill available. This is the aim, I think, of every earnest Poor Law reformer. You would have the local hospitals at Broomes West and Tobermory in touch and in communication, and with the right of transferring patients to the county infirmary. Certainly in touch.

22482. Would they have a right of transferring patients that were suitable cases?—All acute cases or cases amenable to treatment. The infirmary should, I think, be treated also more generously. In Sligo we have an annual grant of £1,400 per annum, and I certainly think we could do very much more good if we had a few hundreds more a year. Modern surgery, for example, requires modern appliances, which are very expensive—surgical appliances are very expensive, and surgery is much more expensive than some time ago, when people were content to work with flinted steel and carbide oil and gasps; the nurses are now more expensive.

22483. Would you say that county infirmaries should be allowed to incur such necessary expenditure as would be required, subject to audit?—I would be quite content to leave the matter in the hands of my own Board, if they had the power. I would like to give them the power to spend as much as they thought was absolutely necessary. The infirmaries, I think, should form part of a general comprehensive scheme; in the infirmaries I think only really acute cases should be treated, and cases amenable to treatment that we could keep in for a short time and send out again; all surgical cases and accidents; for example, we ought to treat acute lung cases—but all chronic cases of the lungs and heart, and chronic obstruction of the legs, should be treated in the district hospitals. Infirmaries, I think, should be always ready, thoroughly equipped, to treat at any time any surgical emergency and sur-

gical operations except such as might be necessary to be treated by specialists—eye operations and peculiar diseases of women. If the infirmaries were placed under a sanitary authority, and made a unit in a general and comprehensive scheme, it would be a very important matter. I am quite sure that most, if not all, the infirmaries, would very soon reach a higher standard and be very much more efficient than they are at present.

22484. You have nothing to do with any fever hospital, but I suppose what you say about the county infirmary would equally apply to the fever hospitals?—Yes, it is hanging in the air by itself too, a thing under no authority; no new infirmary appointments, I think the central authority should have a vote in the interests of the poor and of the public, so that really only men sufficiently qualified should be appointed.

22485. You mean a man should not be appointed surgeon to the infirmary who had not operative experience?—I would put in a clause that no man should be appointed who had not been a house surgeon in some of the large metropolitan hospitals, and I would also have a similar veto in the appointment of matrons and nurses. In my infirmary at present I am sure my Board would not appoint nurses not properly qualified, but we have no rule to that effect. If it was done there would be no power of appeal, and one could quite imagine such a thing might be done. The district hospitals, I think, on the other hand, should be equipped for the treatment of diseases of a chronic type; they should be worked independently of the workhouse.

22486. They might have emergency operations that could not be removed further?—Then the infirmary surgeon, under the new scheme, should be called in; it ought to be part of his work, if properly paid, as infirmary surgeon.

22487. Dr. Browne.—To take his instrument with him, and have his dressings with him, too?—Yes; I think all these dispensaries, workhouses, and infirmaries ought to be intimately mixed up together; and one trying to help the other, instead of, as we are in the county infirmary, occupying a lofty position and removed from the others. I have been several times lottery in the workhouses, and one cannot help seeing a very great improvement in the treatment of the sick; the past history of the treatment of sick paupers is not a pleasant one at all.

22488. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Gellery mentioned there was a great improvement?—I was doing duty there on two occasions, and the kind treatment I think the patients receive there now has done much to remedy old evils, but much has to be done yet in thoroughly popularizing the workhouse infirmaries. Then, on the other hand, the dispensaries do an immense deal of valuable outdoor work. We are not supposed in the infirmary to give medicine or prescriptions to extern cases except in special cases.

22489. Do you give dressings?—Yes. I would like to see more combined work between the dispensary medical officers and the infirmaries. It is impossible for the poor to be treated really in their homes without proper nursing and constant supervision, and such nursing as they have in hospital is very necessary. They get some really in their own homes, which are often cold and noisy, and devoid of proper bedding.

22490. Have you any knowledge of the system that exists at Enniskillen and Lisburn for paying patients?—I have.

22491. There the governing body get each patient to sign an agreement on coming in to pay whatever the governors and medical officers, in consulting with members of the committee, think the man could fairly pay; it might be as little as 6d. a week, or the full cost of maintenance, and we received very interesting evidence from both these infirmaries, showing that there is a very large annual revenue at each from the pay patients, and the evidence was that the patients themselves were better pleased to pay a little and enjoy the independent position of pay patients rather than go in as free patients: how anything of that kind been tried in Sligo?—Not yet, although ultimately, for the sake of the rates, I think we will have to do it. A great many patients come in to us from the adjoining counties just over the boundaries of Mayo and Leitrim, and we charge them a day, and they are very pleased to pay it; we only do that in exceptional cases. In surgical cases, for instance, in Leitrim,

Sept. 20, 1904.

Dr.
Meddison.

they have a long way to go to Carrick-on-Shannon, and we charge them 1s. a day, and they have always paid that without any grudge.

22490. The Keshilleen evidence was that they look on it rather that even a labouring man who makes 12s. to 15s. a week, if a child of his should get ill, the keep of the child would come to certainly 6d. a week, and they assess that sum, or something like that, and then if a trader of the town comes in who can pay they ask him to pay the full cost of his maintenance, including perhaps an extra nurse—they might ask a man to pay from 22 to 25 s. a week, or in some cases as little as 6d. a week, and their revenue from that source is considerable. I think even at pays the surgeon's salary?—We want to increase our revenue very badly; we are not able to carry on with £1,400 a year. I will speak over the matter with my governors.

22491. Dr. BROWN.—You mentioned about a comprehensive scheme of reform: would you give us some of the details of what you refer to?—I mean making the infirmary a unit, as a sort of centre, the district hospitals sending in cases to it as that varied acute treatment, and also the Dispensary men.

22492. You would allow the dispensary men the power to send a patient to the county infirmary?—Yes.

22493. In fact unify the whole treatment of the sick?—Certainly; the same thing in the event of a cottage hospital being at Drogheda West to work with it, and it might be arranged that the infirmary surgeons should go there.

22494. It is a common thing in Dublin and large cities for a surgeon to take his own nurse to private cases; you could do the same in a poor case?—I say that entirely in the interests of the public, because I have been sent long distances like Drogheda West and received a large fee for going there, but I think it should be part of the scheme that the county infirmary should be the central institution, and the county surgeons, acting in union with distant parishes. In Drogheda West people complain they are too far off, and don't receive sufficient benefit from the county infirmary; I think that is a fair complaint, therefore, I think the benefits of the infirmary should be increased in every way.

22495. You think the salary of the surgeons should include that he should go to those distant places without any extra fee?—Yes, or for a nominal fee.

22496. And in that way those districts would gain the advantage and the experience of the county infirmary?—They would.

22497. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose it is a fact that a very large number of local district hospital doctors do not like having operations, major operations?—They do not, as a rule; there are some men who are very glad to get any opportunity, but the majority do not, they do not like the responsibility.

22498. I mean such a change as that would be welcomed by the local doctors; they would be very glad to have an operating surgeon coming from the county infirmary and conducting it with them?—I think it would be well received; on the other hand, I do know some men who are most skilful and only too glad when they do get an operative case, but I think that the number is relatively small; men may be extremely good physicians, but the hand is not constantly in practice for surgery.

22499. Dr. BROWN.—I suppose you have frequently come across patients who would rather pay than not?—Yes, a complaint was made to me only to-day by a man who wanted his wife taken into the infirmary as a paying patient; I could not take her in; I have no isolation ward nor sufficient nursing; if we had more staff and a few wards we could take in such cases and treat them.

22500. In Omagh, for example, Dr. Thompson has a large number of private wards, and for £1 a week he takes in any people that like to come in for the benefit of the place. The county infirmary in Sligo is very

near the County Leitrim; you said something about taking in patients from Leitrim—would it not be better if there was some arrangement with Leitrim that the county should pay for those patients?—Yes. Mr. Dolan wrote to me some time ago suggesting such a thing. Drogheda is within an hour from Sligo by railway; it is a very populous district, but it is literally cut off from Carrick-on-Shannon; the people there have no benefit from their own county hospital.

22501. CHAIRMAN.—There are even more remarkable cases—there is Donaghy, where the county infirmary is on the edge of the county, not a bounded parish from the boundary, and there are doctors in that county of fifty or sixty miles. It is greatly used by the people of Tyrone on the other side of the river.

Dr. BROWN.—About the consumptive patients, could you give us any evidence?—It is a very great difficulty with me. A large number of consumptive cases have come to my hospital. I think it was your Chairman took the matter up in the last instance. We used to have to frequently refuse to take in cases of advanced phthisis; I used to recommend them to go to the workhouse where they would be well looked after under the care of the nurse. They had an objection to do so, but under the new arrangement they have an excellent ward at the workhouse; I have frequently advised patients to go, and they seemed very glad to go. I refuse to treat any cases but incipient phthisis. It is most important that in the district hospitals there should be accommodation for these cases, otherwise they remain at home expectorating over the road floor and spreading the disease.

22502. Do you not think that there should be some arrangement for two or three counties?—Yes. I hear from the number of people trying to go to Newmarket that if there was any properly-equipped place for the treatment of phthisis it would be made very great use of.

22503. These district hospitals often require an extra nurse; do you think it would be a saving to the ratepayers of the County generally if there was some arrangement with the county infirmary where they would have extra nurses that one could be drafted to Drogheda West or Tubercular?—That is my idea; I think these institutions should be all interdependent, working together.

22504. CHAIRMAN.—Talking of what Dr. Bigger is speaking of, would you be in favour of establishing a nursing scheme for the county which would mean the training of these nurses locally at your infirmary in conjunction with your infirmary and the workhouse, as at Waterford, and establish a trained staff of nurses, of Sligo girls, here, and then send them backwards and forwards to assist the nurse in the workhouse and in the district hospitals when required?—I think it would be a very good plan.

22505. Dr. BROWN.—They would also be available for private cases on payment of fees. It would be a source of revenue for the infirmary itself, as Dr. Thompson does in Omagh?—Yes, I often get his nurses in my part of the county.

22506. Is it not unfair to the Sligo girls to bring in Tyrone girls?—We have no way of training them here.

22507. CHAIRMAN.—If that was got over?—Yes, certainly.

22508. You could easily, with the number of medical men in Sligo, arrange for a system of lectures, and you had a house surgeon?—I think a house surgeon is very necessary in a hospital to be always on the spot when the surgeon is away.

22509. They have such a scheme started in Waterford, and it is working extremely well, the county infirmary and the workhouse joining?—Yes. You get the best class of men—young men who come fresh from the schools; it is very good to rub them up against old surgeons and keep them up-to-date.

22510. Dr. BROWN.—Good for both?—Good for both.

Mr. HENRY BARNHAM, Vice-Chairman, Co. Council, examined.

Mr. Henry
Barnham.

22511. CHAIRMAN.—Are you connected with any of the local bodies?—With all of them—County Council, District Council, Poor Law Guardians, District Asylums, County Infirmary, and Fever Hospital.

22512. We have not had any evidence yet about the Fever Hospital; it is managed by a committee of 20 members?—Yes. I am not so conversant with the Fever Hospital, I am not a member of it, although the

County Council appoints the members, I am not a working member.

22513. Do you know much about that hospital?—No.

22514. The county infirmary has been wonderfully improved of recent years?—I believe it has.

22515. Great structural improvements and general improvements; is there anything about that that you

Sept. 20, 1904.
 Mr. Henry
 Dimeson.

but like to say I—What I would like to mention about the county infirmary is that I think the sum that the Act of Parliament states is entirely too small—£2,400. I would like to see the County Council have power to increase that sum, that is provided the necessity arises for the increase. I think myself from my experience of the working of the county infirmary that sometimes serious cases, and patients have not been taken in on the ground that there are insufficient funds. I have seen patients myself, and they have to be told to wait until a vacancy comes.

22513. Would you be in favour of limiting the amount or allow them, like a Board of Guardians, to spend as much as would be necessary subject to audit?—Yes; in fact I have a resolution to that effect, practically coming on, that we appoint an auditor and avail ourselves of the power which the enactment of Dr. Thompson brought in, that we would get the power to increase.

22514. Mr. MURKIN.—Don't you think that would be giving the committee a large power considering that so few outside people attend the meetings?—I would not.

22515. Very few people from Tisbury and outlying places attend the meetings?—I have so far away a Tisbury, and I think it would be the duty of a man who undertook the responsibility to attend.

22516. CHAIRMAN.—How far do you come?—Fifteen miles, from Chisworthy. I don't think that—it may curtail the power of the committee, but I have never found the committee since the Local Government Act has been in operation exceeding that power; on the contrary, they are more for reducing it, keeping down the rates. An instance may occur when the rates unaccountably must be raised. I dare say it may have a tendency to increase the power, but I think the power of the committee is crippled, and it would be a step in the right direction.

22517. Would you give the same power of expenditure as the Board of Guardians possess?—The Board of Guardians is entirely under the control of the Local Government Board.

22518. Their expenditure is practically in their own hands subject to audit and compliance with statutory provisions such as all bodies have?—I would, of course; I would be inclined to give them that; we have the same power in the asylum.

22519. What is your view about the amalgamation of unions?—I would approve of amalgamation of unions with a provision that there would be added to the union that you amalgamate with, where the numbers increase, some industrial houses to train the paupers of that institution in some trade or mode of making a livelihood, and also some means of giving employment to the able-bodied people, and particu-

larly to the tramps who are becoming in Silke Union exceedingly numerous. Efforts have been made again and again and resolutions passed that they do a certain amount of labour—I am referring to the tramps—that they do a certain amount of stones and manual labour that never can be done with the officials. I think they have not sufficient power; there should be some veto put on their admission. If you take a tramp from twelve or fourteen miles from here he gets on and locates himself in the nearest poorhouse: he goes through my place to Ballyshannon possibly, and one week, and he continues that, particularly in the winter months, daily. What I would suggest is that some provision should be made that he would be kept there until he would earn, in manual labour, if he is a labourer, or some other thing, what his cost would be, or that he should not be admitted without some card of admission. If he applies to the relieving officer, or at the gate of the house saying he is destitute, in his case; you cannot put him out. If he applies to me as a Guardian for a ticket, and says if he does not get a ticket he will sleep out, and may be lose his life if it is a frosty night or a wet night.

22520. Mr. MURKIN.—Would you be in favour of having the English law, which enables Guardians to detain tramps several days?—The cure would be worse than the disease in that case; if you had not some remunerative employment for him you would see too much of him.

22521. The idea was that there should be a real workhouse, where tramps could be employed?—That would be my idea.

22522. And paid for the work they did?—If they did more work than the cost of their food, I would certainly give them a start; if they earned four half-crowns in four days and their food only cost two half-crowns, I would give them the balance. Then as regards the workhouse hospitals, I would prefer them to become district hospitals.

22523. CHAIRMAN.—You would cut them off from the workhouse?—Yes.

22524. I don't know whether you were present this morning when we went into that question with Mr. O'Leary, and showed that one way of cutting them off the workhouse would be by taking out of the workhouse all classes except the sick and infirm?—If you had a rural district hospital, that would take away the taint of pauperism; you would get a sick person to come in there and pay for his maintenance; we have no place for them but the county infirmary, and the county infirmary sometimes is crowded, and they have not sufficient attendants there; they have only one doctor, and I think about four nurses; they have forty-five beds.

The Sitting terminated.

Sept. 21, 1904 FORTY-FIFTH PUBLIC SITTING.—WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21st, 1904.

At the Court-house, Carrick-on-Shannon.

Present:—MR. MICKS, (Chairman), MR. MURNAGHAN, and DR. COET BIDDER.

MR. T. W. DELANEY appeared for the Mohill Rural District Council.

MR. JAMES A. KIERMAN appeared for Ballinamore Council.

MR. C. W. ALLYPOE appeared for Carrick-on-Shannon Board of Guardians.

MR. PATRICK MAGUIRE, Vice-Chairman, Co. Council, examined.

MR. PATRICK
MAGUIRE.

22522. CHAIRMAN.—You are a County Councillor?—I am Vice-Chairman of the County Council; I never acted as a Poor Law Guardian, and consequently I will express my views in general terms. I consider one workhouse in South Leitrim ample for the accommodation of all the poor in Mohill, Carrick-on-Shannon, and Bawnboy, who number less than 200. Mohill was built to accommodate 600 or 700; twenty years ago it contained over 200; to-day the number is thirty-eight, and the officials to-day number more than twenty years ago. It follows that the staff there could easily look after the poor of South Leitrim. I believe amalgamation would result in a substantial saving to the ratepayers; the district asylum has about 140 or 150 in excess of the proper number.

22523. That is in Sligo? That is in Sligo. There are about 250 harmless lunatics; these could be transferred to a disused workhouse which would relieve forever—I hope at least it would relieve forever—the existing congestion; I consider, also, that it would decrease the demand on the Irish Taxation Account by £1,300 a year, which would be a step in the right direction.

22524. Decrease your Parliamentary Grant?—Decrease the demand on the Irish Taxation Account; in point of expenditure it would be only 2s. in the auxiliary.

22525. You then think that 2s. would be enough?—I do think so; I certainly do.

22526. Because you are the first witness we have met who has given evidence to that effect?—I am partly aware since I came here that some go for 4s.; I do not. The Irish Taxation Account is a purely Irish fund, with about £70,000 or £80,000 of a contribution from the Treasury. Let me assume for a moment that there are about 4,000 imbeciles in the Irish workhouses; if these were transferred to a fully-equipped asylum they would increase the demand on the Irish Taxation Account by about £42,000 a year, and that would render that account insolvent, and there is a clause in the Local Government Act that when that happens the deficit would be made up by direct taxation—the 2s. would be made up. For that reason I think it would be only right to go in for 2s. of a capitation, besides I believe a disused workhouse is *ipso facto* ready for the reception of these harmless patients on inmates.

22527. When you speak of South Leitrim I suppose you mean the part south of Lough Allen?—I do.

22528. And you think one workhouse would be enough for that?—One workhouse would be enough, and from the geographical position Mohill should be the workhouse, and all the poor now in Carrick-on-Shannon and Bawnboy could be easily looked after there.

22529. You contemplate the abolition of Bawnboy?—And Carrick-on-Shannon; and I would be in favour of withdrawing Carrick-on-Shannon for the reception of the harmless lunatics now in the asylum.

22530. Mohill has railway communication with Ballinamore and also with Carrick-on-Shannon?—Well, yes.

22531. And then from Ballinamore you have the railway to Dromahaire?—Yes.

22532. For that reason you think Mohill is a better centre than Carrick?—Oh, yes; Carrick being on the borders of Roscommon it would be inconvenient to send the poor from the extreme south-east of Leitrim over here—I suppose it would mean about twenty miles. From Sligo here the railway accommodation is very good.

22533. Is there any other matter that you wish to speak on?—I don't think so; of course being a Poor Law Guardian I don't wish to go into details.

22534. Have you ever been a Poor Law Guardian?—No; that is what I have not been; I wish to give my views generally.

22535. What is your general opinion as a ratepayer?—On the question of amalgamation, I believe it is very essential, and more especially it makes it do so; so on account of the congestion of the asylum, if we have not amalgamation there will have to be about £50,000 expended on building the wings at Sligo.

22536. You propose Carrick-on-Shannon as an auxiliary asylum?—Yes, that is what I advocate; it is on the line to Sligo and it would be very advantageous to transfer them up here, not that I have any interest in Mohill, but it is the centre of the South Leitrim, and it is ample, having been built to accommodate 600 or 700; the accommodation is better now than it was forty years ago, and consequently seeing that we have less than 200 poor in South Leitrim there is ample space there for them.

22537. Would you prefer not answering any questions about the treatment of the destitute in workhouses?—I will answer anything as far as I know.

22538. You are aware now that there are a large number of different classes maintained in each workhouse?—Yes.

22539. You know that you have in Mohill, for instance sick, aged and infirm, lunatics, and even who come in to be confined of children, and children and tramps and casuals?—Yes.

22540. And hardly any of any other class; but virtually takes in the whole, and you have this large number of different classes of people grouped together in one building; a great many witnesses, in various parts of the country, have given evidence to the effecting to that system and suggesting that methods might be taken for having a better classification of the inmates by removing them from a workhouse—to instance sending all the lunatics either to the present asylum or to an auxiliary asylum—would you approve of that?—That would have my approval undoubtedly; that is in an auxiliary asylum; because if they were sent from Mohill and every other asylum in Ireland they would cost too much in a fully-equipped asylum.

22541. Do you think the cost of the asylum is very much more than in a workhouse; take the Sligo Asylum; do you think an inmate costs much more in Sligo than in the Mohill workhouse?—I certainly do, except in this instance; in our workhouses we have a larger staff at the moment than twenty years ago, whereas we have not half the number of patients; it is the staff adds on the money; they are looking after each other; they have very little else to do.

Sept. 21, 1904

Mr. Patrick Maguire.

22543. The increase is chiefly in the nursing staff looking after the sick?—Yes.

22544. You would not cut down the nursing attention to the sick?—No, I would not.

22545. That is where the increase comes in; the other officers are as they were?—Yes; I believe amalgamation is the cure for that; we have not quite 200 here; we will not have in Mohill, after the amalgamation, as many as twenty years ago, and it is very clear that would be for the benefit of the ratepayers and would keep the officials wholesomely employed.

22546. People are rather surprised when they look closely into it, the cost in the asylum is not so much more than in the workhouse; the Poor Law Guardian, when showing the cost of an inmate, only shows the cost of his food, and sometimes of his clothing, whereas as far as an asylum they take the whole annual cost of the asylum under every heading and divide that by the number of patients, and that gives you the yearly cost; if you adopt the same principle in the workhouse and divide the entire cost in the workhouse by the entire number of inmates you will find it a very much higher cost than is shown under the present statistics?—I am aware of that, but I am still of opinion, on account of there being so few patients, it is the establishment that takes up the money.

22547. You would rather increase the number in suitable cottages?—Quite so. I am well aware that at the present time the average cost in Mohill, taking everything into account, is £25 for each pauper, and I should say it would not be very much more in the asylum proper, including the Capitalist Grant.

22548. You are aware that a number of women enter the workhouse with the object of having illegitimate children?—Yes, sir.

22549. It has been suggested, in some places, that that is a fruitful source of increase of pauperism, that these women have more children after a time and that their own children in turn become what you might call hereditary paupers; and suggestions have been made to us that it would be a very suitable thing that a girl, on the occasion of her first fall, instead of coming to the workhouse should be sent, at the expense of the rates, to a religious penitentiary, managed by whatever religious community the girl might belong to, and efforts should be made to reclaim her and start her as quickly as possible in some employment, and that her child should be retained for a year and a half or whatever the time might be before it could be turned out; the child should be boarded out if possible at the expense of the girl or of the father of the child, and that that class should in future be altogether excluded from workhouses and in the same way all children would disappear from workhouses by being boarded out; would such a change meet with your approval?—I think it would be most desirable and would be a great protective; the present system encourages the getting of illegitimate children; that would be a very good thing if it could be legally carried out.

22550. That would take out three classes from the workhouse—the lunatics, the mothers of illegitimate children, and the children themselves?—That, I believe, would be an excellent thing if it could be carried into effect.

22551. Then your suggestion about having one workhouse in South Leitrim would mean that all the sick and infirm for that district would go into one workhouse, be it Carrick, Mohill, or wherever it would be?—Yes.

22552. You would have them classified according to their condition and so forth?—Quite so.

22553. Would you propose to remove the sick from the hospital in their own neighbourhood, or would you think that an unfair hardship, putting Carrick out of the question for the moment, because here you have a county infirmary, but suppose a place, where there is no county infirmary like Manchesterhamilton or Mohill, if you were chosen to either of these workhouses do you think it would be a fair or proper treatment of the sick of the locality to oblige them to go very long distances, or would you keep open a small hospital there for the acutely sick that could not be removed?—As I understand permanently ill or curable.

22554. Curable, or at least amenable to cure?—There should be a local infirmary where they would be cured and then transferred.

22555. A district hospital?—A district hospital.

22556. Mr. MURKHAM—Here?—I may mention now, the county infirmary; I don't think the northern portion of the county—although they contribute a sum for its maintenance—wants a single individual here. There are a lot from Roscommon looked after here, and it is very little good to this county except Carrick-on-Shannon.

22557. Do they get any payment from Roscommon?—In very few cases, I think.

22558. We had evidence in Sligo that the Manchesterhamilton people who go to the Sligo Infirmary do pay it, a day?—That may happen here, but I am not aware of it.

22559. Do you think it would be a proper thing for us to recommend that patients coming from Roscommon across the water here, and in the same way from Manchesterhamilton to Sligo, that they should pay to the institution of the other county?—I think they should undoubtedly pay when going to another county.

22560. If the people themselves could not pay that it would be a proper case for the county to pay?—Precisely; it should be put on the rates of the district from which the patients come.

22561. About cessals or tramps, you see something of them?—Very often; I think amalgamation would decrease those.

22562. Would you adopt any stronger methods with them?—On that subject I have given very little attention; I would not like to give a personal opinion.

22563. It has been suggested—I am not now speaking of what you might call the itinerant poor of the parish or neighbourhood; there are certain old folk or people who go about and are welcome from house to house very much; excluding that class altogether and dealing with the professional tramps or vagrants—it has been suggested to us that these people are living on society and giving nothing for it, and in some cases bringing up families in idle courses to become tramps themselves; it has been suggested that these people might be taken and put into an institution, call it a workhouse proper, some people call it a labour colony, an institution where they would have to labour and labour for their support, and put them in there until such time as the magistrate might think fit, and in that way remove from the county all itinerant tramps who are, I think, pretty generally objected to?—That is so.

22564. Put them in there, not so much as a punishment but with a view of teaching them habits of industry, and as soon as they do know some occupation or have been taught to handle a spade or shovel then send them out with a written permission to go, and if they are found tramping about again then put them in for a longer period?—I consider that would be a very good thing.

22565. There are such institutions in Belgium and other places that are practically self-supporting, as far as possible; the idea is this, that these people should live in an institution by the efforts of their own labour?—In that case there should be a tract of land.

22566. Yes and a place for making rough clothing with a view of as little as possible of outside supplies going in?—I believe that would be an excellent thing if it were carried into effect.

22567. Mr. MURKHAM—In the scheme you have outlined you have not taken into consideration the other portion of the county; there is a large portion of the county represented by Manchesterhamilton as a centre; what would you suggest should be done to give it accommodation?—I would prefer the Chairman of the County Council, who represents that portion of the county to answer that. From conversations I understand there is only going to be one workhouse in North Leitrim, and I would leave it to him to deal with; I only deal with South Leitrim, the other part has very little connection with the south; so far as Poor Law business is concerned it can be taken independently I should say.

22568. You think where the workhouses exist at present there should be retained some accommodation for the sick of the locality?—I would be of that opinion—a district hospital, I should say, in each town.

22569. Have you any view to offer on the question of out-door relief as regards its extension or otherwise?—With regard to that I would suggest town ratings. I may again mention I have never been a Poor Law Guardian and consequently don't pretend to know minutely all in connection with Poor Law matters but I am aware very often the majority of the out-door relief is given in towns and the money expended

Sept. 21, 1904
Mr. Patrick
Maguire.

in towns, and consequently there should be a town rating to meet that, and I believe if there was you would not have so much out-door relief.

22570. Do you think that the old system of electoral division rating was a safer one than the union-at-large?—I am not aware what was the custom.

22571. The old system was to make each electoral division responsible for the poor of its area?—I believe

that would be the best system; it would concentrate attention upon the different districts, and, of course, bring home to the District Commissioners or Guardians representing the particular districts the amount of out-door relief given in the district; make them personally responsible. At the present time, when it is divided over a union, what is so man's particular business is not looked after.

Mr. PATRICK GATFORTH, J.P., Chairman, Co. Corneil, examined.

Mr. Patrick
Gatforth.

22572. CHAIRMAN.—You are the Chairman of the County Leitrim County Council?—Yes.

22573. Are you in the Manchesterham Union?—Yes.

22574. You have heard your Vice-Chairman's evidence?—Yes, sir.

22575. What is your view about the Poor Law system in North Leitrim?—If you would not mind I would give you a statement of my own as to what I might think would be desirable with regard to the county-at-large, as I have a practical knowledge of a large portion of it and a limited knowledge of the other part, at least a fairly good geographical knowledge of the entire county. Of course I believe that the present Poor Law system in the County Leitrim could be improved without causing any hardship or inconvenience, and ultimately result in a saving to the ratepayers. Of course under no circumstances would I sacrifice efficiency for economy; I believe two workhouses would be quite sufficient to meet the needs and requirements of the County Leitrim, one situated in North Leitrim and the other in the South. Of course, you see, owing to the geographical formation of Leitrim, as anybody by a glance at the map can see, it is absolutely impossible to do without having two workhouses. Manchesterham Workhouse, in my opinion, should be maintained on account of its central position; it is perfect—sanitary, and with water and hospital accommodation. The Keshmull rural district, that part of Leitrim attached as present to the Ballyshannon Union, should be amalgamated with the Manchesterham Union; the District Council have already passed a resolution asking to be amalgamated with Manchesterham, the County Council have unanimously passed a resolution endorsing that of the District Council.

22576. What union is Killybeggar in?—Manchesterham. One workhouse would be sufficient for South Leitrim, and from all the information I have been able to gather from people situated in what forms the three Rural Districts of South Leitrim the consensus of opinion points to Mahill as the most central and most convenient to be retained. What I mean by that is that that part of Carrick-on-Shannon Union in Carrick-on-Shannon Rural District, and that part of Bawnbeg, known as Ballymore Rural District, should be attached to Mahill Union. Now, of course, with regard to how you might meet the requirements of those people and districts, I would be in favour of establishing a hospital with six beds and a trained nurse attached at Keshmull and Ballymore.

22577. Under the dispensary doctor?—Yes, sir. Keshmull and Ballymore, and, I think, although no such facilities exist, for Drumshambo or Drumkieran, for they are very badly situated with regard to convenient hospital accommodation. Manchesterham Workhouse was built to accommodate 750; there are at present in it only 102. As to the actual number that is in Ballyshannon Union, from Leitrim, I am not actually certain, but I am of opinion, from what I learned last year, that it should be between twenty and twenty-five, so there is no fear of overcrowding. Mahill Workhouse had been built to accommodate 600 originally; there were 86 in it at the end of July, and in Carrick, at the end of July 1903 inmates, that means of course, I presume, the entire number, portion of which had come from Roscommon; in Bawnbeg, from Leitrim, there were only twenty-three, so there is no danger of overcrowding. The Carrick hospital should be merged in the county infirmary, and it discontinued as such.

22578. What discontinued as such?—The county infirmary. I come from North Leitrim, and I never send a patient to it.

22579. Your people go to Sligo?—No, to the union hospital.

22580. The great number go to Sligo Infirmary, we

get evidence yesterday?—No patients are admitted into Sligo Infirmary except under assumed names—apparently resident in County Sligo.

22581. They admit them?—Yes, but they must be paying patients, not otherwise.

Oh, yes, it is as paying patients at 1s. a day.

22582. Dr. Briggs.—It is a day does not cover their cost?—It covers the establishment cost.

22583. It does not cover the whole cost?—They might have a vacant bed.

22584. CHAIRMAN.—No, the other is larger?—They are making improvements at present.

22585. They would rather the Leitrim patients paid their way?—They are the only patients who do pay. If Carrick-on-Shannon Workhouse were closed I believe an auxiliary asylum for harmless lunatics should be established either in the workhouse or jail. The number of harmless lunatics in Sligo Asylum at present, fit to be removed, is between sixty-five and seventy, and as the greater majority of those are males—there are 210 males and 97 females—I believe a lunatic asylum should be confined to one sex alone. There is no overcrowding of females in the asylum at present. The primary reason for establishing an auxiliary asylum is that the asylum is at present overcrowded to the extent of 255 patients, for which, of course, the joint committee will have to provide accommodation, which, I understand from the estimate made out, will cost something about £20,000, without taking into consideration the furnishing of it, and that would, in my opinion, be a very serious charge—the repayment and interest—upon the mortgage of Leitrim and Sligo. It must be faced very soon, because at the last Board meeting we had a letter from the Board of Control threatening to withdraw the grant in aid unless we made ample provision for the lunatics committed to the asylum. To turn Carrick into an auxiliary asylum would be much cheaper; in fact I saw an estimate, that between £4,000 and £5,000 would make ample accommodation for as many patients as are at present in excess of the number which the asylum is able to accommodate, and, of course, Carrick-on-Shannon, besides, is within easy reach of almost any part of Sligo, and it is within reach of all parts of Leitrim, by railway communication. At present, in Leitrim, there are not a large number of harmless lunatics and imbeciles; in Leitrim the total number of imbeciles and epileptics does not number twenty, and those, of course, should be removed to the auxiliary asylum. I have seen the proposal of boarding out harmless lunatics as an experiment; it would meet with my approval, though I have not much belief in its ultimate efficiency. I know there are a number of patients in Sligo Asylum who are quite capable of taking care of themselves, but they happen to be committed there and nobody will take charge of them and they remain there; they do daily labour and are sent out into the town without anybody in charge of them; they are known as "lone patients," but they cannot be discharged as no one will take charge of them. As to the deserving and poor, I believe a grant should be made by Parliament in order to assist in supporting the deserving and poor without coming into the workhouse.

22586. Relief out of doors?—I would consider the term out-door relief objectionable. As a matter of fact the Government gives grants in aid of the maintenance of criminals, and I don't see why the Government, who have worked all their lives as best they could to make a living and are then unable to maintain themselves, should have recourse to the workhouse and be branded as paupers.

22587. But the relief, call it what you like, would be administered by the local Poor Law authorities. By the existing staff; I would not be in favour of increasing it; it is already embarras enough.

believe patients, who are in immediate necessity of the careful supervision of a doctor, should be admitted to the workhouse without having to go through the body of the board.

22558. You would make it a district hospital without any connection with destitution at all?—Yes, sir, I believe, I believe, should be committed to the reformatory or labour colony; that is at the beginning whenever they visited any workhouse officer than twelve months, and as it would be an experimental thing it should be a limited period.

22559. Would that be in order to test whether a man was really a tramp or not; if he came back a second time you would treat him as a real tramp?—Yes; that is the best test that he is a tramp; any of us might be tempted on the road and unable to obtain a decent lodgings and have to take the best shelter we could.

22560. In order to get rid of that union test, if a man knew if he went to the same workhouse in twelve months he would be locked up, it would make him enlarge his circle, but, all the same, he would be just as great a tramp. We have had the suggestion made to us that a bona fide man, really looking for work, should get some testimonials from some persons in his own neighbourhood, in a recognised position for giving such a testimonial, that he was out of work in his own locality, and had to go elsewhere looking for work, and a man having such a certificate would be afforded aid and shelter and lodging, but a man who could not show such a certificate would be treated as a simple tramp?—That is a question, to my mind, considering the present position of the country, that is a complicated one. There are reasons why I would withhold giving a certificate to a man and give it to another man who was not equally deserving.

22561. As a magistrate, you would not refuse a certificate to a man you knew was deserving of it?—Certainly not.

22562. But if you gave a certificate to a man, no matter what you thought of him, if you knew he was a labouring man, and could not get labour in the locality, you would give a certificate that he was going from Manchester to Sligo in search of work, or from Manchester to Belfast in search of work, that would protect him along his road, and enable him to find and shelter until he reached the place?—Yes, sir; but I may speak of the County Leitrim as I know it. I perfectly know of a deserving man leaving a place under in a position to carry himself along.

22563. The inference is, that there are only regular tramps to be dealt with?—And my suggestions would deal with them.

22564. No, because you would let the tramp go off until he came a second time?—I said so an experimental.

22565. You would only penalise him when he came back the second time, but he would take care not to come back the second time?—The First Offenders' Act might be applied in that case.

22566. This legislation would have the effect of making them enlarge their walking tour. The thing is to catch the man who really are living on other people without doing any work for it themselves; catch these people, and try and give them habits of industry; would you approve of it?—I would approve of the idea as I suggested; people look at the same

matter in a different light. I am not in favour of a man going about with a pouch in his pocket; it is in the fashion of a ticket-of-leave.

22567. It is more on the ground of a passport?—I think it objectionable.

22568. No man would require to have such a passport but a man who had no money in his pocket?—It might happen I would get into one workhouse on a passport, and before I got to the next I might lose it. Where would I be, then? I would be in the same position as if I had not one at all. I consider it would be the duty of the workhouse officials or the police to inquire into it. The police inquire into far more trivial things, and spend their time in not very profitable employment when they should look the tramps up; they can have his photograph, and there can be a mouse, without any stretch of imagination, to get a hold of him.

22569. Would not that be more objectionable, as regards paying into and interfering with these people, if they were to be policed and in the Run-and-Cry, and photographed, and all that, would not that be a greater interference with the liberty of the people?—My suggestion is with regard to the person who might apply at the same workhouse under an assumed name twice in twelve months, which is common at present. I believe that children should be boarded out whenever a suitable opportunity arose, but not under the age of three years.

22570. Why do you say three instead of two, for instance?—A child of two years is hardly able to be entrusted where it might be occasionally without anybody in charge of it. At three years it is stronger, and the chances are it is better able to take care of itself when you cannot have the careful eye of somebody over it, as, generally, you cannot under all circumstances. I believe the mothers of illegitimate children should be sent to religious refuges, as it would tend to diminish the first cases and abolish second cases. Convicts should be sent to central institutions, maintained by the State. With regard to the maintenance of patients in auxiliary asylums, I believe the same grant should be made as in the ordinary asylum. That is a highly important thing, in view of the proposed changes, as from information, I learn there is some friction about the matter with regard to the present one at Yeaghal. I believe they ultimately succeed in getting the 4s.

22571. The question raised by the Vice-Chairman of the County Council is an important one—whether there would be money enough to go round without diminishing other services?—I don't like to enter into a controversy. I assumed in coming here that while it is not expressly written on the face of the terms of reference, I assumed that while assistance might be given in order to improve the existing accommodation and facilities for the better treatment of the sick and poor, and better management of the Poor Law institutions in Ireland, that at the same time we go on the assumption that we are to get some financial aid from the Government. It is the spirit in which I, and, I believe, every other witness, enters into it.

22572. You think if there were any shortage of money to pay the difference between the 2s. and 4s. grant, a further grant should be made?—Yes; in fact, I consider that we should claim the aid not as a matter of justice but as a matter of right.

DR. BRADSHAW, Surgeon.

On Infirmary, examined.

22573. CHAIRMAN.—You wish to say something about the county infirmary?—It was more about the workhouse. My idea is, after a very long experience, that the time has come for the lessening the number of workhouses in the county. When I was appointed, thirty-nine years ago, we had 400 inmates in Quirk's Workhouse, and at that time we had more children in the house than the entire population there now; and I think that it would be a very beneficial thing to close one house, at all events, in the county; and, instead of crowding any of the others with patients from a distance, I would be very much inclined that the old, aged, and infirm people should get an allowance—out-door relief, in fact; and I think it would be equally advisable that the children should be in a separate school, where they can get industrial training, and everything else, and in that way, of course, it would lessen the number which you would have to find room for; but I should say, judging from my own workhouse,

that either of the other workhouses almost would contain all that would be necessary; but, of course, Bradshaw, distance has to be taken into consideration; and, therefore, I would say it would be necessary to have a workhouse at Manchester and another at Mohill, that is, provided that this was made an assistant asylum.

22574. And the county infirmary would look after the acutely sick?—Yes, as usual. We have been up to this admitting a number of our neighbouring Roscommon patients.

22575. Do you get any payment from them?—No; we asked, but we did not get it.

22576. You know the practice in Sligo?—I have heard it. They pay 1s. if they pay the same in our hospital it would be very well worth their while to do so, for the accommodation, and to be so near home. It would cost them to go up to Roscommon with a patient 12s.

- Sept. 21, 1904
Dr. Headshaw.
22607. For a car, and there is plenty of accommodation in our workhouse.
22607. You get them from as far as Elphin?—Nearly to Elphin. We have the same staff; in fact it is a bit increased, for we have an extra nurse, an extra sister.
22608. Then your suggestion would be that Carrick-on-Shannon might be closed as a workhouse and made into an auxiliary lunatic asylum?—Decidedly.
22609. And the county infirmary would be sufficient for the requirements of the sick in the neighbourhood?—Yes; the only thing would be that the committee would have to be a little more careful in paying their tickets—not give them to people who did not want them.
22610. At present you are aware that in workhouse infirmaries you are at liberty to incur all necessary expense, and treat all the patients who come there?—Quite so.
22611. You are not limited by any annual financial grant?—I am not; but I am in the county infirmary.
22612. Then, when you come to the county infirmary, what is your annual grant?—£600.
22613. Could you spend more, and would you spend more, and do you think more ought to be spent?—I do.
22614. Would you approve of a variation in the law that would permit the committee of the county infirmary to spend on the same basis as the workhouse hospital?—I would, and not to be cramped.

Mr. J. G. KERR, F.R.C.S., Chairman, Manohamilton Union, examined.

Mr. J. G. Kerr.

22615. CHAIRMAN.—You are the Chairman of the Manohamilton Guardians?—Of the District Council and Board of Guardians.
22616. What is the view of the Guardians on the question of amalgamation so far as it affects either North Leitrim or the whole of Leitrim?—The Guardians think two workhouses would be sufficient in Leitrim, and the Guardians of Manohamilton are very anxious to get the part taken from them which was added to Ballyshannon, the Kinlough division; and the Kinlough District Council passed a resolution to that effect, asking to be taken back to Manohamilton.
22617. Are any of the Kinlough Guardians here to-day?
- Mr. Gaffney.—They were here in Ballyshannon.
22618. CHAIRMAN.—Do you happen to know what that resolution of the Kinlough Council carried by a large majority?—It was unanimous as far as the District Council was concerned.
22619. Then you would leave Manohamilton and one in South Leitrim?—I think that would be sufficient.
22620. Manohamilton and Kinlough take in the whole of North Leitrim?—Yes; and we have splendid facilities and a splendid water supply, and good railway facilities. We are in a very healthy position; and, as far as the management of the Manohamilton Union is concerned, it is about as good as there is in the county.
22621. Are you so much cut off from South Leitrim as to make it impossible, in your opinion, to have any question of amalgamation of Manohamilton with Carrick-on-Shannon?—The county is so situated that I

22622. Mr. MURPHY.—Do you not think that when the county infirmary would become the union hospital it would be a proper thing for the Guardians to take over the management of the infirmary, and conduct it as at Mohill and Manohamilton?—I don't see why the present committee who manage it should be displaced with.
22623. And why should the present Board of Guardians be displaced with?—Because the home is not necessary.
22624. You ask them to furnish all the money?—It is the County Council and all the money for the undertakings.
22625. I understood you to say that this county infirmary would do for all the needs of the sick in the union?—Yes.
22626. That being so, you are changing it from a county infirmary and making it a district hospital; therefore, why should it not be handed over to the Guardians when this workhouse is taken from them? This institution is to be put in place of the workhouse hospital, then should not the proper authority to manage it be the Guardians?—I cannot say, because the others pay money.
22627. They won't pay money under the altered circumstances?—Of course, if there was a change, instead of being paid by the county it was paid by the union; of course, then, I would say, naturally, that the Guardians would have the right to be the managers.

- think it would be impossible, seeing the distance it would be from one end of North Leitrim to the other part in South Leitrim; it would be impossible to have amalgamation with Carrick-on-Shannon.
22628. That is, on the present lines of union management. You would be in favour of removing lunatics or feeble-minded persons from a workhouse to an auxiliary asylum?—Yes; I think they could be better treated in an auxiliary asylum, unless the workhouse was specially fitted up for that purpose.
22629. As regards women with illegitimate children, would you be in favour of having these dealt with in penitentiaries?—I think where it would be a first one, the women should be taken in hand, and tried to be reformed, and the child taken from her, and either boarded out or reared in the workhouse; fortunately, we have very few in Manohamilton.
22630. As regards tramps?—They are the worst we have to deal with. If there could be any law in the world to do away with tramps it should be passed, because certainly they are a nuisance.
22631. You would like to make them industrious members of the community?—If it could be done, but I have my doubts. All the tramps I see won't work. I was trying to get the master to give them a cold bath to try to make them keep away.
22632. You might kill a man with a weak heart after a day's work, and then you would be in a awkward position?—Yes; but certainly there should be a law passed to deal with them in some way; the present system is not a good one; it is good enough for the tramps, but not for the people, who have to keep them.

Mr. PATRICK ROONEY examined.

Mr. Patrick Rooney.

22633. CHAIRMAN.—Now will you give us your views?—I scarcely have anything to add to the evidence of the Chairman of the County Council and the Chairman of the Guardians.
22634. You pointed out to us very clearly the advantageous situation of your workhouse as regards its sanitary position?—I believe there could be nothing got to exceed it; and I pointed it out to you as well as I could when you were there. It is on an eminence, and Manohamilton is becoming a very important town; and I may say food stuffs are to be got there as cheap as in any other town in Ireland.
22635. You think you get your food and coal cheap in Manohamilton?—There is such keen competition that I believe nowhere you go can you get better value for the money. To prove my argument, the cost of an innale with us is less than generally in other unions, and we treat them better, I believe. Well,

we have also the advantage of excellent water, I believe it could hardly be surpassed, taken from a spring some miles away and brought to the town. We have railway accommodation just within a stone's throw of the place—In fact, we have every accommodation. But there is one thing I have to complain of—it is the county infirmary here. We make no use of it, and pay for it, and I don't see that we have a right to pay for what is not useful.

22636. Really, the infirmary some of your people use is illegal?—They have to pay when they go there.

22637. Dr. Broome.—Portion of the cost?—Well, I am not in a way to be accurate. Our patients are treated in the workhouse hospital with us, I believe successfully, too, and we are most anxious that the Leitrim portion of our county that goes down to Ballyshannon would be with us. They are anxious themselves.

advis, as the last witness has explained to you; and I believe it would be to their interest and to ours that they would amalgamate with us.

22638. That is the Kinsalegh portion?—Yes.

22639. You don't offer any opinion about South Leitrim; you let them manage their own affairs?—I know nothing about them; they are able to take care of themselves, I am sure.

Sept. 22, 1904

Mr. Patrick Rooney.

Mr. BERNARD KEAN examined.

22640. CHAIRMAN.—What is the view of the Ballinamore Council—are you in favour of breaking up Bawnboy Union?—No.

22641. You wish it to continue; you don't wish to join with Mohill or Carrick?—No; Mohill would be out of the way, and Carrick-on-Shannon would be very inconvenient for the destitute.

22642. Would you object to join with Mohill?—I would rather not join; I would rather stay with Bawnboy, considering my experience of the way it is managed. There is part of the Banniskillen Union—the Glen portion, in Cavan—that could very readily be added to Bawnboy, because it comes very close to it. Lanesboro Union, that I believe will go, comes within a short distance of Ballymacnall; a great portion of these two unions could be added to Bawnboy; there is also portion of Mohill, in the immediate neighbourhood of Carrigallen, that would be more convenient to Bawnboy than Mohill.

22643. Then you want to break up Mohill?—As between Carrick-on-Shannon and Mohill, in South Leitrim, I think Mohill would be the most suitable union; it is all situated in the county, and is more easily got at than Carrick.

22644. I forget whether you came to Banniskillen to the inquiry?—No, sir. Then, as to these hospitals, I think it would be necessary to retain some of these hospitals at the workhouse. If Bawnboy Union was closed you would have to go within four miles of Bawnboy, and being there either to Carrick or Mohill.

22645. If there was a hospital at Ballinacree?—Yes; if there was one established there, or leave the hospital at Bawnboy. Ballinacree would be very central, and then, if Bawnboy was done away with, it could accommodate a good part of the present Mohill Union; it comes within three miles of it.

22646. Is there anything else?—On this question of tramps, I would make a suggestion. Tramps generally make a point of coming to workhouses a night or two before fair or market.

22647. Those are generally the travelling musicians?—Yes, and pickpockets. I would keep them in the workhouse for two or three days, and make them do work.

22648. They do it in England now, but find it does not stop them?—They did it once in Mohill, and it had a very salutary effect.

22649. They have not power to do it in Mohill?—These tramps won't take you to courts at all.

22650. You would bring in the English provision, about keeping them longer?—I would, certainly, if the Guardians wished, and I think it would have a very good effect—it would leave them scarcer.

22651. That would cost you more?—It would in the beginning, but ultimately it would cost less.

22652. Mr. Delany.—Apparently, you think that Bawnboy ought not to be broken up?—Yes; I give my reasons for it.

22653. Have you considered what effect the breaking up of Bawnboy would have on the rates if you were amalgamated with Mohill?—Of course, if workhouses are done away with for the present it will have the effect of increasing the rates for some time.

22654. What rate do you pay now in Bawnboy?—A poor rate of 6d. or 9d.

22655. You don't happen to know that it is 1s. 1d.?—I don't know this year's rate.

22656. As a matter of fact it is 1s., and it is only 8d. in Mohill?—I can account for that. We had a lot of hospital repairs to get done for the last couple of years in Bawnboy, and had a great number of cases of fever from the Cavan portion of the union; and there is another cause of the rate being a bit higher. When the standard rate was made in Bawnboy our poor rate was very low. We got an Agricultural Grant of £36, in the £; the Mohill rates were high, they got 1s. 6d., and in Carrick 1s. 8d.

22657. You have no railway accommodation to Bawnboy from Ballinacree?—Yes, within about a mile.

22658. The railway takes you into the town of Mohill?—It does. Personally, as far as I am concerned, I would just as soon go to Mohill as Bawnboy; but I am calculating the distance sick people in the manimans would have to go to get to Mohill.

22659. How many miles would they have to go?—Six or seven Irish miles to Ballinacree, and also to Mohill.

22660. You don't happen to know the furthest portion of the Mohill district at Carrigallen; you would not be surprised to hear it is fourteen miles to Mohill?—I would not be surprised; but the distance to Bawnboy is not anything like that.

22661. You think if any union should be retained in South Leitrim it should be Mohill?—I believe Mohill would be the most central.

22662. The balance of convenience would be in favour of Mohill?—Yes.

Mr. MICHAEL MARTIN examined.

22663. CHAIRMAN.—Now you have heard your colleague's evidence; is there anything you would like to add to that?—I believe in the amalgamation of unions, and I wonder very much that they have not been amalgamated long ago. When those unions were built to accommodate 600 or 700 people the population of Ireland was over eight millions, now we have not got half the people, and I don't see how it is that so many unions are maintained for the accommodation of fifty or sixty people.

22664. What change would you make in your own county of Leitrim?—I would say that one auxiliary asylum and hospital would do the whole county of Leitrim, and the sanitary inmates of the union should get a weekly allowance, and let them board out, and do away with all the unions except one.

22665. Which would you retain?—That would be a difficult question for me to say, what point would be more central, and I would leave that to some eminent man and better judges than I am.

22666. But you think one ought to remain and two might be closed, and one of those converted into an auxiliary asylum?—I think they should all be closed, and there should be only one auxiliary asylum and hospital for the whole county, and that would be sufficient for the small population we have now got.

22667. How would you deal with the sick poor of North Leitrim, supposing you closed Manamagallon

Workhouse and made it an auxiliary asylum—what would you do with the sick poor?—If they were not very sudden cases, or cases of contagious disease, they could travel a journey.

22668. You will always have a certain number of sudden cases every year?—For keeping an establishment open for the accommodation of a few people you pay almost as much as you do if the whole house was filled.

22669. Would you be willing that those people in North Leitrim should have no hospital accommodation nearer than Carrick or Mohill?—I would be very sorry to deprive the sick poor of accommodation, but I think under the present circumstances it is very badly managed, to the great expense of the ratepayers.

22670. How would you improve matters in North Leitrim?—I would say if there was a temporary hospital with eight or ten beds, and very bad cases would be left in those places, with a nurse and dispensary doctor.

22671. You would leave a small hospital, under the dispensary doctor?—Very small; and all other cases could go into the general hospital for the county.

22672. What you might call the general infirmary; would it be too great a distance to bring people from Manamagallon or Killybegher to Carrick-on-Shannon

Mr. Bernard Kean.

Mr. Michael Martin.

Sept. 21, 1904
Mr. Michael
Martin.

or Mohill?—That would depend on the nature of the disease, and it would take a doctor to answer the question.

22673. Looking at it as an ordinary, common-sense man, do you think that would be a very long distance to remove sick people by road?—If there was a proper means of conveyance I would not, provided the disease was not a very dangerous one.

22674. And if it were you would put it in the small hospital?—Yes.

22675. Mr. MURKHAM.—You think under the scheme you outline for giving out-door relief to the aged and infirm, due provision could be observed that only the deserving would get it?—I think the healthy inmates could be boarded out, and the relieving officer could look after their welfare once a week.

22676. Do you not think there would be a tendency to give money to poor people if the Guardians had a free hand, and owing to that tendency the care might be worse than the disease?—There are a good many houses in the country that would be very glad to take in those inmates at whatever money would be allowed them weekly, and they would be well looked after.

22677. How would you provide that only the deserving cases should get the money?—How do we provide for the cases that are admitted to the union at present?

22678. In some places there is a great outcry that out-door relief is given in cases where it ought not to be given; under the system that you suggest it might be enlarged. Have you any suggestion to make how to guard against that?—The Guardians of the district should look after that part, and see no one should get it except those who are entitled. No matter what business we enter into we will find great arguments and contradictions. I don't believe everything I hear myself.

22679. Are you a Guardian?—Yes.

22680. What is your experience with regard to out-door relief—is it larger than it was five or six years

ago in your own particular union?—I don't believe it is; I am not sure.

22681. How do you manage at the Board meetings when a claim is put forward?—We inquire from the Guardians for the district and the relieving officer to know if it is a competent case for relief, and find it out in that way.

22682. No discussion about the subject?—Oh, yes, 22683. Do outside Guardians interfere, and say, "We are not quite satisfied that that person is entitled to it," or is it taken as a matter of course when the relieving officer recommends it?—No; they converse with one another, and find out whether the party is a fit subject. I have often seen them refused.

22684. Don't you think Manxhamilton would require a hospital there, at least with twenty or twenty-five beds, to accommodate the sick of that district?—How many in the infirmary altogether now in Manxhamilton?

22685. There is a large number—fifty-two by the last report?—A good many of them could be in the body of the house, perhaps.

22686. No doubt; I am allowing for more than half in the body of the house; but, even then, would you not require an infirmary of some kind?—You would; but a very small one would accommodate it under the rules I suggest.

22687. Don't you think it would be expensive and dangerous, too, to be sending away the sick to a great distance?—A good deal would depend on the mode of conveyance.

22688. By any means of conveyance; it would be costly and dangerous in some cases?—Look at the cost of the officials in each of those unions, where there are only sixty-three inmates in some of them. The cost of sixty-three inmates for their food and clothing for the year would only come to something about £570, roughly speaking. Where does the rest of the money go to?

22689. Under a scheme for a small hospital you would not require the great staff you have at present?—No; but it will take as much cost to stave an empty ship as if all her compartments were filled.

Mr. Charles
Cock B.
Whelan.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I have not very much evidence to give, but I approve of amalgamation; I believe, under existing circumstances, it is absolutely necessary; and I approve strongly of Mohill and Manxhamilton as centres. I think they would accommodate the county.

22690. Chairman.—You agree with Dr. Bradshaw's view?—I think there was a little confusion in his evidence about the infirmary and the hospital in the workhouse. But, with regard to the infirmaries, I think the county infirmary is a misnomer. I think the districts should be completely changed. I don't see why a man, because he breaks his leg in Roscommon, should have to pay for a week, when a man on this side can get in free. I think if they were called district infirmaries instead of county infirmaries it would be much better.

22691. In some cases, where the county town is in the centre of the county, county infirmary is a rational name, but not when the county infirmary is on the borders, between two counties?—From the infirmaries I know—Sligo, Roscommon, and this infirmary—if the districts were changed it would be a great advantage.

22692. Putting Manxhamilton into a County Sligo district?—Yes, for infirmary purposes, and changing the districts that are eligible for claiming the use of the hospital.

22693. And keep the area rigidly round the infirmary as the maintaining area?—That would be my suggestion. I was very glad to hear you mention the matter of a certificate for tramps; it has been a pet scheme of mine for some time. I mentioned it a short time ago to Mr. Lynch. Mine differs a little from what you suggested. My idea would be that a bona fide working man, who could not find work at home, should be provided by the head constable of his district with a book, and a photograph of the individual fixed in the

Mr. CHARLES COCK B. WHITTE, D.C., examined.

first page of that book, so put in that it could not be easily tampered with, and to be initialed by the head-constable.

22694. A signed photograph?—Yes; and when the tramp arrived at the town where there was a workhouse, and wanted assistance, he should have his book vised by the head-constable of the town, who should then refer him to the relieving officer to get relief. To any ordinary vagabond or tramp I would certainly give the benefit of the prison. But as you suggest that certain homes should be opened for such people, where they could get work and be fed, if they chose to do work, I think that would be a very good idea, indeed. As to statistics in connection with the working of workhouses, I have been out of touch with them for some time, and really could not enter into the matter; but I think amalgamation is absolutely necessary. I know the county very well; I am not aware whether Keshigo is in the Ballyshannon Union.

22695. It is?—Because I was going to suggest that if Ballyshannon remained a workhouse in the future that Keshigo should be added on, and taken of Manxhamilton.

22696. It is in the Ballyshannon Union, and you think it ought to stay there?—I think so. All the district between Keshigo and the far side of Lough Melvin is too far from Manxhamilton, and there is a difficulty of transit.

22697. Garrison is in the County Fermanagh?—That would be in Ballyshannon, but should be added to Manxhamilton.

22698. The most distant part would be Colonel Dickson's, of Tullaghan?—Yes.

22699. Then they would have to come up from the Glenside Valley?—Yes; whereas from Garrison there is a road to Longnabey, and it is not such a long way to Manxhamilton.

22700. How far from Tullaghan to Manxhamilton?—Sixteen or seventeen miles.

Mr. Robert
Wallace.

22701. CHAIRMAN.—You are CHAIRMAN of the Mohill Guardians?—Yes.

22702. Mr. Deasy.—Are you in favour of the breaking up of the Carrick-on-Shannon Union?—Yes, and the

Manchesterhamilton Union. The Mohill Board of Guardians are unanimously in favour of amalgamation, and the scheme was agreed on was to take in the Letham portion of Burnley and Carrick-on-Shannon to Mohill. The valuation of the Letham portion of Burnley is about £2,700, and the valuation of the Carrick portion is £20,000.

22705. You have identified yourself that the workhouse in Mohill is ample to provide the accommodation?—Yes.

22706. How have the Guardians been keeping their workhouse?—Well, we adopted everything Mr. Lynch recommended, and carried it out. We spent a good deal of money on it last year, and have a fully-equipped workhouse. We have a special meeting summoned for to-morrow to consider Dr. Smyth's report, and we will adopt it. I approve of it.

22707. From a financial point of view, what do you think would be the effect of amalgamation?—It would be a decided benefit to the ratepayers of Carrick and Manchesterhamilton. The union rate in Mohill is coming down since the Local Government Act, but the union rate in Carrick is going up, and the increased valuation would bring it down much more.

22708. As regards the average cost of maintenance, how does Mohill stand?—Mohill was 3s. 3d., and Carrick 3s. 9d., but the union rate in Mohill is 2s. 6d., Carrick 2s. 10d., and Burnley 2s. 6d. The district rate is 9d. in Mohill, 10d. in Carrick, and 9d. in Burnley.

22709. As regards the added area, what would be the greatest distance—I think that would be from Drumilly?—From twelve to fourteen miles. There are parts of Carrigallen at present fourteen miles from Mohill, and they don't complain that they suffer any inconvenience.

22710. From Carrigallen there is no railway communication?—No; but we have the railway direct from Ballinacorney, and from Carrick-on-Shannon also.

22711. I believe your board passed a resolution giving certain answers to the queries sent out?—Yes, sir, we did.

22712. On the question of rating, what is the view of your board?—They are in favour of reverting back again to divisional charges. The tendency is, since it became a union charge, for cut-door rates to increase.

22713. As to some of the people who are in the workhouse not able to work, have you any scheme for dealing with these?—I think if they were boarded out it would be a very good idea; and the children, I think, should be sent to industrial schools out of the workhouse.

22714. You also think there should be an auxiliary asylum?—Yes, I am strongly in favour of an auxiliary

asylum being established in Carrick-on-Shannon. There are at present 250 inmates in the District Asylum at Sligo, and I heard the Medical Superintendent say he would certify them to be fit subjects for an auxiliary asylum; those with the idiots in the workhouse would make about 300, and I think that would make a fair auxiliary asylum; but I am strongly of opinion that the Capitation Grant should be increased from 2s. to 4s. As the district asylum is in the County Sligo, it would be only just and right that the auxiliary asylum should be in the County Letham.

22715. CHAIRMAN.—And a great many of the Sligo people yesterday were of the same opinion?—I am glad to hear that. For the tramps, I think labour colonies, somewhat similar to what I read about lately in Switzerland, should be established. There is plenty of waste land in this country on which their labour could be utilized, say, for arterial drainage; there is nothing so necessary in Ireland.

22716. As regards the infirmary in Carrick-on-Shannon, do you agree with Dr. Brodshaw?—I do; I believe it should be converted into a district hospital. I would have a joint committee, with some of the local gentlemen and clergy; some of them give good attendance, and take a great interest in it.

22717. Mr. Delany.—In Mohill, are you aware there is an anxiety on the part of farmers, and people of that class, to use the hospital in case of sickness in their family?—I am; I believe there should be wards set apart for paying patients in the hospital.

22718. Dr. Brodshaw.—In all the hospitals?—In all the hospitals, and a regular scale of charges made out for those; they should not be in at all with the poor.

22719. Would you separate the hospital from the workhouse?—I would.

22720. Mr. Delany.—And the country people should be induced to use the hospital?—Certainly; and make a moderate scale of charges for those who could pay, and let them go into the pay ward, and not to be mixed up with the chronic people.

22721. Is there any other matter you want to mention to the Commission?—No; except that I think the area of rating should be changed from union rating. I have an idea that dispensary districts would make a very nice area, provided that towns like Carrick, Ballinacorney, and Mohill should be made separate areas.

22722. CHAIRMAN.—You want to give the towns a great bluster?—The people of the country would complain if they had a town on them.

22723. Are not many of the people in the town people who come in from the country?—Yes; but in the towns they have the benefit of their labour.

22724. You would make the towns pay for all the cut-door relief they give?—I would.

Mr. PATRICK FITZGERALD, J.P., Chairman.

22725. CHAIRMAN.—You are Chairman of the Carrick-on-Shannon Rural District Council and Board of Guardians?—Yes.

22726. What is the view of your board on the question of the dissolution of the Carrick Union?—The vast majority of both the Council and the Guardians would be in favour of a scheme of amalgamation provided it was consistent with relieving the present rating.

22727. If you got a substantial economy, without impoverishing seriously the sick poor, you would be in favour of amalgamation?—Certainly, sir.

22728. What use would they suggest that their workhouse might be turned into?—An auxiliary asylum, in order to prevent an expenditure of £40,000 on the Sligo Asylum; and, further than that, they are of opinion that they could get a Capitation Grant of 4s.

22729. They think they ought to get that?—Yes.

22730. Then we may take it that a large majority of the Carrick-on-Shannon Guardians are in favour of the dissolution of the union on that basis?—Yes. I remember it was unanimous at our board, for the simple reason, that so far as their position goes, representing the sick poor and the ratepayers of the district, we had by statistics that we are paying something like £45 per head for the maintenance of paupers. The valuation is something like £45,000.

22731. Is that the Clerk of the Union's estimate?—Yes, sir; those figures are correct.

22732. Did you get them from him?—Yes; I got them from the Local Government Board's report, the last report.

22733. Did you include in those returns the cost of dispensary administration?—I did.

Carrick-on-Shannon Union, examined.

22734. That would be an unfair charge against the Carrick-on-Shannon Union, you would have that charge, in Flynn.

22735. That would not be the basis to make the calculation on?—Whether it is or it is not, it is an extraordinary fact that it exists all the same.

22736. No, no; the cost of the dispensary has no relation whatever to the workhouse?—It is for the relief of the sick poor, whether in the dispensary or workhouse, I take it.

22737. We are not dealing at all here with the Medical Charities Act, we are only dealing with Poor Law administration?—You can, of course, strike out half the cost of the medical officers.

22738. That is a very large item, dispensary administration?—It would be an extraordinary thing to be paying £90 per annum for the maintenance of a pauper.

22739. That is not the case?—With the exception of half the salary of the medical officers.

22740. The dispensary medical officers for the entire union and the cost of medicine?—Half the salaries are paid by the Treasury.

22741. That completely puts out your whole calculation?—It would take £5 per annum, I think, of the estimate of £45.

22742. You must not take me as agreeing on that?—I don't wish to make any point of that; but workhouses generally are too well officered for the number of inmates, and too much gone to the expense of the establishment. It may have been right enough when we had 400 inmates, but that is not as now.

22743. Mr. MURPHY.—Do you think the county requires two workhouses?—I don't believe that we

Sept. 21, 1904

Mr. Robert Wallace.

Sept. 21, 1904

Mr. Patrick Ryan.

could do with one, considering the geographical position of our county. It is not very easy to get at Carrick-on-Shannon from the extreme northern position; railway communication is a difficult matter.

22752. The number is so small in the county—something under 300?—Yes.

22753. CHAIRMAN.—Any other matter you wish to refer to?—I desire to express the opinion of the Council that I preside over that unless an auxiliary asylum was established we would oppose any form of amalgamation.

22754. Why do you take that position?—On account of the rate. We expect to relieve the rate by doing this. At the present moment we pay something about 1s. in the £ for the Sligo Lunatic Asylum; if we could prevent a further expenditure of £40,000 by having this auxiliary asylum established here we consider it would be a great relief.

22755. Supposing the auxiliary asylum was established at Manorcunningham instead of Carrick-on-Shannon, and a reduction of the rating would take place by such an establishment as that, would you be in favour of breaking up the workhouse then?—I hardly think it would be feasible or reasonable to do that.

22756. But supposing it were done?—It might alterate the rate as far as the lunatics are concerned.

22757. What would then be your view as regards the workhouse at Carrick-on-Shannon?—I should say Carrick-on-Shannon would then be the centre.

22758. Geographical centre?—I would not say geographical so far as Manorcunningham is concerned, but as far as North Leitrim is concerned.

22759. Unless the Carrick-on-Shannon Workhouse were filled with some other class of inmates?—I think we would be financially at a loss if it was not.

22760. You mean the trades in the town would?—I don't mean the trades at all; I don't represent them at all.

22761. What class of people would be at a loss—the carpenters would get the benefit of the change if the surplus of the inmates were put at Manorcunningham?—They would, so far as that would be concerned; then we would have to tide over a great difficulty so far as sending our representatives to other districts; that might be, in some cases, twenty-five miles.

22762. Would you not have that even if you had the lunatics in the asylum here?—I don't say we would, but the difference in the rating would compensate us.

22763. The difference in rating would disappear even if they went to Manorcunningham?—Well, yes, it would, so far as the asylum is concerned. On the question of tempest, I heard some gentleman in the witness-box expressing a view that there should be something done to remedy that. I consider it a great evil in the country, not so much on account of the money spent on them in the workhouses; there is a great deal more mischief done in the country than that—the example set by them in towns that they come into, and where they remain, when sent out of the workhouses, and very often those people are the cause of spreading disease.

22764. And they have families with them brought up badly?—There is nothing in connection with the Poor Law that requires more to be remedied than that evil; there should be some form of registration or some place provided for these.

22765. You would not hesitate to deprive these men of their liberty—they would be deserving of nothing more than strict consideration?—The majority of them would be better off in jail; there may be exceptions; it may occur that a man gets out of work, and has to travel to some neighbouring town for work.

22766. That man could be segregated?—But it is an established system now, a sort of profession. I should like to say a word, in case the result of this Commission of Inquiry was that there would be amalgamation, and that our union would be amalgamated with Mohill. I am directed to express the view that we are entitled to what you call district rating, or union rating, that our portion of the union would have a separate rate, on the ground that in 1900 the rate was 1s. 3d., whereas Mohill rate was 3s. 3d., and in the year 1904 the rate for Carrick-on-Shannon—

22767. Are you again taking in expenditure outside Poor Law expenditure?—I am not—union expenditure.

22768. Are you taking in the cost of roads?—Nothing but union expenditure.

22769. No union ever struck a rate of 3s. 3d. for Poor Law purposes?—That is embodied in a report of the Local Government Board. At the present moment there is a difference of 7d. in the £, and we don't object

to a scheme of amalgamation with Mohill on the grounds laid down, but we do ask that we would be entitled to union rating.

22770. Do you think you would gain or lose by that?—We would gain; that is my opinion.

22771. It would look as if the joint expenditure would be reduced, and if the joint valuation was very much raised, on an increased valuation, you would imagine at first sight that you would have a reduced rate?—It would be an average rate then, and we would have to bear the burden of the existing rate at present to make it average.

22772. We can hardly talk of that without going into it, but we will go into it very carefully?—There are a great many other matters, but I would be only repeating the evidence already given. With reference to the overcrowding of Sligo Asylum, it is not necessary for me to make any remark. There was a matter that cropped up in the evidence given by Dr. Bradshaw with regard to the representation on the county infirmary. I desire to say that the management at present is represented by the county-at-large, and if you were to put the management into district bodies they would have the responsibility.

22773. You think, if it was converted into a district hospital, the management should be district?—Yes, and a district charge, whereas it is county-at-large at present.

22774. You are not claiming for Carrick-on-Shannon—a : you—the position of paying all the cost of the infirmary?—Oh, no; I don't wish to interfere with that at all. It is a county infirmary, supported by the county, and it is a very well-administered institution; £600 per annum is not a very big amount; it relieves a great number of people, and they are very well looked after, as far as I know, and that is the report of the Governors for years; the only thing I have to say on it is that if you were to leave it in the hands of our District Council they would have all the responsibility.

22775. Dr. Bradshaw.—They would have all the payments, too?—Yes; that is what I object to.

22776. You would rather see it as it is?—Certainly.

22777. Mr. MURKIN.—But if it does not serve all the county, is it fair that portions of the county that it does not serve should pay for it?—That is the point. The gentleman who made the statement that North Leitrim got no benefit from it was inaccurate. The only portion of North Leitrim that we do not get inmates from to the county infirmary is the Union of Manorcunningham.

22778. CHAIRMAN.—Is not that nearly the whole of North Leitrim?—No; North Leitrim goes down to Down district—ten miles long and six or seven miles across.

22779. What part of North Leitrim is in the Carrick Union?—From here to Down Bridge, and there is ten miles of that in North Leitrim—from Drumahaire to Down. We get a number of patients from Drumahaire.

22780. You admit the Manorcunningham and Keshbeg districts don't send many?—We get very little from Manorcunningham Union. I should say the majority of patients in the county infirmary are from North Leitrim. Some arrangement for pay patients in the county infirmary would be a very useful and necessary thing, or otherwise legislation on the subject, so that portion of our union in the County Roscommon would be compelled to pay a reasonable amount to compensate for any loss we sustain by having their inmates there. The County Council, up to the present, have refused to contribute anything, and for a number of years we have been maintaining them free of charge—up to two years ago.

22781. Mr. MURKIN.—They have no power to pay under the existing law?—That settles that part of it.

22782. Dr. Bradshaw.—You would recommend that they should?—I would, strongly. It is a great hardship for people to have to travel from the extreme end of one county to their capital town; they might die on the way.

Mr. ALLEN.—With reference to that remark about the contribution, I have looked into the matter of law, and I understand they can contribute; and it is in the Local Government Act that they can contribute to the infirmary.

Mr. MURKIN.—The question was raised elsewhere, and the opinion of counsel was taken on the subject, and he advised that the County Council could not pay towards the support of an infirmary in another county.

Mr. *Allyne*.—I have looked into the matter, and I thought they could.

CHAIRMAN.—It is very possible, for legal opinions often turn out wrong.

WITNESS.—There is just another little matter. You have the replies to the queries on the sheet before you, and I venture to express the opinion that those are subject to the conditions already expressed—that is to say, if the Commission decide on having the auxiliary asylum established here, we would waive any claim we have to the union; but I would wish to remind you

we have other available premises about the town—the present county infirmary and an old military barracks, in the best of condition, just as good as the jail premises—that could be utilized for some suitable purposes. In that report the gentlemen representing the County Reformatory made a sort of protest, inasmuch as their patients used to go to Ballinacree; they would quite acquiesce now if, by amalgamation, they were allowed to have these harmless lunatics included in the case of Carrick-on-Shannon—that is, for Leitrim and Sligo.

Sept. 21, 1894

Mr. Patrick
Flynn.

Mr. PATRICK GALLAGHER, P.L.C., examined.

22773. CHAIRMAN.—Is there anything you wish to add to your chairman's statement?—Nothing. I am in favour of amalgamation if it brings any relief to the *insane*.

22774. What part of the union do you live in?—In the eastern portion of the union, about seven miles from the town, below Drumana.

22775. You are very near Mohill?—About five miles from Mohill.

22776. You would be quite willing, as a member of the Carrick Board, that the union should go into Mohill if there was a substantial abatement of the rates without any hardship to the sick?—Yes, sir; that, principally, I would like to have taken care of. I certainly would not like to see the union extended in any way to give any inconvenience to the members of the Board of Guardians; I would be afraid that their attendance would not be as good. There was another matter touched on by Mr. Maguire. He said that he would be in favour of town rating; I quite agree with Mr. Maguire in that; it might lead to economy, and to see that no one but those justly entitled to out-door relief would get it.

22777. If there was rating for the towns would you also have rating for the country on the electoral division?—For the division. It looks like divisional rating in the Act when it says each division can appoint two representatives. It would appear that

these two representatives ought to have the management of the division, and take care of the division; and it is only under such circumstances that a Guardian can understand how to discharge his duty. I approve of the rule you laid down yourself with regard to the tramps. I would not like to see them punished; but rather sent to a place, and improved.

22778. And try to make them labourers?—Yes, sir. Improve them, and give them a couple of years' industry. It might improve them, and edify them.

22779. Harden the muscles, and make them fit to work?—Yes, and make them take a view of themselves as industrious, respectable men. With regard to the mothers of illegitimate children, too, I think your own statement would be a very salutary one, and I endorse that. But I believe no Guardian can do his duty until he has divisional rating.

22780. Do you think the expenses are increasing?—I believe the expenditure on out-door relief is something higher than it was nine or ten years ago.

22781. Do you attribute that to the union-at-large rating?—I do; but I would like to see the Carrick Workhouses continued.

22782. You would be willing to see it closed if there was a substantial saving?—Yes, if it brought a substantial saving to the ratepayers, provided it did not bring any hardships to the sick poor or any considerable inconvenience to the representatives of the people.

Mr. Patrick
Gallagher.

Mr. THOMAS FLYNN, P.L.C., examined.

22783. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the Carrick Board of Guardians?—Yes.

22784. Do you agree with your colleagues that you would be willing to have amalgamation if there was a substantial saving?—Yes; but that was not the conclusion we came to at a joint meeting of the Reformatory and Leitrim Guardians.

22785. Are you a Reformatory Guardian?—No; from Deera. We agreed if we got back the original area belonging to this union prior to 1850, we would be more satisfied with it; and, also, there was a Local Government Board inquiry here in 1893 in reference to parties of this union that went to Strokestown and Boyle. And our agreement was in answer to the question of amalgamation, that if we got the portion of the union back, we would be more satisfied with it than with amalgamation. That would be amalgamation in one way.

22786. Keeping your union on, and breaking up the others, as they were before 1850?—Yes; that was the answer we gave that query, as well as I remember. Supposing this union was done away with, in the district I represent the sick poor would have to go twenty-three miles to Mohill, and we would have to go to Banishton or Manerhamilton. The road to Car-

rick is level enough, but the road to Manerhamilton is very hilly.

22787. How far are you from Manerhamilton?—About twenty English miles. The same distance as from Carrick, but not as the crow flies. Manerhamilton is nearer across the mountain; we have to go down to Slackton and on by Glenties. I am sure two workhouses are enough for the county.

22788. What one would you think might go?—I would not wish to say that. That is for the Commission to decide when they see the location.

22789. You think two would be enough?—I would, but the question of the harmless lunatics. I attended a meeting at the Sligo Asylum once about the question of amalgamation. Dr. Pett, the Chief Medical Superintendent, made us believe in the case of an auxiliary asylum, that it would be no saving; and so the Sligo Board would have the election of all officers, and he, or whoever would be the superintendent in Sligo, would have the control of Carrick-on-Shannon, or wherever the auxiliary asylum would be; and we would have to pay his expenses up and down. He told us that distinctly, but I did not believe it. So we left him the lunatics, and him along with them.

Mr. Thomas
Flynn.

Mr. JOSEPH O'BRIEN, P.L.C., examined.

I am a Guardian from the Reformatory portion of Carrick. We had a meeting two months ago, and came to the conclusion to hold the union as it stands, and get back the Strokestown portion of it. We don't want to hold the union if they don't want to hold it themselves; but what we want is, in case it should be dissolved, to be sent to Strokestown.

22790. CHAIRMAN.—Supposing Strokestown does not survive, where would you like to go?—I don't know where we would go, then.

22791. That is a contingency that might happen.

Would you be willing to go to Reformatory?—No, sir. We are willing to stop here; but in case this is amalgamated, they would not wish to go to Boyle; they want to go to Strokestown.

22792. You think Reformatory too far?—It is. It is twenty miles from where I live and twenty-eight from some others.

22793. What you would wish is that either this union should be maintained, or, if it were dissolved, that Strokestown should be maintained, and you should be sent there?—Yes, sir.

Mr. Joseph
O'Brien.

Sept. 31, 1904

Mr. John
Moore.

Mr. JOHN MORAN, F.R.G., examined.

22794. CHAIRMAN.—You are also a Home-
member?—Yes, sir.

22795. Do you agree with the last witness?—Be-
cause it would be entirely out of the question with my
part of the county.

22796. He said Strickstown?—Even Strickstown.

22797. Would you rather keep up Carrick-on-Shan-
non?—Keep up Carrick-on-Shannon; and all my con-
science tells me the same.

22798. Under no circumstances would you approve
of breaking up Carrick-on-Shannon?—Not at all. It
would not do; because in case of any kind of sickness
it would be impossible to go eighteen or twenty miles.

Mr. James
Clarke.

Mr. JAMES CLARKE examined.

22802. CHAIRMAN.—What do you wish to tell us
from Boyle?—It is very little. There is plenty of
room for improvement in the Poor Law system, to my
idea. Of course the classification of inmates of the
workhouse at the present moment is urgent, and can
be carried out; it is not in keeping with any well-
regulated governed country to see imbeciles and inmates
in the body of the workhouse with people that have
been earning an honest livelihood all their life, and
then, through force of circumstances, compelled to go
there.

22803. You would remove them?—I would; and I
would have the imbeciles classified into one institution.
I would have a desirable home made that it would not
have a pauper's brand on it, the same as at the present
moment; or I would not have children reared up in
the workhouse, the same as they are at present. There
should be a central institution for the county to give
education to the children, male and female, and by
that means I believe the ratepayers would be saved a
considerable amount of expense; the inmates would be
better looked after by appointing a class of officials, at
the same expense, to superintend and look after the
different inmates when they would be properly
classified.

22804. You would classify them by grouping them
together?—Yes; the principle to cover that and pro-
tect the ratepayer would be that the Inspectors that
would come round would be more stringent in their
examination and inspection.

22805. And have larger powers, perhaps?—Have
larger powers than they have at present.

22806. What powers would you give them?—That
they should see that there would be nobody appointed
to superintend or look after those institutions only
duly qualified competent people. Of course, by the
present state of affairs an incompetent person might
be appointed.

22807. Might slip in?—Quite so. There should be
some standard of examination for the individual.

22808. For each institution?—For each individual, to
be classified as to his competency. It would be false
all round to the general public by adopting that idea.
Then, of course, by establishing one school in a centre
you save a lot of taxation, because in each workhouse
there are two teachers—one for the female and one for
the male; by having a competent teacher for one
central school you would save a lot of money to the
general public. Then there is another point that I
would like to draw your attention to, and that is with
regard to the hospital. We will take it like this:
there is a certain individual, and he can go into the
hospital, and spend down there at the average charge
for the dietary without taking into consideration what-
ever the clothing, fuel, and other necessary charges.
If that individual has money, and goes to a private
hospital or lodginghouse, he would pay more than the
average cost for the rental of that room, yet he goes
in and squanders down at the public expense, and may be
making money by coming in and getting hospital
treatment. He has the best of nursing and medical
attendance and hospital diet, and everything. If a
week would not be a proper charge, by making an
accurate calculation, and yet once have arisen where
they have spent many months in that position.

22809. You would suggest the Guardians should have
a discretionary power of assessing how much a man
ought to pay?—Quite so. Amalgamation and classifi-
cation of the inmates are the necessary things required

22799. Supposing they came in here to the building,
known as the county infirmary, would you still have
the same objection?—I would support my resolution;
I would support what I say.

22800. You say you would not like it on account of
the inconvenience to the sick; supposing the sick could
come into Carrick all the time, and come to the county
infirmary—would that satisfy you?—Certainly. Now
is the way I look at it—it would be impossible for a
person with a broken bone or any disease to go twenty
miles. Of course the other member is very convenient
to Strickstown.

22801. He is a neighbour there?—A neighbour, I
may say.

at the present moment. I hear a lot with regard to
tramps; I heard various theories to-day that I would
not agree with. We will have tramps to the end of
time. I don't believe in the Russian or German pauper
system. I don't see why the public bodies should
be turned into Scotland Yard Departments for leaving
paupers to poor, unfortunate tramps. They are in
every country. Of course, there are some countries
that take very stringent measures, where they see
there is an individual that makes it a profession. The
ordinary law is such that if he cannot show he has
visible means of support, they imprison him, and make
him work for his support, and he gets tired of that,
and thinks it better to work outside than in the
prison. They make that prison work remunerative
to the general public. He takes the alternative, and
prefers to work outside rather than inside for the
Government; but I would oppose all the pauper
business.

Mr. ALLEGRE.—Archibald Moore, Chaplain to the
workhouse, has asked me to hand in this document:—

The Rectory, Carrick-on-Shannon,

20th September, 1904.

DEAR SIR,—I regret I cannot attend before the Poor
Law Reform Commission to-morrow, as I will be in
Dublin. In case the Commission are willing to re-
ceive a written statement, I submit the following sug-
gestions, which it seems to me would be advisable:—

1. Tramps or Casuals.—That some uniform method
of treating this class should be adopted by all
Boards of Guardians. That they should, in all
cases, be made to work before being permitted to
leave the house.

2. Children.—(1) That children should be boarded
out at as early an age as possible; and that all kind
of the house (seminatorial and otherwise) as far as
possible removed from them.

(2) That committees of ladies be appointed to in-
spect such children, in addition to or in lieu of the
present inspection.

(3) That the law be relaxed about children not
being admitted into the house without their parents
or parent; and when such children are admitted,
they be sent to industrial schools, or boarded out.
This would substitute in an economy, as such a large
proportion of the children of "tramps," &c., become
a burden on the ratepayer. Of course, this would
have to be carefully safeguarded, as parents able
to support their children should be made to do so.

3. Hospitals.—(1) That the aged and infirm be placed
in separate wards from those who require surgical
or medical treatment.

(2) That separate wards be appointed for pay
patients. I am sure many, after a time, would
avail themselves of such; and, further, the so-
called reasons which now prevent the poor but
deserving class from entering a union hospital
would eventually be done away.

4. Idiots and Epileptics.—If such are retained at
all in the unions, better and separate accommo-
dation should be provided for them.

5. That in the case of the aged and deserving poor
who are obliged to enter the house, provision be made
for married couples to see more of each other, and,
if possible, they be allowed to live together.

If possible some classification be made between the deserving poor and others in the house.

Q. I am in favour of amalgamation of unions, as I think it would result in economy; and probably also reduce the number of "tramps," by making the distances between the houses greater.

Wm. N. Moore, Archdeacon,

C.I. Chaplain,

Carrick-on-Shannon Union.

A. O'Connor, Esq., Carrick-on-Shannon.

Mr. P. Flynn.—In reference to No. 3, every gentleman coming before you would endorse that. We have

cases of that description cropping up frequently, and it leads to no end of trouble, and it is a very absurd thing that parents should go into the house and be maintained when they should be made work, and support their children.

Mr. J. Clarke.—Permit me to make one remark with regard to the county infirmary in Roscommon. It is a great injustice on the ratepayers of the Boyle Union that they should have to contribute to the maintenance of the infirmary, whereas they have a completely-equipped and up-to-date hospital, and they have to maintain it.

MR. J. CLARKE.—That objection has been made elsewhere.—It is absurd to say that one portion should be taxed for the benefit of another portion of the same county—each part should be equalised.

Sept. 21, 1904

—
Mr. James
Clarke.

The Sitting terminated.

Sept. 22, 1904.

FORTY-SIXTH PUBLIC SITTING.—THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 22nd, 1904.

At the Courthouse, Roscommon.

Present:—Mr. MICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURNAHAN, and Dr. COVE BAKER.

Mr. S. W. L. Burke appeared for the Fever Hospital.

Mr. John Stanley.

Mr. JOHN STANLEY, F.R.C., examined.

22810. CHAIRMAN.—Are you a member of the Strokestown Board of Guardians?—Yes.

22811. Are you going to speak of the opinions of the Strokestown Board of Guardians or of your own individual views on the subject?—I am sent by the board here to give evidence.

22812. What is the view they asked you to present here to-day?—For general amalgamation of workhouses in Ireland.

22813. They are in favour of the amalgamation of workhouses?—Yes, unanimously.

22814. Have they considered what would be a good arrangement as regards their own workhouse and the workhouse of Roscommon generally?—The board are not unanimous as to dissolving the Strokestown Union, but I myself am, and the majority of the board are—a large majority.

22815. What arrangement then would you make for the treatment of the destitute and the sick if the workhouse there were closed?—To be transferred to the adjoining unions that it would be attached to.

22816. What would be the unions that you would recommend the Strokestown Union should be divided between?—Castleknock and Roscommon, Boyle and Carrick—they are the adjoining unions to the Strokestown Union. The Roscommon Union boundary comes within three miles of the workhouse of Strokestown, and the Boyle Union and Carrick Union come within five miles of the workhouse.

22817. Is Elphin more than five miles from Strokestown?—Just five.

22818. And that is the border part of your union. Some of the Carrick-on-Shannon Guardians, yesterday, that are in the County Roscommon part of the Carrick Union, were in favour of adding their rural district to Strokestown, and were in favour of continuing Strokestown—that would not be in accordance with the views of the Strokestown Guardians?—If you put it that way, if the area of the Strokestown Union was largely increased, I would not be so much in favour of dissolving Strokestown Union then; but it would require to be very largely increased, owing to the great reduction in the population of the union, so that it is not necessary there at all, but at the same time I would not like to see Strokestown Union dissolved without utilizing its buildings for some very useful benefit for the country.

22819. What use would you suggest for these buildings?—I would strongly suggest that it should be used as an auxiliary asylum for Ballinasloe, because the Ballinasloe Institution is a wonderful tax upon the County Roscommon. I think an unnecessarily high tax, and that the usual 4s. per patient should be given for the auxiliary institution.

22820. How far are you from Roscommon town at Strokestown?—Nine miles.

22821. That would involve for every lunatic patient a drive of nine miles, at the least?—There is no asylum in Roscommon.

22822. But the patients would have to drive to get to Strokestown a distance of at least nine miles?—Certainly, and farther.

22823. Nine at the least—Roscommon is your nearest station?—In this direction it is.

22824. In any direction?—There is a station, Drumma, on the Sligo line, eight miles.

22825. Then you would have to have a drive of at least eight miles?—Yes.

22826. That you can see is a drawback against converting Strokestown into an asylum if you have to drive insane patients such long distances?—But we have to drive them further—twenty Irish miles to Ballinasloe.

22827. Do they drive there or go by train?—The train does not suit very well, and they have to drive in nearly all cases from the lower end of the county.

22828. But the Castleknock, Roscommon, and Athlone people would get there by railway?—They would. From the northern portion of the county, on track Carrick-on-Shannon, they would have to go to Mullingar and come back to Athlone, which is a vast about way altogether. I think they nearly all drive from Carrick.

22829. Do they drive in open coach?—No, I think carriages, all I have seen coming. Then, if it was not converted into an auxiliary asylum, the opinion of the country is that it should be converted into an industrial school.

22830. For children?—For children.

22831. Or for a technical purpose?—Either. The institution was fitted up to accommodate 700 inmates, at present there are only seventy in it, and it is admirably situated for either an auxiliary asylum or for an industrial school, because there is a nice piece of land of eight acres, neatly fenced in all round.

22832. We saw that—a very good piece of land?—A very good piece of land, and nicely plotted out. It would be of advantage to either of these institutions, and it is a very nice location.

22833. Do you live in Strokestown or at some distance from it?—I live four Irish miles from it, near Elphin.

22834. If the ratespayers of the Strokestown Union found that by the closing of their workhouse they would get a substantial and large reduction in their rates, do you think they generally would be in favour of that?—Oh, certainly; but in the Strokestown Union at the present time I think the rates are lower than in any other union in this county.

22835. If they were made considerably lower, even than they are?—Oh, certainly; as far as the ratespayers are concerned, with the exception of those who are gaining some benefit from the institution, as its officials, they are all for entirely dissolving the Strokestown house. It is under discussion with the object for thirteen years, and I think on one occasion it was dissolved; the order was issued by the Local Government Board dissolving it, but through some political dodgery the order was cancelled.

22836. Was it not a resolution of the Guardians themselves?—Several of them; but I think the order was issued by the Local Government Board, because I am aware the valuer had the order.

22837. The law would require at that time the assent of the Guardians?—On several times—on one occasion the board was unanimous in dissolving it; on other occasions the board had a large majority for dissolving it.

22838. Had they not also once a majority against dissolving it?—Never.

22839. What I was asking you was—you told us just now that if the ratespayers got a substantial reduction in the rates you feel sure they would be in favour of amalgamation, provided, of course, that there was no hardship imposed upon the sick and destitute of the district?—I am satisfied if it was dissolved that there would be little or no hardship.

Sept. 22, 1904

Mr. John
Stanley

22830. If Strokestown Workhouse was closed and the hospital were closed, they would have to come, I suppose, to Roscommon?—I would not be in favour of doing up the hospital wholly.

22831. You would leave a small district hospital there?—Certainly, for urgent cases, or otherwise for contagious cases.

22832. You would leave the fever hospital and a small portion of the workhouse for acute cases?—Yes. In other cases they would be very much inclined to come to the county infirmary here.

22833. Could you offer any suggestion as to what electoral divisions should go to the various unions?—I could, if you would include any portion of the union of Longford; it is in a different county, I know. When we had decided to abolish the union there was a portion of it going to Longford, the divisions which were adjoining the Longford Union—Ternoherry, the two Kilmans, Roscary, and Lonscawry.

22834. Since the establishment of County Councils and District Councils a great many witnesses throughout the country have been in favour of the idea that for Poor Law purposes the county ought to be the unit also?—Yes.

22835. But that is an open question. What is your view on it?—I have not formed an opinion as regards that point. There are some objections by some for the Strokestown Union to be attached to these unions—that the rates are higher than they are in their own.

22836. As regards the aged and infirm, do you think there are many of those that might be provided for under an out-door relief system?—I am very much in favour of out-door relief.

22837. Do you find in the last five or six years any increase in it in your union?—No, I think it has reduced.

22838. Then the effect of the union-at-large charge has not been to increase out-door relief, in your opinion?—Not in our union. There are some members of our board very watchful and very vigilant, and we insist into everything very fully.

22839. Then you have got objection to the union-at-large charge?—No. I am very much in favour of out-door relief, because I think a great many of these poor fellows who have to go into workhouses if they got some reasonable relief outside would remain outside, and be more contented.

22840. Do you suffer much from tramps in your part of the county?—Largely. I think if you dissolve a lot of the workhouses in Ireland you will reduce the tramps very largely.

Mr. T. A. P. MAPORESE, D.D., Chairman, Roscommon Union, examined.

22841. CHAIRMAN.—You are Chairman of the Roscommon Board of Guardians?—Yes.

22842. And have been for a great number of years?—Yes; I suppose over twenty.

22843. What is the view of the Board of Guardians of the Roscommon Union as regards the closing of some workhouses in the County Roscommon?—The matter came before us in reply to the queries from your Commission, and the reply we made I am afraid you may consider of a vague, colourless character, but it was generally in favour of amalgamation, provided no inconvenience would be suffered by the sick poor, or poor generally. We did not give a more decided opinion than that; but if no inconvenience could result to those who would be the recipients of relief we were in favour of amalgamation generally.

22844. Did you consider the question of closing any workhouse in the county?—No; we thought as we were not in favour of closing our own workhouse we preferred leaving it to the other workhouses to express an opinion.

22845. You are not in favour of closing Roscommon?—No.

22846. But it is your opinion that fewer workhouses ought to be continued in Ireland?—It is an undoubted fact that the population being so much reduced the accommodation provided is far in excess of existing requirements, and fewer houses would supply the accommodation if the difficulty of the distances could be overcome.

22847. Since the time these workhouses were established communication has been very largely facilitated and increased?—It has; but with the centre of our county, the Strokestown district, railway accommoda-

22851. You have no further suggestions to make?—I do believe you will not be able to adopt any effectual plan to check the tramps unless to dissolve the workhouses. I hear them as they pass me, living on a very public road, and I often hear them having new properties or houses that there are not more workhouses to stop at, and they are getting very tired when drawing near Strokestown; which would give me to understand that if you dissolve workhouses you will get rid of the tramps, unless those tramps who are looking for work. There are two other subjects that are rather vexatious with this board—one is the fees given to doctors for examining lunatics. Unfortunately, lunacy is increasing very much in our country, and we think the fee should be charged to low costs, and not come directly out of the rates. And the other is where the medical officers are remunerated by the Crown, we think that the Crown should not alone pay them their fees, but should also pay their substitutes.

22852. These are questions that are connected somewhat with Poor Law, but they don't come directly under the Poor Law. These doctors you refer to are the dispensary doctors?—Or workhouse doctors. I think it should come under the scope of your inquiry; I also think that the dispensary area should be increased.

22853. That is not within the scope of your inquiry—the dispensary. We don't touch the Rural District Councils or the dispensary arrangements, only the Poor Law?—Now you will not touch the chargeability of the relief.

22854. Yes, anything you have to say about chargeability of relief?—It is a union charge at the present time, and I think it should be a dispensary district charge, because there is a sanitary rate, and that is a dispensary charge.

22855. Is that for all kinds of relief?—No, only out-door relief; I would not touch establishment charges.

22856. Or in-door relief?—No, because the Guardians would have more supervision over a dispensary district than they would have over a union; there would be no jobbery then. The country is very much in favour of a general amalgamation.

22857. And to have a reduction of rates?—And to have industrial pursuits placed in their places; until that comes into force we will have a grievance.

22858. Do you think a great deal of the poverty of the country results from a want of industrial occupation?—Largely; and workhouses, in my opinion, have a tendency to create idleness and bad habits.

tion is very deficient. The Strokestown Union is the only union that it is proposed to abolish, and it is just the one town that has no railway accommodation.

22859. There was never then any question of touching Boyle, Charlemore, or Roscommon?—Well, there was never any resolution passed that I know of in favour of amalgamation.

22860. Have you ever considered the question of making the county a comprehensive unit for Poor Law as well as county purposes?—I cannot say I have given much consideration to it.

22861. That would be taking away from Athlone, Ballinasloe, and Carrick, the portions of the County Roscommon that are in their unions for the purpose of bringing them into the Co. Roscommon for Poor Law purposes?—But Roscommon County is, as far as I know, separated from every other county for administrative purposes.

22862. Not for Poor Law purposes. Some of this county belongs to unions situated in other counties. I really was under the impression they were divided into two portions, these unions. They are divided into District Councils, but the Board of Guardians at Ballinasloe is partly composed of Roscommon and partly of Galway Guardians?—I did not know that; our union is altogether in the county.

22863. Then you have not considered the question?—I have not, indeed.

22864. If Strokestown or any other union in the county were closed, have you any suggestion to make as to the use of the buildings in future?—Our board did not offer any very decided opinion on that point. We suggested two or three different courses. One was the establishment of an asylum for harmless lunatics; and it was suggested by some of the members

Mr. T. A. P.
Maporse.

Sept. 22, 1904

Mr. T. A. P.
Magister.

to apply the building for some industrial purpose. At one time it was suggested, and there was a meeting held in connection with the matter, to have a central school established, to which children might be sent from either unions, and Stocktonhouse was suggested. That was a number of years ago, but since then the boarding-out system has come considerably into use, and, I dare say, that the idea would not now be maintained.

22872. Teaching the boarding-out system, are you in favour of it?—I am in favour of it from the experience I have had.

22873. Have you found in this action that, on the whole, the children are brought up well and healthily?—We have had the system but a very few years established—we have not the finished product of the system yet.

22874. About how many years has it been tried?—Five, at the very outside.

22875. Have you seen any of the children who were put out early?—I have not seen them. We have a committee of ladies, who inspect them regularly, and we receive periodical reports from them.

22876. Are the reports encouraging?—They are, decidedly. In some few instances there are complaints made, but, on the whole, they are encouraging.

22877. Is the feeling of the Board of Guardians in agreement with your own opinion in favour of that?—It is, decidedly.

22878. Would you be in favour of an enlargement by law of the powers of the Guardians to enable them to board out any child that may come into their custody?—I would.

22879. Your Board of Guardians also consider that it would be desirable that power should be given to Boards of Guardians to make provision by a mutual arrangement for such a translocation of persons from one union to another as would secure better classification than that which exists at present?—That was one of our proposals.

22880. Before adopting that general resolution, did you give any suggestions in detail as to how that general idea might be carried out?—No, we did not; it required very small discussion on that point.

22881. Would you have in view, for instance, the idea that if a person, say, at the house of your union—we will say in the Longford direction—were taken suddenly ill, that that patient might be received in other unions on your paying the average cost; would that be an instance of what you mean?—I can hardly say that; it was not discussed.

22882. Or were you thinking of sending all your male infirm to one union, and getting back, say, all their female infirm, so as to have nothing but females in your own workhouse?—I had something in my own mind generally like that, but it was not discussed.

22883. Something that would generalize your classification, so as to make administration within the walls of the workhouse more easy?—Something like that I had in my mind.

22884. You have observed in your long experience that a considerable number of girls come in to give birth to illegitimate children?—Unfortunately, that is so.

22885. We have had suggestions that it would be a good thing to close the workhouse to such cases, and not admit girls who are first offenders into the workhouse to be delivered; it has been suggested to us that they should be sent to some penitentiary male religious management, either Catholic or Protestant, according to the religion of the woman, that she should be there, and efforts should be made for her reformation?—That would be a very good idea.

22886. Is it your experience that when a girl comes in she rarely, if ever, goes out again to any employment in the country?—Well, they do, rarely, sometimes.

22887. As a rule, do a very large number of them go out again, and, perhaps, come back with an illegitimate child?—That has happened. I cannot say whether it has been frequent; I know it has occurred.

22888. In some unions, perhaps where labour is more easily obtained, the number of girls going back to employment is very small, they generally become mothers of more children, and remain as with their children in the workhouse, but you would be in favour of sending them to be reclaimed?—I would.

22889. As regards tramps, you have got a great many of them in Roscommon?—We have, indeed. It is a very difficult subject. We merely suggested as increased stringency in the law, but we did not make any specific recommendation on the subject. I am not clear myself how the law could be made more stringent.

22890. It has been suggested that men who are wandering through the country and are unable to prove that they are really and honestly looking for employment, should be arrested, and brought before a magistrate, with a view to being sent, not by way of punishment, but by way of reclamation, to some central, licensed workhouse, where they might be employed in real labour, that would be self-maintaining, as far as possible; and that they should not be allowed to leave such an institution until they had, in the opinion of the managers, acquired some habits of industry that would make them likely to look for work when released?—If it could be experimentally tried I would be strongly in favour of it; but if you establish an institution like that, you have it there, and you cannot do away with it afterwards.

22891. Suppose you put them into a licensed workhouse, like Stocktonhouse, where they would be employed, would you be in favour of it?—I certainly would, as an experiment.

22892. Dr. Broom—Are there many cases of consumption in the neighbourhood?—I don't know that we have any at present; we have, of course, from time to time, but I never know of our having very many at one time.

22893. You are speaking of the workhouse?—Yes, here no experience except that.

22894. You really don't know whether there are many cases in the neighbourhood?—Sure that I am aware of. I know of one fatal case that occurred in my own immediate neighbourhood recently.

22895. You have not thought of making any provision for them outside the workhouse?—I have not.

Mr. WILLIAM TULAY, J.P., F.R.S., examined.

Mr. William
Tulay.

22896. CHAIRMAN.—You have heard the evidence of your chairman; we would be glad to hear from you anything that you would wish to state, if you differ from him in anything?—I don't differ from him in anything.—In fact, I think he has covered almost the entire ground.

22897. If there is anything you think has been omitted from his examination that you would like to mention, we would be glad to hear it?—With regard to the question of tramps, our board recommend that the law should be more stringently enforced or should be improved in certain directions. The great difficulty in getting convictions of tramps before local magistrates, or any magistrates, is that at present you are bound to prove that that tramp has come from one union to another for the purpose of receiving relief. That is very difficult to prove to the satisfaction of the magistrates, because those tramps are generally going from one town to another, with the intention, probably, of securing some money in the towns they go through, and, therefore, not for the sole purpose of receiving relief in the workhouse. I think the law requires amendment with regard to that.

22898. In what direction would you improve it?—If a man has been coming into a town without any reasonable prospect of employment and no means whatever of maintaining or sustaining himself in that town, I don't see what business he had to leave the previous town and come to another unless he had some reasonable prospect of getting employment in it; and I think he ought to give a reasonable excuse why he left one town and came to another.

22899. You would put the burden of proof as it is instead of on the Guardians?—Yes. I say it is impossible for the Guardians to prove what his object was. That is only a suggestion of my own; it does not come from the board.

22900. Is that partly due to your experience on the bench?—Yes, partly.

22901. What is your view about the chargeability—the union-at-large as an area of chargeability for all purposes?—I think the present state of the law with regard to making it a union-at-large charge is working satisfactorily.

22902. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you heard out any children in your union?—We do, all the children.

22903. How do you find it worked?—It is working splendidly.

22904. No difficulty in providing homes?—None whatever.

22905. Would you like to see it extended?—Very much.

22906. So as to enable Guardians to board out all children under their care?—That is exactly what we have done at Roscommon—every child that is eligible is boarded out.

22907. But you can only board out a certain number?

22908. CHAIRMAN.—You cannot board out a child whose parent is in the house?—Oh, no.

22909. Mr. MURKIN.—Would you like to see it extended so that the Guardians could board out the children of parents who neglected them?—Yes; and I think it would be well if the Guardians had power to board out the children of inmates of the workhouse.

22910. CHAIRMAN.—Should all children from the workhouse, that is what it would come to?—Yes, all children of a certain age.

22911. As soon as they were able to use their teeth, and eat whatever food was going?—You may extend a little longer the care of the parents.

22912. Do you think the case of the workhouse parent is an advantage?—I think it should be extended for a longer period than you mention. About the transfer of inmates, Mr. Shanley was asked if Strokestown Union were broken up, inmates would have to come an additional ten miles on their way to the asylum; at present they don't; they have to go to Ballinacree, and their nearest way is through Roscommon.

22913. Do they go by road or by railway?—They have no possible means of getting from Strokestown but by road.

22914. In the other case all County Roscommon harmless lunatics would be sent to Strokestown; that would mean that every harmless lunatic would have to drive at least eight miles by road. A very large number get on at Roscommon, Castlebar, and Athlone,

and go by railway to Ballinacree; and then, I suppose, in the Boyle district they go down to Mullingar and come back?—Then you are taking the railway station as knowing the route by which the families go back. I know, in Roscommon, we more frequently send them by vehicle direct to Ballinacree.

22915. How many miles?—Twenty Irish miles by road, and the reason why local magistrates—I speak from some little experience—do that is this. The trains, in the first place, do not always start; and, in the next place, sending inmates and police by train is generally objectionable to other travellers by train; it is also a cause of exciting the inmates, changing him from station to station. Then he has to be driven from Ballinacree Station, a distance of two miles, to the asylum. We go direct to the asylum in a covered vehicle; there is no difficulty about it; the expense is about the same.

22916. So that really, as a matter of fact, the inmates, as a rule, are conveyed by road from your unions?—Yes, mostly; of course we send some by rail, when the train suits; but there is nothing gained by sending them by train.

22917. It would be an advantage to have an auxiliary asylum near a railway station?—As far as that is concerned, I think the Board of Guardians would be wiser that any one of our unions you might dispose with should be an asylum for a class of inmates, not exactly dangerous inmates; and I think inmates are people who would not suffer very much by being asked to travel ten miles, which is the outside extent.

22918. Then, for getting supplies?—It is a sort of asylum we would like to see established for these, relieving the taxation on the different unions by having them all together; by not being bound in each workhouse to have a set of officials to look after those, but to have one set; and in the next place it would be very much more comfortable for the poor afflicted people themselves to have them altogether, under proper supervision; and I think there is no great hardship inflicted on them by asking them to go a few miles extra to one central hospital or asylum.

Mr. JOHN FERGUSON, Chairman, Roscommon County Council, examined.

22919. CHAIRMAN.—You are Chairman of the County Council of Roscommon?—Yes.

22920. Would you kindly tell the Commission what the view of the County Council is as regards the maintenance or dissolution of any of the unions in this county?—Perhaps my own views are what I should give more than that of the County Council.

22921. Was there any distinct resolution of the County Council?—Not a distinct; there was a reply to the queries, which, I think, must be in your possession; they were of a very brief nature.

22922. They gave just a simple affirmative to the first query that they are in favour of it—could you give us your view on that?—Speaking in a general way, I consider that the institutions are very extravagantly managed for the amount of the inmates and the amount of relief that we are able to impart. For instance, take the Castlebar Union, of which I am chairman also; there is not more than one-third the number of inmates in the houses that the house is capable of accommodating, and, in fact, the staff that is there would be sufficient for the County of Roscommon. If all the poor in the County Roscommon were placed in our workhouse the staff would be sufficient.

22923. And the same remark, I suppose, would be true about the other workhouses?—As far as I know, I think so.

22924. That would mean that you had three or four times the staff that would be necessary to look after all the inmates if they were together?—I think so. For instance, if the schoolmaster and schoolmistress were dispensed with. The schoolmaster at present has not more than four children, and the schoolmistress about the same number.

22925. And in Roscommon, I believe, practically none?—Yes.

22926. Have you formed any opinion yourself as to what union in the county might be dissolved and the workhouse, to some extent, if not altogether, closed?—No, I have not.

22927. That would depend very largely, I suppose, on considering the circumstances of surrounding counties?—Quite so.

22928. You think it would be difficult for an individual in one county to make an inclusive scheme for his own county without considering other counties adjoining?—Quite so. Germanagh has been often mentioned.

22929. And Carrick-on-Shannon, yesterday, were unanimous in favour of the dissolution of their own union under certain circumstances?—Take Castlebar, I would certainly say that all the aged people in the Castlebar Workhouse could, for instance, come on to Roscommon. I think the Castlebar Workhouse for the old and infirm could be dispensed with. Keep it for the sick; just a hospital; and I think that the remaining portion of the house could be very advantageously used for industrial purposes, or for the education of the destitute poor of the entire County of Roscommon.

22930. When you say the education, do you mean technical and industrial education?—Yes. I heard you questioning Mr. Tully about the boarding out of children; of course, I am in favour of the system in preference to the one that previously existed; but, at the same time, from my experience, you are not certain of placing the child under the most suitable foster-parents, and I think it would be much better if there was one central institution, where they would get a good industrial training. It would be safer, and a better method of bringing up children, and making them useful for the country afterwards.

22931. Do you think a child brought up in an institution is in after life as handy and useful, say, as a farm labourer, as a child that would be brought up in a home where it would be put to work of the same sort from its earliest age?—That is just as I mentioned before. It would entirely depend on the class of home the child is placed in—if you can get a good home it is all right.

22932. Have you tried the boarding-out system very much in the Castlebar Union?—Oh, yes.

22933. What have the results been?—Just mixed.

22934. You have had some good and some indifferent and some bad results?—Quite so.

22935. Do you find out the best sufficiently soon under your system of inspection and observation to remove

Sept. 22, 1904

Mr. WILSON
Telf.

Mr. John
Ferguson.

Sept. 29, 1904.
Mr. John
Finckleton.

them at once, and put them in the hands of better people?—I cannot say that any of them were bad, because if they were, we would have them reared; but we have not had to do anything of the kind; but still I am not myself perfectly satisfied that all the children are in proper homes.

22936. Is your object largely to get them with small farmers, who would be able to give them a milk diet and also to employ them, so that they could join the ranks of the agricultural labourers?—There are no other classes.

22937. Except boarding them out with destitute labourers. In some parts of the country we find the children have been boarded out in the houses of needy labourers, who required some little money, and children have been sent there, and in those cases the results were often unsatisfactory, because the child is not well-fed, and has not had agricultural employment or training?—We have not had to do with that class.

22938. That class, you think, would not be a promising class?—No. So far, it has worked very well; but simply, I consider, for instance, the attendance at schools in very often not as satisfactory or as constant as we desire. For instance, the school may be a considerable distance from where the child is placed, and if the weather is not fine, it is a pretext for keeping the child at home.

22939. I suppose the attendance of all children in remote parts of the country is a little but uncertain for the same reason?—Yes.

22940. You will find that in the case of the children of small farmers who live at a distance from a school the schoolmaster complains that they don't qualify for results by attending regularly?—That is so; but when we heard out these children there is an undertaking given that their attendance at school will be regular.

22941. As far as you observe, are the children who are boarded out brought up in a healthy way?—Yes, with very rare exceptions.

22942. Labour is scarce in the country?—Yes.

22943. Therefore, it would be desirable that children who are in the hands of the Guardians as paupers should be brought up to be useful agricultural labourers?—It would be, perhaps, very desirable; but still, I would be in favour of giving every child the opportunity of becoming what he is naturally fit for. You will find children in the workhouse that are possessed of the best talents if they only get an opportunity.

22944. A child of exceptional ability will make its opportunity when it comes out?—Not if sent to a small agriculturalist or farmer—he won't have the opportunity.

22945. It may make it?—I don't see where he will have the opportunity.

22946. Mr. MURKIN.—There are notable examples, not in this country, but in others. President Lincoln was not very well equipped in early life?—He lived in a different atmosphere.

CHAIRMAN.—Sir HENRY STANLEY was a workhouse boy. Mr. MURKIN.—You don't think it would be a just thing to put children of the workhouse on a higher level than the children of the industrious poor outside?

22947. CHAIRMAN.—As regards making them trainees?—It is a very humiliating position for a child to be in a workhouse, and I would try, as far as possible, to take from that position by giving them the best opportunities of ascending.

22948. Would you be in favour of giving them better opportunities than small, independent ratepayers could afford to give their children?—If I could do it at the present cost, certainly.

22949. Mr. MURKIN.—Would not that be giving an advantage to children born in the workhouse?—The children are often not accountable for being born in the workhouse.

22950. CHAIRMAN.—Yes may say that no child is accountable for the position?—The workhouse ought not to be a barrier.

22951. CHAIRMAN.—At all events, we do need agricultural labourers in the country at present?—Very much.

22952. And that you would consider an honest and useful employment for workhouse children?—For those that would be naturally suited to it.

22953. Would it not be the natural employment for boys and girls, it would be the most economical, and would it not also be a good, healthy, useful life to give them?—Oh, very good. In your queries you are not inquiring into the working of the Labourers' Act?

22954. Not?—Because we suffer from the delays.

22955. We are not inquiring into that. All of us have a good deal of experience on the subject in various capacities, but we are not authorized to go into that. As regards chargeability, is it your opinion that the existing law of union-at-large chargeability is satisfactory?—Yes.

22956. Whether, having regard to the number, capacity, and situation of the workhouse hospitals, county infirmaries, county fever hospitals, and other hospitals existing in the county, additional accommodation is necessary?—Not in our county.

22957. Is there anything you would wish to say about any of the existing institutions for the relief of the sick in your county?—Nothing.

22958. Then the next query is: "Whether any administrative and financial changes are desirable in order to secure a more economical system for the relief generally of—(a) the sick, (b) the insane, and (c) all other classes of the poor or destitute, without impeding efficiency of administration." You have touched on that already to a large extent—is there anything else you think of adding to that?—Nothing further, than that one of the workhouses in the county could be kept for the children, and another for the aged and infirm. Roscommon, for instance, would suit admirably, because there is railway communication between Carlow and Roscommon.

22959. Have you considered whether if one of the workhouses was dissolved, it might not also be made into a place for treating the infectious disease of phthisis or consumption?—I think there ought to be an institution in Connemara for the province.

22960. And that some distasteful workhouse might be avoided?—Yes, if its situation was suitable. It is very much needed. It has come under my own experience where the patients have made application, and have had to wait.

22961. At Newcastle?—Yes.

22962. And where they have brought the disease, perhaps, to other members of their family?—Yes, and have not been able to get admission; whereas, we see in other cases that have gone there—very bad cases, indeed—they have come home relieved, if not cured.

22963. The question of pay would be, to a large extent, mixed up with district hospitals, and I gather from what you say about Carlow that you are a favourer of a district hospital there?—Yes.

22964. Would you introduce any system of payment by persons who are able to pay?—Oh, yes; as it is, we have such a thing.

22965. But you can only charge the full average cost of maintenance. Would you be in favour of giving the governing body of the district hospital discretionary power to charge the patients such sums as the patient or his friends might be able to pay? For instance, in some districts very small charges are made—5d. or 1s. a week for a child of a person who is not altogether destitute. We will say the child would cost to the extent of 5d. a week, then the hospital authorities would charge him 5d., and up to 5s. or 6s., whatever the full cost of employing an extra nurse would be, or whatever assistance might be desirable; would you be in favour of not obliging them to charge, but giving them discretion to charge if necessary?—I think it would be advisable.

22966. At present they can only recover a fixed sum, and that sum is often quite inadequate. In your last hospital, if you got a well-to-do person in there, the only way you can recover is quite disproportionate to the expenditure—therefore, you would be in favour of such a discretionary power?—Certainly, and having such a discretion, a better class would avail themselves of it.

22967. And there would be no longer the workhouse associations, because all these inmates would be removed?—Quite so.

22968. As regards tramps and casuals, have you any opinion on that?—I think they ought to be widely employed at a central institution; they are a great nuisance.

22969. We will say one for a province or a large area?—Yes, some central position; that is most desirable.

22970. Made self-supporting, as far as possible?—It is most desirable.

22971. Would you send them there by a magistrate's warrant?—I have not formed an opinion as to the mode.

22972. At present you have a great many tramps going about the country, bringing their families with them; that is obviously a great hardship and cruelty

Sept. 22, 1904.

Mr. John
Pritchard

to the poor children—would you think it desirable that the law should step in and take the children of such people from them?—Decidedly.

22973. Then, if you take the children from a man and woman trespassing about the country that way, would it not be rather undesirable to leave them at large, perhaps to raise another family of their own children were taken from them?—Before I would have recourse to doing anything of the kind, certainly the authorities in power should be very careful to see—

22974. It would have to be on the fullest investigation?—On the fullest investigation; because that might be the greatest hardship on some, and on others it might be the opposite.

Mr. MURKIN.—With an appeal to the local bench.

22975. CHAIRMAN.—That should be the authority that would send them—the local bench, not the Guardians?—I stated I had not formed an opinion.

22976. Dr. BROWN.—Do you know if the county infirmary at Roscommon is much availed of by people in the County Galway?—Not much; but they would be very much inclined to come to the infirmary.

22977. Are they excluded?—They consider they are, at all events.

22978. Otherwise they would come if you had arrangements made whereby they could be treated there?—Oh, yes, and are very anxious; but, of course, Galway is a very considerable distance, the town of Galway, from that portion of the county that adjoins Roscommon.

22979. Do you think it would be a desirable thing to have some arrangement with the County Galway whereby the County Council could pay for any patients coming from their county into your infirmary?—Most desirable.

22980. Would you apply the same principle to the Carrick-on-Shannon cases going from the other side of the county to the county infirmary of Leitrim?—I would apply it in every case where it is on the border.

22981. It is just on the borders, and we were told yesterday that quite a large number of patients come from the County Roscommon into the county infirmary—you think some arrangement might be made?—Oh, I think so; most desirable and necessary.

22982. Then, also, some objection was raised yesterday that Boyle should not pay for the upkeep of the infirmary at Roscommon—what would you say about that? They said they got so little advantage from it, so few patients come from the neighbourhood of Boyle and that end of the county, that they should not pay for it—An equitable arrangement might be made if the entire scheme were altered.

22983. What would you think of this—that has been raised in several places, and it does apply, to some extent, where the county infirmary is situated at one end of the county and the opposite end does not get the same advantage as the part near the county infirmary—has been suggested that there should be a county rate for hospital purposes, say a district hospital situated at Cheltenham, or even at Boyle, should be supported out of a county rate the same as the county infirmary; what do you think of that?—I think it would be equitable; I certainly think it would be a great convenience; the infirmary would be more availed of.

22984. Do you think it would be a good thing for the people that they should be more availed of?—I do, certainly.

22985. Because they are mostly equipped in a way for performing operations much better than any of the workhouse hospitals, and very often the county surgeon does the larger portion of the surgical operations of that county?—Yes.

22986. Mr. MURKIN.—Have you considered that that would imply taking out of the hands of the Board of Guardians the management of their own particular area and leaving it with the county-at-large?—I have

not considered that. The first thing to be considered, of course, is the best method of distributing the relief.

22987. Dr. BROWN.—To get the best value for your money?—Yes.

22988. CHAIRMAN.—Would it not be possible to leave the district hospitals under district management, even though it were a county-at-large charge—would not the committee of management or body of management be a local body?—If it is a county.

22989. Would not the body that would be, most normally, nominated by the County Council be a local body?—Yes.

22990. Would it not be the District Council; would not that be a very proper body for the County Council to place in charge of the local hospital?—Certainly.

22991. Then it would actually be the district hospital, in charge of the District Council?—These could be as other convenient way of managing it.

22992. Mr. MURKIN.—The District Council would naturally want to look after their own particular area, and see that the money raised by themselves would be spent within their own area?—At present, although there are county-at-large charges for the repairing and working of roads, still the District Councils watch and see that they are properly administered.

22993. But the money that they give is spent within their own area?—Oh, yes.

22994. But under the other suggestion the whole thing would be a county rate, pretty much as the infirmary rate or asylum rate is at present?—Yes.

22995. And that would mean the taking out of the hands of the Board of Guardians the management of their own particular area?—I don't exactly follow you. I think the matter would cut both ways, if there be a give-and-take system. I am not far from abolishing hospitals at all.

22996. Dr. BROWN.—You would rather increase their numbers?—Yes.

22997. And get them availed of by the people they are supposed to benefit?—Exactly.

22998. CHAIRMAN.—And make them more used by classes who have hitherto avoided them owing to their connection with workhouses?—Yes.

22999. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you think a committee appointed by the County Council could manage the local affairs better than the Board of Guardians in their own districts?—I don't consider that; but I consider the position of Roscommon Infirmary at present. I think the people of Boyle have reason to object, because it is an arrangement that really deserving cases cannot make their way to the infirmary.

23000. I quite agree with you as regards that, but the point raised before was a different point altogether; that is, to take away from the Board of Guardians the management of their own area and place it in the hands of some committee appointed by the County Council?—That is for the infirmaries only.

23001. And workhouse hospitals?—They would remain in the hands of the Guardians or in the Rural District Councils.

23002. CHAIRMAN.—Although the expenditure might be a county-at-large charge, the local body should administer it?—Quite so.

23003. Dr. BROWN.—The idea was to get all the hospitals on one basis and have an interchange for the benefit of the county, and also save the money of the county; because, if you have an interchange, it is not necessary to keep up a large stock of instruments in each little hospital, and the concern might be more availed of, and so on; the same way as your idea about the convalescent hospital being a provincial hospital, paid for by all bodies?—Quite so.

CHAIRMAN.—I have just received a telegram from Mr. Tully, M.P., regretting he is unable to be here to-day. Are there any other witnesses from the County Council present?

Mr. WILLIAM HIGGINS, M.C.B., P.L.C., examined.

23004. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the County Council?—Yes. I am a member also of the Roscommon Board of Guardians, and I have been appointed by that board, and would prefer speaking in their name.

23005. Were you here when Mr. Magister gave evidence?—No, sir, I was just in when Mr. Tully was speaking.

23006. We went through with them the replies to the queries that were given?—Yes; we decided it would not be to much advantage to abolish our union.

23007. And while passing a resolution generally in favour of amalgamation, you did not indicate any workhouse that should be closed?—Decidedly not; we have not sufficient information to guide us. I think there are a lot of difficulties in the way of amalgamation.

Mr. William
Higgins

Sept. 22, 1904.

Mr. William Higgins.

23008. You don't suggest any workhouse as a workhouse that might be closed up?—No.

23009. Mr. MURKIN.—What are the difficulties you see?—I consider, as Mr. Fitzgibbon says, you require a hospital in every union for the treatment of the sick poor.

23010. But even that the staff of the workhouse would be considerably reduced, with a corresponding decrease in expenditure?—If you reduce the staff you must curtail the inmates of the house to some other union, and you naturally increase the duties of the officials in the next union, and they will expect to be paid for their additional labour.

23011. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think officials whose whole time is at the disposal of the Guardians have any equitable claim for a large increase of salary owing to additional duties?—Judging from the Local Government Act, they have; because there is provided in that Act for an increase of duties, and in every instance it is made compulsory.

23012. That is for certain officials. What would your own opinion be on that point? Do you think if you were paying a man for his whole time that you could not employ him as much as you liked during that time?—I think that would be equitable; but it would be very difficult for me to prove whether he had not enough to do already, and he might apply to me for assistance.

23013. Is there any suggestion you wish to offer as regards any improvement, apart altogether from the question of closing any workhouse. Supposing you were keeping on all the workhouses, have you any suggestion to offer as to any improvement in the law with a view to improving the existing administration?—Well, very little.

23014. Or do you cannot pretty much in what you have heard up to this?—Yes, sir, very much, except that I think it would be very advisable to have boarded-out children sent at an early age.

23015. As soon as they could see the face of the neighbourhood?—Decidedly.

23016. In that way do you think the persons with whom they were boarded out would become more attached to them, knowing them as little children?—Yes; and the children, not having acquired the habits of the workhouse, would become more useful.

23017. As regards the system of rating, are you in favour of the present union-at-large rate for all parishes?—Well, I think that the rates were better looked after before the Local Government Act, when the charge was on the electoral division.

23018. Would that make you in favour of any change in the existing chargeability?—I think when each Guardian looked after the various divisions he was more careful when applications for outdoor relief came before the board; he was more careful in seeing how they were dealt with; he had a keener eye to his own division. The out-door relief has increased between £150 and £300 in our union since the passing of the Act.

23019. Would that make you in favour of reverting to the old area of charge?—It was the only thing, it would not.

23020. Don't you see it would be a handicap on towns to have to support all the people from the country that come into the towns and look for employment?—I think towns are much benefited by the passing of the Act.

23021. Would they not be rather unfairly hit if they had to pay for all the poor themselves?—They had to do it before the passing of the Local Government Act.

23022. But when their rate reached a certain amount they had a contribution-in-aid from the other divisions—would you be in favour of restoring that contribu-

tion-in-aid?—Yes, I would give them all the benefit they had before the Local Government Act.

23023. It was suggested by one witness that the amount might be considered, having regard to past experience, say, for a number of years, and it might be determined what was the fair amount that might, one year with another, be paid under the head of outdoor relief, and that that fair amount should be a union-at-large charge, but that any increase over and above that amount per annum should be paid by the electoral division. For instance: if your electoral division paid £1 a week, and if that was ascertained to be the fair amount to be paid one year with another, and if you chose to give another one £2 a week, making in £2s, £2 would go on the union and £2 go on the electoral division—would that be a fair arrangement?—It would complicate the accounts very much; it would be very difficult to get through them.

23024. You prefer a simple reversion to things as they were?—I think so.

23025. Would you be in favour of charging persons who were able to pay such sums as the Guardians or Council thought they were able to pay?—Decidedly.

23026. You would wish the law changed, so as to enable the Guardians to recover?—I think they have it in their power to recover.

23027. They can only recover the full average cost of maintenance; they cannot recover the actual outlay. For instance: if they had to get a special surgical nurse or a fever nurse for a well-to-do patient, who could well afford to pay £3 a week, they could not recover that, but only the full average cost of maintenance, which would be very small?—I think it would be more desirable if they could recover more.

23028. What is your view as to transport?—It is a very difficult question as to how they are to be dealt with effectually. Sometimes it used to be suggested in our union that they would be compelled to break stones, do some work, before they leave the house; it is rather difficult, however, to carry out all these suggestions. I have no suggestion to make as to how they should be dealt with.

23029. Mr. MURKIN.—But you do think something ought to be done?—Decidedly.

23030. It has been suggested that power should be given to turn them over to the police once they were proved to be confirmed tramps; do you approve of that?—I cannot say; they suffer a lot of hardships as it is. If they were proved to be confirmed tramps and annoying a union constantly, it would be a proper thing to send out some punishment.

23031. It has been suggested that there should be a central workhouse, either in the province or group of counties, where these people could be sent for a time, and compelled to work; and after they had proved themselves and shown that they were desirous to be reformed, they could be let out and given a chance?—How are the funds to be provided for that?

23032. It has been stated that this system has been tried abroad, and found nearly self-supporting?—By all means, I would have no objection.

23033. The object is reclamation—to get these people off the road?—It would be a capital idea, if it is going to be self-supporting.

23034. But even if it would not be more costly than at present, it would be better than to leave things as they are?—If it would not be more costly. With regard to the hospitals, a county rate would be objectionable, if the hospitals are to be continued in the hands of the Guardians. It would not make the Guardians take the same interest in seeing who the patients should be, as it presently does as to who are to be the recipients of out-door relief.

23035. CHAIRMAN.—You think it would have an extravagant tendency?—I think it would.

Mr. PATRICK CONNOR, F.R.C., Castlebar, examined.

Mr. Patrick Connor.

23036. CHAIRMAN.—You were here when Mr. Fitzgibbon gave his evidence?—Yes, sir.

23037. Would you kindly mention any matter in which you would like to add to or vary his evidence?—There is one matter that would affect as very unevenly, that is divisional rating; because it is on one side a suggested district, and thickly populated, and on the other it is all prime farms; and if it had not been union rating it would come very heavy on those with small holdings and the town generally.

23038. What rating would you be in favour of?—Union rating. In some districts, with regard to out-

door relief, people would be more careful in giving out-door if it was divisional rating, but looking at it generally it would be unfair. Then, with regard to foster-parents, I would be entirely in favour of children being given to foster-parents, but there is a great difficulty in getting proper people to take them in charge.

23039. Have you a ladies' committee in Castlebar?—Yes.

23040. And they are active?—They are active. Great care is required with girls when they grow up to sixteen or seventeen, but it is a great improvement

to young boys, because they would be trained in the manual art of going on in the world, and becoming useful citizens; and when they grow up between sixteen and twenty they would be more likely to look out for parents they are obliged to.

23041. They are already trained for labour?—Yes; if they had a taste for trades then it would be seen what they are best suited for.

23042. It might be brought before the Guardians by the committee or their inspectors?—Exactly. When taking them out of the workhouse those who were in the habit of taking them out as servants found they were seldom or never any use at all; they seemed to be quite useless; it is quite different when trained with practical farmers outside.

23043. Is there anything else?—With regard to the tramps, they are a very great nuisance in small towns. They sometimes come down very rapidly, whatever is the cause. Sometimes we don't be troubled with them; other times they are very troublesome.

23044. Before fatal?—Exactly; and they give great trouble in going through the streets looking for money and looking for alms; they then proceed to the workhouse for shelter for the night.

23045. Have you any knowledge of how they get along in the country; are they and to intimidate people into giving them money?—Yes, sir, they do; I have learned that repeatedly; they go about in gangs sometimes, and give great trouble.

Sept. 20, 1894.

Mr. Patrick
Gentry.

Mr. JAMES NEARY, J.P., Chairman, Strokestown Union, examined.

23046. CHAIRMAN.—I don't think you were in when the last witness came forward?—I was not.

23047. The Strokestown people were unanimously in favour of the breaking up of their union?—No, they were not at all unanimous.

23048. A large majority, was it?—No, that meeting was not well attended. I think they might be nearly evenly divided; but if there was a full attendance the majority would be against breaking up the union; but as far as the general question of amalgamation is concerned, I think there would be unanimity on that point.

23049. In favour of some reduction in the number of workhouses throughout Ireland?—A very large reduction.

23050. That would reduce the rating?—There might be a very considerable number of the Guardians in Strokestown in favour of doing away with the workhouse as such.

23051. But they would like the union to remain as it is. Supposing there were a number of the inmates sent to different institutions, according to the class—the children to be sent to an institution for that purpose, the imbeciles might be sent to another place for the same purpose?—If it could be arranged that we would pay so much per head to cover the cost of maintenance in those institutions, I think it would meet more with the approval of the Guardians.

23052. Would you keep any class in Strokestown except the sick?—I don't think any house should be maintained to keep any class unless there was a very considerable number—say 200.

23053. Would you keep a hospital for the sick?—No, I think not.

23054. Would you let the sick follow the same rule as the healthy?—If the workhouse is to be broken up I would break it up altogether. I think out-door relief might be judiciously increased.

23055. Would you establish any general check to prevent any undue increase in out-door relief?—It has not increased very much.

23056. If you make it a general practice with aged people, who would rather get out-door relief than come into the workhouse, would you apprehend that cases might be put forward for old people to get relief who would not otherwise come forward?—That is always

done; but, still, I think there is no relief given except in deserving cases.

23057. If you enlarged the class for out-door relief and were enabled to give out-door relief to old people who are now received into workhouses, and if you make these people, and all old people in fact, eligible for out-door relief, would you be afraid that you would receive a great many applications from people who would not dream of asking to be received into the workhouses?—Yes, we have received such applications already; but, then, I think the Guardians would not increase it. And I would be in favour of extending the powers for giving out-door relief slightly. It is limited now to a quarter acre; I don't think that restriction should be.

23058. Would you also enable the Guardians to give out-door relief to all classes of old and infirm people?—Yes, in nearly all cases.

23059. Even if they were what you might call healthy?—Yes, if they were indigent.

23060. And you don't think it would be necessary to safeguard that provision in any way except by the discretion of the Guardians?—Exactly, I don't think so; I think it is the best relief that is administered. I know there is a tendency since the passing of the Act of 1886 to increase the out-door relief in certain divisions. The Guardians wish to get as much as they can as a union charge; but at the same time I think it is better it should continue a *maius charge*.

23061. Having regard to that, don't you think it would be necessary to have some little safeguard?—Yes; I heard you suggest that; and I think if there was a slight safeguard, and if a certain Guardian wished to have it increased from what the Guardians thought reasonable, it would be well for the division to pay the excess.

23062. Is there anything else that has not been mentioned by previous witnesses?—It is my impression that it would be well for the unions to continue; possibly Strokestown might be discontinued as a workhouse, except we had imbeciles or children to be brought there. With regard to tramps, I think it would be very well if there was a place set apart for what you might call the vicious poor, and those habitual tramps ought to be compelled to go there for some time, until they were self-supporting, or partly self-supporting.

Mr. James
Neary.

Mr. TIMOTHY O'LOUGHEE examined.

23063. CHAIRMAN.—You are also from Strokestown?—Yes.

23064. Are you a resident in the town?—No, in the rural district—the Castlewaide side.

23065. What was your individual opinion when you had the division on amalgamation?—I was in favour of amalgamation, and for twenty years.

23066. Did that mean the closing of the Strokestown Workhouse?—I would imagine it would be one of the smallest. Two or three in the county would be quite enough.

23067. If it were closed, you would be very anxious, I understand from the minutes, that some useful purpose should be found for the workhouse?—Quite so.

23068. What would you suggest?—I don't know; there are several matters—an auxiliary asylum.

23069. A place for consumptives?—Yes, or a place for children. An industrial school; whatever would be best.

23070. How would you divide the union of Strokestown—would you send it nearly altogether to one workhouse?—I think it would be better, and Ac-

common I would say; it would be very difficult to do it otherwise.

23071. Would you be in favour of enabling Boards of Guardians throughout the country to charge and recover such sums as they in their discretion might think patients or their relatives could afford to pay?—Quite so; I would be strongly in favour of that. Up to this we could only charge the average maintenance.

23072. Are you in favour of the boarding out system for children?—Yes, I think it is very much better.

23073. As regards tramps?—They are a great nuisance, and a great expense.

23074. You would be in favour of detaining them in a union like Strokestown?—They are the worst members of society, I must admit; but there is no use in throwing them out entirely.

23075. You would be in favour of putting them into an institution, where the object would be to try and give them habits of industry, and bring them back to useful life?—Quite so.

23076. Is there any other matter you would wish to mention?—Well, no.

Mr. Timothy
O'Loughlin.

Sept. 28, 1904.

FORTY-SEVENTH PUBLIC SITTING—WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28th, 1904.

At the Courthouse, Belmullet.

Present:—Mr. MICES (Chairman), Mr. MURTAGHAN, and Dr. COEY BIGGER.

Mr. E. N. FLYNN, Clerk, Belmullet Union, examined.

Mr. E. N. Flynn.

23077. CHAIRMAN.—The Union of Belmullet has been in existence since about 1850?—1850.

23078. Have any resolutions been passed for or against the amalgamation or the breaking up of the union?—Yes, sir, there were.

23079. Give us the most recent of those?—About three years ago.

23080. What generally was the effect of the resolution then?—It was a resolution, as far as I remember, that came from another union and recommended amalgamation, and they adopted it.

23081. That did not mean that they were in favour of their own workhouse being broken up, but it meant they were in favour generally of the idea in the case of some workhouses?—Exactly.

23082. Did they ever consider the question of breaking up their own union?—No, sir; they made no definite proposal or recommendation about it that I remember.

23083. What is the valuation of your union?—I think £14,843; the reason I have any doubt about it is that we don't get this from the County Council regularly.

23084. About how much does Ld. in the £ produce?—£45.

23085. So that any expense of £45 or £50 in this union means Ld. in the £ on the ratepayers?—Yes.

23086. I suppose that means that it is almost impossible. Next to Oughterdown you are the lowest valued union in Ireland?—Kilbake is about double.

23087. I think Oughterdown is £9,000?—I think it must be more; we are the lowest in Ireland.

23088. The number of your inmates is at present about?—I think about 60.

23089. Have you considered the question of closing the workhouse, or was it discussed at all by any of the Councils or Guardians?—I was present when they discussed these queries you mentioned, but nothing more than that.

23090. In the event of the workhouse being closed, did they think it desirable that some building should be left for the treatment of the sick, urgent cases?—I think they considered that absolutely necessary.

23091. For fever and urgent sick cases?—Yes.

23092. Have you got many tramps in your union?—No, sir, we are very free from them; we are so remote we have very little.

23093. Are there many cases of illegitimacy in the union?—Well, no, sir; there are some cases.

23094. You have only three or four in the workhouse at present?—Yes.

23095. On the 1st January, when the last statistics were taken, you had 31 sick and 27 infirm—

that would be 58 out of the 60. The rest would be very largely children?—Largely children.

23096. And fathers and mothers of babies?—Yes.

23097. As regards inmates, you have only one or two closed in that way?—There at present, not inmates, but inmates, of the idiot class.

23098. What the Councils ask, I gather from their replies, is that owing to the very small valuation of their union they would rather like to see the union increased in size so as to have a larger valuation, or else they would like some arrangement to be made that would save them expense in some other way?—Exactly.

23099. Did you ever hear any discussion or any idea as to how the rating of the union might be lowered?—Oh, no, sir, except in a way.

23100. Except by giving them a larger territory. Is there any other way that occurs to you?—To myself, personally, no, sir; I don't think so.

23101. How much do you get from Parliamentary grants?—Our agricultural grant, do you mean?

23102. Do you happen to know what is the total amount, or approximately, the amount that is paid to your treasurer out of the county-at-large charges in aid of your expenditure?—I really don't know, it is not paid direct to us; it is paid into the County Council. I really don't know; I could send you these figures.

23103. It would be a substantial amount?—It is; we get £750, I think, for the agricultural grant, and then half of what we pay out for medical charges and other expenditure.

23104. How much percentage would £750 mean, 15d. in the £?—A little more than that; I think about 12d. in the £.

23105. What is the highest in recent years that you have known your rate to go to?—Our standard rate would be 3s. 5d. for poor-law purposes, our county rate is 2s. 10d. The standard would be, perhaps, the best test.

23106. We might take it, perhaps, that the public contribution to your rates would be nearly 3s. 1d. I think so; I am sure it would be that.

23107. Then that would leave you to find another 3s. or thereabouts?—Yes; we are paying 6s. 8d. at present for both services. Of course I would have had all these figures for you if I had known about it.

23108. We intend to get it on the 4th from the County Council witnesses at Castlebar, and we just came here as the distance was so far for you to come. They are figures that would be more properly given by the County Council officials?—They would; that is my difficulty.

Mr. ALEXANDER BEELEY, F.R.C.S., examined.

Mr. Alexander Beeley.

23109. CHAIRMAN.—What division do you represent?—Mullingnab.

23110. But you are not resident in it. I believe you reside in Belmullet?—Yes.

23111. How many Councils have you on your Board?—Upwards of thirty.

23112. You have about fifteen divisions?—Fifteen or sixteen, or seventeen divisions; something like that, two to each.

23113. Have you more than two members for Belmullet?—Belmullet returned two members formerly. I think there are only two in it still.

23114. What about the members of your body—do you think you are too numerous, or are you a happy family as you are?—We agree pretty well down here.

23115. You don't find you have too many?—Sometimes it is too few; they have to come a long distance.

23116. I suppose most of the labour falls on the town Guardians?—A good deal.

23117. Except that there is something existing or impending on?—Yes; they become more numerous when there is anything on.

23118. This is not one of the unions in which they feel they have too many Councils?—I don't hear them complaining.

23119. You have plenty of room in the Board-room?—Plenty of room.

23120. Have you at all formed any opinion as to whether it would be well to close at all, wholly or in part, the workhouse here of Belmullet?—I often heard it discussed. We generally say that the rates are high, and we don't see any possibility of keeping them lower, seeing the low valuation, and any change we would think would be almost for the better.

23122. You find the rates very heavy here?—Very heavy, and we cannot get them, unfortunately, reduced, and in the way of appointments and everything else we are met by this Board in Dublin, that does not allow us to reduce them, but in increasing them; houses, doctors, and everything; we have no vote in it.

23123. And you find an increase of expenditure?—An increase, and we cannot help it; the only thing we have any control over is the relief, and that is out done to the very lowest figure.

23124. What are your payments on outdoor relief at present?—I could not exactly say.

23125. I think I am aware that it is about between £200 and £300 a year?—I did not come prepared to give evidence.

23126. Do you know that you look very closely at the expenditure in relief?—Very closely; it is the only thing we have any control over.

23127. As a practical man, if you were to close your workhouse here, do you think it would be possible to safely enlarge the giving of outdoor relief with a view of keeping old people out of the workhouse, and if you could keep the old people out of the workhouse, and in their own houses or locality, do you think that would be a safe thing to do?—Supposing we were amalgamated with some rich union, Ballina or Westport, that would bear part of the burden, we could do that, but Belmullet could not afford it.

23128. If Belmullet remained, the area of charge you could not afford it?—No.

23129. Even if you might get of a considerable expenditure if you closed the aged and infirm part of your workhouse, that would mean that you could dispense with the others that look after that part of the house?—Yes, of course; but I say we should have a kind of temporary hospital here, and we would want a staff there still.

23130. Oh, you would want your hospital staff?—You would, the distance is so long to any place.

23131. You would be afraid that if you started with the idea of giving outdoor relief in the houses of the people that you would find a great many more applicants for outdoor relief than you would for admission to the workhouse?—No doubt of it; those that are refused relief, half of them don't come in.

23132. Would that make you rather afraid of the extension of outdoor relief as a means of dealing with the property of this poor Union of Belmullet?—The Guardians could still exercise their own judgment; they know who is deserving and who is not.

23133. Then don't you think there would be no risk in leaving the question of outdoor relief to the Guardians?—Oh, I think not; the Guardians are very sparing in that respect.

23134. And if you closed the aged and infirm part of the building you think you might very easily discriminate what persons should get outdoor relief and what persons should not?—I think so.

23135. And you would not be afraid of any abuses?—I think not. The Relieving Officer, to a certain extent, can go beyond the control of the Guardians, and the Guardians sometimes curtail the expenses.

23136. That would be in cases of sudden and urgent necessity?—Oh, yes. And if he considers a person is deserving, even though the Guardians don't think so, he can at his own risk give relief.

23137. Only temporary, only for a week?—They can continue it from week to week.

23138. Is that their practice here?

Mr. Flynn.—It is to some extent; they continue it from week to week.

Witness.—And when they come before the auditor it is a question whether they will be sanctioned or not; they can do in and sometimes they do it.

23139. Keep at the Guardians disapprove of the temporary relief that is given, and other than the Guardians?—The officers don't like to go against the Guardians. But sometimes when the Guardians don't see their way and would like to do it, they do it.

23140. That is the Guardians say, "We will leave it to yourselves"—then they don't go against the Guardians?—They do not.

23141. Have you any opinions about keeping lunatics in workhouses?—I think they would be better anywhere than in workhouses.

23142. As regards children, have you had any experience at all of what is known as the boarding-out system. You don't board out any children here?—No.

23143. In a great many unions the children who can be boarded out, that is, the orphans and deserted children, are placed at two or three years of age out in families?—I saw that in the papers; we have none of it here.

23144. And the families in those cases, as far as the experience goes, get attached to those children, and they become in a very large number of cases members of the family?—I believe that.

23145. And contribute to the savings of the family in after-life. Would you be in favour of all of starting such a system as that?—I think it would be a very good system. You would board them out as cheap as you would rear them in the home.

23146. More cheaply?—And they would become better members of society; I never see them doing much good those that are brought up in the workhouse.

23147. When they are boarded out they don't know their way back to the workhouse?—No; I would be inclined to approve of that system.

23148. How that question has brought forward at all at your Board of Guardians?—No; I never saw it in my time.

23149. It would be a useful thing for you to discuss?—I think it would.

23150. I dare say you would take an opportunity yourself of bringing it forward. As regards girls coming into the workhouse for the purpose of becoming mothers of illegitimate children, you have noticed that such girls do come into the workhouse, not very often in this district, but they sometimes come in?—Yes; there is a certain class.

23151. Can you tell me what happens to those girls when they come into the workhouse. As soon as they give birth to a child, as a rule do they remain for a considerable period, or perhaps for the rest of their life in the workhouse?—I think very few remain; they go out and mostly go away to America, if they are young girls, and I am afraid sometimes leave the offspring here in the charge of the union. That is the worst of it.

23152. Do you know any instance of these girls coming in a second time to the workhouse to become the mother of another child in the same?—Well, I do not.

23153. It is very frequent in more populous places?—It may be so, but of my own knowledge I don't know. I suspect there are cases of that kind.

23154. It has been suggested to us in various places that we have gone to that it would be a good thing that such girls should not be eligible for admission to the workhouse at all, but that they should be sent by order of the Relieving Officer or by the order of the Guardians to a religious penitentiary or refuge on the condition of their first fall, so that they might be there reclaimed. Would you be in favour of closing the workhouse to such cases?—I think so; reform them, I think.

23155. And give them a fresh start in the world after good influence has been used upon them?—I think so. As far as they are concerned here, I think they are under very good influences, because they have the nurse here who takes good care of that class.

23156. The workhouse, of course, in any workhouse, even where the nurse is, is that the classification of the workhouse makes it very difficult, if not impossible, to exclude this class and keep them by themselves. It is always understood that in treating people of that class that a certain amount of solitude and seclusion is desirable as a means of bringing them to a sense of their condition, that could not be in a workhouse?—I don't know the general arrangement in that respect. I don't see why there could not be a ward for those in the workhouse; our workhouse is very large.

23157. It is very difficult to keep any class apart altogether in a workhouse?—Indeed it is.

23158. Is there any other matter that I have not asked you about that seems to you on which you would like to make any statement?—Oh, no; the only thing I see for us here against amalgamation is that there are no facilities for taking the sick away. If there are a railway to Ballina or Westport there would be no difficulty, but from Blackrock to Ballina it is forty-two miles, and to Westport sixty. If we had facilities that way there is not a Guardian in Belmullet that would not like to have them amalgamated with some place, because we never would get rid of these heavy rates.

23159. Then you go back the distance is the only barrier you see?—That is the great obstacle.

Sept. 28, 1904.

Mr. Alexander Begley.

23159. Have you ever considered the question whether a union like this might fairly ask for some assistance to your local rates?—We may think of it, but I believe it is hard to get it.

23160. You are aware, of course, that very large contributions are given from the public taxation of the county, from Parliamentary grants and Agricultural grants. You are aware that there are very large contributions given?—Very large.

23161. Are you aware that by far the greater portion of these grants is given to the large and wealthy unions?—Of course they get their proportion.

23162. Do you think, or has it at all been considered amongst you here, that a union of a distressed and impoverished condition like this might fairly ask for more than a rich union like Belfast or Dublin would get?—I think so. We often asked when we were in difficulties with fever in Inniskea and other places and we got nothing.

23163. That would be asking for a subscription, but have you thought of the question of getting a larger share of the annual grants than unions which

are rich and comfortable?—No, we thought we could not get it, and did not try for it.

23164. If you saw any way of getting that, what would be the opinion of your Board of Guardians?—We would be very glad to accept it, and to look for it if we thought we had a chance of getting it.

23165. Do you think you would be fairly entitled as a very poor union that does not rise above flag and tile floor, and keeps the patients miserably in comparatively uncomfortable quarters. I am not blaming the union at all, because I think your hospital is very creditable, and everything about it very nice, considering your means, but if you had a little more money it would be better?—Certainly, it would.

23166. You would be able to have the hospital better, and up to the average condition of well-managed unions?—Anything that would reduce the rates with us, we would try to pull through without asking any change or amalgamation if we are assisted in any way.

23167. If you had a larger contribution?—Yes.

23168. Do you think it would be reasonable for you to ask it?—I think it, and I am sure we will do so.

MR. JAMES MILLS, J.P., M.C.C., EXAMINED.

Mr. James Mills.

23169. CHAIRMAN.—You are a County Councillor, and you are also Chairman of the Rural District Council?—Yes.

23170. About the number of your Guardians, does the number change any inconvenience, or as it is a convenient number, your present number?—It is a convenient number.

23171. Do you find it more convenient than in the old times?—We have an increased number now.

23172. But the total is small?—The total is small, about thirty-three.

23173. And that, owing to the long distances to be travelled, is not an excessive number?—No; some of them have to come fifteen or twenty miles.

23174. And I suppose the representatives who are living in and near the town have most of the ordinary business to do?—Oh, certainly; you could not expect the Guardians living at long distances to come in except there is something special.

23175. A great many of the distant divisions, I dare say, are represented by Belmullet residents?—Well, no, Mr. Begley represents one of the distant divisions, and Mr. O'Malley, if I don't mistake, a representative of a distant division, lives near the town.

23176. What is the general sentiment of your Board of Guardians and District Council on the question of amalgamation?—They believe that if the union is amalgamated the rates will be less.

23177. And by amalgamation what changes would be carried out?—I have not asked them; the matter was not discussed in that detailed way. They merely said "Give us something."

23178. That will reduce our rates?—Certainly.

23179. They did not think what would follow on amalgamation?—I don't think they considered it.

23180. For instance, did they consider the question, if amalgamation took place, whether a hospital would be left here for the treatment of the sick?—I believe that if that was discussed it would be their own opinion that a hospital should be here for the sick.

23181. You could hardly ask fever patients, and people suffering from pneumonia or broken bones to go to Ballina for treatment?—Not at all.

23182. Therefore, it would be utterly inhuman to take them such distances?—Yes, to take them now from Blackrock to Ballina is something like sixty English miles; that is a long distance; it would be rather inhuman.

23183. That would be quite impossible to consider, so if any change took place here you could not contemplate the closing of the hospital?—Not at all.

23184. We heard from Mr. Flynn that for every £45 that is raised by way of rates in the union it means 1d. in the £1.—That is so; our valuation is so small that the people imagine we would be better off if we amalgamated with other unions.

23185. So as to have a larger valuation over which to spread the expenses?—Exactly so.

23186. If a provision were left here for the sick, do you think there would be very much hardship in moving those who are able to travel to another workhouse?—I think not, if the union is amalgamated, say, with Ballina and Westport; we have a steamer service, so

I don't see that we would have much hardship in removing the people. From Bangor they could go to Ballina, and from Blackrock they could go in with Westport.

23187. You have not much connection with Castlebar except for horses?—No.

23188. Do you ever go to the animals?—Very seldom.

23189. When you do go, how do you go?—Go to Ballina and take the train.

23190. Before you had the train from Ballina you went from Corick Bridge?—Exactly; go by road all the way.

23191. What places did you pass?—Corrylea, and Corick; go on straight from Corick, keeping to the south of Nephin.

23192. How far would it be from Corick Bridge to Castlebar. Would Castlebar be a little further than Ballina?—Six or seven miles further; about twenty-two miles, I think, from Corick to Castlebar.

23193. You have a long car daily, or twice a day, to Ballina?—Once a day; we had some time ago a double service, but we lost that.

23194. How did you lose that?—I believe it was not paying; it was a private enterprise.

23195. In competition with the mail car, what is the price of a seat on the mail car?—Six shillings.

23196. What used it to be when you had the competition?—Down to 2s. or 2½. 6d.

23197. If, for instance, Castlebar were selected as a central place for one class of inmates, the proper way to send in inmates from here who could not travel would be by long car to Ballina?—What I mean is that if there is a portion amalgamated with Castlebar or Westport, we have the steamer service to Malinbeg, and it would be very easy taking them to Castlebar.

23198. Is that service sure to come?—They are building piers for it, and I believe they are going to start on shortly; the County Council have given the necessary guarantee.

23199. You have a pier here, and all you want is a pier at Tynkeague?—Yes.

Mr. Flynn.—This pier is not suitable; they intend to build a new pier into deep water here or to dredge.

Witness.—So that they could have a daily service.

23200. CHAIRMAN.—I did not know that it would be possible to get a daily service nearer Belmullet than Cleggan; it would have to be a tidal steamer?—No, sir; we have deep water within a quarter of a mile of the town at any state of the tide.

23201. A very narrow channel?—Very narrow.

23202. A steamer could not turn in it, I suppose?

Oh, yes, up to the end.

23203. That is the channel that brings the water right through to Broadhaven?—No, into Blackrock.

23204. But the water is the water that flows into Broadhaven?—Oh, yes, through the canal.

23205. I suppose it is the fear of that keeps that deep?—It keeps the Blackrock side deep, but fills in the other side.

23206. Do you think that lunatics ought to be kept in workhouses, or that it would be better to send them to an institution kept up purposely for lunatics?—That is my opinion.

23287. As regards children, you have not tried the boarding-out of children?—No, never.

23288. Were you here when Mr. Begley was discussing that question?—I was not in here at that time.

23289. The boarding-out of children is tried in a great many other unions; a child is placed out at between two and three years of age, placed in a small farmer's family where he can get skill, and doesn't fool and trained up to be an agricultural labourer?—I think that would be better than the present system of keeping them in the workhouse.

23290. You have been a long time connected with poor-law administration?—About fifteen years now.

23291. What is your opinion about the rearing of children in workhouses?—I never saw them turn out very good until the nuns came, but since we got the nuns here I must say they are brought up very nicely and make very good servants.

23292. You have seen some of the little girls go into service from here?—Yes.

23293. Have you ever happened to engage one yourself?—No.

23294. You know the people who have?—Yes.

23295. Have they proved handy and useful servants?—Generally.

23296. Are they amenable to discipline?—Very much so, especially since we got the nuns.

23297. They don't take a huff and go off to the workhouse?—No, I don't know of any going back, especially since the nuns came in.

23298. We also had some evidence from Mr. Begley about outdoor relief, and I take it that he considered that the Guardians exercised a very careful and wise supervision in the case of applications for outdoor relief?—That is so.

23299. And that no relief was given except in cases of most urgent necessity?—That is so.

23300. Rather than go long distances to Ballina or any other workhouse, you possibly consider that there would be more applications?—I think so.

23301. Do you think that the Guardians would be able to deal just as satisfactorily with any increased applications as they are able to deal with applications at the present time?—Well, owing to the long distance to Ballina I am afraid of it.

23302. Would you be rather afraid that there would be an increased pressure that it would be difficult to meet?—I think so.

23303. You think if a poor person came in and said "You cannot ask me to go to Ballina away from my locality and people," do you think the Board of Guardians would be more likely to give outdoor relief in that case than if the person was only going to the Belmullet Workhouse?—Undoubtedly.

23304. Would you then apprehend a larger demand on outdoor relief in the event of amalgamation?—Certainly, sir; I believe it.

23305. Do you think it would be very much increased?—Well, I think it would be increased very much.

23306. Do you think people might apply for outdoor relief who would never dream of applying for it at present?—I think so, because the Guardians at Ballina or Westport or Castlebar would be quite ignorant of the cases, and the Guardians could not attend there from home.

23307. You hardly consider it possible that the District Councils should be asked to go such long distances as Ballina or Westport to attend a meeting?—It would be very hard to expect them.

23308. You would be in favour of some body being allowed to operate locally?—Exactly.

23309. I am speaking of such a local body?—That is the body that would have to deal with the applications for relief.

23310. Do you think the local body here, not the Guardians at Ballina or Westport, could deal satisfactorily with applications that were received from the old Belmullet Union?—Certainly.

23311. And you would not be afraid of their yielding?—Certainly not.

23312. Then you entirely agree with Mr. Begley's evidence, that a local body here, dealing with relief, might be trusted only to give it in urgent cases?—I believe they would carry out the intentions of the ratepayers to the letter.

23313. You most likely then would have a less expenditure than you have at present?—That is so.

23314. Because you would be saved the comparatively large average cost of the house, and then you would have the outdoor relief, and it never costs so much as indoor; and you think you would ride on outdoor relief applications with sufficient firmness to save you from spending more than you now spend, and, perhaps, you would be able to save?—I think we would be able to save.

23315. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—You make the point that distance is a great obstacle in the way of doing away with the workhouse here for the infirm and aged?—Yes.

23316. Has it ever occurred to you that there is an intermediate course, that is establishing cottage houses for these poor people; the few that are left might be boarded out?—No, sir, I never went into that.

23317. That would be a method of getting over the distance trouble. For instance, now if the Guardians could do with the aged and infirm what they do in some places with the children, that is to say, provide homes for them—houses that would be occasionally inspected and looked after—that, to some extent, would get rid of the distance trouble?—It would.

23318. And the extension of out-door relief would be another aid in that respect; and you think if something like that was done, and an infirmary retained in Belmullet, it would meet all the necessary requirements?—I think so.

Mr. JOHN O'Malley, M.C.C., examined.

23319. CHAIRMAN.—What is the county electoral division you represent?—Belmullet, including The Mullet and the surrounding districts.

23320. Does it take leave in it?—No, the inside of The Mullet, and as far as Gallagher's district.

Mr. FLYNN.—It takes in Binghamtown, Belmullet North and South, Glenties, and Rathill.

23321. Rathill is a place where there is a good deal of poverty?—Very much.

23322. Do they do much labour in England and Scotland?—They maintain their parents by sending home money and paying rents.

23323. Have you many people in receipt of relief?—A great many; it is one of the worst districts in the union.

23324. Have you ever been a Poor Law Guardian?—No.

23325. I suppose you have considered the question of expenditure on poor rate?—I have; I have been thinking over it for a long time.

23326. What do you think about the question of closing, either wholly or partially, the present workhouse in Belmullet?—Well, I believe it is the ambition of all whom I represent that it should be closed, for the reasons Mr. Mullis has explained.

23327. As regards the sick, you would leave a place for treating them?—Yes, I have gone to the trouble in Castlebar of picking out some figures with reference to the union. I find that all it costs for an average—now I am talking of the out-door relief—I add that to the number of papers inside, and it comes to 3s. 11d. per head per week.

23328. That only takes in food and clothing?—Food and clothing are only included in that.

Mr. FLYNN.—I really don't know what figures you are giving.

CHAIRMAN.—It is from the table of the Local Government Report.

Mr. FLYNN.—Our average weekly cost is 4s.—3s. 6d. for food, and 6d. for clothing; but I think Mr. O'Malley is speaking also of out-door relief.

Witness.—I take outdoor and indoor relief, the average for the year; that comes to about £209, roughly speaking. As against that, there are expenditures shown which come to about £2,800.

23329. That is the rate raised?—Yes. So that my idea about it is, that if you had, roughly speaking, one union in the whole county it would be the better way.

23330. Supposing you had one union in the whole county for the class that you have to deal with,

Mr. John O'Malley.

Sept. 28, 1901.

Mr. John
O'Malley.

and exclude the sick; the main class that you have in your workhouse, including the sick, are the aged and infirm; they are the bulk of your people, and if you based on the children and send the inmates elsewhere, you, practically, would have nobody left but the aged and infirm—you think it would be possible to manage those in one workhouse in the county?—Certainly; some central workhouse.

23251. Say Castlebar or Claremorris?—Well, Castlebar or Ballina.

23252. Ballina would not be central?—No; I suppose Castlebar or Claremorris.

23253. Some central workhouse where they could all go, and, therefore, you would have a large number of inmates looked after by a very little increase in the staff of the workhouse where they are?—Quite right.

23254. And you would save the salaries of all the officials in all the other workhouses?—That is the feeling of the County Council of Mayo.

23255. And that is your view, too?—And my view.

23256. Then you would leave the sick in each locality where there is a hospital at present?—For the sick, and you would also require a hospital for contagious diseases; you could not possibly remove those forty or fifty miles.

23257. In your union do you think there is any further provision necessary for the sick than there is now?—No, I think they are very well off here.

23258. The most distant point of your union on the north-east would be beyond Portlaniel?—I think that would be it.

Mr. Flynn.—Craggahog and Ballycastle is the furthest.

23259. CHAIRMAN.—That is a good road; how far would Skraggle be?

Mr. Flynn.—Twenty-two Irish miles.

23260. That would be as distant a part of your union as there is?

Mr. Flynn.—It would be as troublesome.

23261. And there is a fairly thick population at Portlaniel and Skraggle?

Mr. Flynn.—Yes, and round to Portlaniel.

23262. When you come to the south, what is the most distant point?—Doonagh, twelve Irish miles.

23263. Do you cross the Tullaghan ferry?—No, that is the meeting; Westport Union comes there.

23264. Then you have Fallowa?

Mr. Flynn.—That is the most distant point—twelve miles further.

23265. Banger has the thickest population towards Outok Bridge?

Mr. Flynn.—Banger is ten Irish miles.

23266. So those are your chief distances, and you don't think any further hospital accommodation is necessary?—I don't think so.

23267. The sick out at Portlaniel and Portlaniel and round to Rosport are all attended by the Proudhon doctors?—Principally; we have never many from those distant places.

23268. Don't you think, perhaps, that the distance prohibits it? There is at present a nurse at Aghose

kept up by the Rosport newspaper—her district is chiefly on this side of the ferry?—Yes.

23269. The people that live on the far side of the ferry, do you think they are sufficiently attended to when they are sick?—We have rarely ever a complaint.

23270. At present the nurse lives at Aghose, that is about twelve Irish miles from here; if she was living at Rosport, or some place in that direction, and if her little cottage had, say, six beds attached to it, so that the sick of all that district beyond the ferry could, wherever there was a serious case of illness go in there, and if they could be kept at a very small expense without any additional medical cost—the little hospital to be looked after by the nurse and by the dispensary doctor, and built on a cheap and economical scale—do you think that that would be a reasonable and far provision for looking after the sick in that distant and cut-off district?—A more humane proposition than taking them into Belmullet.

23271. Do you think they would be entitled to some such consideration?—I think so.

23272. I know that country very well, and I know it is a terrible distance to think of bringing people over bad roads?—That would be the most convenient suggestion in the world.

23273. If you had only a small hospital, with six beds?—That would be quite sufficient at any time, except in the case of an outbreak of fever; you would have to take those in here. If you take the average from the books of the union, you will find that there are hardly ever more than six beyond the ferry.

23274. Is not that largely owing to the fact that they cannot be brought so far?—Perhaps so.

23275. If you look at the nurse's register, you will find she attends a very large number, and some of them very serious cases, that would be in the hospital here if they lived in Belmullet, but there she is attending them in their own homes. A good many of those houses are very primitive dwellings, most prejudicial to recovery. Do you think the Guardians here would look on such a suggestion as being reasonable and fair if the expense was kept within narrow limits?—I am sure it would be the feeling of the whole country.

23276. Was there anything else you wish to add about the financial arrangements that you looked into at Castlebar?—Nothing further. It was a sort of preliminary meeting; I intended to bring it before the Council; Mr. Daly and a few more suggested that if there was a provincial asylum or refuge for all these it would be better; but, at all events, one workhouse in the county would be quite sufficient.

23277. For the main body, excluding the sick?—Yes.

23278. And you would not dream of bringing in the children there if you could board them out, and make good use of them?—No.

23279. You have no transport?—No, thank God.

Mr. MURPHY.—There are few attractions at Belmullet.

Mr. J. T. MURPHY examined.

Mr. J. T.
Murphy.

Having heard the evidence here, I think you have all the particulars that anyone could say.

23280. CHAIRMAN.—It does not occur to you to add anything more?—Nothing that I think of just now; but one remark I may make, I think that, taking the whole thing at one glance, you will find it very difficult to work the business of taking the paupers to a central place. It may, of course, work, but from my view at present I think it would be very difficult to work.

23281. That is such long distances!—The distances would be, of course, the cause. We have to contend with long distances, and we have not a railway or convenience by boat. If they are to go by public vehicles or vans or any form of transit that could be thought of presently, I fail to see how it can be accomplished, but it may be.

23282. It would be people who are able to travel, not the sick, the sick would still remain?—The able-bodied that would be poor, would they be obliged to walk?

23283. No; they would not get money for their conveyance, but they would get a ticket to bring them, and they would be met at Ballina, and forwarded to whatever place they had to go to?—It is quite possible the matter may work out in a feasible way.

23284. But you see difficulties?—I see difficulties.

23285. Explain to us now, you know the country, and all the travelling facilities, and you would see things that we would not see?—It was that which seemed to be clear to my mind; the difficulty in bringing these poor people to any central position in Mayo.

23286. For instance a person from Belmullet comes in here to the local body, and the local body says "We will not give you outdoor relief, but we will give you an order of admission to Castlebar or Ballina workhouse?"—I think they would be very slow in doing.

23287. Suppose that the person's poverty was so great that they would be willing to go?—In cases of that kind I think there should be some provision made for relief, then here; that would be the deserving case for relief.

23288. The deserving cases for relief according to the idea outlined would be dealt with by outdoor relief at home in their own homes?—I understand, but will be, as has been alluded to before, there will be those cases coming in asking for relief, far more than those at present; if they are told that they must go to Castlebar, the chances are they may make up their minds that they will not go to Castlebar but hang on in the old-fashioned way without any relief.

Sept. 12, 1904.

Mr. J. T. Murphy.

23302. Here is the position you would be in—a person that would be told to go to Castletor either would or would not be in need of relief. If they were in need of relief the Guardians would try, and most probably successfully try, to ascertain that fact—that would be their duty.

23303. And if they were really in need of relief, would they not then get outdoor relief, which would cost less than admission to the workhouse here?—They would be justified in doing it.

23304. And if they thought that a person could hold out outside without getting outdoor relief, then they would offer Castletor or Ballins?—Quite so; that would be the extreme.

23305. And they would not go, and there would be no harm done; it would be merely a good test to save the Guardians, because they would say we are not going to refuse all relief; we don't think you require outdoor relief, but we will give you transference to Castletor or Ballins or Westport Workhouse as the case may be?—Would you convey to him as to how he should go to Ballins?

23306. Give him a ticket on the mail car to go?—Then he would stay at home.

23307. Then there would be no harm done if he was able to stay at home, and if he was not able to stay at home without relief most probably would he not get outdoor relief from the Guardians?—He would most probably take it, did a day from me.

23308. That would be far better for the country?—At present they are getting very snug.

23309. You are short of labourers?—Yes.

23310. Is that the reason you would be glad to see the little boys and girls, of whom there are twenty in the workhouse reared up so as to become labourers in the district?—I certainly would; if I had a casting vote I would give that my first vote.

23311. And the way to secure that would be by boarding them out with small farmers where they would get into the habits of labour and industry?—If these farmers could be got to take them in as members of the family.

23312. Is it not a great thing for a small farmer in Erin to get a certain amount of dry money coming into his house?—It is, and one would imagine an incentive to him to have a little child and its maintenance paid for.

Rev. J. O'Donnell, C.C., examined.

I don't think, sir, I could give you any additional information; I agree substantially with what has been said by the members of the Council.

23313. CHAIRMAN.—You would not be out of accord with the views that have been expressed?—I would not, except that I do not see how Agboson needs any additional accommodation more than Blackod. I think one house with six beds would be sufficient for the whole district, say on the east side of the ferry; those on the west side could go to Belanisset.

23314. Or go to that one on the west side of the ferry?—Quite so.

Mr. Murphy.—There has been no mention made of the Lisbikes Islands.

CHAIRMAN.—There was no mention made of them, but they were in our minds; you could hardly propose any institution for the islands.

Mr. Murphy.—No, but they are very remote.

CHAIRMAN.—And the population is small.

23309. Do you think there would be an anxiety to get such children?—I expect there would be, or there should be.

23310. Especially in a family that might not have too many children?—I may mention we are all well blessed in that way here.

23311. What do you think about the idea of a little hospital of six beds, say with that Hemmell nurse in charge?—I would quite approve of that.

23312. Do you hear of cases of sickness which have to be nursed in their own homes and not removed to Belanisset?—It is an everyday occurrence that when they get sick they must be nursed in their own homes.

23313. Are you aware of many cases that don't come in but remain such in their own homes?—I am not aware, but it is a very large district.

23314. And, of course, there is the ordinary percentage of sick there?—Yes, and as you mentioned a recent one the present nurse is on the other side of the ferry, and the extent of the country down there to Belanisset is a very wide country.

23315. She visits the people on the Bannock side, but not to the same extent as on the other side?—She could not very well, because it is so far, and she must go to the expense of hiring a car or else walk; I think some provision should be made for beyond the ferry.

23316. Similar to what there is at Agboson, with a little cottage attached with six or seven beds?—It need not be very expensive.

23317. And it may be built at a small cost?—It may.

Mr. O'Malley.—That would be in the event of amalgamation, we would never think of having any such home otherwise.

CHAIRMAN.—All our supposition really is in the event of amalgamation; there might be another contingency if the contributions to your expenditure were increased.

Mr. O'Malley.—Quite so.

CHAIRMAN.—You may be quite sure it would be entirely opposed to the view of any member of this Commission to do anything which under any circumstances increase your expenditure here. Our whole object is to try and reduce it materially, and we would not make any recommendation that would not, in our minds, show a substantial reduction on your rates.

Mr. Murphy.—There are fifty-eight families on one island.

Rev. J. O'Donnell.

CHAIRMAN.—When there was a big epidemic I visited the island, and we were able to get possession of two buildings, the Congested Districts Board's for one sex and a school for the other sex; you had a resident doctor and a resident nurse, so that Lisbikes, in any serious outbreak, can be attended to; it possesses buildings that have been used. Was there any idea that any further accommodation would be desirable at Lisbikes?

Mr. Murphy.—It being part and parcel of the union I thought it well to allude to it.

CHAIRMAN.—We have discussed it among ourselves; we have been speaking of Lisbikes, and we are aware how it stands, but for such a very small community as that it would be difficult to propose anything at all, considering that when a difficulty did arise it was successfully met.

The Sitting terminated.

Oct. 4, 1904

FORTY-EIGHTH PUBLIC SITTING—TUESDAY, OCTOBER 4TH, 1904.

At the Courthouse, Castlebar.

Present:—Mr. MACKS (Chairman), Mr. MURKAGHAN, and Dr. COBY RIDGER.

CHAIRMAN.—One usual course is to invite witnesses to give their evidence as representatives of the County Council. We have not received any notification from the County Council that any witnesses are coming forward expressly to give the views of the County Council,

but there may be some witnesses since nominated, and the Commission would be glad to hear any County Council witnesses if they are in attendance.

Mr. DOWD.—I was deputed by the County Council; I have only a few words to say.

Mr. WILLIAM DOWD, M.C.C., P.L.O., examined.

Mr. William Dowd.

23311. CHAIRMAN.—You came forward as a member of the County Council?—Yes, sir.

23312. Are you also a member of one of the District Councils?—No, sir; but I am a member of the Westport Board of Guardians, which is distinct from the District Council.

23313. Have the County Council nominated any witnesses to attend?—We did not receive any record of it?—Mr. MURKAGHAN, I understand, and myself; we did not discuss it at the County Council; we left it to the District Councils.

23314. Then your views would be individual views?—Yes; I adopt the opinion of the Westport District Council. There is just one particular in which I don't quite agree with them; they seem to think it would be very economical to change back to the divisional rating system; I don't think it would make much change in the way of economy; I think the present system is fair enough, that the deserving poor, and the deserving poor only, should get out-door relief.

23315. You would not go as far as Swinford—perhaps it should be a county-at-large charge?—I should not; I don't see that there will be very much economy; people are crying out for economy, that is the only reason for amalgamation; I don't think there would be much economy in amalgamation. If all the poor-law officers of the Westport Union were dispensed with, ratepayers and all, it would amount to more than £4 in the £. I calculate the salary of the master, matron, porter, and the salaries of the schoolmaster and schoolmistress; I think in all the other departments the officials would have to be provided for under another new scheme.

23316. That is the nurse, doctors, and chaplains?—I don't think you can economize anything in that.

23317. You would keep on the hospital at Westport?—We should. I think you cannot do away with Westport at all; we at present cater for a distance of forty-one miles in the Achill direction.

23318. Do you think any additional accommodation would be desirable in the Westport Union for the sick of the Westport Union—do you think any further accommodation is desirable for the sick?—I think the present system works very well.

23319. You think it is not too far to take a sick person over forty miles?—I have not heard of any hardship in connection with it.

23320. If we were to break up the unions now, do you think it would be any hardship to make the people who have accommodation close by, go forty miles?—Certainly, it would be; you must relieve the hospitals.

23321. In Westport Union you say some people now have to go forty miles; do you think that is a hardship on them?—In the case of a dangerous epidemic like the Achill smallpox we get up temporary hospitals; it is cheaper to do this than to keep on a permanent hospital.

23322. Take the case of fractured limbs and pneumonia—do you think the hospital accommodation is adequate?—There have been no complaints about it; cases of fractured limbs are not numerous in Achill. And in the case of pneumonia you could bring them by train.

23323. Cases of pneumonia, people in high fever?—Not in very high fever; we could have them nursed in their homes.

23324. You are aware there is a name in Achill at present—do you know the kind of cases she attends to?—I think she attends cases generally.

23325. Do you know that she attends a very large number?—I do not.

23326. And the list of sick in her charge in their own homes is very large?—I think that system is good enough.

23327. You would not give them any further accommodation?—People who are able to travel to Westport Hospital do travel; I think the people are very much opposed to any additional hospitals over the union; there have been no cases of hardship arising that I have heard of.

23328. Could you imagine the breaking up of a union and people objecting on the ground that it would oblige the sick to go long distances?—I think each district broken up should retain its hospital.

23329. But you think Achill does not need any hospital?—I have heard no complaints.

23330. How far is Galsboro from Westport?—Ten miles.

23331. How many in Louisburg?—Seventeen Irish.

23332. Is it not seven Irish out?—Yes; there is a very thin population along there.

23333. I was going to ask you whether there was not a large population, at all events you don't think any further hospital accommodation is necessary in the Westport Union?—I don't hear it called for, and I don't hear any complaints about the existing system. I find the average out-door relief has increased comparing the three years since the passing of the Act, and the three years before; the average has increased by £250 in the whole union.

23334. How would you meet that?—I don't see any way out of it, and I think if you go back to the divisional rating system you will have the same expenditure; there may be one or two cases of abuse under any system, but I think generally the system is not abused.

23335. You think the present disbursements for out-door relief are fair?—I think they are fair; I think these getting out-door relief require it.

23336. We had evidence elsewhere from a witness who made the suggestion that as a sort of protection against any possible over-expenditure in the future, that, say, the present expenditure, or whatever might be found by the bodies concerned to be a fair expenditure, should be stereotyped as ordinary union-at-large charge to be paid for out-door relief, and that everything over that, supposing that was found to be in your Electoral Division of Westport £4 a week, supposing that were stereotyped to be levied off the union-at-large, and anything additional, say 2s. 6d. or 5s. or a shilling, or whatever it might be after the 24, that that should become an Electoral Division charge?—I don't think there could be any objection to that.

23337. That would be a guard against future extravagance if it should occur?—I don't think there is any extravagance.

23338. Would you like to see the amount increased beyond what it is at present?—I should not.

23339. Do you think it could be increased?—I don't think it could without extravagant or throwing away money.

23340. But you would be willing to put that safeguard on it—Yes. The Board I am connected with are in favour of a discretionary rating.

23341. Mr. MURKHEAD.—Might there not be a danger in that that each Electoral Division would want the full sum to which they are entitled?—Yes,

there is that danger; they get into their heads that they are entitled to have a certain amount. My Board, too, think that if any workhouses are to be done away with Kildare and Chesham would be the most convenient to abolish.

Oct. 4, 1904.

Mr. William Dent.

Mr. MARK C. HENRY, Chairman, Swinford Union, examined.

Mr. Mark C. Henry.

23342. CHAIRMAN.—I have got two documents that were prepared, evidently with great thought, by your Board of Guardians; taking the replies first, you say that, in your opinion, the number of workhouses at present in Mayo, namely, eight, is excessive, "and we consider this number could with great financial advantage, and without entailing any undue inconvenience or hardship on the poor, be reduced to four; we recommend that Ballina, Ballinrobe, Swinford and Westport be retained, and the other four unions be dissolved and amalgamated with those?"—That is the Board's answer.

23343. Then, as regards the workhouses to be closed, you recommend the Castlebar Workhouse be converted into an auxiliary asylum under section 76 of the Local Government Act?—Yes; we consider that an advisable thing to do.

23344. Getting a contribution from the Government for each burrough?—Yes, and partly from the county.

23345. No. 3.—"We consider that the workhouse children should be removed from the workhouse to a central institution or home which could serve a number of counties, and that the children should, as far as practicable, be boarded out amongst the agricultural classes." That is largely in favour of boarding out, but until they reach an age for boarding out you would put them in a central home?—Exactly.

23346. And you think the Claremorris Workhouse would be a good institution owing to its central position for such a children's home?—Yes, it would be.

23347. You are strongly against the boarding out of aged and infirm inmates?—Yes.

23348. Does that mean that you are strongly opposed to give out-door relief rather than indoor?—No, but we think there would be more care taken with the aged and infirm at a central home such as Claremorris.

23349. I suppose you have in Swinford Union at present a good many old and infirm people on your out-door relief list?—We have.

23350. Those are people with some relatives or friends to take care of them?—Not to take care of them; they live independently of their friends, and have to subsist on the relief they get from the union.

23351. And I suppose some charity besides?—Very probably.

23352. Have you considered very closely the question of boarding out the aged and infirm?—We don't believe that would be an advisable step.

23353. Do you think the expense in a union such as yours, where there are so many below the border line of comfort, do you think it would be too great an expense for you to face?—I think it would exceed the cost of keeping them in a central home for the whole county.

23354. I would like to hear your views about the chargeability.—It is an exceptional suggestion you have made?—Are you including the out-door relief in that?

23355. Your reply to query 4 is, "We consider that all poor-law expenditure"—Should be chargeable to the county-at-large. Our union is one of the poorest, perhaps, in Ireland, the valuation being so low and congested.

23356. You mention the ratio between valuation and population?—Exactly, the valuation per head of the county would be £1 11s. 8d., but in the case of our union it is only 15s. 4d.

23357. What is it in the case of the most highly-rated union?—£2 17s. 6d.; that would be Ballinrobe or Claremorris.

23358. What you propose is that all the expenditure of the county should be bulked?—You have richer people at Ballinrobe, and they are paying a smaller rate than our poorer people in Swinford.

23359. If you turn to page 2 of your other document you point out that of that £1 spent by the Poor-Law Guardians, 12s. 9d. comes out of the Government fund, and 7s. 3d. only out of the poor rates, that is correct?—I believe it is; that is the clerk's estimate.

23360. Do you think that any re-apportionment of that grant on the ground of exceptional poverty of the district would be fair. I mean you get 12s. 9d. out

of every £1 you have to spend, and then the 7s. 3d. means a very high rate on your district. If your 7s. 3d. were reduced still more by adding more to the 12s. 9d. grant, would that equally meet the views of the Swinford people?—I dare say it would; to be sure if you increase the grant it will meet the views of the people.

23361. If the Government grant were apportioned, having regard to the necessities of the district and the poverty of the district rather than to other considerations?—I dare say it would.

23362. You did not put that forward—at all events you have not considered that?—Unless the clerk, who is present, can answer; he is more accurate than we are.

23363. You get 12s. 9d. out of every £1 you spend, and then the 7s. 3d. means a very heavy rate in your union and a still heavier rate proportionately in Belmullet, where the valuations is so very small. You want to throw what you may call the excess of your expenditure on your neighbouring unions; did it ever occur to you that it might be a little more equitable to throw it on a wider area?—I think we would be inclined to stretch it over a greater area.

23364. The Government grants are apportioned over the whole of Ireland, and the question is whether you would suggest that where there are very poor districts those districts ought to receive special consideration in the apportionment of the Parliamentary grant?—So they ought, indeed.

23365. On the ground of their poverty and nothing else?—Poverty and congestion and low rating.

23366. In your next query, coming to No. 6, in answer to the query whether you consider additional hospital accommodation to be desirable for the treatment of the sick, you say that in your opinion there is no necessity for additional hospital accommodation for the treatment of the poor in the County Mayo, not in Swinford particularly. Have you any knowledge of the conditions in West Mayo at all?—Not personally; I am not speaking personally.

23367. You are of opinion that in the nursing arrangements in union hospitals it would be beneficial that nursing should be entrusted to a community of nuns?—Very much so.

23368. And that hospitals should be detached from the workhouses and made distinct hospitals?—Yes.

23369. You have had the Sisters of Mercy for a long time in your workhouses?—Fourteen or fifteen years.

23370. You have seen a great improvement under their care?—A remarkable improvement.

23371. Now as regards the contributions from persons who are able to pay, you say, "We consider that all persons who are able to pay for their maintenance and treatment in union hospitals should be required to pay the entire cost of same." A man might be able to pay something and not pay the entire cost?—We generally take what he is able to pay.

23372. That is what you mean by that?—Yes, as far as we think he is able to pay.

23373. A wealthy farmer, if you have any such, or a comfortable shopkeeper, might get fever and go into your fever hospital, and he might be able to pay the full cost that his treatment would demand; you might have to get an additional nurse to look after him; and you think it would be fair that he should be obliged, in the Guardians' discretion, to pay the full cost?—We go in for his paying the actual cost.

23374. Supposing a labouring man who makes 15s. a week has a child of his hurt, or that for any other reason has to go into hospital for treatment, that child, at all events, consumes 6d. to 1s. worth of food. Would you think it any hardship that the Guardians should be given a discretionary power to charge such a man, we will say 6s., and to go on from that to any other class of persons proportionately to their means, and give the Guardians power to recover it?—I think the Guardians should get that discretionary power; they are a very conscientious body as a rule, and if those means are left in the Guardians' hands they will not treat that labourer badly.

23375. In places where that has been tried, I may mention that the people who have to pay like it; they feel more independent if they are paying their way.

On 4, 1864.

Mr. Mark O.
Henry.

as far as they can, they look on the admission as less of a compliment, and money is earned for the institution and the rates reduced?—That is right.

23376. As regards the tramps and casuals?—It is very hard to deal with those.

23377. Have you any suggestions to offer?—Nothing at all, except merely to make them work in the morning before their discharge.

23378. You still would allow them to come into the workhouse?—I don't see how you could keep them out.

23379. One suggestion made to us is, that a man who is a habitual wanderer, without any pretence to work, that it would be no hardship if that man were obliged to give some work or return for the support he gets from the country?—That is what I say.

23380. If he was put into a closed workhouse that was established for that class of people, and detained there under a magistrate's warrant or order, would you consider that any hardship?—That is a matter I would like to consider; I think there would be a little hardship in that.

23381. The suggestions that were made to us carefully excluded from that class of tramp or wanderer those people who move about in their own parish, and who are welcome at the firesides of their neighbours, and move about from house to house in a very small area—it excluded that class; but the men who tramp the whole country round and have no local attachment to any place, would you consider if any hardship that these men should be put under restraint and obliged to do something for their living, and, if possible, get them into industrious habits, so that they might come out and be working men in the country?—It would require some time to suggest a means to prevent that; you would want to pursue them and find out.

23382. Well, no; the way witnesses suggested was, that if you find a man who cannot satisfy you that he is a bona fide labouring man, and that he is honestly looking for work, if he has no recommendations or evidence to give that he is a man honestly trying to get work, then you would put him into one of these industrial workhouses if he was trying to get his support from the public?—It would be a very good thing; there would not be much hardship in that.

23383. Say a couple for Ireland?—I think that would be a very good thing; either that or make them work next day before being discharged.

23384. It would go farther than that; it would mean he would be detained for a considerable time. The suggestion, if carried out, would mean the absolute exclusion of that class: on the given day any one who presented himself for public assistance would be looked up unless he could show that he was a decent man by evidence from the locality?—That is quite right.

23385. Without having considered the matter your

first impression would be favourable to such a suggestion?—Yes.

23386. On page 7 of your recommendations you say, "We think that in any case where a union may be dissolved the hospital of such union should also be discontinued." Is that really your opinion. You suggest that four hospitals should be abolished; you suggest Belmullet should go. Would they not require a hospital there?—Oh, certainly.

23387. Take Glencorris; would they not require a hospital in Glencorris?—I dare say they might; it would be a central home for aged and infirm, and perhaps children.

23388. Would you keep no portion of the premises for a hospital for the sick?—I dare say you could.

23389. It struck me that perhaps it was not thoroughly considered by you. Of course it would mean economy to shut the hospital when you also shut the workhouse; but whether it would be compatible with humane treatment is another question. I really could not tell you that, but the clerk of the union, who carefully considered this matter, will give a better opinion than I can.

23390. You would close Glencorris, and also Cullinbar, and you would have to bring the sick to Seafort or Ballinrobe?—Ballinrobe is about nine Irish miles from Glencorris.

23391. What would be the most distant part of the Glencorris Union?—Ballyvaughan?—That would be very convenient to Seafort, within Irish miles.

23392. Your Board of Guardians is of opinion that all persons of unsound mind should be removed from the workhouse to a central institution, preferably an auxiliary asylum?—Yes.

23393. And you add as regards the children, "We consider the children should be boarded out as soon as, and as far as practicable, and until they are boarded out they should be in some central place." You would board them out with the agricultural classes?—Yes, sir.

23394. And you would not rear them up in trade; you think it would be unfair that the rate-paying community should be compelled to pay for giving them an education or training superior to that which the ratepayers can afford to give their own children?—Yes.

23395. Is there anything else you would wish to mention?—We are entirely in favour of union rating, for we have very little experience of divisional rating.

23396. Contrasting union with electoral divisional rating you are in favour of union?—Yes.

23397. And you want to go a good deal further?—Yes.

Mr. T. Reaghern.—I endorse what the Chairman said.

Mr. Patrick Jones.—I also agree with the Chairman.

Mr. THOMAS BOURGHEEN examined.

Mr. Thomas
Bourghreen.

On the subject of boarding out I may say it is a great benefit to the children; we give the persons who have charge of them 2s. a week, and when they are of the age of fourteen there are a great many looking for them to go to service, whereas if they are kept inside the workhouse they would be good for nothing.

23398. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think many of these children remain on with the families?—They do.

23399. And are virtually absorbed into the families?

Mr. GEORGE O'NEILL, Vice-Chairman, Killalea Union, examined.

Mr. George
O'Neill.

23400. CHAIRMAN.—You have been deputed by the Killalea Board of Guardians to give their views?—I have.

23401. You are in favour of amalgamation?—We are in favour of a general scheme of amalgamation.

23402. Would that general scheme close up your own workhouse?—I suppose so.

23403. Would you bow to that?—I believe so; I favoured amalgamation fourteen or fifteen years ago, myself, and carried it by a nice majority, and subsequently it was rescinded; but it was then under the old scheme of divisional rating; but under the present rate I would not be for connecting our union with any others unless we had divisional rating.

23404. You only provisionally would approve of closing Killalea workhouse; you would not approve of

—Yes; they have to send them to Mass every Sunday and to school every day, and the teacher has to send it a certificate that they attend.

23405. Do you meet these children yourself?—Yes; and go to the schools to make inquiries.

23406. Are they looked on in any way that makes it unpleasant for them?—Not at all; they fall in with the children of the school and the children of the village.

breaking it up unless you had divisional rating?—Unless we had divisional rating.

23407. Which is your division?—The town of Ballycastle.

23408. What was your average rate under the old electoral division rating?—I can give you the average rate for 1877.

23409. What is the standard rate?—3s. 3d.

23410. That was for all purposes of the Guardians' expenditure?—Yes.

23411. You don't happen to know how much of that was Poor Law proper?—No.

23412. What was the average expenditure since the Act of 1868?—I could not answer that.

Mr. Larnhin.—Gt. Rd.

23413. Did the expenditure seem to you to be up & bit?—I thought so.

33414. You think the rates are up, and you are paying them?—I think so; I am paying them.

33415. Mr. MURKIN.—Why do you wish to go back to electoral division rating?—There is one thing certain: the town Guardians are all entirely for union rating, but these Guardians living in the rural districts are for electoral division rating, because the town papers are the cause of swamping the rates.

33416. CHAIRMAN.—Don't you call Ballycastle a town?—It is a village in reality.

33417. You have not many on outdoor relief?—Not a great many.

33418. Are there many in the town of Killybegs?—Something about double the number in Ballycastle.

33419. The valuation of Killybegs is double?—It is more than double that of Ballycastle.

33420. You are afraid of paying your share of the Ballina outdoor relief?—Unquestionably. I believe it would swamp us in Killybegs; it would be only robbing Peter to pay Paul.

33421. Would you be in favour of uniting with Ballina if you had uniform-large rating for every purpose except outdoor relief?—No, I would be for universal rating all through.

33422. You would not like to see Killybegs Union broken up unless you had divisional rating?—No.

33423. Mr. MURKIN.—You would not mind seeing Killybegs workhouse closed if you had the management of your own affairs, and could fix the rates as you do now?—I believe we would be a lot better off in Ballycastle; I have known Guardians summoned for special meetings, and when the relieving officer's books are going to be ruled they take and leave. It was not so when I became a Guardian twenty years ago; they used to devote their time and attention to one who was entitled to relief and who was not; now they are away unless the clerk, through charity, gets a quorum to wait.

33424. CHAIRMAN.—They leave it to the Killybegs men?—Not altogether.

33425. From the Killybegs workhouse to the Ballina workhouse is only about six or seven miles?—Six miles. In the Ballycastle Electoral Division in 1844 we paid £75 7s. 6d., and the amount collected was £133 13s. 6d.

Mr. WILLIAM McNAMARA examined.

33440. CHAIRMAN.—You have heard the evidence of Mr. O'Grady; are you from that part of the country?—Ballycastle.

33441. Then your evidence would practically agree with his as regards that cottage hospital we were speaking of?—Certainly.

33442. As regards the question of rating, do you agree with him in thinking it most desirable that you should go back to electoral division rating?—From my experience, I entirely agree with him.

33443. Is that a pretty general view in Killybegs?—It is the view of all the Guardians I had a conversation with.

33444. Was this question discussed at a meeting of your Board of Guardians?—It was.

33445. And were your Guardians practically unanimous in that?—They were; there may have been some dissenters, but they did not express their opinions.

33446. There was no dissent from the town of Killybegs?—I have not heard it.

33447. Do you wish to add anything to what Mr. O'Grady has said?—Very little; I quite agree about having a cottage hospital at Ballycastle under the superintendence of a nurse; it is a most central place, and it is there the workhouse should be.

33448. A small hospital that would not cost much?—A small hospital with eight or ten beds, and under the superintendence of a nurse. Under the present

33436. What is the object of that bit of evidence?—To show the rate is going up by degrees from year to year.

33437. Mr. MURKIN.—Are you aware that in that year an inmate of a workhouse could be kept for 1s. 5d. a week, and now it is 3s. 1s.—I believe they could be kept much cheaper. The clerk of the union was only paid £35 then, and the master £30; well, some of these are up to £800 now.

33438. CHAIRMAN.—Workhouses did not become hospitals until 1850, and the treatment of people in hospitals is much more expensive than in a public institution.

33439. In the event of the Killybegs Union being amalgamated, you say it would be necessary the workhouse hospital should remove or there should be a cottage hospital at Ballycastle?—A cottage hospital at Ballycastle would be more suitable.

33440. Is Belderrig in your union?—It is.

33441. How far is that from Ballycastle?—Eight miles.

33442. And Killybegs is?—Eight miles; so Ballycastle would be most central.

33443. You would not suggest an expensive hospital?—Oh, no, I don't think it would be necessary.

33444. You would only suggest a hospital where there would be from six to ten beds, looked after by a nurse and a dispensary doctor, just for the people who are really so sick that they would require hospital treatment, not for the poor, aged people to spend their lives in?—I am sure ten or twelve beds would be quite enough, and Ballycastle would be the place for that.

33445. What depth of country is there behind; how far back does the union go, and is there much population away from the shore?—There is a pretty large population.

33446. How far back does it go from where you are?—About nine miles, I should say.

33447. Does it go half way to Crossmolina?—It is something about ten or twelve miles. There is a very large population.

33448. Your hospital would be central for those two?—Certainly.

33449. Is there anything else you would like to add? There is nothing else I am aware of.

conditions poor patients coming twenty miles suffer a good deal in having to go to Killybegs.

33449. Do you think that would be better than putting the hospital at Belderrig, which would accommodate people from both unions?—That would not do at all.

33450. You think that could not be availed of by the people between Crossmolina and Ballycastle?—No; it is altogether out of their running.

33451. There is no place, you say, that would be so useful a centre as Ballycastle?—Not that I am aware of; it is there that all the patients go for medicine and to the doctor; the district is about twenty miles square or more.

33452. What do you think about the transport?—We have a little experience of them in Killybegs; a fair share of them pass that way; they are not very desirable for any community.

33453. What was your idea about how they might be dealt with?—Those lads that go through the country without any profession except picking pockets and robbing churches, I would deal arbitrarily with them; I would not encourage them with lodgings in the workhouse.

33454. You would put them in some place where they would have to work for their living?—I would like to see every one of them working.

33455. If they were obliged to work for a while they might get into working habits?—Yes; they won't work in the workhouse.

Mr. MATTHEW J. MURPHY, J.P., examined.

33456. CHAIRMAN.—The Ballina Guardians are in favour of a general scheme?—A general scheme; I am chairman of the District Council.

33457. Are you pretty well unanimous in your recommendations?—We are unanimous entirely, but not in the same sense as suggested by my predecessors here.

33458. What is the view of your Board of Guardians?—My opinion is that you should lay down a map and not take in counties, as one county may join another, as at Ardarae; Downshire Union comes within three miles of the Ballina Workhouse.

33459. You personally would be opposed to a county-union Poor-Law system?—Personally my

Oct. 4, 1894.

Mr. George O'Grady.

Mr. William McNamara.

Mr. Matthew J. Murphy.

Oct. 4, 1904
Mr. Matthew
J. Mahon.

self I would; I would go in for a general scheme, not looking at it from that point of view.

23460. You would proceed on the lines on which the Poor-Law Unions were originally laid out—ignore the counties and take market places as centres. How would you suggest a reduction of workhouses in Mayo?—It would take half Drogheda to Ballina, and let the other half go to Sligo.

23461. You would take up Ennisey? I would, and on to Drogheda Workhouse itself; also, I would take in the whole of Killybegs and Belderrig.

23462. Did your Board of Guardians think very much of the question beyond Ballina as a centre?—They did on broader views.

23463. What did they say as regards the rest of the county?—We consider about four workhouses ought to do Mayo.

23464. Did you mention what four you thought?—We did not.

23465. But Ballina was to be one!—From its central position.

23466. Did you contemplate the breaking up of the Castlbar Union?—In my opinion the Castlbar Union, from several points of view, should be broken up. We could take Lahardane portion of it. The county is supporting an infirmary in Castlbar that the county pays £1,800 a year to, and we only send about eight to ten or eleven each half-year from my union, while Castlbar supplies some 135 and up to 150, and Westport nearly up to that. Remember, now, that goes to relieve the rates in Castlbar; as far as the Castlbar Union Hospital is concerned, they usually go to the infirmary, not to the union hospital at all.

23467. So that the county-at-large is paying more than its share to Castlbar, you think?—It is the same between eight and 180, and twelve and 150, and that applies also to Killybegs, I may add, four or five half-yearly.

23468. How far does your union go in the direction of Swinford?—It goes on out to the Ox mountains, and to the bridge of Foxford, or near it.

23469. Then a little part of Foxford is in your union?—Yes.

23470. You don't contemplate any breaking up, I suppose, of Swinford Union?—Not presently, that did not occur to us, taking into consideration the population of Swinford Union; it is a congested area, entirely and thickly populated.

23471. You think that would require to stand?—I think it would.

23472. You don't touch Westport at any point?—No, except at Corick.

23473. The workhouses that might be closed you think might be made into auxiliary lunatic asylums?—Yes, particularly Castlbar on consideration that we would get the grant for the support of the asylums.

23474. You want to get the same rate?—I would.

23475. Are there not new buildings being erected at Castlbar?—They have expended £25,000.

23476. And would any auxiliary asylum be necessary now?—I am afraid it would. But with regard to epileptics in workhouses, some of these workhouses that are to be closed should be used for that purpose.

23477. You have not more than sixty in the whole county—for what number are these additional buildings to provide?—I don't know.

23478. Do your Board of Guardians prefer an auxiliary asylum to the enlargement of the county asylum?—I would not like to expend any more money on new buildings as long as we had a workhouse in Castlbar.

23479. You think they might be maintained more cheaply in a workhouse than in an asylum, perhaps?—It is possible they could, but it is a wrong place for them.

23480. Not a suitable place for feeble-minded people?—Not at all; there are several objections with regard to it, and several complaints with regard to it.

23481. You think it would be well to revert to electoral division rating, particularly as regards out-door relief?—With regard to out-door relief it has come to this, that out-door relief is the greatest fraud we have in the country at all.

23482. Are you a town guardian or a country guardian?—I am a country guardian, and chairman of the District Council; I represent a division for six years that has neither a pauper in the workhouse, nor one on out-door relief, and we have to pay at the time of £1,000 a year for out-door relief alone.

23483. And before the Act of 1889 passed you had practically nothing to pay?—Not as regards out-door

relief, nor for a number of paupers in the workhouse unless I had them there.

23484. You had only your share of establishment charges, and you had a very low rate?—A very low rate.

23485. What is your present rate?—3s. 6d. on land, and 5s. 4d. on buildings.

23486. What was it for the standard year?—I forget what it was. The rate is going up gradually.

23487. At all events the expenditure is increasing?—There is a tendency in consequence of out-door relief being union rating to corruption in every way.

23488. Are you often asked to put forward people's names for out-door relief?—No, because I represent a division in which I would not allow them to get out-door relief when they don't want it. But there is no check on it.

23489. When an application comes before your Board of Guardians how is it dealt with?—On the day of the particular Guardian of the division. I may have no knowledge or the majority of the Board have no knowledge of this particular case. Well, if I was responsible to my constituents for the amount of relief given in the electoral division, then they would have a say to me on the question of election. I would be the best judge myself whether the particular individual was entitled to out-door relief or not; presently the thing is open to corruption.

23490. Do you think payments are given for out-door relief rather on charitable grounds than on grounds of destitution?—On charitable grounds, I believe, myself, in a great many cases.

23491. You could not give an instance of that?—No; but I have a personal knowledge of it for the last thirty years; my father was a Guardian before me, and he was directly responsible to the ratepayers of the division.

23492. But it was never a division with much poverty?—In his day there were more on out-door relief than now; but he was directly responsible for who did or did not get out-door relief, and it was a check on abuse.

23493. Do you ever object, yourself, to a case?—I do; and did on several occasions.

23494. What happened?—The result was, I might succeed in a particular case to refuse an individual to get it, but notwithstanding that I find the relief going from £5 to £7 a week thirty years ago in my union, to £10 now.

23495. How do the relieving officers stand?—That is open to abuse; you cannot always rely on officers, and in addition to that there is provisional relief; that is open to abuse entirely.

23496. That they give in their own discretion?—Yes, and on the doctor's certificate; he certifies that a certain patient is entitled to certain things.

23497. That is medical treatment?—Yes; and that is open to a lot of abuse; the relieving officer uses very little discretion, in my opinion, to see whether the parties are able to provide it or not.

23498. The doctor's certificate would be that so-and-so is suffering from such an illness and requires beef tea?—Yes; milk, or bread, or mutton, or perhaps brandy.

23499. You were a Guardian before the rating was changed?—I was not myself, my father was.

23500. Have you any accurate knowledge of the way in which applications for relief were dealt with then?—The Guardian of each division was directly responsible to the division and the ratepayers of that division, for if such and such got out-door relief he was responsible to them.

23501. Do you know of any division now, embracing the town of Ballina—do you know any country divisions where the expenditure in old times was very little for out-door relief and where it has become substantial now?—I don't, in the country divisions.

23502. Then you think it is all in the town?—I do, in the town; we were reducing our out-door list the other day, and of the 104 individuals on out-door relief 68 were within the township, and that did not include the whole town, only as far as the bridge of Ardarae.

23503. If Ballina took in the whole of Killybegs and went off as far as Belderrig, do you think it would be reasonable that some little cottage hospital might be established?—I agree with the witnesses in that, but then the question will arise whether it would be a fever hospital or a medical hospital; if the question of the fever hospital arises we would have to have two classes in such an institution.

23504. At present the suggestion made is for an ordinary medical and surgical hospital for urgent cases?—I would agree with that for cases of pneumonia or fracture of bones, that could not go to Ballina.

23505. But you would object to the fever hospital?—It would entail a lot of expense; you would have to have a nurse and a whole staff. With regard to the hospitals, I consider there should be a paying ward attached to each union. We contemplated doing so in Ballina some two years ago, and prepared plans to change the hospital, but in consequence of the present Commission being appointed it lay in abeyance since. In my opinion there should be a paying ward attached to each hospital.

23506. Would you give the Guardians discretion to add out, after careful inquiry, how much could be

paid for each patient, if anything, and empower them to recover it?—Yes.

23507. Up to the full amount incurred?—Yes; in case the individual was able to do it.

23508. To give a discretion?—Take Trillick as a rule, they are rather friendly; they are good-natured.

23509. As regards tramps, does your good nature extend to those?—From the tramps I would take out the bone fide man in search of employment; I don't call them tramps. I would adopt the Belgian system with them; I would give them a ticket, and allow them to go on as long as they were in search of work, but the real tramp I would put into a labour colony.

23510. That evidence corresponds with what we have received from a number of Guardians who have looked into it carefully. Is there anything that occurs to you that you would wish to mention?—No.

Oct. 4, 1904.

Mr. Matthew J. Melvin.

Mr. JAMES STEWART, P.L.O., examined.

I have nothing to add to our Chairman's statement.

23511. CHAIRMAN.—Are you representing a rural constituency?—Yes; I am almost in the town.

23512. And still you agree with the evidence of your Chairman?—Certainly I do.

Mr. James Stewart.

Mr. W. A. CRAIG, P.L.O., examined.

I have nothing to add to the Chairman's remarks. I think they embrace the views of our Board, as far as they have been discussed a few weeks ago, when we got an intimation from the Local Government Board that the inquiry would be held.

23513. Do you share his opinions about chargeability?—Yes; they all go very strongly for electoral division charges.

23514. Including the Guardians of the town of Ballina?—I cannot speak for them.

23515. They are not here?—There is one for Ardara.

Mr. Stewart.—I have nothing to add.

23516. You would like the electoral division charge too?

Mr. Stewart.—We were all unanimous in that. I represent the rural division of Ardara, but I have a fair knowledge of the urban also, and as far as the out-door relief is concerned, I don't know that it could be brought down any way. The parishes that get it are deserving of it, and they are mostly evicted tenants, who must get some support.

Mr. Craig.—They look on it that the electoral division would be looked after better by the individual Guardians; at the present time they look on it as if the money was coming out of a general pocket and not out of the immediate neighbourhood.

Mr. W. A. Craig.

Mr. CONOR O'KEEFE, M.P., Chairman, Mayo County Council, examined.

23517. CHAIRMAN.—The Commission have not received any expression of opinion from the County Council yet; they have not passed, I think, any resolution. Perhaps you would tell us the line that they are disposed to take?—I will say, in the first place, that I don't represent the County Council at this hearing, because I learn they have not passed a resolution at all on the subject; but there are two or three things I would like to tell you, and I will confine my statement to those. In the first place, I would like to say that the feeling is general in Mayo that there should be some readjustment of the contributions to the Boards of Guardians.

23518. That is from Imperial sources?—Yes; we feel that there are many Boards of Guardians in the country, such as those you find in Meath and elsewhere, who get very large contributions, and are able to make the rates very small because of them. There are some Boards of Guardians, I think, in the Co. Meath, whose rates don't amount to more than 9d. or 10d. in the £.

23519. For Poor Law purposes much less?—And I think there should be some adjustment of those contributions.

23520. You are not going into any particulars about the readjustment of the grant?—No; I merely speak generally that I think there ought to be some readjustment.

23521. The grants that are given to unions now towards payments of salaries, that these should be apportioned; on what grounds?—I have not yet had time to study the subject, but I think that there are many unions in the country—the Belmullet—where a rate of 1d. in the £ only produces 24s.; 1d. in Belmullet would produce 25,000, for they have a million and a quarter valuation.

23522. Was your idea rather that the very poor unions, such as Belmullet, should have a contribution based on their necessity and poverty?—I agree entirely, because there are some of these unions, as you know, that could entirely do without any contribution whatever from Imperial sources.

23523. They would not admit that themselves?—No, of course not, human nature being what it is; but I think the contributions ought to be based on the necessity of the district, and not upon any other artificial basis such as valuations.

23524. Or even expenditure?—Yes. I have in my mind a certain union that I won't mention where a rate, I think, of 9d. in the £ suffices for all their expenditures. I do not think they ought to get the contributions from Imperial sources that they are now enjoying.

23525. Based on their expenditure or any other test?—Necessity, as you said a while ago, ought to be the basis.

23526. Are you aware, from your own knowledge of county government here, in Mayo, that some of the Poor Law unions are unable to meet such expenditure as is considered necessary by their advisers, in the interests of humanity, to bring the hospital up to the proper level—that they are prevented owing to their inability to raise a sufficient rate. A union that can only raise 24s by putting a rate on of 1d. in the £ cannot bring its hospital up to modern ideas of fitness. Are you aware from your own knowledge and observation in county government, that some of the western unions in Mayo are unable to spend enough to bring the hospitals up to the proper standard?—I must confess frankly I have not had anything to do with questions of that kind. I have never been a member of a Poor Law Board, so I don't think I could answer that question. Of course, generally speaking, I know that want of funds has been a great drawback in all these cases. I would like to say, too, that I think that something ought to be done to bring what I may call the tramp nuisance to an end; that is a matter that might be dealt with very effectively by administration or legislation.

23527. What legislation do you think might be asked for?—I am firmly convinced that this tramp nuisance is the greatest nuisance we have in the country, and I, myself, would be in favour of refusing admission to any tramp to the workhouse.

Mr. Conor O'Keefe.

Oct. 4, 1895.

Mr. Chase
O'Kelly.

23523. That is abolishing the tramp or casual ward?

—Entirely.

23524. Then what would you do with him?—I confess I would not have a single tramp go into the workhouse.

23525. They would still tramp about?—Let them tramp.

23526. Would you let them tramp?—I would, of course.

23527. Would you not be rather afraid that the people in the country districts would be unpleasantly visited by these men, burning houses and haystacks?—I would face all that; I have considered that question extremely carefully, and I think the tramps might be allowed to look after themselves. It is a terrible nuisance that these men should go from town to town and have splendid lodgings and splendid attendance.

23528. They don't give them up to the standard of the other inmates; they don't treat them as well?—But I don't think the tramps have any claim on our philanthropy.

23529. I am not standing up for tramps at all; I am rather surprised you are so gentle; if you let them go the road, I am afraid they will go the road?—Let them go the road.

23530. Do you think that is desirable in the interests of the country, that they should be levying their contributions as they go along?—I would let them take their chances.

23531. They are quite willing to do that, because there are a great many parts of the country where there are only workhouses at long intervals, and still they go there?—I have seen these men on the Continent and in America.

23532. A gentleman from Ballina mentioned Belgium. There they put them into a labour colony, a workhouse with land attached, and the idea is that the inmates should be, as far as possible, self-supporting; eat what they produce, and be clothed with what they make, and so on?—I think the tramp system is a reproach. I have had occasion as a magistrate to deal with many of these tramps, and I always send them to jail whenever I find them. But I think this tramp question ought to be settled in a very drastic way; I would not really have a tramp in the workhouse, if I could help it.

23533. You would close the casual ward?—I would close it entirely. A friend of mine, Mr. Daly, and the best way to deal with tramps is to deal with them under the Vagrancy Act. I don't know how far I

could agree with him in that. Now, I only want to say one or two words more with regard to the asylum grants. Suppose we closed some of our workhouses. A suggestion has been made that we might turn some of them into an auxiliary asylum. The great objection we have in Mayo to an auxiliary asylum is that we would not be able to get the grant of 4s. that we get in the regular asylum; we only get 2s. in the other. If we could impress on the Government the necessity of giving us the 4s. for the auxiliary asylum I think there would be no difficulty.

23534. You would then prefer the auxiliary asylum?

—It would cost us a lot less.

23535. You can tell me, perhaps, what is the present accommodation of the asylum?—We are expending in this county something like £28,000 or £30,000 in the way of the asylum.

23536. That will give accommodation for how many hundreds extra?

Mr. James Daly.—About 120 extra.

23537. Would that be sufficient for all the requirements?—I think that will be sufficient for our present needs, but at the alarming rate of increase in lunacy I am afraid that soon we will have to make another expenditure.

23538. Would you, in that event, prefer an auxiliary asylum to a further extension of the county asylum?—Our asylum is a very splendid building, and any addition we make to it must be uniform with the general structure of the building; but if we could get from the Government the 4s. capitation grant that we get now for the regular asylum we would be pleased to have an auxiliary asylum, but, as you know, we cannot get more than 2s.

23539. You would be in favour of amending the law so as to enable the Government to pay 4s. to both institutions alike?—Quite so.

After an adjournment for lunch.

Mr. Davis.—You were asking me what additional numbers the new buildings would accommodate in the asylum. The official figure is 250, and the present number is 736. It was contemplated to take in all the lunatics from the unions.

23540. CHAIRMAN.—Then it was not contemplated that there would be any necessity for further accommodation for a long time?

Mr. Davis.—No, it was not.

Mr. JOHN WALSH, Chairman.

23541. CHAIRMAN.—What is the view of your Board of Guardians?—You have a copy of the report.

23542. Are any of the dysentery nominated to attend here?—Yes, Father McDonald, and Father Kelly.

23543. You think two of the existing unions might be broken up?—Yes, that is the opinion of our Board of Guardians.

23544. What part of the union do you represent?—I represent a rural division, Silverman, six miles from Westport on the Clifden side.

23545. Do you reside there?—I live in Westport.

23546. There are no more unions which could be broken up so far as you know?—That is the opinion of our Board.

23547. Do you think any additional accommodation for the sick is necessary in the Westport Union?—I don't believe there is.

23548. You heard the evidence this morning about the dysentery?—I did.

23549. You think places like Dagh are recommended?—In my opinion there is no more accommodation required.

23550. How far is Achill Sound from Westport by road?—Twenty Irish miles.

23551. Then on to Dagh?—About fourteen.

23552. Thirty-four Irish miles—do you think there is no hospital accommodation requisite for people thirty-four miles from a hospital?—I don't think there is; it has worked well in the past, and I believe it will do so in the future.

23553. You know at one time there was only one dispensary doctor in all Mayo—do you think it was desirable to increase the number of dispensary doctors then?—Well, I believe it was.

Westport Union, examined.

23554. You would not propose to go back to the old state of things then?—I would not wish it.

23555. At one time there was only one hospital for Mayo; that was not sufficient; there were no complaints then very likely?—The more hospitals we have the more complaints we have.

23556. The more diseases you have?—No, the more anxiety for hospitals.

23557. If Belmullet was amalgamated with Ballina, would that be too far to take the sick?—I don't think so.

23558. Do you think it would be fair to take sick people such an enormous distance?—If the hospital was retained in Belmullet I don't believe it would be any hardship.

23559. Then you would keep the hospital?—Oh, certainly, in Belmullet.

23560. Taking everything into consideration, your colleagues on the Board of Guardians were of opinion that it would be better not to dissolve Belmullet?—They were of that opinion.

23561. You would only break up the two workhouses, Castlebar and Killybegs—what would you do with the Castlebar Workhouse if closed for poor-law purposes?—I don't believe it would be required for an auxiliary asylum; they have sufficient accommodation; it could be used for a technical school or something connected with that.

23562. And Killybegs?—That is not within my district; I don't know much about Killybegs.

23563. You say, referring to boarding out, "This can only be recommended in the case of children under fifteen years of age, it has always been held that the surroundings and associations of the union workhouse are not calculated to improve the moral condition of children of a tender age; if not boarded out they could

Mr. John
Walsh.

be sent to industrial schools, or better still to a central institution especially established for them?"—The Board of Guardians are in favour of boarding out, and not sending these children to any central institution, because they are of opinion that if these children want to get on in the world they must go out into the country, and get the habits of the country people. We have adopted it already.

23564. What is your view about the question of charabancs, union-at-large or electoral division?—Electoral division; that is the opinion of the majority of the Guardians.

23565. Is that your personal opinion as town guardians?—I represent a country division.

23566. But you pay rates in the town?—I do; I am in favour of the electoral division charge.

23567. Is that the general view of your Board of Guardians?—There were one or two dissentients.

Mr. Davis.—The town of Westport would benefit by divisional rating as to out-door relief, they pay so much rates on buildings that if they get the share of the expenditure on out-door relief I believe it would be beneficial to the town.

23568. That is unusual, but I see how you explain it. And all the insane should be removed out of the workhouse?—Yes.

23569. You think that any legislative changes in the direction of improving the condition of the aged

and infirm should be in the direction of old age pensions?—Yes, the Board is of that opinion.

23570. What do you think about getting people to pay something for their maintenance in the hospital?—It is very difficult to get people to pay for their maintenance in the hospital; some may be able to pay, but it is very hard to draw the line in a poor district like ours; there may be some, but it is very rare, and the Guardians in all cases when they see they can make a person pay without injury to themselves they do so.

23571. The only other point is as regards tramps?—Certainly, they are a great nuisance, but still they must get accommodation. There are a section of those that are very deserving people that go about through no fault of their own.

23572. You would not call those tramps?—I would not, and I believe they should be accommodated.

23573. People who have no intention of earning anything but simply walk about from place to place as a means of livelihood, putting up at workhouses and then getting donations of food and money from people in that way?—I would get the labour test applied to them.

23574. If necessary, would you bring them before a magistrate and commit them to a place of detention?—I would be very slow in doing that.

23575. How would you get them to work?—The master in all cases gets them to break a box of stones.

Mr. CHARLES McDONNELL, *r.s.d.*, examined.

The principal point is out-door relief; I am one of those who are in favour of divisional rating. When things are on a union rate Guardians take very little interest in out-door relief in keeping it down, because they consider it is everybody's business, and in the result it becomes nobody's business. Some time ago Westport Union was amalgamated with Westport with the result that Westport came under a terrible liability, because when the rates in Westport were only 1s. 12d., Achill used to pay 5s. 10d. in the £.

23576. It was 5s. at the time of the amalgamation. Witness.—And for that reason the majority of the Board are very much in favour of divisional rating.

23577. CHAIRMAN.—You see the hardship of making a very poor district support its own poor altogether?—Taking the divisions by themselves, there are not a great many on out-door relief, but when you come to the whole side of the country ten square miles it comes a very heavy thing for another part of the union to have to pay for them.

23578. You would like to go back to electoral rating for out-door relief, or for all purposes?—For all purposes.

23579. Is there anything else now?—Then as regards the union charges, of course the out-door relief is a very large charge, but at the same time it is very small compared with union charges; for instance, in Westport there are over 350 on out-door relief; the amount is about £20 or a little over in the week, whereas in the union we have 155, and it costs nearly £40 a week taking all charges into consideration.

23580. What class of people get relief in the town?—Practically speaking, in the town the little out-door relief they get half of it goes to their lodgings or rent.

23581. About how much would a single person get there?—3s.

23582. And for two?—1s. 6d.; of course if there were any children there is generally 1s. extra for children, so that really out-door relief is only a small item compared with indoor. As regards tramps, I believe in some parts of England there is a permit given to certain deserving tramps by magistrates who know them to be artisans in search of work.

23583. At all events it is given there?—I believe it is in the North of England, and the result is that people get relief for the night who really deserve it. As regards tramps, I think the Vagrancy Act could be applied in their case; we have them in Westport coming round every three months.

23584. These would not be musicians?—Oh, no, sir.

23585. You would not shut out musicians?—Oh, no; they come from Castlebar to Westport, and by Letterkenny to Galway.

23586. Dr. BIGGER.—Do you know if there is any necessity for increased hospital accommodation for Achill?—No, sir, I don't believe it; they go down to Achill Sound in twenty minutes from Westport by rail.

CHAIRMAN.—That would have to be an extra special, but anyway it is a very big bag.

Mr. Davis.—It is sixty minutes.

Witness.—The farthest point from Achill Sound is fourteen miles.

23587. Dr. BIGGER.—Have you known any patient being admitted to the Westport Workhouse or Hospital from Dagh or Kesh?—Yes; they were brought up by the relieving officer, three for the last year.

23588. What is the population of the whole district? 5,000.

23589. You don't know the population of the whole union?

Mr. J. Walsh.—34,578.

23590. Dr. BIGGER.—Then from that district, which has more than a sixth of the population, there were only three patients admitted to the workhouse last year.

Mr. Walsh.—And even that was the time of the smallpox.

23591. Dr. BIGGER.—That shows how few can avail themselves of the accommodation at Westport; would not that point to the necessity of having some accommodation for these people?—The present system is a great improvement on what it was some ten years ago when they used to come up in a cart.

Mr. Walsh.—They prefer to get 1s. a week in their own place, and remain there, those old people, than come to the workhouse.

23592. Dr. BIGGER.—Are there many on out-door relief?—350.

Mr. Walsh.—There are 294 cases on out-door relief in the union; 445 persons.

Witness.—Certainly, Achill is a poor district, but there are districts just as poor in the Westport Union. Louisburgh is very poor, and also Aghaveer.

23593. Do they avail themselves much of the accommodation at Westport?—They do when sick; we have an ambulance.

23594. Is it not a long distance to some?—Some nine or ten miles.

23595. Is there not a large district beyond Louisburgh?—Sundarra is twenty-three miles.

Mr. Walsh.—We had a number of typhus fever cases from that district; I don't think there are many medical cases; they get treated by the dispensary doctor.

Mr. Davis.—We had sixteen from Dundarra recently in the hospital.

23596. Dr. BIGGER.—Are the people in Westport content with being treated by doctors in their own homes?—They go into the hospital.

23597. Would you allow these people the same privilege as the Westport people?

Mr. Walsh.—If there is a dangerous case we send a nurse from the workhouse; had cases that could not be removed.

Oct. 4, 1904.

Mr. Charles
McDonnell.

Witness.—In a case that has been reported by the relieving officer there is always a man sent down from Westport.

23502. That does not get rid of the fact of the few that come from these out of the way places compared with the large number that come into the hospital from Westport?—Certainly, a good many come from the country districts.

23503. You said it was got fair that a poor district should be put on the union, and made a union-at-large charge; would it not be much heavier to leave that district to pay for its own relief?—The relief in my opinion is allowed, and if they had to pay for their own out-door relief they would be none within bounds.

23504. It strikes me you get more rates from Achill for the support of Westport than the Westport people contribute themselves?—Oh, no; the valuation of Achill is very low indeed.

23505. It looks as if Achill was supporting Westport?—Not at all; if you take what Achill was paying and what it is paying now as a union-at-large charge.

23506. But still the Achill people don't evidently get a return for their rates?—They get it as out-door relief in my point.

23507. I have heard that they don't get more than 55 or 65 a year out of it?—Oh, no, sir; it is nearly 24 a week.

23508. What is the total out-door relief for the whole of the Westport Union?

Mr. Walsh.—21,177.

23509. CHAIRMAN.—That is over £20 a week! Mr. DONA.—In the Westport Hospital there is a loss proportion from the town of Westport than from any other division of the union.

Witness.—Between 24 and 25 a week is expended in out-door relief in Achill.

23510. Dr. RIGGON.—That may be, but I am talking of hospital accommodation, and I see the people of Achill get very little benefit from the hospital in Westport?—As much as they require.

23511. I would not say that, because they don't come to it?—If there is a case of anyone sick it is reported; it is open to all.

23512. The distances are so great. How many trains a day are there to Achill Sound?—Three.

23513. CHAIRMAN.—If you were told that the sick in Westport should in future go to Clonsilla where would you think of that?—If it was a matter of necessity they would have to go; if Westport could not support them it would be another matter.

23514. Do you think it would be a hardship on the sick of Westport?—Well, really, I don't think so in these days of train accommodation.

23515. Supposing they could not go by train, broken legs, &c.?—Then they could have the ambulance.

23516. Then would you think it would be a hardship on the sick of Westport to have to go to Clonsilla? The distance from Keel to Westport is as far as from Ballyhaunis to Westport; I would think it a hardship to go to Clonsilla.

Mr. PATRICK O'DWY, P.L.C., examined.

Mr. Patrick
O'Dwyer.

23517. CHAIRMAN.—You come from Louisburgh district?—Yes.

23518. Do you think the sick in Louisburgh go to the workhouse in sufficient numbers—that there are sufficient cases?—Any of them that are very sick come to the infirmary in Castlebar rather than the workhouse.

23519. These would be farmers' children?—Yes, decent people don't like going into the workhouse.

23520. Does that apply to the country west of Louisburgh?—Oh, yes, several miles behind Louisburgh.

23521. These would be people that could afford to take a seat on a mail car and to go Westport?—Yes, and employ a car and get home.

23522. Now the destitute, who would not have the price of a car or cart, and would be too sick to go by mail car?—The ambulance is always sent for them.

23523. Of course there is a fairly big population out west of Louisburgh?—There is.

23524. Do many of these people go to Westport?—Very few.

23525. Why is that?—They are treated at home.

23526. They prefer that?—Oh, they do, and in a case like that the doctor gives them extra relief when they are poor, extra out-door relief, and they are better off and they prefer staying at home.

23527. You have property yourself in the Tully district?—Yes.

23528. How many miles is that from Louisburgh?—Five miles.

23529. That has a thick population?—Yes.

23530. From that into Louisburgh is all a fairly thickly populated country?—It is; there are five or six villages there belonging to me and they are thickly populated.

23531. What do the people of those villages do when sick?—When they are sick, which is very seldom, they get extra out-door relief; the doctor attends to them, and their friends take care of them; I never knew one of them to go into the workhouse.

23532. I suppose that is the objection on their part to go to a place that is known as a workhouse?—No doubt of it; but at the same time no matter what it would be, they would rather stay at home to be attended by their friends and the doctor, the doctor giving them the necessary treatment and relief.

23533. So that, practically, these people out west of Louisburgh do not call much on the workhouse hospital?—They do not, nor on relief either; there is only one man on out-door relief in the division, and he is blind, and he was not on the relief until he got blind. Although it is thickly populated, there were never any people on out-door relief or in the workhouse either; they are neighbourly and help each other.

23534. There are a number of people going about through these parishes that put up one night at one person's house and another night at another's?—Very few.

23535. But still anyone that is in need there is enough neighbourly feeling to help them?—They are never left out in the cold.

23536. There are very few of them that have to make for the workhouse?—Oh, never; poor people are very charitable; they would give a bed or supper to any poor person that would be going, but they are very few indeed.

23537. Mr. MURKIN.—You say the people in your neighbourhood are fairly well-to-do, and come into the infirmary when they are sick?—They do.

23538. Do the poor come into the infirmary?—They do, if they are very sick; if they are very unwell; if they consider they can get better treatment in the infirmary than at home they come to the infirmary. Some of them consider they would get better care at the infirmary than at home.

23539. CHAIRMAN.—It is the custom of your neighbourhood to come to the infirmary rather than to the workhouse?—Oh, yes; I scarcely ever knew one of them going into the hospital except people who were very unwell, and the Guardians would send the ambulance for them; they are poor people.

23540. Was there any other matter you would like to refer to?—I would be for amalgamation of unions.

23541. Have you thought what workhouses you would close?—My experience about amalgamation is this. I am, perhaps, thirty years a Guardian, and the amalgamation of the Newport and Westport Unions—the Newport Union was bankrupt at the time, the Government several times had to come to its assistance, and the majority of the Westport Guardians were against taking over the Newport Union. The Local Government Board connected the two unions, whether they liked or not; I must say I was not opposed to it.

23542. There were only six miles between the two?—Although the Newport Union was very poor and the rates very high the consequence to Westport was that the average rate when the two Unions were amalgamated was lower by 8d. in the £, so that Westport, in fact, benefited by the amalgamation, although Newport was very poor.

23543. Mr. MURKIN.—Did Newport lose anything in the transaction?—It gained by it.

23544. Were the sick inconvenienced?—Oh, no; they were not at all inconvenienced.

23545. So the saving was due to the reduction in the staff?—They have a very good ambulance and a very good staff at Westport for taking in sick people, and the ambulance is sent any distance, to Mahon or Achill if necessary.

23546. Would you not like to see amalgamation extended a little?—I would, but not in that direction; the furthest part of the union, Ballyvaughan, is thirty-three Irish miles from Westport. If you take Achill, Keel is thirty or thirty-two Irish miles from West-

port, and being mountainous country, I would not like to see the Westport Union extended to that country any further.

23647. CHAIRMAN.—Would you like to take in Castlebar?—We will take as much of Castlebar as you like. The farthest part of the Castlebar Union from Westport is only twenty Irish miles.

23648. You feel quite equal to take in Castlebar?—Oh, certainly.

23649. What do you think about Ballinrobe?—Ballinrobe comes towards Westport; the side that is on the west of Lough Mask I don't think there could be any objection to take in a portion of that; Oughan is in the Ballinrobe Union, and is only five miles from Westport.

23650. TOWNMAYOR.—Well, that is only fourteen miles; I don't think there could be any objection to take in that; I would like to say one word about out-door relief; there are a great deal of abuses connected with it at present, but I must say it is not abused in the west, the Lough Mask direction, for the relief there is very small, not more than £2 10s. 6d. a week; it is a large district and a poor district, while in the other portions of the union the out-door relief is £23 10s.; I think it would be very prudent for out-door relief, and only for out-door relief, to have it a divisional charge, and then the Guardians in that case would take and look after it, and I would be certainly, instead of sending people to the workhouse, I would be far liberally giving them out-door relief.

23651. That is, if you had some security that it would not be unduly expended?—Certainly.

23652. Can you think of any other direction for general expenditure except making it a local charge?—There is no other in my neighbourhood; if there is any abuse I take good care to speak to the relieving officer and prevent it, but I know nothing about Newport or Westport and those places. If there was divisional relief for out-door relief the Guardians of every district would look after it, and I would be for giving liberal out-door relief in the case of sickness or poverty, but I would much rather there was no amalgamation if there is not a divisional charge for out-door relief.

Mr JOHN B. LECHE, R.S., examined.

I agree with the report of the Westport Committee, and I would also suggest going back to divisional rating for the purpose of preventing existing abuses.

23653. CHAIRMAN.—You think there are some cases in which people get out-door relief now that they would not get if it was divisional rating?—Yes.

23654. You think that would not cause hardship?—I don't think it would; the Guardians from rural districts have no opportunity of checking the granting of out-door relief at present.

23655. You think the town Guardians are rather too generous at your expense?—I think so.

23656. About the breaking up of unions—do you think it would be sufficient to break up two unions in the county, or do you think even more might be broken up?—I think four unions would be sufficient in the county.

23657. Do you suggest what four should be broken up?—I think Westport should be retained naturally, and Ballina should be retained, and either Claremorris or Swinford; it would be optional whether Ballinacorney should be retained or not on account of its distance from any centre.

23658. It would want a hospital there?—In the event of its being amalgamated.

23659. Do you think some of the sick in your union have too long distances to travel for hospital accommodation?—I think it is a great hardship on them to have to come so far, and it would not be just towards the sick poor to add to the distance they have to be brought.

23660. Would you diminish it by giving them a little local hospital at a small expense, say a hospital at Achill Sound, where there would be a few beds?—I would be in favour of a cottage hospital in Achill, but not to have a nurse there; to have it looked after by the dispensary doctor, and in the event of a patient being there to send a nurse from the district hospital as required.

23661. But if you found there was never a day in the year in which there were not a number of patients?—You would want to keep a nurse then.

23662. You are familiar, of course, with the country west of Westport?—Yes.

23663. You think a further extension would only lead to?—To abuse.

23664. An expenditure that could not be checked?—That is my view; there is so much talk about tramps.

23665. You have not a great many on your side?—No, but they are in the Westport Union; there is no doubt there is an abuse, but at the same time I would rather bear with the abuse ten times over than that one man would be left out in the cold.

23666. You would not like to adopt such measures generally?—No; I would rather hold on to abuses than that one man will suffer or be left out in the cold, because there will be some deserving men passing.

23667. Do you think some means could not be devised of finding out who were deserving. Suppose a man being in Galway—here you are going to have big harbour works in Westport—supposing a number of men came along with documents from some respectable person certifying that these were labouring men coming in search of work, they would present that at Clifton or Cloughward, whichever they came by, and got a card on the way until they came to Westport?—That would be a very prudent thing.

23668. Do you think that would be an unreasonable thing to require wayfarers to provide themselves with if they are going to be put up at the public expense?—I think it would be very reasonable.

23669. Any man who had not a sufficient explanation when he was walking about without money in his pocket and seeking relief, do you think it would be advisable to put him into some place where he would be made to work?—With these people who are making a trade of it I think it would be very prudent to put them into places and let them work, but I would refuse no man shelter whether he was good or bad; I would refuse none.

23670. If he was a lazy fellow you would put him where he was obliged to work?—Certainly, but I would refuse no man a night's shelter.

Mr. WALSH.—For the past three years the Guardians have expended over £500 on Westport Hospital.

23671. There is a large country there that is very populous—do you think any little cheap hospital out there might be advantageous?—I don't think so; I have heard no complaints from that district about the present arrangements.

23672. Do you think that lunatics ought to be maintained in workhouses?—No.

23673. You would move those?—To a central asylum, and in the event of Castlebar being abolished I think the workhouse could be very well used as an auxiliary asylum for harmless lunatics.

23674. Would you agree with those who say that wherever a workhouse is closed it would be desirable to keep up hospital accommodation?—Not on a large scale.

23675. Not on a large scale, certainly, but for the acutely sick?—Certainly.

23676. In Castlebar do you think the infirmary would be sought?—Quite sufficient.

23677. Is not the infirmary pretty full always?—I don't think so.

23678. It seemed to me the other day to be unusually full for a County Infirmary?—Then I would add to the infirmary rather than have two staffs.

23679. Or, perhaps, make a new one?—Yes; transfer the infirmary to the workhouse.

23680. But a place like Swinford where there is such a very thick population, you think they ought to have a hospital there in their midst?—I think so.

23681. And similarly Claremorris?—It is such a central district I don't think they require one there.

23682. But you can never send the acutely sick by train?—I would keep a small hospital with a very small staff.

23683. And Ballina is a town which would always require a hospital?—Yes.

23684. Ballinrobe?—Ballinrobe could be done away with, but keep the hospital.

23685. As regards paying patients, would you be in favour of Boards of Guardians getting discretionary powers to charge such cases as they thought people could afford to pay?—I would; I think they would use their discretion.

Oct. 4, 1905.

Mr. Patrick O'Donnell.

Mr. John B. Leche.

Oct. 4, 1904.
Mr. John B.
Loshin.

23665. Up to the full cost of maintenance?—Yes.
23667. Have you any special views about tramps?—
I think the labour test should be applied in every
case.

23668. In the workhouse, or in what is commonly
called a labour colony?—I would not have a labour
colony; I would apply the labour test in the work-
house, and bring them before a magistrate where they
refused to work.

23669. You know the difficulty of keeping a large
number of different classes in a building such as we
now have in a workhouse. It is found by experience
to be desirable to have as few classes as possible in
the same building?—We don't have many of that
class in this part of the country.

23670. Still you have some, and not desirable
people?—Quite we call undesirable.

23671. Mr. MURPHY.—Do you not think it would
be well to have a workhouse, for instance, in the
provinces where men who say they cannot find work
should have the excess taken away from them, and
could no longer say it, because if they went there they
would get employment?—I have never considered the
question from that point of view.

23672. It has been suggested that there ought to be
established, perhaps in the provinces, a workhouse where
those who wanted work could get it, and those who
tramped about the country could be sent there and
make work, giving them some small remuneration for
the work they did?—I think that is a good suggestion.

23673. You have heard that, theoretically, people
are very much opposed to the workhouse?—Yes.

23674. But when inquiry is made as to what work-
houses should be closed the people of the locality
object, and say their workhouse is needed. What
would you think of this method of arranging the
system—suppose the children were taken out of the work-
house and boarded out as far as possible, the lunatics
and imbeciles sent to a suitable institution, and the
house closed altogether against mothers of infants,
sending them instead to a religious institution for
reformatory purposes, managed by sisters or ladies
belonging to their own denomination, and all the
classes taken out of the workhouse except the old and
infirm; do you not think for the County Mayo one
workhouse for that class would be enough?—Yes, if
you adopt that course.

23675. You would not have over 250 or 300 of that
class in the whole County of Mayo, and by that
method of separation and distribution you would
get the various classes sent to places where each of
them could be better looked after and taken care of?—
Provided these institutions were confined within the
county or province.

23676. You could hardly do that in regard to the
mothers of infants, because they are not likely to have
an institution in each county that would take them,
but you could keep the children in the county by
boarding them out in farmers' houses and have the
aged and infirm in one institution to which there would
be attached an infirmary where, if they get sick, they
could be looked after and cared for?—I think that
would be a very good suggestion.

23677. And then by a prudent extension of out-door
relief the people could be kept in their own locality as
far as the Guardians would think it wise to keep them,
provided proper safeguards should be established, such
as that of divisional rating, which is one of the greatest
safeguards?—I think no reform would be workable un-
less you adopt divisional rating.

23678. It has been suggested by some that, in addi-
tion to the divisional rating, it should also be neces-
sary for two-thirds of the Guardians present to vote
in favour of an application for out-door relief; would
that additional test be required?—I don't think so;

you would have the friends of those seeking relief
going round canvassing; I think divisional rating
would be sufficient.

23679. You think there would not be any great diffi-
culty in carrying out the suggestion if informants were
kept where they are at present?—It is a scheme that
would require a great deal of consideration, and I
have not considered it.

23700. Many witnesses have spoken in favour of it?—
It is a question that would require longer considera-
tion than I have given to it.

23701. Still you believe the children ought to be
kept out of the workhouse?—They ought to be boarded
out.

23702. And you think the lunatics and imbeciles and
tramps ought to be kept out of the house?—I did not
say I would keep the tramps out.

23703. I thought you approved of a workhouse in
which they could be made to work?—That was your
suggestion; I have not considered it sufficiently.

23704. Would you not keep the aged and infirm all
together, where the name of a workhouse would
no longer exist?—That would be a very good idea.

23705. I just threw it out because some witnesses
have mentioned it?—It seems very good, but in the
event of amalgamation I don't think it would be as all
desirable unless you abolish union rating. In the
event of amalgamation one member for each electoral
division would be sufficient; if you amalgamated two
existing unions the Board would become unwieldy.

23706. Do you not think it would be better to re-
tain the local body to administer relief as at present
looking after its own interests?—That would be a very
good idea.

23707. Leaving the local body to look after the
affairs of its own locality and raise money for it, and
pay the money for it?—Yes.

23708. And retain the administration as at present
as far as possible?—Retaining it as you suggest, I
would withdraw my suggestion about limiting the re-
presentation.

23709. I am only putting before you what has
been suggested by other witnesses. Do you think
Achill is well enough off for the sick?—A cottage
hospital, as I said, in charge of the dispensary doctor,
would be sufficient for Achill.

23710. And one witness has suggested that instead
of having the infirmary at Killala, it should be at
Ballycastle?—I don't know the district; I would be
slow to offer an opinion.

23711. Killala is so near the neighbouring infirmary
in Ballina perhaps one hospital would accommodate
both?—We in Westport take very little interest in
Killala or Ballina.

23712. You don't know much about that district?—
No.

23713. You would not go as far as to say that tramps
should be compelled to go to a labour colony for a time?—
I would not be against it; but my suggestion would
be to apply the labour test, and in case they did not
work to bring them before a magistrate.

23714. And have them confined for a stated period?—
Yes.

23715. Dr. BROOKS.—You appear to be very much
in favour of electoral division rating?—I am.

23716. That is for all purposes or for out-door relief
—For all purposes.

23717. Some witnesses have proposed that it should
be only for out-door relief?—I think it should be for
all purposes.

23718. CHAIRMAN.—There are some charges that
necessarily must be upon-at-large, such as officers'
salaries?—I understand but for the administration of
the poor-law generally. I think it would be well—

23719. You would localise charges as much as pos-
sible?—As much as possible.

Rev. M. MacDONALD, Adm., examined.

Rev. M.
MacDONALD.

23720. CHAIRMAN.—You are at present adminis-
trator of Westport?—Yes.

23721. You are aware of the recommendations of
the Guardians?—Yes.

23722. I think if you would give us in your own
words anything that occurs to you to say on these?—
I would point out first of all that Westport Union as
it stands embraces two unions, Newport and West-
port, and it embraces more than a quarter of the
whole county of Mayo; I think that that being so, it
would be rash to interfere with the Westport Union.

23723. You think provision ought to remain at West-

port for the sick and all classes that could be treated
beneficially by the Poor Law?—I think that. I was
listening to some statements made about Achill and
other places; I frequently go among the inmates of
the workhouse, and one of the questions I ask is,
"Where are you from?" Of course I don't take note
of it, but I am speaking generally, and I should say
every fourth person in Westport would be from Achill;
it would seem to me that the explanation is this—that
when people come from Achill they come to stay; I
should say that the same or nearly the same applies
to Loughshinny. When they come they come from old

age, and to spend the remainder of their days there; and there are many from Loughborough and very many from Achill in the Westport Union at present.

23724. Old people with no one left to support them?—Yes, and people who may be an incumbrance on the young people at home, and think they would be more comfortable in the workhouse.

23725. But you don't most many coming in to be cured of some disease, and going back again?—Sometimes; I should not say many, and I believe in regard to that that if this hospital you speak of were in Achill I think the same complaint would be of Achill that the gentlemen to your left found with Westport a while ago, that is the gradually in the hospital would bring in many people to the hospital at Achill who would stay away if they had to come to Westport; I rather think they would go in for lighter cases. But if it was divisional rating, and Achill was made to pay for it, I don't think any of the Guardians would object to it, but otherwise a hospital at Achill would be expensive.

23726. Might not the Achill people say, "We will agree to that if you make the Westport Hospital a district charge for the district round Westport?"—I don't think the Westport people would have any objection to that; we have Loughborough and Aghagower in the Westport hospital as it stands at present; I think Westport suffer rather than gain anything.

23727. Still, of course, if people are seriously ill they could not travel such a long distance as thirty or forty miles?—I would suggest if there was an ambulance van at Loughborough and one at Newport or Millinaw, or the Sound of Achill, it would be a convenience; I think that would be a kindness shown to the sick poor of this district, and I think it would be sufficient.

23728. It might be as cheap to get a small cottage hospital?—One that I can offer to opinion.

23729. It would simply mean getting a trap and leaving it there in the care of a man who has a horse of his own who would be paid so much as the common steeple.

23730. If it were made a local charge, would you be in favour of letting people have their hospital locally, say for Achill and for the Loughborough West district?—I would, but I don't think the people in those particular districts would like a hospital located in Loughborough or Achill if made a local charge; it would be very burdensome. If they had it at the union-at-large cost it would be very pleasant then.

23731. You have heard Mr. Murnaghan's questions to Mr. Louden just now about getting the various classes out of the workhouse and putting them as far as possible by themselves?—There was one remark there I would not agree with—that is taking children away and sending them to a central home; that presupposes the consent of their parents is got; if the consent is not got it is the breaking up of a family. Let me take the case of a widow who when the head-winter dies is bound to go into the home herself and two or three children; it would be a great hardship to take the children from her.

Mr. PATRICK JENNINGS, Chairman, Ballinrobe Union, examined.

23732. CHAIRMAN.—You are Chairman of the Ballinrobe Board of Guardians?—Yes.

23733. You think that Castlebar and Killybegs might be broken up?—Yes.

23734. And you would convert Castlebar into an auxiliary asylum if necessary?—Yes.

23735. And the other you would have as a school, if required?—Yes.

23736. You don't know the buildings of Killybegs?—No.

23737. You are not aware that they would not be suitable for a school. The next recommendation you make is that you should return to electoral division rating?—Yes.

23738. Are you all in favour of that?—All in favour of that.

23739. The town of Ballinrobe included?—Yes.

23740. With regard to the county infirmary you express the opinion that each union in the county should pay for the maintenance of its own patients in the county infirmary and district asylum?—Yes.

23741. Would not that be a proper case for out-door relief?—I should think so, but you find such cases in the workhouse.

23742. Don't you think it is a mistake to have them in the workhouse?—I would think so.

23743. Mr. MURMAGHAN.—The reference only applied to illegitimate children, or the children of vicious parents who had shown their disregard of all paternal obligations?—I think it would be excellent there; there is one point I did not hear any of the witnesses bring up, and that always struck me as being a great one in connection with workhouses, that is the want of a hospital for consumptives. I don't wish to speak of any particular workhouse, and I am not a doctor either, but going about I can easily see there are many suffering from consumption; we know how infectious a disease it is, and it is very hard to have a young boy coming in with a broken limb being placed next to a consumptive, and then going out with the limb cured, but bringing home consumption to his family.

23744. CHAIRMAN.—That is one of the subjects on which we have received a great deal of evidence, and the purport of that evidence is to impress us with the importance of setting aside some institution, a diseased workhouse, according to the requirements of the locality?—One for a county; I am not five years in Westport, and I know myself where there are five members of a family stretched one after another by that disease; I know other instances of four and other instances of three. I mention that to show how prevalent it is, and how necessary it is to have some provision made for these poor people.

23745. Of course you are aware that it is only recently that consumption has been found to be infectious?—Yes, and I am aware there are medical gentlemen up to the present day who deny that it is infectious.

23746. Dr. BROWNE.—From your knowledge you have no doubt in your own mind that it is contagious?—I have seen it; it has been abundantly proved to me.

23747. Can you remember any case where you believe it was contracted in the hospital?—I can. The case I mentioned a while ago of the boy who came in with a broken leg and in whose family there was never consumption before.

23748. Did he take consumption after being in hospital?—After being in the hospital, and the assumption is that he took it there and brought it home to his family.

23749. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose there would not be the least doubt but that all the Boards of Guardians in the county will hail with delight any such proposal?—Oh, I think they would. We send poor fellows to Alladown and Wicklow, paying two or three guineas a week, who could be just as well treated at home.

23750. Dr. BROWNE.—Have you had much difficulty in getting patients into the National Hospital at Newcastle?—Yes; it does not seem that there is accommodation for the demand; I know cases where they had to go to other hospitals because they could not afford to wait for a vacancy at Newcastle.

23751. I suppose each union would also bear a share in the establishment charges?—Yes, sir, we are satisfied to do that.

23752. Pay a share of the establishment charges and so much a head for the patient?—Yes.

23753. You think the Government ought to contribute to the maintenance of lunatics, idiots, and epileptics in auxiliary asylums to the same extent that they do in district asylums?—Yes, sir.

23754. Now as regards the Vagrancy Act for tramps, you think that ought to be strictly enforced by law?—Yes.

23755. You have the law at present. Do you think the law ought to be changed in any way?—I do, with regard to the tramps. There should be a distinction made between the tramps—a professional tramp should be handed over to the police authorities, and those men tramping in search of work should be retained in the casual ward.

23756. You would give them their board and lodging without any imputation?—Yes; what we term profes-

Oct 4, 1904

Rev. M. MacDonnell.

Mr. Patrick Jennings

Oct. 4, 1901.

Mr. Patrick Jennings.

sional tramps should be summarily dealt with by the police authorities.

23757. As regards pay wards, are you in favour of them?—Yes.

23758. What power would you give the Guardians—would you give them power to charge as much as they thought each person could pay. At present they have

to pay the full average cost of maintenance; you cannot get that from a great many people. Would you be in favour of giving the Guardians discretion to charge as much as they thought the people could pay, up to the full cost?—I would. There are other witnesses to give evidence, and I think I have answered all the queries.

Mr Thomas Branghly.

Mr. Thomas HERAGHTY, E.L.C., examined.

23759. CHAIRMAN.—I have read out the answers to the queries given; is there anything you would like to add yourself?—There is one thing certain, that so far as divisional ratings goes we are all unanimous for that, electoral division rating. I believe if that is carried out, it will reduce the rates by 30 per cent. in Ballinrobe.

23760. And you would be in favour of having all possible charges on the electoral division?—Electoral division; all charges the same as under the old Poor Law before the Local Government Act came into operation. I have been a Guardian for seventeen years of the Ballinrobe Board.

23761. When the rating was electoral divisional were you in favour of trying them rating or were you sorry when the change was made?—I was all in favour of electoral division. I know one division, Bessies, and in that the rate was only 7d. or 8d., and now the people feel the severe tax on them.

23762. How much have they to pay now?—I really don't exactly know; at all events, it is double what it was in those days. And another matter—I say, in Ballinrobe we are not in favour of amalgamating with another union; we have already a very extensive area, a large union; and furthermore, under the Local Government Act there has been a portion of the County Galway added to Ballinrobe, and that being so we are thoroughly well satisfied to keep it as we are.

23763. And you have a good and excellent hospital?—An excellent one, and an excellent medical officer.

23764. Mr. MURKIN.—If the hospital and medical officer were allowed to remain there could you not let away the aged and infirm and keep the hospital?—Oh, yes; those epileptic cases and harmless lunatics I certainly say should be removed, and I agree with what Father McDonald said with regard to these consumptive patients, that there should be some provision made for those also, because there is no mistake it is a terrible disease and contagious. I have experience of it; and people have been carried away that came into these hospitals. With regard to the children there should be something in the shape of an industrial school in some part of the county.

23765. CHAIRMAN.—Would you rather have that than put the children out with suitable people, who would take them and bring them up to be ordinary members of the community?—I have a doubt on that.

23766. You have not tried boarding-out much in Ballinrobe?—No; but I believe if there was a proper training school in some central part of the county for these children.

23767. What would you train them for these?—There could be a school got up for carpentry and tailoring.

23768. Do you think it is right, as the Swinford Board of Guardians say, to train the children of the weavers and strays to trade, that the small ratpayers could not put their children to?—Really, of course, that is a question; but no matter, they should get a proper training and be fitted for something in life.

23769. I suppose you have a good deal of need for agricultural labourers where you are?—Oh, yes.

23770. You often find it hard to get a man or boy?—Very hard at present.

23771. Do you think you could do much better for the children than make them agricultural labourers?—It would be very good.

23772. And could a better plan be adopted for making them agricultural labourers than boarding them out with small farmers who could make them handy and useful?—I quite agree with you.

23773. Mr. MURKIN.—You have a large number of children in the workhouse there—about thirty?—I don't suppose it amounts to more than that.

23774. If those thirty children were taken out, and also the imbeciles, you would not have very many left in Ballinrobe, and the expense per head would be higher even than it is at present, considering you

would not get as much value for the money that you expended on the staff. Do you not think that if you had an infirmary there for the sick it would be a prudent thing for the Guardians to let their old and infirm go to some institution where they would be kept by themselves, and where they would have more comfort and freedom than at present?—My belief is that as far as Ballinrobe is concerned it would increase taxation there; I have so rarely doubt on my mind about that.

23775. If you reduce the staff it cannot increase the cost?—In my belief the larger the area the more the charge.

23776. Suppose the Ballinrobe Guardians had to look after the same extent of area?—We have six years of it now, and it is well suited; and I certainly say, with the authority of the Board, that taxation has gone up, and will go up, if this system is continued, but if we revert to the electoral division charges and it comes to a district charge the taxation will come down; there is no question about that. So far as the Guardians concerned in these eighteen districts it is everyone seeing in what he can and no one seeing.

23777a. Supposing you had electoral division charges established again and your infirmary retained, and you sent out the various classes alluded to, the children, the imbeciles and the consumptive and alcoholised, you would have very few left except the sick and infirm. Let the sick remain in the infirmary there and send the few infirm to some central institution where they would be looked after. Could you see any difficulty in that method?—You could get rid of a considerable expense; the number and number and the power could be got rid of, and the cost of the housing of a large establishment could be very largely reduced. All these people that you dispose of should be remunerated.

23777b. The remuneration in no case would come up to as much as their salary, and it would come with their lives, and it would be an ongoing charge?—I know that; but I have seen unions almost bankrupt when Ballinrobe was sending very well and very low rated, and I see those people becoming almost as solvent, and the rate almost as low, as Ballinrobe, and so the people of Ballinrobe have cause to complain. There is another matter, too; we have a military barracks there. I have heard remarks made here that Ballinrobe could be done away with. I don't see any other place in the County Mayo such a fine healthy place. We have two barracks; and to fancy that the thing should be done away with is monstrous.

23778. You don't want a workhouse for that class?—But they want a hospital.

23779. I am speaking under the supposition that your hospital will remain as it is; it is always understood that in a large centre of population like Ballinrobe there should be accommodation, and suitable accommodation, for the sick; but having retained that and sent the children out and the lunatics and imbeciles, do you see any great objection to letting the infirm go to some central institution, where the Guardians of Ballinrobe could pay for their keep?—There are some able-bodied people in the house. If these people are taken and boarded with their friends the cost of them runs to 6s. 3d.

23780. CHAIRMAN.—You may put it at 5s. or 15s. a week; that is only for their food. It comes to 2s. or 3s. share of all the expenditure it comes to 2s. or 3s.

23781. Mr. MURKIN.—You would agree that there should be some institution for the consumptives?—I certainly do, most unhesitatingly. With regard to those tramps—

23782. CHAIRMAN.—You have a fair number of them in Ballinrobe?—Yes; they travel from Tass and Galway. I would not go as far as some of the witnesses, refusing them admission, certainly not; but those who are professional tramps they should, at all events, do some labour, and be kept there until they did some

labour; but tradespeople who go in pursuit of labour and trade, these men should be licensed at once, and the law should be enforced against professional tramps.

23783. The difficulty is to find out which are professional tramps and which are not. Would you oblige

a man honestly looking for work to carry some testimonials from his own district?—Exactly; that is a very good idea. Or from his late employer or parish priest.

23784. Some person who could be trusted?—Exactly.

Oct. 4, 1904.
—
Mr. Thomas
Brough.

Mr. PATRICK M'GINN, J.P., examined.

23785. CHAIRMAN.—You are also a member of the Ballinrobe Guardians?—Yes.

23786. Do you agree generally with the Guardians, your colleagues, in the evidence they have given?—Yes. Mr. O'Dowd, in giving evidence for Westport, mentioned Craghan and Townshead. I must certainly take objection to that. No doubt we are nearer Westport than Ballinrobe, but we have a doctor at Cappaduff very close, and there is no doctor on the Westport side until you go to Westport.

23787. Supposing the Cappaduff doctor was put into the Westport Union also?—It could not be managed; Cappaduff extends into part of Galway.

23788. If the Westport Union were extended to the new county boundary that would take in the doctor?—Yes.

23789. If Mr. O'Dowd had his way what is there to prevent the whole of the County Mayo part west of Lough Mask going into Westport?—There is everything; there is a chain of mountains there, and if you wanted a doctor in it—

23790. The doctor would be at the same place, Cappaduff?—He would be, coming towards Westport.

23791. He would be in the same place still, and get merely a different paymaster—to be paid from Westport?—Yes.

23792. That would not be any inconvenience?—Not as far as the sick poor are concerned.

23793. Where would the inconvenience be?—In the rating.

23794. There is a lower rate in Ballinrobe than Westport?—Yes.

23795. Are you resident on that side of the lake near Townshead?—Yes.

23796. How far have you sick to go to the hospital at Ballinrobe?—Fourteen Irish miles.

23797. Of course they cannot go by boat, except on a very fine day; they have to go round by Farry?—Yes.

23798. How far would it be to Westport?—It is only seven miles from where I live, but Townshead is a station.

23799. And unless there was some very strong reason indeed, you think it would not be fair to oblige your people to pay the extra rate of Westport, rather than the lower rate which they are accustomed to at Ballinrobe?—No.

Mr. P. W. JUDGE, J.P., Chairman, Clonsilla Union, examined.

My Board passed unanimously at a full meeting the following answers:—1st. We are in favour of amalgamation to a certain extent, where the workhouses are in close proximity.

23799. CHAIRMAN.—That is where they are near each other?—Yes. Secondly, where it can be shown that a saving of rates will be effected thereby.

23800. And the second answer is?—That the district workhouses be utilized as convalescent hospitals; at least one in each county for agricultural and technical schools, or some useful industry.

23801. Does any other useful object occur to you?—Technical, or some useful industry.

23802. One witness suggested they might be used as quarters as long as they lasted. Would you approve of that?—No, I would not. We recommend that the workhouse children be maintained in one institution in the county, and receive at least the elements of industrial education and training.

23803. Have you boarded out any children in your workhouse?—No, sir.

23804. You have not had any experience of it there yet?—No, there are very few in it.

23805. You heard some of the witnesses from Belfield here, to-day, point out that they, after consideration, thought it wiser to put the children of waifs and strays in a better position, that is in position of trades, on positions that the children of humble ratepayers could not hope to be, that they thought that under?—There are applications for them every other day when they come of age.

23806. And then they are likely to turn back on your hands again if they are not pleased with their situation, are they not?—The party who takes them out of the union is bound to look after them; they grow up for a few years with their, and then go to England or America and join the army.

23807. Don't you find they come back or join the army, as you say?—I scarcely ever see any of them coming back.

23808. I suppose there is the usual complaint in your neighbourhood, that they are not able to get enough labourers?—It is a complaint.

23809. Do you see any objection to putting these children out with small farmers and accustom them to farm work?—It is generally there they go after being educated.

23810. Do you think the workhouse education is a useful course of instruction for a child?—I think if there was one place in the county where you could have them all together, and have a proper staff to train them it would be much better.

23811. Do you think instruction rearing is ever as good as home rearing?—It is not.

23812. Would not that be rather an argument in favour of home rearing by boarding out?—It is, but we hear so much about boarding out—about the officers coming and looking after them.

23813. Is rather frightens you, the ladies coming after them?—Yes.

23814. I think you might give one or two of the children a trial; the experience in Mr. McLaughlin's union, and a vast number of unions, is overwhelmingly in favour of the boarding-out system?—Of course, there are some parties that would get children to board out that would be very kind to them.

23815. And then if they were not it would be a good thing to have the ladies of the ladies' committee to look after them?—It would.

23816. Whether amalgamation occurs or not your Board of Guardians are in favour of going back to electoral division rating?—They are; they are strongly of opinion that we should return to the former system of electoral division rating, as under the present system there is no incentive to economy.

23817. You think the union-at-large expenditure makes people a little careless how they spend the money?—It does.

23818. There is no further hospital accommodation required for the sick in your union?—No, sir; we erected a new hospital this year that will cost nearly £1,500, and we have accommodation in our union.

23819. When was it finished?—About a month ago.

23820. Have you taken it over?—Yes, and paid for it. The furniture is not yet; it is on for contract now. There is accommodation in the old fever hospital for twenty, and that new one for forty, and in the house there is accommodation for 675 altogether. The valuation is £44,000, and the population 25,000, and we are under the impression that there is no more suitable place for a union. I fall in with Mr. Laminick's ideas as to four unions.

23821. You have given the number relieved in the various unions in Mayo to the 31st of March, 1903: you put Clonsilla far ahead of anything else?—Clonsilla is 1,611.

23822. That must be mainly tramps?—There are a good many tramps.

23823. The excess over other unions. You would never dream of saying you have an average number of people more in your workhouse than in Ballina or Westport?—The average number is 126 in our house.

Mr. P. W.
Judge

Cu. 4, 1901.

Mr F. W.
Judge.

23824. But nothing approaching Westport and Ballina if you exclude the tramps?—There are tramps in Ballina and Westport, too.

23825. There are not as many admissions of tramps as with you?—Yes; it is just a center when coming round there.

Mr. MICHAEL BROWN, P.L.C., examined.

Mr. Michael
Brown.

23826. CHAIRMAN.—Are you resident in Clonsilla?—No, sir, within three miles of it.

23827. Do you agree generally with the answers or do you dissent in any case?—There is only one thing I would like to remark, that when we go back to electoral division rating for out-door relief I think it would be right that each union should be a rating unit. As it stands at present it is at the County Council office that the rates are struck for every electoral division. That would involve a good deal of extra expenditure.

23828. Book-keeping, it would?—That we should employ a larger staff. We should make each union a rating unit, and then allow the Guardians to strike a rate for Poor Law Union purposes, and the County Council to strike a rate for Poor Law county purposes. It would simplify the finances of the county very much, and the Guardians of the union would be in a position to examine the accounts and know their own finances; at present it is very difficult to do so.

23829. That would be putting the County Council into a somewhat similar position to the old Grand Jury?—Nearly so; to separate county business from union business and each strike their own rates; but at present it is a shifting of responsibility from one body to another.

23830. You think the clerk of the union cannot get before you, as required, a financial statement of the position of your union?—He can; but we cannot examine beyond our own union.

23831. I think I understand what you mean by that. Is there anything else?—Well, no, sir; we don't favour amalgamation unless it is made clear to us that there will be a saving by amalgamation. I don't think it would be wise to separate the weak and infirm from the able-bodied, for the able-bodied are very useful in the workhouse, if you leave them as they are; they do a good deal of work, and sometimes objectionable work, that would have to be paid for if we had not them.

23832. That is one point of view; but do you think it is desirable to have able-bodied women in the house with illegitimate children—do you think it is a good thing to have them going through the house doing work here and there?—They are very useful, and save a good deal of expense.

23833. There are a great many old people who might do more than they are asked to do in a workhouse, and if you had an institution, say, at Clonsilla, for the aged and infirm of the county, do you think it likely that some of the old people could be profitably employed in doing little things such as they would do if out in the country?—If they are able to work.

23834. The majority of men you see going about are able to do some little thing, and if you walk out in the streets you will see a number of old people about their businesses. You will see the same class of people in the workhouse doing nothing from morning to night?—I thought those old people would be sent away to one place.

23835. Supposing they were sent away, the people who could do some little work?—If they could do some work it would be just as well.

23836. If the aged and infirm of the county were sent to the central institution somewhere do you think that would be a fairly satisfactory thing?—I am afraid you would have the able-bodied then with nothing to do at all.

23837. What do they consist of? They consist of the women who come in with children. Supposing they were sent to a penitentiary—supposing the object was to get everybody out of the workhouse except the sick, so that you would have in each town instead of a workhouse an infirmary or hospital for the sick, and all other classes should be kept out of it; children boarded out, women who come in to have illegitimate children placed in penitentiaries, lunatics sent to lunatic asylums, and tramps sent to some place where they would be obliged to work, a disarmed workhouse, spe-

23838. Mr. MURKHAM.—Coming along looking for work?—No, those parties would not work.

23839. Does not Mr. Down employ them sometimes?—He does not; they would not work, even if you paid them, those fellows.

cially for that purpose, do you see any reason why the aged and infirm should not be sent to a central county institution in the same way?—I suppose not in that case; but that would be a great change.

23840. Would it not get rid of that unpleasant classification that brings so much discredit on workhouses now?—I dare say it would.

23841. Mr. MURKHAM.—Do you think it would be an improvement?—I would require time to consider that; I did not consider it in that way at all.

23842. Don't you think that the mixed system of classification that exists at present is not very beneficial, having children, lunatics, mothers of babies, able-bodied and tramps all in one house?—Well, I suppose it is not; I don't approve of it, and those being kept in a workhouse. I think that class should be placed in an asylum.

23843. CHAIRMAN.—Do you not think it is even more dangerous to have the unmarried women and children in such a place?—If a proper place could be provided for them without incurring a great deal of expense.

23844. You have some of that class in your own workhouse?—There are some—a few.

23845. The few that do come in, do they very often remain there permanently?—I am not sure about that.

23846. Are you aware of their going back to their ordinary positions in life again after once coming into the workhouse?—I cannot answer that; I don't know them at all, or where they come from.

23847. Mr. MURKHAM.—The object of such a change would be reformation: the hope would be that in the course of time the number would lessen, and in years to come that we would not have the very large number of people of the different classes at all. If that change is properly carried out it would be a very good thing.

23848. If this vagrant class could be dealt with separately it would rid the workhouse of a great number. Some witnesses suggest they could be sent to a colony?—I think that would be a very good thing. We have, on an average, twenty-five every week. Draconic measures should be taken to put a stop to the tramp nuisance, and I think the labour colony would be a good idea.

23849. These tramps have children, and these children grow up and become tramps again, and the class continues and increases; but the people that have expressed a desire to see a change such as has been outlined live in the hope that such a system would largely do away with the present inmates of the workhouse?—I approve of a labour colony, certainly; I think they should not be accommodated in the workhouse at all, those who are known to be regular tramps.

23850. If such a system as that were pursued there would not be a need of more than one or two workhouses in the county, and you could get rid of a large number of officials and save a good deal of money in fuel and the up-keep of the institution?—I imagine that we would require a fever hospital and workhouse hospital in almost every place where it exists at present, and I believe the little savings that you would effect would be more than counterbalanced in other directions; you may save the salaries and retires of a few officers, but I believe there would be other expenses that would more than counterbalance the saving.

23851. The saving would not be very little, it might be very considerable, both as regards salaries and the up-keep of the buildings?—I imagined you would have to put up additional buildings.

23852. Not at all; you have too many as it is!—There would not be accommodation in one or two workhouses.

23853. Almost any workhouse in Mayo is large enough for the aged and infirm?—I dare say you would require additional people to look after them in the places you send them to.

CHAIRMAN.—Much smaller than you have at present.
23854. Mr. MURPHY.—The cost per head would be no more than at present.—And the additional expense.

23855. That would be only in the beginning?—I thought in other ways it might be made more costly sending people long distances and superannuating the old officers.

Oct. 4, 1904.
Mr Michael
Brown.

Mr. MARTIN STANTON, Chairman, Castlebar Union, examined.

23856. CHAIRMAN.—You are the Chairman of the Castlebar Board of Guardians?—Yes, sir.

23857. You were asked to give your own personal views by the Guardians, I think?—There was something said to that effect, but I did not happen to be there.

23858. What is your view on the question of amalgamation of unions?—I think we want no amalgamation here, or Castlebar.

23859. You think Castlebar Union ought to remain as it is?—So I think.

23860. Would you have it go on as it is—the same class of people admitted, or as there any class that you think ought to be housed elsewhere than in the workhouse?—I don't think a good deal goes wrong with the exception of a few tramps now and again. I think it would be all right if there was something to straighten that.

23861. What would you propose to do about the

tramps?—I should not like to be too hard on them, but I would want to keep them in their proper places.

23862. What do you think might be done with them without too great expense?—I think those who would be bona fide tramps in search of work should be handled leniently, but with the professional tramps I should be—

23863. A little hard with him?—Yes; if I thought they were professional tramps I would send them to some place by themselves.

23864. Would you approve of the suggestion that they should be put in some damned workhouse and put to labour, with the hope that they might be made industrious people eventually?—Yes, they might become industrious people after some time by that means, but I consider them dangerous to be at large.

23865. Is there any other matter that you would wish to allude to?—I don't think I have any more to say.

Mr Martin
Stanton.

Mr. JAMES DALEY, M.C., F.R.S., examined.

23866. CHAIRMAN.—The Guardians of the Castlebar Union put you forward as one of their witnesses?—Yes sir; I wish to state I am an elected Guardian for Castlebar since 1893, and for Bellina since 1878; I am also a member of the County Council and of the Urban Council here in Castlebar, and a member of the Asylum Board. I have a good deal of experience on Poor Law Boards. I served on the old Board, under the Poor Law Commissioners, and I must say that during that time the landed element was very predominant on the Board and had all the power in their own hands. They were very active in levying taxation and careful in looking after it. That Act was superseded by another Act, and it came under the Local Government Board. That went on fairly well until the People's Act of 1898 was passed. But during the reign of the Local Government Board they went in for adding several things to the rates which, I believe, should be paid out of Imperial taxation, such as the franchise, Parliamentary voters' and jurors' charges, and the Cattle Diseases Act, and the latest scientific works.

23867. Were not the Cattle Diseases and Franchise put on by Parliament?—Yes; but I think it should be an Imperial charge, and not on the local rate, which was first struck at a poor rate, and now it has to pay everything.

23868. Your suggestion is that we should recommend that a great many of those charges should be either partly or wholly paid out of the Imperial Exchequer?—Certainly. Now, as regards amalgamation, I go in for merging all the unions of the province, because as unions may work into one another the counties may work equally so. Portions of Mayo could go into Sligo, and Sligo into Leitrim, and so on. I am not in favour of rejecting one union and letting another stand; I go in for some intelligent gentlemen, to lay the map of the province before them, and let them reset all the unions, retaining only one or two in a province for the aged and infirm. I would be for taking all the children of the province to one, the male children to be educated under the supervision of the Christian Brothers, and the female children to be taught under the tuition of the nuns; and the same rule to apply to children of any other denomination, to be brought up in their own religious belief; and I think the Government ought to pay a stipendium for towards them. I would be in favour of retaining the Boards of Guardians as at present, to levy and regulate taxation. I would retain the clerk of the union; I would retain the present hospitals as local hospitals for the sick poor of the various districts. As regards tramps, I think they should be classified; there are professional tramps who go about to robs and larcies, returned three-or-four times; they are very objectionable. There is another class, young fellows who, perhaps, may leave their employment, such as apprentices, tailors, or shoe-makers, or printers; they often run away and go on tramp. It

should not be at all encouraged; they should be confined to their own localities, where they are better known, and if they had not workhouses as refuges they would stay at home. I think any person going about looking for employment from one county to another should have a pass or a letter of introduction. That class should be assisted on the road and treated properly and well. But the other classes are very objectionable; they are not for their own good or the benefit of the public. I look on the present Poor Law system as very bad. I object to it altogether in its present state. The indoor system is bad, and calculated only to breed idleness and misery. The outdoor system is worse, as it encourages a rather dishonest state of things; it is not, as a rule, the really deserving to whom the relief is given; a relieving officer, if dishonestly inclined, could perjure it and represent it as given to illiterate, who, as a rule, only get paid once a month or once in three months. I have known poor aged women to be in their beds sick, and perhaps could not come into town for five or six weeks, and when they came to the relieving officer they told him they were curable. Any person who can afford to wait a month or two for relief should not be eligible. I also know women to be on relief whose sons are earning 14s. a week. I know it is to the knowledge of the District Councilors and, I believe, also to the knowledge of the relieving officer.

23869. How would you propose to check that?—While rates are made a union charge that will continue; if it does not go back to an electoral division charge, as of old, it is going from bad to worse.

23870. Did you know of any such cases under the old electoral division?—I did not, because each Guardian had a keen eye to business; if he had not, the next time he would be told by the ratepayers to stand aside. By the passing of the new Act there was double representation, and as a rule men were put in who had no rating qualification, and when I grumbled about the taxes going up, "Ah," said one, "thanks be to God I never pay any taxes." I think half the representation would be quite enough for any union, one for each electoral division, and then men should be elected who would have to put their hands into their own pockets or have some idea of union affairs. I know men to be discharging duties of the union who could hardly sign their name, and could not find anything in a book, and know as much about it as I do about Hebrew or Greek. That is not the man to administer the Poor Law.

23871. Are not the ratepayers to blame for that?—They are greatly to blame for it; I go in for men who are intelligent, and who understand something about the Poor Laws. I think the charges for each union should be limited to the union, and county-at-large charge or union-at-large is a bad business. It is well known where relieving officers have deputies to distribute the relief, and the deputies are District Councilors that are handing it across their own counters.

Mr James
Daley.

Oct. 8, 1904.
Mr. James
Daly.

Taxation in my time has trebled, and it is on the increase, and will increase while the present system of taxation exists. I think the Government acted very cleverly; it was once taxation without representation, and now it is representation without payment of taxation; the result is very bad for the country.

22872. You do think that going back to the old electoral division would completely remedy all that?—I think it would remedy a great deal of it. Or, relief should be made a dispensary or parish charge, and there should be a parish committee appointed to administer the relief. I think the old electoral division system may tell against the towns, for the reason I will give you. To my knowledge and experience the bulk of the people on relief in Castletar are widows of men who lived free, ten, or perhaps twenty miles from Castletar, before they were evicted; they begged about at first, and then came into the town and settled down. It is hard on Castletar to have to pay for these. But I would suggest a remedy: suppose there were a head tax, and when the taxes went in any division 20 or 25 per cent. over the ordinary taxes of the union it should become a union-at-large charge or paid from some other fund, as was mentioned here today. I think the rich gentlemen of the County Mayo get more than they are entitled to, and more goes to the fat and rich hands. We will say, of Lonsdale or Manner. We know that ballads won't come looking for out-door relief, but where there are congested districts, as in Mayo, those portions ought to get more than the ordinary share so devoted to relief from the Consolidated Fund. There ought to be some provision made, some Parliamentary grant; I would be in favour of that. I am also in favour of the remark made by Father McDonald; I think there should be a sanatorium hospital in this province at least, and to select it on some rising ground—wherever the medical faculty thought was the most suitable place. In a country like this, where the climate is very moist and damp, consumption is on the increase. I think it is an admirable suggestion, and one that has pressed on my mind for a long time; I am very glad Father McDonald brought it up here today. I am not in favour of the boarding-out system. First, I think it would be very wrong to board out illegitimate children, because it would be a kind of cast out on them; they ought to be sent to a central institution and the mothers sent to a home or place where they would be made self-support-

ing to a great extent, and they may get a better and more religious training than in the past. We know that society will take in children except to make by them, and I believe the children would contract bad habits, visiting at night; and at the best they could never be more than slaves. Let the mother rear the child until it is three or four years old; send the child, then, to an industrial school, and that child ought to have a fair education at fourteen with the prospects of a trade. The child might be looked down upon; it might be cast up against them if they remain in the country mixing with the public, whereas if they get a training and went to some other part of the country they might turn out to be respectable and good members of the community. If they remained in their own country they themselves would not respect themselves, and they would be looked down upon in the country. Boarding-out is only creating more officers: we will have ladies' committees and lady inspectors, and they won't do it for nothing.

22873. The ladies' committee don't get paid?—But there are lady inspectors, who go about seeing as to the cleanliness, and they don't do it without pay.

22874. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—You have them already; there will be no more expense!—If we had more boarding-out we would require more officers.

22875. The cost of boarding-out a child is much less than the cost of keeping one in the workhouse.—It might in the workhouse; but I think a child sent to some place where they would be taught and brought up under religious instruction, and have a good deal, would be better off than a child out in the country rambling about; they might go to school one day and stay away two days.

22876. It is a common report that the peasantry of Ireland are well brought up. Where could you get a home for children better than among the farmers?—I am sorry to say the taxpayers' children are not brought up one-half as well, or get the same care, as in those institutions.

22877. CHAIRMAN.—Don't you think the country people live quiet, peaceful and moral lives?—As a rule they do; but children may contract habits of rambling, and smoking tobacco, and attending wakes.

22878. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Children would not have much money to buy tobacco!—They would get it at wakes; fill their pockets and then take old pipes, and also attend American wakes, for people going to America: another very objectionable business.

Mr. ALEXANDER G. LAMMIE, J.P., examined.

22879. CHAIRMAN.—We have had the advantage of reading, quite recently, the pamphlet you were kind enough to send us copies of?—It is very kind of you to say it has been an advantage.

22880. Having been so long acting in connection with the Poor Law—thirty-two years—and having been practically all your life in the county?—Yes, I was born here.

22881. Your observations must be very valuable. Do you think similarly to Mr. Daly about the increase of taxation?—I don't think we have so very much to complain of, if you come to look at it comparatively: if you take, for instance, the standard rate, which was an exceedingly low rate, it so happened. I am now talking of the general rate of the county. You find the standard rate in Ballina was 3s. 4d.; and the average rate since was 2s. 6d.

22882. What about the agricultural grant?—Of course, that is the result of it to a great extent. I am now talking of what the people have to pay, for really that is the point.

22883. Don't you think you ought to take in the agricultural grant?—That has reduced the taxation.

22884. But the expenditure has increased?—The expenditure has increased.

22885. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—It has greatly increased in respect of the occupier, because under the old system he had only to pay half the rate, now he has to pay all the poor rate?—I speak entirely from an occupier's point of view; I pay rates both in the town and country.

22886. What is the rate on houses and land combined?—You cannot combine them.

22887. You do combine them?—You don't pay the combined rate on anything.

22888. What is your rate on land and houses?—Excluding the urban district in Castletar the rate on land is 2s. 7d. this year, and on buildings 4s. 2d.

22889. CHAIRMAN.—Your rate would be 4s. 2d. on land if you had not the agricultural grant?—Yes, in Castletar, it was very little less than that.

22890. Can you tell us what it was?—On that very low year in Castletar Union it was 3s. 3d.

22891. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—That is 1s., and representing 55 per cent. increase; that is considerable?—That is so. I agree with you; but the increase between 1872 and 1895 is enormously greater than the increase in the subsequent period in many cases.

22892. The standard of living is much higher now. Of course it is; the in-door relief is very much increased, and the number decreased receiving relief.

22893. CHAIRMAN.—That is owing to the additional comforts for the sick?—Yes; I am not talking of the officers' salaries at all, mostly of the in-door relief; the in-door relief in 1872 was very nearly the same as now, but in 1895 it was 22,000 less.

22894. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—The average weekly out in the house, does that include the infirmary?—Oh, yes.

22895. CHAIRMAN.—The growth of out-door relief is very remarkable. From 21,000 before 1890, to 42,000 now. You have not brought out the total of the average daily number in the house?—I don't know how you could very well; at least I did not attempt it.

22896. About the number of workhouses in Mayo, what is your view about that?—There are two things have rather changed my opinion; one is, I see by the evidence you received at Belmullet, that they are quite prepared to abandon their workhouse. I am not going to object to that. And, also, Mr. Murtaghan's idea. I had not gone into the numbers of the other workhouses—that are workhouse would easily contain all the aged and infirm in the county. Well, then, I would do away with another workhouse. I quite adopt nearly all Mr. Murtaghan's views, and I think I have pretty well stated so.

2387. Mr. MURKIN.—Don't take them as my view; I would not like anything to go forward as being my view.—I will apologise for saying that; but the view you appear to have pointed out on behalf of sanely.

Mr. MURKIN.—I merely mentioned the suggestion that was received in other places.

2388. CHAIRMAN.—How many workhouses do you think might go, supposing that the hospitals remain?—Oh, certainly, I think we don't require increased hospital accommodation.

2389. Except, perhaps, Kildale?—Then it was suggested Ballyvaughan should take its place. I suggest Kildale should be made use of as a consumptive hospital.

2390. Have you seen the building?—No; I am only talking of the position.

2391. You would not suggest it if you saw it. It was occupied by the French in 1793, and General Humbert slept under its roof. It is not on modern lines.—You might remodel it.

2392. You might as well talk of remodeling a round tower!—Then take Newport, it is well circumstanced. There is no other place in Mayo you could have a consumptive hospital with sea air. Here is an old map of Mayo, and I suggest the four towns to be named are Belmullet, Ballina, Westport, and Claremorris. Geographically, they appear to be the best circumstances you could have if you retain four.

2393. Where would you put your infirm inmates for the county?—Claremorris, decidedly; there is a very excellent building and nice grounds.

2394. What would you use Westport for?—You must have your hospital there, and then there is the question of the children.

2395. What do you think about the suggestion made as to suppressing the powers of the Guardians to enable them to board out children of parents who had deserted them, or the children of parents not fit to have charge of children?—It is a question of equal difficulty and importance, because you must consider that the Guardians stand in those parents with regard to the children, and you must treat them as you would treat your own children, and do the best for them in the future.

2396. You are put very much in the position of a good trustee?—Yes; and therefore I am more in favour of what the last witness suggested than I am in favour of boarding out, as far as I know; I have an open mind on it, for I have no experience of boarding out. I think the result to the children, which is the first thing, and to the community at large in the second place, would be better.

2397. You cannot speak from experience of boarding-out?—No, I don't think anyone can; it has been such a short time in operation.

2398. In Cork and Limerick, and a number of other towns, they started in 1876 boarding them out in the country?—They are taken from the cities.

2399. Well, yes, from the union; the union of Cork is largely an agricultural district, and the same way, Limerick, the children are boarded out there, and the system has been in operation for twenty-eight years with splendid results?—I don't see anything objectionable in it.

2400. In Belfast they board them out even in districts outside, where there are mills, and the children work as "half-timers," and their earnings go towards the reduction of rates. Cardinal Logue, of Armagh, has started, himself, with some charitable funds of his own, a scheme that we were very interested to learn of when we were there. He came to the conclusion that the boarding-out was a good system, and organised a diocesan committee, a number of parish priests, who meet once a month to administer this fund in conjunction with His Eminence, and they place out children in different parts of the diocese, and they have appointed a lady inspector, who visits them from time to time, and the results, as we have heard from those who are directly managing it have been entirely favourable to the method of boarding-out?—I cannot see that there is the slightest objection to it.

2401. Children get absorbed into the ordinary life of the country, and, of course, there are difficulties. I quite understand the difficulties that Mr. Daly sees about the children being allowed to wander about, and we think they had better not see, but as a matter of fact it is found from experience that these children are as closely looked after as people's own children, and when a little child of the tender age of three or four comes into the family it very soon becomes looked upon as a member of the family practically?—Yes.

Mr. MURKIN.—Indeed, so much is that the case that I know a union where a foster parent, rather than give up the child, proposed to adopt it without any payment.

2402. CHAIRMAN.—It is frequently done; there are a great many old people who are supported and kept going in life by the earnings of those who were their adopted children, when boarded out?—That does not in the least surprise me; anything would be better than the present system, having half-a-dozen or twenty children in different little unions, where you cannot give them that education and supervision that is necessary.

2403. You would not keep people of feeble mind in a workhouse?—Oh, certainly not.

2404. Then if the children were boarded out they would go, too. Then the mothers—the idea we had put before us at our very first meeting in Dublin, by a deputation, was that they might be sent to religious institutions under the management of ladies of the same persuasion as themselves, so that they should be as quickly as possible fitted to return to life again?—Give them a chance.

2405. Then get support, so far as possible, from the father or mother of the child, and let it be boarded out in the ordinary way until the mother can take it?—Unless there is a great change in the law it would be interfering. Could the legislature give you that right over the prison?

2406. No; the woman would have to come there?—Can you take her child from her?

2407. Would not a girl be glad to go to a place where she would have a chance of coming out again with as fair a start as she could have under the circumstances, and would she not be glad to have her child kept for her until she could take it?—That is where the question comes in. I would rather she would not take it if it were possible to deprive her of it. The question is, whether the ordinary girl, under these circumstances, would be willing. I think she would rather be without it.

2408. Mr. MURKIN.—In England the law enables the Guardians to take the children of dissipated or vicious parents?—Then, could they board these out with some other parents?

2409. CHAIRMAN.—They would?—Here we have the children, either orphans or deserted, if they are found begging the police can take them up, and they are sent to industrial schools. Why should we treat these children differently? These are the children of misfortune, and very often the others are the children of crime, and get a better chance in life than the children of misfortune.

2410. That would get out the children and the feeble-minded; and you think the girls would be better in such a penitentiary than in a workhouse?—Oh, infinitely.

2411. Then if the aged and infirm were sent to a central place, supposing Claremorris, for argument's sake, you would have nobody left at Westport and Ballina, except one class?—Apparently not, if you eliminate everything else except the sick.

2412. Mr. MURKIN.—Does that strike you as a feasible plan?—Quite so; I thought the number of aged and infirm was greater than that in the county.

2413. According to this report, they don't amount to over 300?—Any one of the institutions would accommodate those.

2414. Of course, there are in the infirmaries chronic cases that should not properly belong to the infirmaries, and under the suggested plan no cases, but the acutely sick should be kept there?—Cases which are recoverable; but you would hardly send chronic bed-ridden cases to the central institution.

2415. CHAIRMAN.—If you send a lot of old people like that to one institution they will very soon become sick, and then there will want to be an infirmary?—You must have an ordinary hospital in addition to that, wherever the place is.

2416. Of course, for places like Westport and Ballina?—And that supposes that all the idiots and insane are removed from the workhouses.

2417. Mr. MURKIN.—Have you any choice between an auxiliary asylum and an ordinary asylum?—I think, decidedly, the auxiliary asylum. I would not have a hospital idiot in any regular asylum. I think it is a great drawback in ordinary asylums that these unfortunate idiots are herded with, perhaps, intelligent people. We know they have very filthy habits, and ought to be kept entirely apart; they cannot do that

Oct. 4, 1904.
Mr. —
Mr. Alexander C.
Lennett.

at present in asylums. I suggest that all that class should be taken out of the asylums and brought into auxiliary asylums.

23028. And kept it less expensive?—Half the expense. I think the St. would very nearly cover their actual board and lodging.

23029. It would certainly cover the difference between the keep in the auxiliary asylum and the keep in the workhouse itself?—I think so.

23030. CHAIRMAN.—As regards the out-door relief, would you approve of a restricted area for raising?—I don't like restricting movements; I don't think they would reduce it much by having electoral division charges.

23031. Do you think the increase is due to the alteration in the area of charge?—I do not; the increase before that was much greater.

23032. It is a continuing increase; but it has increased from £4,400 in 1895 to £6,000?—It had increased from £1,100 to £4,400 in the other period, from 1873 to 1895. It was greater in some of the years before 1890, owing to the relief of distress; that is at the bottom of it all.

23033. Do you think the reason that out-door relief increases is a charitable tendency towards providing for the poor, in whatever way they like best?—I think it has a great deal to do with it.

23034. A hard and fast line of relieving only destitute cases is no longer drawn?—Not so tightly drawn as before.

23035. You could not relieve a case of destitution, as they say they do in Westport, by giving it a week?—That is a very ordinary case.

23036. That would not relieve destitution, it would only be to supplement some other means?—It would be no use to give it a week to a person really destitute. If people have nothing of their own the proper place for them is the workhouse, where they would be better taken care of.

23037. Or if you could maintain them outside?—Do you mean to pay someone for looking after them. That would be a desperate thing—frankly; it would lead to awful abuse: every person who had an old relative in the world would bring them into the workhouse for the purpose of taking them out again.

23038. Mr. MURPHY.—But the Guardians would be the masters of the situation?—A man comes and says, "I cannot get on outside, take me into the workhouse," they take him in, and he costs £9 or £10 a year, a friend comes and says, "I will take out that man if you pay me £8 a year." You are between the devil and the deep sea; what are you going to do.

23039. It does seem to me that the Guardians have the power to give or refuse the money?—If a man applies for admission you cannot refuse him if he says he is destitute.

23040. CHAIRMAN.—You think a number of persons would become inmates of the workhouse for the purpose of being boarded out again?—Certainly; it would not be human nature to do otherwise. These Guardians who gave evidence to-day appeared afraid of this in the way of out-door relief. What would it be if you opened that door to them?

23041. Mr. MURPHY.—They were not afraid of themselves, but they were afraid of their neighbours?—Even if a man is inclined to be a little extravagant in his own division his neighbour has to pay for it, and he has so many neighbours looking after him that he won't be likely to succeed.

23042. We were told that under the old system the inspectors kept a close eye on the Guardians?—We put up the names of all the recipients of out-door relief, with the amount they got, at certain intervals, for the information of the inspectors in the district.

23043. They get the information generally, but they don't get it particularly; under the old system they knew how much was the expense of their own electoral division, whether it had risen or fallen; Guardians said to be reminded very promptly when anybody died that was getting out-door relief, to see that the

name was struck off?—They do that still; we often have information from inspectors saying that so-and-so ought not to get out-door relief.

23044. In any union the vigilance as regards out-door relief has ceased?—Perhaps you have not increased it.

Mr. MURPHY.—We have increased it, almost doubled it since 1898.

23045. CHAIRMAN.—Apart from your instinctive objection to a retrograde movement, what objection do you see to limiting in some way the charge for out-door relief?—I don't see any particular objection, except I think that the poorer the division the more particularly the extra relief will press on it.

23046. I don't know whether you were here when one of us mentioned a suggestion made in another part of the country to have the additional amount made an electoral division charge?—The initial point would be to make your standard, and then everybody would rush to get up to that standard.

23047. There appears to be an upward tendency generally?—Yes; why not attribute that to good nature instead of bad.

23048. Supposing you fixed it at the present rate, and said any advance in future goes to the electoral division, do you think that would be a wholesome check?—It would be some check to extravagance if there were extravagance, but it might be a check to charity if it were charity.

23049. Yes, as an old Guardian, know there is no power in the Poor Law to do a charitable act?—Everything you give is supposed to be charity.

23050. It is the relief of destitution?—If you don't feel for a man you don't care whether he is destitute or not.

23051. A man being poor is no reason why he should get any kind of relief; he must first be destitute?—If you applied that you would have no out-door relief; either that or give a man 6s. a week.

23052. That is what did exist for a number of years practically throughout the whole of Ireland. If you take the old reports of 1851 you will be surprised to see that?—I dare say the rule was that; but it was not carried out.

23053. Oh, yes, it was?—Then the number in the workhouse must have been enormously increased.

23054. Not?—Then destitution was not so much. You must give a man enough to live on if he is destitute, or you must give a man something to assist the insufficient means he has, or bring him into the workhouse, or send him to beg. The out-door relief has increased, and, I dare say, permanently increased in some cases; but the difficulty is, how you are going to put on the brake.

23055. Then came out of ten of the Guardians here to-day say, "Go back to the electoral division rating?"—I admit it may have some deterrent effect, but it is a retrograde movement, and contrary to the general spirit of the age in limiting charity. I am in favour of extending charityability. My idea is that all in-door relief should be a county charge.

23056. What about out-door relief?—I think it should be a union charge. The reason I say county charge for in-door is, that if you separate the different classes of inmates, they are not the poor of the district in which they are supported; but old people from Edmestown come to Castlebar, and another class go from Castlebar to Westport; therefore I would make it a county rate.

23057. Mr. MURPHY.—Not necessarily; the Guardians could still continue to look after the poor of their own locality?—Then you would have a very complicated account with the central institution.

23058. Not at all; it is carried on in the asylums. In my asylum we have the County Fermanagh and Tyrone joined together?—They are only dealing with the two.

23059. CHAIRMAN.—Then the County Fermanagh people go to Omagh to meet, they don't stay in Fermanagh and deal with the Omagh asylum?—That is the difficulty of having your Boards away.

Mr. MORRIS C. DALY examined.

23060. CHAIRMAN.—There was a resolution you were good enough to send us a copy of, with which your name is associated, suggesting that in any reconstruction of the Poor Law system the classes of the poor be divided into groups, and that a capitation grant should

be paid for their maintenance, which might be paid to any religious order or body which, through motives of charity, was willing to see that they were properly cared for. How do you suggest that should be worked?—I think by putting them into groups.

Mr. Michael
C. Daly.

23963. That is, by getting the good and infirm into one class?—Yes, in the different workhouses; that is, not by going away with any workhouse, but one or two. I am opposed to doing away with any workhouses in this country but Killaue and Belmullet.

23964. What would you do with the poor of Belmullet and the sick?—I think there should be an auxiliary.

23965. Then that would be only a change in names, you would have the same institutions?—You would not have the union, but you would have a useful place for receiving the poor.

23966. You would not have fresh buildings?—The same buildings.

23967. The same people going there?—Oh, no.

23968. What class would you have going to the present buildings in Belmullet?—I would have none in the union, but in the auxiliary.

23969. Would not the present buildings be the auxiliary?—I think so.

23970. What class of poor would you have going to the auxiliary?—The sick.

23971. Where would the other people go who are there now?—You may take them to Westport, or Belmullet, or any other union.

23972. You would just leave in Belmullet accommodation for the sick?—For the sick only; and the same at Killaue.

23973. You heard some of the Guardians suggesting the accommodation should be at Ballinacree?—I don't know that country; but whichever was most convenient.

23974. At present Belmullet hospital is named by Sisters of Mercy?—I don't understand that thing of naming by Sisters of Mercy; it is a thing I don't agree with. I don't think it is in a position at all that Sisters such as nuns should have; I think another class of people, such as nurses, should do it. I don't believe in nurses going through the class of people they have to meet in these institutions. I am in the habit of going through the institutions and seeing queer things.

23975. Some of the Guardians from Swinford spoke very strongly in favour of the results at Swinford, where a nun is mistress, and also, where there are nuns nursing the sick?—Yes, I heard that; but I may tell you I am not in favour of it, because I think it is not at all a position fit for them, from what I have seen of these institutions.

23976. What would you do with the workhouse at Ballinacree?—I would retain it.

23977. And leave the sick there?—The sick, most decidedly.

23978. Any other class?—All classes such as it has presently.

23979. And Westport?—In the same way.

23980. Castlerea?—Yes.

23981. And Ballinacree, Swinford, and Claremorris?—Yes.

23982. So that the only change you would make would be in Killaue and Belmullet?—Yes; I think it unfair to the ratepayers of these districts to say that they would be deluded from becoming contractors for selling their turf, their potatoes, their sugar, milk, butter, fowls, and swine; it is not fair that they should be deprived of that. And if these institutions are taken away they will have no means of going to these other places to contract, and I say it is unfair to the ratepayers altogether, and I don't agree with it. Then, in my opinion, it is opening the door for taxation and creating new offices.

23983. How do you think that could happen?—In the first instance you have to remove your patients to and fro to these institutions, and you have to pay the parties who take them there for going with them.

23984. Are you speaking of the sick?—I am speaking of those who have to be removed.

23985. For the sick you have the ambulance?—And somebody to travel with it, say, a nurse, and when these people get well you have to take them back again at the expense of the ratepayers.

23986. Is that the practice here in Castlerea?—Of course, anywhere.

23987. Do you pay people's expenses for going back again?—You must, when you take them from Belmullet.

23988. Does any public body in Castlerea pay the expenses of the sick when carried home again?—Not powerfully; but I think they would be expected to pay it now, when they are going to put them to this extra travelling, bringing them out of their own district to another district.

23989. It would not apply to the sick, because the hospitals would remain for the sick as they are?—At I say when people are brought out of their own district they should be taken back again.

23990. But if accommodations were left for them in their own districts then there would be no necessity for that?—There is no necessity. There is another thing in which you will increase the expenditure, the travelling of relieving officers every fortnight to have their books written up; you must pay them, surely, because when they took their position there was no allowance made for that.

23991. Don't you think the relieving officers and outdoor relief should still be dealt with by the local bodies in their own districts?—Yes, but if you bring them to Westport or Castlerea you must pay them extra.

23992. You are thinking of the possibility of a man having to go from Swinford to Westport to have his books examined?—I am.

23993. Such a thing could never be, the local body would do that; they would examine his books at Swinford, or wherever he will be?—You will have a rate collector in Belmullet.

23994. We have nothing to do with rate collectors, these are County Council officers?—Then what about the relieving officers?

23995. The local Council will deal with the question of outdoor relief?—Where would they meet?

23996. They would meet where they always met?—But you would have no clerk then.

23997. We are not touching the District Council, which would remain in most cases, unless there was something special. We have no power to look into District Council business?—But I am talking of the relieving officer.

23998. He would have his books examined by the clerk of the District Council acting as Poor Law authority?—Then you are going to have no saving.

23999. We would not make any suggestions unless a saving were pretty obvious to us. One of our first planks is economy; that is the object for which we were first appointed?—I hope it will be so. About the tramp class, I don't see how you can get shot of them; it is a thing that is tried, I dare say, all over the world now, and I don't see how they could be done away with. I am in favour of giving the tramp housing for the night and let him pass on to the next, as they did in the old days. I heard it suggested here, to-day, that a man may get a ticket to pass him on to the next union. I don't see, in this free country, why any man should be a ticket-of-leave man. I cannot understand it; I am for giving them a night's lodging and a bit to eat, and let them go in the morning.

24000. Continue the present system?—Continue the present system. They tried the system of breaking stones here for a short time, and it cost them a few pounds, and it was a complete failure. I went into the yard the other day, at this workhouse, and saw three men supposed to be picking grass. They were not picking grass. I asked how long did it take to pick all that was done; they told me three weeks. There was not as much as a man would do in a quarter of an hour. I consider it a farce, nothing short of it.

24001. Mr. MURPHY?—Does not that speak for establishing some place where those people would have to work?—It would be a very expensive business.

24002. CHAIRMAN?—You would not like to interfere with their liberty?—I would not; nor to build any buildings for them. Let them have the building they had before and pass on. I heard some talk about divisional rating. That is a thing I would approve of; and in case there is not divisional rating I would be very sorry you would have anything like amalgamation, because it would mean ruin. At one time I represented two divisions in Tyrone; there are now four Guardians for that. At the time I represented that place the rate was 1s. 4d., and when I was leaving it after the adjustment it was only 11d.; now it is 2s. 4d., and you have four Guardians representing it.

24003. Mr. MURPHY?—Too many rates spoil the truth?—Quite so; I would be in favour of the old system in many things, and in my opinion it would be much better to have one Guardian for each division than two. You would have seventeen Guardians in Castlerea Union instead of forty; it is only one contradicting the other, and doing no business, in fact.

24004. Practically, as a rule, you never have more than ten or twelve?—I wish we had less.

24005. CHAIRMAN?—There is too much conversation when there is a meeting?—There is a good deal. Castlerea is after getting in a full supply of water, we

Oct. 4 1864.
Mr. Michael
Glasby.

Oct. 4, 1904.

Mr. Michael
C. Daly.

have three ambulances, two new ones and an old one, a small cart. And I think Castletbar, being the county town, it would be very hard to deprive it of the institution of a workhouse, and to deprive the ratepayers of the privilege of contracting for their goods at the institution.

24034. Mr. MURPHY.—The trend of the whole evidence was to keep Castletbar and make it bigger?—No, the other way; all against it. About out-door

relief, there is a great shade altogether in this union. I know parties getting it who are professional beggars, and people from the country coming to the workhouse and being put on the town of Castletbar. I consider it unfair that a great many of these should be on out-door relief, and that is principally the reason I would ask that it should be made a divisional charge. We are suffering very much in the town of Castletbar.

Mr. MICHAEL LAVELLE examined.

Mr. Michael
Lavelle.

24035. CHAIRMAN.—What district do you represent?—I am a co-opted member of the Castletbar Board of Guardians.

24036. What did you wish to mention?—According to what I gathered from the feelings of the various members of the Board they are not in favour of the amalgamation of Castletbar.

24037. Mr. Daly, who has just spoken, would represent their views?—Yes, exactly; and I thoroughly agree with Mr. Daly's views with regard to divisional rating, because, as it has been remarked all along, when a Guardian is responsible for the raising or the reduction of the rates in his division, the ratepayer there has a loan and close eye on him, and will question him from time to time as to the increase of the rates in any particular division. It makes him more popular when there is a reduction in the rates, and a Guardian is always very cautious in meddling with out-door relief for his own sake—if he wishes honours he must bid good-bye to them in a short time if the rates go up without proper cause, unless he can explain his reasons.

24038. You would prefer being more directly responsible to your constituents?—I would, certainly; and I would be glad to see divisional rating on that account.

Then with regard to tramps, who are becoming a nuisance more and more, I think there should be something done in the way of legislation to bring them to an end, because you have them going about through Ireland and coming to towns such as Castletbar—coming habitually to Castletbar, through its being a very good market town and county town, and I think it is very unfair to the ratepayers to be under such expense in supporting them. As far as amalgamation goes, my individual reasons are, that by keeping a staff of officers in care of the sick in a hospital, and having more than one hospital, I don't well see how you could diminish the expense of the institutions by amalgamation.

24039. You think there is not much economy to be hoped for if there is amalgamation?—No, sir. Then, in the central institution we must look forward to an increase in the staff, which will become a burden on the whole union when amalgamated; and I think, from our experience in the past, we must expect from those officials demands or claims for increases of their salaries with respect to the increased labour in the central institution. There are my reasons for believing we cannot expect much relief by amalgamation.

Dr. HOPKINS examined.

Dr. Hopkins.

In connection with Poor Law administration I consider it ought to be a county administration: dissolve all the unions and have amalgamation. I would abolish the entire present system.

24040. CHAIRMAN.—How would you work up a new one?—By parish committees; and having the chairman of each parish committee I would form a county administration.

24041. What would you have in the way of institutions?—I would have them under classification.

24042. If you dissolve the Boards of Guardians what body would manage any institution that might be maintained for the relief of the in-door sick?—I think I would have local administration—local committees.

24043. Perhaps you would not mind thinking over the thing and sending us a little note of your plans; it appears a little complicated to explain right off; we shall be very glad to hear any scheme you put before us?—I think classification in public institutions is necessary.

Mr. DUFFY MULLAN, F.R.C.S., examined.

Mr. Duffy
Mullan.

I am a Guardian of Castletbar. I firmly believe if it was divisional rating the rates would be lower, and be far lower, if each district managed its own business. This union rating encourages extravagance. If I

happen to be at home and want to be careful, and others, in my absence at the Board are extravagant, it encourages me to be extravagant also.

The Sitting terminated.

FORTY-NINTH PUBLIC SITTING—THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 3rd, 1904.

Nov 3, 1904.

At the Courthouse, Galway.

Present:—Mr. MECKS (Chairman), Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. CONY BIGGER.

Mr. JAMES COCHRANE, Chairman, Portlanna Union, examined.

Mr. James
Cochrane.

24014. CHAIRMAN.—The Portlanna Union has not given us any abstract of the evidence that you intend to give, so that perhaps you would just tell us, in your own words?—As Chairman of the Portlanna Board of Guardians I may inform you that the Board are unanimous for amalgamation—either Portlanna to be amalgamated with other unions, or parts of other unions to be amalgamated with Portlanna. Of the ten unions in Galway, Portlanna is the largest—218 1/2s. per head—and the clerk, Mr. Lavan, is here, who is better able to inform you as to statistics.

24015. We are pretty well aware of the statistics as to the cost and all that, and we will get further information from Mr. Lavan by means of returns, but we don't propose to examine him to-day. If there is anything that you, personally, would wish to put before us—I understand the attitude of your Board of Guardians is that you are in favour of reducing your poor rates by amalgamation, either of your own union with some of the adjoining unions, or uniting some of the other unions with you?—Yes, sir.

24016. If your workhouse were to be closed, do you think it would be necessary, in the interest of the sick, that some provision should be left at Portlanna for treating the sick?—I certainly think it would.

24017. You think it would be necessary to keep a small hospital there?—I should think so.

24018. Is there anything that occurs to you if the Portlanna Workhouse were partially closed—any use that it could be put to?—It could be converted into a good factory; we have great facilities in that way, water power, and the Shannon close by, within 500 yards.

24019. There is water power there?—Certainly; the Shannon passes by.

24020. I mean on the hill where you are?—Within 500 yards of the workhouse.

24021. What is the difference in height?—I could not exactly tell.

24022. At all events you think it could be used for a leucery?—Certainly.

24023. Are your Guardians in favour of union rating for all purposes?—I think not; the majority of the Guardians are in favour of divisional rating.

24024. Are you in favour of divisional rating?—Certainly.

24025. For all purposes or only for some purposes?—For all purposes.

24026. Would you go back exactly to the old law?—Certainly; that would be my opinion. I think it is a great hardship on the outside district to have union rating.

24027. As regards payments by the sick who would be able to afford to, would you be in favour of giving the local body some power to fix what payment should be made by the sick, or for the sick by their relatives?—I should think that would be the best arrangement.

24028. Have you very many tramps at Portlanna?—Well, yes, there are a great many tramps; it is a great pain between the two counties for tramps.

24029. Owing to the Shannon Bridge?—Yes.

24030. Have you any views about what should be done as regards the tramps?—Well, I have many views, but I think it is very hard to banish them. They suggested three-banded at Portlanna, as a labour test. It is going on for a good many years, but it did not banish them very much.

24031. You have the same number still?—Not as many as there used to be; there are a great many females who are on the road.

24032. Do you think it is desirable that the children of such parents should be left with their parents; I suppose they go about the country without any education?—Indeed they do.

24033. Do you think that is desirable?—I do not.

24034. Would you be in favour of any modification of the law which would give local bodies the power to take the children of such people from them?—I would be in favour of it.

24035. And if they were taken up by the local bodies and boarded out or treated in any other way, do you think it would be a proper, prudent, and safe thing to let these parents go at large through the country, relieved of the burden of their children?—I would not think it safe.

24036. So would you think that if parents are unworthy to take care of their children that they should be secluded in some public institution where they would be obliged to work?—Certainly, but the boarding-out system I don't approve of at all.

24037. How many children are boarded out in your union?—Only three presently.

24038. Have you had any more before that?—No, but I know quite recently we boarded out some and had to take them back again after two months.

24039. What age were the children boarded out?—Eleven years.

24040. That is very old?—Sent out to very respectable people, recommended by some of the Guardians representing the district, and the relieving officer had to report that the child was not being taken care of, and we had to get it in; it was actually in a disgraceful way, badly clad, and badly fed, apparently.

24041. And yet you think the people were respectable who had it?—Apparently they were; they were highly recommended by the local Guardians.

24042. At all events they were not kind to the child?—Not at all.

24043. Then you did quite right, of course, in taking it back. The other children that are boarded out, have you anything to complain of as regards their treatment?—Well, no; they are living with their grandparents; they are fairly well.

24044. That is not so much boarding out as outdoor relief?—I should think so.

24045. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—You have never tried the system very much in your union?—No; we never have tried the system very much, only three cases.

24046. Until lately you had only one case?—We had two cases for the last five or six years; this case I mentioned just now was only quite recently.

24047. Really your experience could hardly be a guide to you as to the value or otherwise of the system?—I cannot say that it would.

24048. CHAIRMAN.—Would you prefer the present system of managing the children to boarding them out?—Yes; I think they are better cared for, and better looked after, and better educated than the would be outside.

24049. As Mr. Murnaghan says, of course your experience of the boarding out is as yet small in Portlanna?—Yes.

24050. Does anything occur to you that I have not asked you about?—Nothing, I think.

Mr. LAWRENCE TAYLOR, R.L.O., examined.

Mr. Lawrence
Taylor.

24051. CHAIRMAN.—You have heard the evidence of your chairman?—I did, sir.

24052. Is there anything you wish to add to what he has said?—I differ with him in some things; I would rather have union rating than divisional rating because I think it is a great hardship on towns—where very few people are living in the country all

the poor people gather into the towns. It is a great hardship on the towns.

24053. It throws an undue burden on the towns, you think?—Yes.

24054. That was a benefit given you by the Act of 1864?—Yes.

Nov. 3, 1904.

Mr. Laurence
Taylor.

24055. You have a lower rating than before 1866?—We have, in the town, owing to that.

24056. Did you ever get relief under that other Act, the old Act?—Mr. Lavan could tell us.

Mr. Lavan.—No sir, we never did.

24057. CHAIRMAN.—You would not approve of divisional rating for any purpose?—I would sooner have union rating.

24058. Do you agree with Mr. Cosgrave as to the desirableness of amalgamating some of the unions in Galway?—I think we ought to get an increase of our valuation; we are far away from any other union, and if we got part of the unions nearest to us out of Ballinasloe, or Longhrea, or Bormokane, to increase our valuation, it would lower our rates.

24059. How far do you get towards Woodford?—We go beyond Woodford, although it is not in our union; part of our union goes down to Mountshannon.

24060. Is Mountshannon in Scariff or your union?—It is in Scariff; it was in our union before, and the Bormokane Union, which is a very small union, runs into within a mile of us.

24061. Have you any of the Co. Tipperary in your union?—Not a bit; all our union is in Galway.

24062. And you would be in favour of getting some of Tipperary?—Certainly; because the poor people on the other side of the bridge from us are very anxious to come into our union rather than go to Bormokane or Scariff.

Mr. JOHN MURPHY, Chairman,

24075. CHAIRMAN.—Are you Chairman of the Board of Guardians of Glensmaddy?—Yes.

24076. Will you kindly tell us what is the view of the Glensmaddy Guardians on the question of amalgamation?—The Guardians are unanimous in not having Glensmaddy done away with, and the reason that they are so unanimous is that they have recently spent a considerable sum of money in repairing the workhouse—building a very fine hospital—and the rate is very low, and they believe that by being added on to another union the rate would not be decreased. We are just living on the border of Roscommon and we don't think it desirable we should be sent into Roscommon; but then we are very far away from any other union; we would have to go to Tuam, and that would mean about twenty miles.

24077. Before your union was formed it used to be partly in Tuam and partly in Ballinasloe?—Mr. Cosgrave, Solicitor.—Partly in Castleroe.

24078. CHAIRMAN.—None of it in Ballinasloe?—No.

24079. You are utterly against going to Roscommon?—We are; the Guardians are unanimous that they are not anxious to join on to any other union on account of its bordering on the county, and the great inconvenience it would be to the sick poor to have to go to Tuam.

24080. That is, your Guardians are altogether in favour of allowing the Glensmaddy Union to remain as it is; have you any suggestion to make in the interests of economy of administration?—No, nothing particular, except that our district is a very poor district.

24081. Or do you think it ought to remain as it is?—No; we would prefer, if we could, to increase our valuation; the average valuation of the people in our district would not be more than 25, and there are a considerable number of very poor people. The ratepayers and the Guardians don't seem to be anxious to have the union dissolved; they find that they are going on very well as they are. We would be anxious to increase our valuation.

24082. I suppose that would be with the object of reducing your rates?—Yes.

24083. If you found any scheme could be produced that would mean a reduction of your rates without any hardship to the sick, or people who could not be removed without hardship; if you found such a scheme could be produced do you think the ratepayers of your union would be disposed to listen favourably to it?—I think so.

24084. Is it largely the fear of extra taxation that makes them opposed?—No; it is the inconvenience to the sick.

24085. If a hospital were left with you so that the sick would still be treated at Glensmaddy, and if for the remainder of the house what is generally known as amalgamation were adopted, would that

24063. How far is Woodford from you?—Eight miles.

24064. Do you also suggest that Woodford should go in with you?—I am sure it should.

24065. What do the Woodford people think themselves?—I don't know; I think they would be inclined to join with us.

24066. You have lower rates than Longhrea?—I think our union is a better managed union than Longhrea.

24067. You would not be surprised to hear the Longhrea people detaching from you?—I think I can call upon Major Fair to bear me out in what I say.

24068. Is there any other point on which you differ with Mr. Cosgrave?—No.

24069. Is there anything you would like to add yourself?—Nothing, sir. I would be opposed to boarding out the children.

24070. What is your experience about that?—I have only seen a few cases of it in Portlaoine, and from what I see I think the children that are boarded out would be a great deal better taken care of in the workhouse than they are outside.

24071. Have you read much of what has been written on the subject?—I have not.

24072. You don't know what the opinions of various bodies and persons on the subject are?—No; I have something else to look after; I did not give it much attention.

Glensmaddy Union, examined.

24086. How far is Woodford from you?—Eight miles.

24087. Do you also suggest that Woodford should go in with you?—I am sure it should.

24088. What do the Woodford people think themselves?—I don't know; I think they would be inclined to join with us.

24089. You have lower rates than Longhrea?—I think our union is a better managed union than Longhrea.

24090. Is there anything you would like to add yourself?—Nothing, sir. I would be opposed to boarding out the children.

24091. What is your experience about that?—I have only seen a few cases of it in Portlaoine, and from what I see I think the children that are boarded out would be a great deal better taken care of in the workhouse than they are outside.

24092. Have you read much of what has been written on the subject?—I have not.

24093. You don't know what the opinions of various bodies and persons on the subject are?—No; I have something else to look after; I did not give it much attention.

24094. Is there anything you would like to add yourself?—Nothing, sir. I would be opposed to boarding out the children.

24095. What is your experience about that?—I have only seen a few cases of it in Portlaoine, and from what I see I think the children that are boarded out would be a great deal better taken care of in the workhouse than they are outside.

24096. Have you read much of what has been written on the subject?—I have not.

24097. You don't know what the opinions of various bodies and persons on the subject are?—No; I have something else to look after; I did not give it much attention.

24098. Is there anything you would like to add yourself?—Nothing, sir. I would be opposed to boarding out the children.

24099. What is your experience about that?—I have only seen a few cases of it in Portlaoine, and from what I see I think the children that are boarded out would be a great deal better taken care of in the workhouse than they are outside.

24100. Have you read much of what has been written on the subject?—I have not.

24101. You don't know what the opinions of various bodies and persons on the subject are?—No; I have something else to look after; I did not give it much attention.

24102. Is there anything you would like to add yourself?—Nothing, sir. I would be opposed to boarding out the children.

24103. What is your experience about that?—I have only seen a few cases of it in Portlaoine, and from what I see I think the children that are boarded out would be a great deal better taken care of in the workhouse than they are outside.

24104. Have you read much of what has been written on the subject?—I have not.

24105. You don't know what the opinions of various bodies and persons on the subject are?—No; I have something else to look after; I did not give it much attention.

Nov. 2, 1904.
Mr. John
Marty.

24085. But if you were allowed to adopt a scale of your own at your own discretion, and charge according to that scale, you think that would be fair and proper?—I do.

24087. Charge a poor person less than the average cost, and charge a wealthy person the full amount expended?—Certainly.

24088. Is there anything you would like to state that I have not asked you about?—Well, I am delighted to state that the Guardians are unanimously in favour of divisional rating, and that they approve of the boarding out system.

24089. You have no town in your union?—We have not a town, it is a village—the village of Glensmaddy. Well, I made a mistake, the two Guardians who represent the division of Glensmaddy are against divisional rating; with that exception they are unanimous.

24100. Would that be for all purposes or only outdoor relief?—For all purposes. If it were divisional rating, I imagine it would be better administered, and every Guardian would take more interest in his own division when he would have to finance his division.

24101. Do you think it would operate on anything but outdoor relief?—I imagine it would operate on everything.

24102. You cannot reduce the number of the sick for instance; the Guardians could not keep down the number of sick if they had divisional rating?—No; but the Guardians would be better able to decide who were the deserving cases.

24103. Take the sick, which are a very large class, it could not have any effect on the reduction of expenses?—That is the indoor; I don't think it would.

24104. Do you think it could have much effect, except on the outdoor?—I think it would have a little.

24105. You think you would not be so likely to give an officer an increase of salary?—That would be union rating.

24106. In what way do you think the electoral rating could make an economy except for the cost of outdoor relief?—There would be a lot of public works—the making of roads.

24107. That is rural districts?—I mean for all purposes.

24108. We of course are strictly limited to the Poor Law?—If an applicant now from one portion of the union came into a meeting of the Board of Guardians and said "I am in want of relief," and if the Guardians who represented that division were not there how did the other Guardians know whether he was a fit subject for outdoor relief at all?

24109. That is outdoor relief; I am rather anxious for you to show me how it would affect any class but outdoor relief?—I cannot go into any other portion.

24110. Mr. MURKHAM.—But in the case you instance the Guardians have the very best authority; they have the relieving officer to refer the matter to, and for him to make a report on the claim?—That is a fact; but I think the parties affected—the

ratepayers and the Guardians—should give their opinions whether the applicants were deserving or not, and in that way I believe the outdoor relief would be lowered without any harshness to the sick poor.

24111. CHAIRMAN.—Can you see any other class where a saving would be effected?—I believe there would be a saving indoor.

24112. Supposing a girl comes in to have a child?—Or if they came in with fever.

24113. These are sick cases. Take the case of a man who comes into the workhouse with his family to be maintained in the workhouse; do you know of many such in the locality who would take such a step as that unless they were in the last stage of destitution?—I believe some people would.

24114. And for such a class as that you think it would be useful to have electoral division rating?—Yes; the Guardians would be able to know the position of that family, and the ratepayers of the division would say, when they saw that such a person had gone into the workhouse, "We think he ought to be able to pay something." They would be more particular if there was divisional rating. I approve of the boarding out system; we have recently used it and I think it will be a success in our union.

24115. Have you had many cases?—It is only within the last few months we commenced it, but we are very particular as to the foster-parents; we always try and give them to middle-aged people who won't have a big family of their own, and I think they would be better looked after than in the atmosphere of a workhouse.

24116. You think they are more likely to turn out handy and useful?—Yes; then of course I believe the cost is lower than it would be if they were kept in the workhouse.

24117. Mr. MURKHAM.—You have a considerable number of children in the workhouse?—I think twenty-five.

24118. That is a large proportion for so small a workhouse?—Yes.

24119. CHAIRMAN.—You are trying to board them out?—Yes, we board them over until we get good foster-parents.

24120. Mr. MURKHAM.—Do you give much outdoor relief in your union?—Before the passing of the Act of 1898 our outdoor relief was about £700; I think it is only the same now.

24121. Do you approve of it as a system of relief for the poor?—I do; I think it is fairly well administered.

24122. CHAIRMAN.—But you would like to have it safeguarded with the electoral division charge?—I think so; it would make everybody more interested.

24123. Would you be in favour of an amendment of the law which would give you power to board out all children that would be on the rate?—I would.

24124. At present you are only able to board out orphans and deserted children?—Yes.

24125. Would you be in favour of an amendment of the law giving you discretion?—I think I would.

REV. W. CONWAY, P.R., CHAIRMAN.

Rev. W.
Conway, p.r.

24126. CHAIRMAN.—We have had evidence from Mr. Martyn indicating the views of the Glensmaddy Guardians; they seem to be, as I suppose you are aware, in favour, generally, of not breaking up the Glensmaddy Union?—They are. There was one reason Mr. Martyn hinted, that is—that the district is very poor, nearly all congested; I think it was an account of the inconvenience, as well as because the expenses would be less, that they wished to preserve the union.

24127. You heard me putting to him, though, that if the hospital still remained for the sick that would of course very largely diminish the force of the argument against amalgamation made by those who thought the sick would have to go long distances?—To what? I am sentiment on the part of the old people; I believe the old people who are not sick would object to be removed to a distant union.

24128. We have heard that frequently in different places?—It is a sentiment of course, but after all it is a sentiment that must be respected; they would not like to be hustled far away, or go far away from their friends, and it might be better if they got outdoor relief at home, and left them at home.

24129. You would be in favour of an extension of the powers of Guardians to give outdoor relief?—Yes,

if it were judiciously bestowed, but sometimes it is not; and I must say, if it would be allowable for me to trespass on the Guardians' domain, I would say that I do not at all approve of union rating. Within the last month even I have met cases where Guardians actually recommended outdoor relief where they admitted that the party did not require it, which would not be the case if you had divisional rating.

24130. Do you think that is general as regards outdoor relief?—Outdoor relief only.

24131. You don't see any necessity for making the sick an electoral charge?—No.

24132. But you think for outdoor relief it would be prudent to have the electoral division?—It would be much more economical.

24133. Do you think that would be a sufficient practical safeguard to prevent over-expenditure?—It would certainly lessen the expenditure. It would be better on some divisions than the division I inhabit. Outdoor relief amounted to about £700 in the year, and they adopted a drastic measure of cutting off all from outdoor relief, putting them on by degrees, with the result that the outdoor relief was very much lessened and the majority of those cut off did not seem to feel it; but I believe the system of union rating increases the outdoor relief.

Nov. 4, 1904.

Rev. W. C. Conway, F.R.S.

24134. In your union, would it be a distinct hardship to close up the workhouse without making ample provision for the treatment of the sick?—I think it would, on account of the inconvenience of getting the sick's disease.

24135. Supposing Mountbellow were also closed, then you would be thrown either on Tuncel—Tuncel, or Gethers, or Bismarck.

24136. Or Ballinacree; how far is that?—I think twenty-seven Irish miles.

24137. How far would it be from Tuncel?—It is exactly nineteen statute miles from the workhouse.

24138. How far would it be from the most remote part of the union to Tuncel?—It would be about twenty-seven statute miles. There were two or three things I just jotted down. About the tramps, I think it is a great defect in the management of workhouses that the law regarding tramps is not more strictly enforced; the workhouse is made too comfortable for them.

24139. Are you aware, Father Conway, that they have the power of obtaining their discharge on giving three hours' notice?—I think they should be made work a little.

24140. Would you extend the powers of the officials or Guardians to enable them to keep them longer to work?—It is done in England.

24141. It is, under a special Act, but I may tell you it has not operated in England;—it has not diminished the evil. I believe, myself, that there will be no stop put to tramps until they are taken forcibly by the Government and put into a labour colony.

24142. That is a view we have heard in a great many parts of the country. They are the greatest nuisance, and on the other hand, if things are made too disagreeable for them in the workhouse they may not go there and they become a greater nuisance.

24143. You think it is a police question largely?—I think they should be taken up and put into a labour colony wherever it is proved they are tramps and could get employment if they wish.

24144. Especially if they had children?—Yes. There there is another question about these unfortunate women; I would say there ought to be a distinction made between a person who has fallen once and one who has fallen two or three times. I would be in favour of taking the children away as soon as it possibly could be done from those who have fallen once, not leave them to suckle them, and they should be taken and put into an asylum.

24145. We did receive evidence from a clergyman on that very question very early in the session, that a girl, who, on the occasion of her first lapse, should be sent to an institution managed by religious people of whatever religion she belonged to, that after the birth of the child they should make efforts to reclaim her and get her a situation as soon as they thought she was fit for going out again; the child should be looked after until she was fit to leave it, and in that way it was hoped that these girls never should enter a workhouse at all. I say there ought to be a broad distinction made between those who have fallen only once and those who have fallen several times. Really those that have fallen once I have found by experience are not very bad, but any that have fallen twice should be removed to some institution.

24146. Most of those cases that we meet in this country who fall more than once are cases who have been in the workhouse, and they keep on falling. Oh, yes.

24147. Therefore do you think it is an improper place to have such?—I think it is; they corrupt the other women.

24148. And go downhill themselves?—They don't improve, and if they get an opportunity of going out again they are just twelve months away and come back.

24149. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Do you think the law ought to be altered in regard to the paterfamilias, so as to enable the girl to take some steps against him?—I think it ought.

24150. It is stronger in England than in Ireland?—It is sometimes very difficult to prove the paternity, especially in the case of those who have fallen more than once; it is easy enough to prove the first case.

24151. CHAIRMAN.—Even in the first cases the Guardians don't get very many instances in which

they can get a decision?—Very few; I did not hear of any in Gloucestershire.

24152. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Do you think it would be well to consider the advisability of strengthening the hands of the Guardians so as to make the father responsible?—I think it would be very desirable. I don't think there is anything else, except in the event of the union being amalgamated with others I don't know anything that the workhouse could be turned into except some kind of technical school, and besides, if the hospital is left it occupies the front part of the workhouse; persons might have an objection, especially where contagious diseases are, to come in; they might have an objection to stay and work in such an institution.

Mr. CONWAY.—With regard to the proceedings against the alleged father of these children, perhaps Father Conway is not aware that you require corroborative evidence of the women's statement, and at Quarter Sessions the experience is that the defendant is never called upon to give evidence; you rely on the point that there is no corroboration; very often, if you get the party up, you very probably could get corroboration.

Mr. MURKAGHAN.—The English law is a step in advance of our law.

24153. Dr. BURNER.—Could you tell us whether there is much consumption in the district?—I think it is pretty prevalent.

24154. Have you any recommendations to make regarding the treatment?—No, except that in the event of your doing away with some of the workhouses, as workhouses, that you get the healthiest and most suitable of them to turn into sanatoria.

24155. Do you think a workhouse would make a sanatorium?—I am not up in those things; I know they have to be very well aired. I think, with a little expense, they could be made; they are generally healthily situated.

24156. How would you suggest that sanatoria should be supported; by the county-at-large?—I think if the patients were taken from the county-at-large, or whatever districts they were taken from, they should contribute to the upkeep of the institution.

24157. You could hardly support an institution on those lines?—I believe, myself, one would do two provinces, if not the whole of Ireland.

24158. At present there is a national institution but it is not large enough to receive anything like the number of applicants for admission?—I think consumption is the form of disease that ought to occupy the greater part of the attention of the authorities; it is so preventable and contagious that they ought to take strong steps and secure this sanatorium; I don't know whether it might not be necessary to have some power of compulsion to compel parties to go into it.

24159. And treat it as you would treat fever?—Almost.

24160. CHAIRMAN.—Make it a notifiable disease?—Yes.

24161. Dr. BURNER.—Would one sanatorium for two counties be too large?—I have no idea of the number of patients.

24162. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose when you spoke about the locality furnishing the patients you did not mean that it should be a per capita charge pro rata?—Pro rata; it might be a portion of the rate, and if it were to be managed, two counties might have a sanatorium.

24163. Dr. BURNER.—Would you suggest it should be put on the same basis as the county infirmary or asylum?—I think it would be a good way to do it, because if you begin to make it so much per capita you cannot get the establishment kept up in a proper way.

24164. You would see no objection to putting it on the same basis as the county asylum?—I suppose that would be the best way; I think it is one of the most urgent of the reforms—to make provision for this disease, because, unfortunately, it is much more prevalent than people imagine.

24165. Do you think it is getting more prevalent?—I know the constitution of the people is weakening; whether owing to emigration or the artificial food they are taking, but they are becoming weaker and more prone to disease, such as consumption.

24166. Have you any cases you remember where you have seen it spreading in a family?—Oh, I did; a friend's family all died of it. They were not aware it was contagious, and I saw other families also.

24165. Whereas if the first cases had been removed and isolated you think it would have prevented the others taking it?—I presume it would.

24166. Mr. MURKIN.—The old idea was that it was in the blood and that it was hereditary; the present idea is that it is infectious?—I think, without

trespassing on the doctor's domains, there are several families more prone to it than others and that it is like other diseases inherited from the parents.

24168. Still if the infection was not there they could not develop it?—No.

Nov. 4, 1901

Rev. W. Conway, F.R.S.

Mr. F. O'Hara, R.S.O., examined.

Mr. F. O'Hara.

24170. CHAIRMAN.—You are one of the Guardians of the Clifton Union?—Yes.

24171. I have the very full replies which the Guardians have been good enough to furnish me with, and in reply to our first query on the question of amalgamation, their answer is "We consider from the depressed population and economic condition of the County Galway, that it would be desirable to dissolve, wholly, some of the unions, and we consider, that where a workhouse is dissolved that the hospital attached to each should also disappear if a saving in rates is to be effected."—That is the unanimous opinion of the Board?

24172. ASSUMING for a moment that Clifton could be broken up, do you think it would be a hardship to the sick to give them no place for their treatment, locally?—I do not, in this way, that our means of commiseration are such that I don't consider it would be any hardship for the sick to send them to a central hospital, say, Galway, and I say this for the purpose of saving taxation, in this way, that if you keep the hospital you might as well keep the workhouse, because the number of officials that will be required for the upkeep of the hospital will be nearly equal to that of the staff necessary for the workhouse.

24173. You would have a dispensary doctor at the hospital; you would have a nurse and a chaplain; you would have nobody else?—We would have waiters and waitresses.

24174. You would lose all the able-bodied officers?—We could not lose the doctor; we could not lose the night nurse and day nurse; we should have a clerk of some description, and we should have a porter.

24175. Mr. MURKIN.—You have the clerk of the District Council at present?—We would have almost the entire staff except the master and matron of the workhouse, they are the only parties that I could see that we could do away with.

24176. You do away with the upkeep of a large portion of the institution, the heating at which alone amounts to a large sum every year?—Quite so.

24177. CHAIRMAN.—You spoke about the facilities for removing the sick being increased?—We have railway communication.

24178. But you cannot send the sick by railway?—Why not?

24179. You could not send a paramonia patient or other serious cases?—I know instances of serious cases in my own family that I had to take out only to Galway but to Dublin.

24180. But there are serious cases you could not remove, except by an ambulance?—I don't see any ambulance you could employ that would remove a patient with more ease than a railway carriage.

24181. In Galway that might mean a journey of over sixty miles?—It is a journey of forty miles; it might mean more if we went to the extreme end of the district.

24182. Don't you think that would be practically prohibitive; how could the sick be properly dealt with if they had to go to such distances?—That is a suggestion, and it is the opinion of the entire members of our Board; but really I must confess, it may be very hard in some cases, you might get a big case of sickness that it might be dangerous to remove such a distance; I agree to that.

Mr. MURKIN.—The cost of transport would be very considerable.

24183. CHAIRMAN.—Take fractures, or anything with fever, you cannot remove those cases by rail?—I really think, in cases of paramonia, it is dangerous to remove the patient out of the house in which he gets sick; I think it would be better to treat him in the house in which he happened to get sick. I know a case myself in our district where the doctor got sick.

24184. Even in a bed-ventilated cabin?—Our cabins are not so bad as they were; we are making great improvements in that respect; they are not up to date yet.

24185. You see the force of the argument against removing the sick from great distances?—I see the force of the argument against removing cases.

24186. Any case that could be put into the train and brought to Galway, that would be all right?—I would not say there would be any hardship.

24187. Dr. BRIDGES.—Do many cases at present go to the Galway Infirmary?—Several cases; we have sent numerous cases to Galway from our union for treatment that the doctor alleges could not be carried out in the union hospital.

24188. Operations and cases that can wait, but supposing a case occurs sixteen miles from Clifton how are you to get that case into Galway?—By ambulance car as far as the workhouse, and have it removed by rail.

24189. If there was not a workhouse there, how would a case go in from 3 o'clock in the day to Galway; it would be next day before it was there; that might mean the difference between life and death?—If the ambulance is to be retained it would take such cases and send them off by train; we are bound to have a relieving officer. There are no trains on Sunday and after a certain hour in the evening. Our union is able to accommodate over 320, and, all told, we have only 122; I venture to say, if our union was broken up, that out of the 122, if we were to amalgamate with any other union, forty of the entire number would not come to Galway if we made Galway the centre, for this reason, that they prefer going home to their friends, and I would certainly look upon it as a great saving to the rates that those people who would have an anxiety to remain with their friends, and the friends would have an anxiety to keep them if they got 2s. or 3s. a week at home, because our average cost is now 4s. a week, and if the people who are in the workhouse got 2s. a week half of them would not be there.

24190. CHAIRMAN.—You would be in favour of increasing the power of the Guardians for giving the outdoor relief?—Yes.

24191. Would you have any admeasurement, such as electoral division rating?—Electoral division rating worked well, and now we have union rating in our union; I have not seen any change.

24192. You find outdoor relief is not going up?—No.

24193. It is less than it has been for a number of years preceding the passing of the Act; you are a very poor union and have to look closely after your expenditures?—We are a very poor union, 193,772 acres, and the valuation is £18,662, and the population is 18,760; our workhouse is able to accommodate 723, and the hospital 32, that is 854, and all we have in the workhouse is 122.

24194. Mr. MURKIN.—What is the annual expenditure?—The average cost is 4s.

24195. And the annual expenditure for the last year?—I have not it, but it is 7s. 3d. for the hospital.

24196. CHAIRMAN.—Of course having the view you have expressed just now about the removal of the sick, do you think any further hospital accommodation is necessary; take for instance, Carrig; do you get many patients in from Carrig?—Not very many. Very often further accommodation is advocated for Carrig, and that district. I see the anxiety of the Local Government Board, since the passing of the Act, is to force on taxation.

24197. You may take it that our object is to reduce taxation?—I hope that will be the result.

24198. What do you think about Carrig?—Well, Carrig is an out of the way place.

24199. How far is it from your workhouse?—About thirty-three miles.

24200. Do you think they require any little cottage hospital there at a low expense?—Yes, at a very low expense.

24201. Say not more than twelve beds for instance?—That would be quite sufficient, except in this way, that if you make cottage hospitals in the several districts of the union you dissolve your exchequer.

24202. For the sick only?—That is another feature.

Nov. 2, 1904.

Mr. P. O'Hara.

24203. And further, for the acutely sick people who come in and spend on an average three weeks, would you be in favour of such a hospital at Carna?—I would be in favour of a hospital of that description on a small scale, of course, if the necessity arose afterwards it would be necessary to increase the accommodation.

24204. And you begin with a very small scale?—Yes.

24205. You would have the dispensary doctor there as the medical attendant?—Yes; but I should think we should increase his salary if he did any duty beyond his present duties; he would be looking out for an increase of salary, and all the doctors of our union would be anxious that district hospitals would be established here, there, and everywhere.

24206. There would be a great deal of benefit to him as well as to you, because the risk that would be scattered all over his district would be brought in to his door?—I should think it would be necessary to have a hospital of that description in remote districts.

24207. Is there any other district in your union that is as remote; Kilkerrin that goes with Carna; you have a dispensary doctor at Boffin, and if you had a small house there with, say, half-a-dozen beds?—I am told we have scarcely any, if any, sickness in Boffin.

24208. I suppose you have been there?—I have.

24209. Have you not seen any sick when you were there?—Never.

24210. I am sorry you were not with us a few weeks ago?—I have not seen many sick coming from Boffin.

24211. Have you seen them in it?—No; I have not been very often there.

24212. I think you will find the sick there in the ordinary proportions?—If there is any nourishment attached to sickness at all to be given free of charge, if you go look for sick people you will get plenty of them.

24213. A very small ordinary cottage with half-a-dozen beds or even four beds?—Yes; it might be necessary to have that, but really we have to get sick sometimes.

24214. And the question is whether you have not to get well at all?—We have people with relatives and sons and daughters; if my son or daughter gets sick it is my duty to act as a father towards them, and see after them.

24215. We are talking of the very sick poor who cannot be attended in the same way that you and I could; do you think in these remote places, where there is great poverty, that it would be only fair play to bring hospital accommodation as much within the

reach of the very sick as it is within the reach of the people of Clifden?—It would be fair play if you could establish it on a small scale; I would like to have some means of giving relief, but if you go to establish them in such a way that your outlay would be greater than at the present time, I am strongly against it.

24216. I think we would agree with you there; we would not like to see anything added to the rate?—I am very strong on the point of representation. To my mind one representative is quite enough for each electoral division.

24217. You would go back to the old number of elected Guardians?—Yes; during my twenty years' experience I have always found that the greater number attending a Board Meeting the less work we are capable of doing, and the smaller the number the better work we do. Then I think that that representative who makes a law compelling the ratepayer to put his hand in his pocket should be a man of substance, so that when he makes a law he should have to put his hand in his own pocket and pay for that law.

24218. You would make him a ratepayer in the division?—Yes.

24219. About tramps; you have so few in Clifden that they don't become a serious matter for you there?—We don't have many of them; they are very few in comparison to other places.

24220. What are your views about the treatment of tramps?—I think the law should be amended in such a way that tramps, seeking the shelter of the workhouse, should be kept in for three days at least, and make them work during that time, and pretty hard too. I would suggest, also, as a deterrent from coming to the workhouse, though I don't think it would be feasible, that any of them that required the shelter of the workhouse should have it at 6 o'clock; my experience is that they come to the town, and beg and beg round the town, and stop until the publichouses are about closing, and spend the last copper they obtain before they go to the workhouse. Whereas if it were made the law that they should have the shelter of the workhouse before 6 o'clock it would be a deterrent in itself; they would not have the pleasure of getting money and spending it in the town, and it would meet the case of a bona fide person looking for work.

24221. But the hanger and the strutting misanthrope?—I would recommend strongly that they would be put somewhere—some labour institution; they are a very great nuisance.

24222. It is an undesirable class in the country, and you would like to stop it?—I would like to stop it very much.

Mr. J. J. Darcy, P.L.O., examined.

Mr. J. J. Darcy.

We consulted before we came here—all the Guardians—and my evidence would be the same as Mr. O'Hara's.

24223. CHAIRMAN.—There is nothing you wish to add or vary?—No.

Rev. R. McHugh, P.R., Carna, examined.

Rev. R. McHugh.

I think after Mr. O'Hara's evidence I may sit down.

24224. CHAIRMAN.—We are anxious to hear your views about the treatment of the sick in your parish; it goes into Kilkerrin; you have a church there as well?—Yes. My parish is very remote from hospital accommodation, and I think it would be very desirable to have a cottage hospital at Carna if we can have one without putting a large burden on the rate. We have at present, a nurse there—one of Lady Duffell's nurses—that lady is no burden on the rate, and I believe she would be very glad and pleased to act as head nurse of the proposed cottage hospital.

24225. It would really mean something very small?—Very small.

24226. Have not the Congested Districts Board given you some public institutions; they have not given you a hospital?—No.

24227. Dr. Bourne.—I suppose you find the district is so remote from the workhouse that the patients cannot be removed there?—They cannot be removed; I may say nobody goes from the district to the hospital in Clifden, that is altogether on account of the distance, and the road from Carna to Clifden is a very rough bumpy road; it tries a person who is strong to go over that distance.

24228. You are practically disfranchised as regards hospital accommodation?—Quite; last winter and spring we had a very bad outbreak of typhoid fever, and those cases had to be treated in their cabins, and we could not get anything like trained nurses for them, for there is no accommodation, and we had to put up with some wretched old women we got in Galway, and the only patient who went into Clifden was our doctor, and the poor man died, and I believe, thoroughly, that the journey had a good deal to say to his death. If there was a little hospital at his door where he could have been treated and get proper nursing he would be a living man to-day.

24229. Is the ambulance a bad one?—It is a new one; I cannot speak for it.

24230. You would suggest that there should be a small hospital with a few beds?—I would say about twelve beds.

24231. Would not that be too large?—Perhaps ten or twelve, not more than twelve, say five for men and five for women. That would cost very little, and the nurse is there already.

24232. CHAIRMAN.—And the doctor?—Yes; the doctor is there.

24233. Dr. BOGHER.—It would not increase his work much.—On the contrary I think it would be rather a relief to him to bring the patients to his door.

24234. And he could see them more frequently?—Decidedly.

24235. CHAIRMAN.—It would be only for serious cases?—Yes, such as puerperia, and I should think

too that in case of an outbreak of fever it ought to be closed to all medical cases.

24236. That would be possible?—But of course in that case it would be necessary to get special nurses down, because the nurse we have as a district nurse and has to attend maternity cases, and could not do both; I don't suppose there would be any difficulty about that.

Nov. 3, 1904.

Rev R.
M'Hugh.

Mr. P. J. O'MALLEY, Chairman, Oughterard Union, examined.

24237. Mr. GEORGE, Solicitor.—You are Chairman of the Board of Guardians?—Yes.

24238. What is your opinion as regard the expediency of dissolving the union?—My opinion is that a general scheme ought to be introduced, and one union in the county would be sufficient; that is my own personal opinion, and to have harmless lunatics brought into an auxiliary asylum, have a labour colony for tramps in some central part of Ireland, and send all able-bodied tramps and paupers to work in this labour colony. I would make all these work in the labour colony, and make the labour colony pay for itself as well as possible. I believe that workhouses, as they are carried on presently, are only encouraging pauperism and idleness. I would send the children to industrial schools, and have those tramps committed to the labour colony, the same as you presently send children to reformatories.

24239. CHAIRMAN.—What would you do with the sick?—I would establish cottage hospitals where I think they would be necessary.

24240. Take your own union; what hospital accommodation would be desirable in that union?—In case that the union is dissolved you should have a hospital at Bealadangan.

24241. Would you have one at Oughterard?—Yes; we have a splendid one there presently.

24242. Mr. GEORGE.—If the union were broken up would you keep a hospital at Oughterard?—I think so.

24243. And another at Bealadangan?—Yes, unless you get the Galway Union to share in with us and establish one at Costello Bay. You could take off a good piece of Galway and put it there for Carraroe. There is no doubt, from my experience since the Act of 1898 came into operation, I have seen any quantity of money lost as fever in Carraroe and Spiddal districts, and if you take off from Knock to the end of Gormans Island and amalgamate that part for the business of a hospital with Carraroe and Gormans you could establish a hospital at Costello Bay, and it would be a great saving; I believe that several valuable lives have been lost there for want of proper hospital accommodation.

24244. CHAIRMAN.—And you think Bealadangan would be a good centre; either that or Costello?—Yes.

24245. You would put it at Costello if it could be a joint charge on Galway?—Yes; I would attach a couple of divisions of Galway Union to Carraroe and Gormans.

24246. How far is Costello from Galway?—Fifteen Irish miles.

Mr. GEORGE.—Twenty-two, I think.

Witness.—It is twenty-four statute miles nearly.

24247. CHAIRMAN.—There would be no further hospital accommodation necessary than one at Oughterard; there is nothing wanted for Leenane?—You should detach Bannaghraha from the Westport Union, if you establish it there, because the population around Leenane, in the Oughterard Union, is very small.

24248. Mr. GEORGE.—I suppose the Oughterard Board, at present, are in a very good financial position?—We are the dearest union in the county at present.

24249. Are your rates very low?—They are; they are lower than Galway or Clifton.

24250. Would you like to be amalgamated with any other union?—I would not touch them with a forty-foot pole if they don't manage their affairs better. Since we got into possession of the union in 1898 we have been palling down our rates every day since, and our neighbours, who have a higher valuation than us cannot come near us at all. Unless you get a county-at-large scheme I would rather stay as we are.

24251. CHAIRMAN.—You are the poorest union in the county?—We have the lowest valuation; our population is over 18,000, with a valuation of £50,500, and still we have a cheaper rate than either Galway, or Clifton, and Ballinrobe only beats us by ½d., where

they have a valuation of sixty-seven or sixty-eight thousand pounds.

24252. Mr. GEORGE.—Considering the situation of the union if there is anything like amalgamation what would you suggest?—I think our place would be a very suitable place for an auxiliary asylum, for the simple reason that we have twelve acres of land attached, and if we had harmless lunatics there we could make them cultivate the soil, and instead of getting £10, as at present, for the grass, we might make every acre worth £20 or £30 by cultivating it, and the situation is a very good one. I happen to be myself one of the governors of the Ballinrobe Asylum.

24253. There is room for an institution of the kind you think in the district?—As a member of the County Council we had to pay a good deal of money to buy land to attach to the Ballinrobe Asylum. I don't think there is so much land attached to any other workhouse in the county as there is to ours, and it is a pity to see beautiful land like that not cultivated, and it would be recreation for these harmless lunatics and a fine healthy exercise for them, and they would make it profitable, and it is quite accessible to any part of the county.

24254. CHAIRMAN.—What about the part of the union in the barony of Ross?—On the Glenbar side; in case that you did amalgamate the barony of Ross part of the Oughterard Union with Ballinrobe it would not be advisable to amalgamate it as a district because I find that the union charges in Ballinrobe are only ½d. in the £; we are 1s. 4½d. But then our district charge is only 9d., whereas the Ballinrobe district charge is 1s. 6d.; it would be a fine saving for that part of the barony of Ross if they are put in with Ballinrobe, provided they are put with us as a district charge; but if you charge us the district and union charge we make nothing out of it, and it is a big inconvenience, and we would have very little control over our own affairs when we get into Ballinrobe because there would only be an odd one of us able to get there.

24255. Are you a resident in Ross?—Yes; I live fourteen miles from Oughterard, but I would be twenty-two from Ballinrobe.

24256. Where do you live?—Between Maam Cross and Leenane. I would not join Westport at all except, as far as the cottage hospital is concerned, if they want advice with us then.

24257. Mr. GEORGE.—Generally, what is your opinion on the amalgamation scheme?—I believe, if there is not a general county-at-large scheme, there is one thing I would extend—that is the outdoor relief; I would make the union charges for the county a county-at-large charge, but so far as outdoor relief is concerned I would make two-thirds of it a county-at-large charge and the remainder a dispensary district charge, and the administration of that relief put into the hands of a committee, such as the old dispensary committee.

24258. CHAIRMAN.—A local committee?—A local committee for each dispensary district in order to put a check on them; they would have to pay their proportion of the two-thirds, and they should pay the remaining one-third themselves in order to check them.

24259. You think that would be a sufficient check?—I believe it would at present; we have a union-at-large charge, and the Carraroe man, when he comes into Oughterard, is quite stiff and does not care a button—maybe a man that is not paying ½d. in the whole union. I remember Mr. O'Hara's remarks a while ago, and I agree with him thoroughly, and I think it is an extraordinary thing, that a man who is paying ½d. rates, can go round and put his hand in other people's pockets and make them pay. The man that pays the paper ought to call the tune.

24260. Mr. GEORGE.—Some people are very conscientious—I know the sort of conscience a lot of them have.

Mr. P. J.
O'Malley.

Nov 5, 1904.

Mr P. J.
O'Malley.

24251. CHAIRMAN.—If there were a hospital at Lanesme it would serve the small population in your neighbourhood; it would not serve Maam itself.—It would be nearly as easy for them to go to Oughterard; it would serve Kilmichael, but I think it would be too expensive, except Westport Union did not in part part of the cost. You know we have no nurse there presently; the only thing I would suggest would be if you could get a hospital established in it, of course at a cheap rate, and if the Congested Districts Board helped as out with it we would not mind losing a little on it, and if you would have to have a caretaker, that would mean something.

24252. The nurse would be the caretaker, and she would be available for district nursing as well.—I understand. I think it is rather premature to mind about Lanesme; Father Flaherty might be able to give you an idea about that. I know, as case of emigration, you want one at Beldangan or Castella, and it would be more judicious if part of Galway Union were put with us.

24253. Mr. Conway.—Your idea is that unless there is a general amalgamation it would be injurious to your union?—I would not part with the present administration of our union for a good deal; I would not like to join others unless there was a general scheme.

24254. And you are justified in that by the rates?—Certainly; we are 1s. in the £ cheaper than Clifton, and nearly as cheap as Ballinrobe, and we can manage our own affairs very well.

24255. Would it not be some inconvenience to the poor if there was only one union?—The scheme I have in my head would mean very little inconvenience if you extend the outdoor relief.

24256. CHAIRMAN.—What people would be eligible? At present the people who are eligible are two or three definite classes of destitute persons; would you increase the discretion of the Guardians and enable them to give outdoor relief to any poor person?—Anybody that they thought required it.

24257. Poverty?—Exactly. At present we have a rule in Oughterard Union that we don't give outdoor relief to any person who does not get a doctor's certificate that they are unfit for removal to hospital. There are lots of poor people who would rather die than come into the workhouse, and if they only get a couple of shillings outside, instead of getting us, as it does, from 2s. 11d. to 4s. 2d. a week, per head, or you might say 5s., including clothing, and if they get half of that they would stay outside and not ask to come in.

24258. Mr. MURKIN.—You would practically give no outdoor relief at all?—We do give a good deal.

24259. You say you only give it on the certificate of the doctor?—What we have to do is to bring them into the workhouse and they cost a good deal more.

24260. Then you don't give outdoor relief to anybody without a doctor's certificate?—It is something over £200 a year which is a big lot in a small union like ours.

24271. You say you only give it to those who have a doctor's certificate that they are unfit for removal?—Yes; we make others come in and they cost more.

24272. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose you have so many poor that you cannot really begin?—We have an awful crowd; there are several that we cannot give a penny at all to; down in Roscommon, Carragee, Gorman, and Letterman; there are dozens of people in those districts that their valuation is not 5s.; there are a lot more with no valuation; they live on commons. I have known the rate collector to take the makings of their clothes away with him instead of the rate; he could not get it any other way, and this year they are worse than ever.

24273. Mr. MURKIN.—Would you like to see the children boarded out?—I would send the children to industrial schools if possible; that would be my idea.

24274. Have you any children boarded out in your union?—No; we have only six altogether.

24275. You never tried the boarding out system?—No; I don't approve of that at all because they treat them very badly—all I saw of them, and I move a good deal through the country.

24276. I thought you said you had none boarded out?—We have not any, but I go a good deal through the country and have seen some boarded out children.

24277. CHAIRMAN.—In what union have you seen the boarded out children treated badly?—In various places; they have some in Ballinrobe, but I don't like to go into other unions.

24278. We don't want names, but in what union have you seen them badly treated?—I would not like to say, but as a rule what I have seen of them.—

CHAIRMAN.—We would value the evidence more if it were substantiated somewhat.

24279. Mr. MURKIN.—This gentleman makes a statement against a system that has many advocates, and we would like to know what basis he has for making the statement?—I would not like to mention where I saw it.

CHAIRMAN.—Then we don't ask you.

Mr. Conway.—As a matter of fact I don't think he ought to.

Witness. I might hurt the feelings of other people. Mr. Conway.—He is making a general statement.

Witness.—Another suggestion I would make would be that children in the workhouses presently be sent out to a school convent and not be kept in a workhouse.

24280. CHAIRMAN.—The Guardians have power to do that of course?—I have an idea of trying that in Oughterard yet, in case we are not done away with. I never knew yet, during my experience, I knew very few feared in a workhouse but went back to the workhouse in the finish. I have seen a few cases that did not, but I was not old enough anyway to know the history of all of them.

Mr. J. P.
O'Flaherty.

24281. Mr. Conway.—You are a magistrate at Oughterard?—Yes.

24282. And I suppose you are connected with the Oughterard Union for a number of years?—Nearly thirty years.

24283. About the rates of the different unions?—The rates in Oughterard are lower than in Clifton or Galway; I am opposed to the question of amalgamation.

24284. CHAIRMAN.—If it were shown to you that a saving would result from an amalgamation scheme put before you, would you be in favour of amalgamation?—Quite so, if it were proved to me.

24285. If it were proved that, without hardship to the sick poor, amalgamation would mean a saving, you would be in favour of it?—Yes.

24286. Mr. Conway.—But at present you think your

Mr. J. P. O'FLAHERTY, J.P., examined.

union stands well?—I think it is one of the best managed unions. The rates in Clifton are 1s. 8d. on land and 2s. 3d. on buildings; Galway is 1s. 8d. on land and 2s. 7d. on buildings; Oughterard is only 1s. 4d. on land and 2s. 10d. on buildings.

24287. As regards the district, it is a large and poor one?—Yes.

24288. Would it be a hardship on the poor people to be sent a distance?—I consider so—away from their friends—they like to be near their friends when they are in the workhouse.

24289. What is your opinion about the general scheme; do you agree with Mr. O'Malley?—I do; I think he has gone thoroughly into it; he knows the district better than I do. I attend the Board regularly, but I consider my duties end there.

24290. You are a large landowner there?—Yes.

Mr. J. Mullins.

I fully agree with what Mr. O'Malley and Mr. O'Flaherty have said.

24291. Mr. Conway.—You are connected with the union for many years?—Nineteen years.

Mr. J. MULLINS, J.P., examined.

24292. You are Chairman of the Guardians?—Yes.

24293. And do you fully agree with what Mr. O'Flaherty and Mr. O'Malley have said?—I do.

24294. So you are against amalgamation?—Most decidedly.

REV. MICHAEL M'HOON, P.R., ROSSMACK, EXAMINED.

Nov. 3, 190

24295. CHAIRMAN.—You are Parish Priest of Ross-mack?—Yes.

24296. Mr. Carey.—Your parish, I suppose, extends very considerably?—It is a very extensive parish—including land and water.

24297. What is your opinion about amalgamation? I don't come here to speak about amalgamation; I leave that to the Guardians; it is more about the sick I come here.

24298. CHAIRMAN.—What about the sick?—They are daily neglected in my parish, for the simple reason that some of them have to be taken thirty and thirty-two miles to the workhouse in Oughtermond in case of sickness. I have known patients to have died shortly after going into the workhouse, from the long journey. I knew a girl who was taken thirty-two miles, and to reach the workhouse car she had to walk two miles across the mountains; it was a very wet day; she was suffering from fever, and she died inside the workhouse, not of fever, but of pneumonia; she got wet, and was carried in that condition for thirty-two miles.

24299. Is your idea that a cottage at some available centre would be the best?—Yes.

24300. What is your idea of a fair centre for all the surrounding districts?—I think Bealadangan would be a fair centre; that is where the doctor of the district lives, and Lady Dudley's nurse.

24301. You heard of the suggestion about Costello?—I would not approve of it; they are two separate districts; it would not be so central; there are about

1,000 families quite convenient to Bealadangan—800 in Carraro, and 200 to another part of my parish, not to speak of Carrac and Ross-mack—that are awfully neglected. In a short time—three years and four months in Ross-mack—I have known two or three to die for want of proper treatment; no doctor to be had, and the weather being awfully rough, and coming from Bealadangan he would have to travel thirty-two miles in some cases, and I have known three or four, for want of a certified duly trained matronly nurse, lose their lives. I have known three cases. The doctor lives the other side of the Bay, and in rough weather it is impossible for anybody to come.

24302. It is fairly sheltered water?—It is not. There are days you could not possibly cross. It is fairly sheltered.

24303. As a rule it is fairly smooth water?—Only in summer time; not so a rule in winter time.

24304. If you were there to-day you would have calm water?—Yes, but during February and March there are squalls.

24305. Mr. Carey.—Would it not be worse if these patients had to be sent to Galway?—I am anxious for a local hospital.

24306. As regards the union itself, would you offer any opinion?—If you ask me, I certainly would be in favour of doing away with Oughtermond Union.

24307. On what ground?—I don't care to go into the question of ground.

CHAIRMAN.—He wants a local hospital, and has no other object in coming here.

REV. JOHN HEALY, P.R., CARRARO, EXAMINED.

Rev John Healy, p.r.

24308. CHAIRMAN.—You have heard the evidence Father M'Hoan has just given; yours is the next parish?—Yes.

24309. Bealadangan is in your parish?—It had been, at one time, but is not now.

24310. At all events you know Bealadangan thoroughly; do you think it would be a reasonably fair centre?—Unless there was another portion—a western portion of the Galway Union attached—I would. If there was no portion of the western part of Galway attached then I would say Bealadangan would be a central and convenient place for the district.

24311. Take Costello for the people in Lettermullan and Gormanac?—Bealadangan would be more convenient for them.

24312. And then for Carraro peninsula?—It would be just as convenient as Costello.

24313. From your parish they would go by boat to Costello?—From Gormanac they would go by boat, but not from my part of the parish.

24314. You would take them by road, almost from Bealadangan?—Yes.

24315. Mr. MURKIN.—What about Lettermullan?—It is nearer to Bealadangan than Carraro or Lettermullan.

24316. CHAIRMAN.—The people that would benefit most by Costello would be the Carraro people and people around there?—All Carraro and the western portion of Galway, if there should be a hospital established at Costello.

24317. From the most southerly point of Carraro, they would have to go a long way to Costello?—They would not; it would be about the same distance as to Bealadangan—hardly any difference.

24318. It would not make any difference to your parish which was selected?—No, hardly any.

24319. Either Bealadangan or Costello would be practically equally convenient?—It would.

24320. Mr. Carey.—Of course you are in favour of a local hospital?—Yes.

24321. Would you think the Congested Districts Board should contribute?—I don't know what they might do; I think there was a movement made in that direction some time ago; they were approached

on that very matter some time ago, and they refused to give any assistance.

24322. You are in one of the most populous and poor districts—very congested?—So they are.

24323. Would the suggestion come from you that the Congested Districts Board might contribute, if they thought fit, to a local hospital?

CHAIRMAN.—They have a great deal to do with their little income.

Witness.—I think they ought, by reason of the poverty of the district.

24324. Mr. Carey.—It is nearly all going to Mayo?

—There is only one thing I wish to add; it is this. I am just eight and a half years there now, and every second year—I think there are some gentlemen present who can bear me out—every second year since I went there we had a most serious outbreak of fever, and the people there are so badly bowed that there can be no such thing as isolation, and the result is that whole families are stricken down; that would go to show I think, to all present, the great and absolute necessity there is for a hospital in that district; and furthermore, I would say, that being such a populous district larger provision should be made for it than was mentioned a while ago for Clifton. I would suggest that twelve beds would not be sufficient for Ross-mack and Carraro.

24325. CHAIRMAN.—It is a dangerous thing to ask too much, and there is no doubt about it that a hospital with twelve beds would be an enormous boon to the locality, whether it would be enough or not would depend on experience. My reason for making any reference at all to the matter is that you seem to think that twelve beds would be required for Carraro; well, Carraro and Ross-mack are twice as populous as Carrac and their provision should be made on a larger scale.

24326. What we said about Carrac was, not exceeding twelve; but at all events you would be very glad to see a local hospital of such a size as those who were really convenient with statistics in disease would consider enough to start with?—The Poor Law inspectors, going round from time to time, have seen the necessity.

REV. J. FLATTERY, G.O., LEONANE, EXAMINED.

Rev. J. Flattery, G.O.

24327. CHAIRMAN.—You are at present at Leonane?—Yes.

24328. You have heard some evidence about the hospital accommodation at Leonane?—I think a cottage hospital would be very much required at places

like Leonane, Bealadangan, and Carraro; all these places, remote from Workhouse hospitals, would require the accommodation of cottage hospitals.

24329. A few beds?—Yes. With reference to the evidence given by Father Healy; I think there was a

Dec. 3, 1904.
 Rev. J.
 Killybeg, Co. D.

slight misunderstanding, and I can make a suggestion which would tend to clear it. I think Father Healy understood the twelve beds as intended for the accommodation of ordinary patients and fever patients as well; I think the twelve beds would be sufficient for the ordinary patients at Carragee; but in the case of an outbreak of fever, such as Father Healy speaks of, and although I have not had a great deal of experience, I have been through a good many epidemics, and I think that when an epidemic breaks out in a district, whether there is a cottage hospital there or not, for a purpose of that kind the Local Government Board should have temporary movable hospitals that could be put up and taken down in sections.

24330. Tents?—I would not say tents, but such structures as the police huts.

24331. Tents are used in some places?—Very well; if tents are approved of they would do. And when an outbreak of fever takes place there should be, at once, accommodation given for ten or twelve fever patients, and kept there while the outbreak lasted, and be moved when the fever was stamped out. Of course there should be special nurses sent down for that, but the dispensary doctor could attend both to the permanent cottage hospital and, when it was required, to this temporary hospital. Now in Spiddal last year and the year before there was a frightful outbreak of fever, close on sixty people had to be attended to, and there was a good deal of suffering, and I am sure loss of life caused by the removal of those poor people to the hospital in Galway. There was a good deal of trouble taken to have them removed as soon as the fever appeared, so as to isolate them. A temporary hospital would have been a very useful and necessary thing there at that time, and other places I saw. And then as to the permanent cottage hospital; I think if it was established in such a place as Beaslodangan or Costello; it is a mere matter of detail where it would be, if the principle were agreed to; it would be afterwards a matter of arrangement the place it would be.

24332. Where do you think would be a good centre?

—If there is to be a cottage hospital for the west part of Galway Union, and a cottage hospital for the south part of Oughternan, the right place would be Beaslodangan for Oughternan, and the right one for Galway would be at Tully; but if there is to be one cottage hospital to suit a united district, made up of part of Galway and part of Oughternan, then I think Costello would be most convenient for all purposes.

24333. How far is Tully from Spiddal?—Six Irish miles.

24334. Of course Spiddal would go to Galway?—Yes.

24335. How far is Tully from Galway?—Sixteen miles. Then as to Leenane; I think it would be useful to have a cottage hospital at Leenane; no matter what you say about the suppression of unions or amalgamation Leenane, in any case, will be a very long distance away from whatever union it is attached to. On the suppression of Oughternan, if it is suppressed, even as it is in a long distance from any town—Westport, Clifden, or Ballinrobe—and the population to be served is a pretty large one, and I think there would be more villages to be served by it than Mr. O'Malley speaks of.

24336. Have you many inhabitants of Westport Union in your part of the parish?—I think there are only twenty-two.

24337. Do you go any distance up the Biffe river?—No.

24338. Is there a large population between the Biffe Bridge and the Asallagh Bridge?—Not very large; but there are 230 families in the district I serve, and there is also part of the Clifden Union that comes very close to it, and to which the cottage hospital would be very useful.

24339. It is very thickly populated?—Part of it is thickly inhabited—down near the shore. There are forty-six houses in Glasham; that immediate district is thickly populated, and it is only eight miles from Leenane, four or five from Tully. Tully is three from Letterfrack, and Letterfrack is nine from Clifden.

MR. MICHAEL CREK, P.L.O., Mountbellew, examined.

Mr. Michael
 Crek.

24340. CHAIRMAN.—The Commission have got the resolution passed by the Guardians? That considering the proper maintenance of the poor we believe that the amalgamation of this union would not, in any way, benefit the people of the district?—That is the unanimous opinion both of the Guardians and of the people of the district.

24341. On what was that opinion based?—Our rate, in comparison with the other unions around us, are about 8d. in the £ under any of them.

24342. For Poor Law purposes or all purposes together?—For Poor Law purposes; our rate, in 1904, on buildings, was 1s. 6½d. and on land, 2s. 4½d.; it was 1s. 5d. this year, and 2s. 1½d. on land, and 2s. 1½d. in Tans, and 2s. 1½d. in Ballinacree, so I think it would be a very great hardship, and would not be treating us fairly, if we were amalgamated.

24343. What do you take to be about your average annual rate?—1s. 5d.

24344. Mr. MURKIN.—That includes road maintenance?—No; union, 1s. 5d.

24345. CHAIRMAN.—If you found out that under some scheme to be drawn up your rating would be brought below that, what would then be your opinion?—Considering that there is 8d. or so between ourselves and all the other unions that might be amalgamated with us, I think it would be a very great drop that would benefit us in any way.

24346. Supposing such a drop took place, what would be your view?—I would have no objection.

24347. It was evident that a drop would take place would you then see any objection to amalgamation?—We were compelled by the Local Government body to spend £2,500 on the improvement of the workhouse.

Mr. J. C. McDonnell.—I am the representative of the Mountbellew district on the County Council; that is the whole rate—the total amount of the union—large and district rate.

24348. CHAIRMAN.—So we thought, but taking it even on that basis, whatever the amount be, if you found that there would be a saving under the head of union charges by amalgamation do you think the feeling of the Guardians and of the ratepayers would

still be opposed to amalgamation?—I think not; I don't believe there would; I don't see why there should be.

24349. Mr. MURKIN.—Your objection is altogether based on the question of expense?—Not altogether; we have spent such a lot of money on the workhouse, fixing it up, and also in the interests of the poor, I think it would be very hard on the poor to be taking them away long distances from Mountbellew; it is seventeen or eighteen miles to Tans, and it is the same distance to Ballinacree.

24350. CHAIRMAN.—Supposing you were still left hospital accommodation?—The hospital accommodation would certainly be required. The inmates are kept, I think, very well, considering that it is 4s. 10d. per head—the cost—and our rates are a good deal less. I don't think we ought to be amalgamated.

24351. Mr. MURKIN.—The number in the house is not large?—No, it is not.

24352. What is your view as regards the children; do you think they ought to be continued in the workhouse?—No; for the last six or seven years they have been boarded out with us and I think it has worked admirably.

24353. Would you approve of the Guardians getting more power in regard to the children of parents who don't take care of them?—I think so; I think they ought.

24354. You think the Guardians should be empowered to take children away from neglectful parents?—If they are very neglectful, but I don't approve of taking children from their parents.

24355. That would be a question altogether for the Guardians to decide themselves, as to the qualities of the parents?—I don't know that.

24356. They have that power in England already; do you think it is a good thing to have these children taken from their parents?—It all depends on who the parents are.

24357. Suppose the tramp class?—Certainly; that unless done that won't provide for the children—stick them in a workhouse and take them out and move about the country.

Nov. 5, 1904.

Mr. Michael Carr.

24358. Do you think that something should be done with regard to them?—I do; I don't believe in putting children into institutions.

24359. You would rather board them out in the country?—Yes.

24360. As you are in favour of boarding out, I suppose you would desire to see homeless lunatics put in a place where they could be looked after as a separate class?—Yes.

24361. If they were taken out and the children taken out you would have very few in your house; do you think it is wise or economical thing to keep up a large institution, that costs a great deal of money for maintenance and firing, for a very small number of people?—Talking from a selfish point of view of the ratepayers of the district I know it would benefit us to keep the lunatics there in the future.

24362. Why do you say that?—Because our rate is so much lower than in the surrounding districts.

24363. But supposing you were still allowed to manage your own affairs and have nothing to do with other unions, and continue as a Board of Guardians to carry on your occupations, and only provide for the poor of your own district?—I don't see any objection.

24364. There would be no pooling of paupers; do you see any objection to that?—No, I do not.

24365. Have you many tramps at your house?—A good number.

24366. What would you suggest about them?—I don't think it would be wise to close the house against them and not have a place for them.

24367. Would it be any use to try to make them work?—I believe it would be impossible to do so.

24368. Don't you think, having a house there convenient for them, tends to keep the class in existence, whereas if the house were removed and these people punished for imposing on the public, vagrancy would lose its attractions?—I don't think it would make any difference whatsoever; they would sleep under a haystack if they did not sleep in the house or some other place.

24369. You think it is better just to have the house for them?—I do, or some place where they could be kept.

24370. As an alternative would it not be better to make provision that they get a night's lodging and not keep a house for the accommodation of a class like that?—When they get a night's lodging in towns they are awfully demoralising; in the small towns through the country it does a lot of harm to the towns—drinking round, drinking all night.

24371. Would you agree that they be turned out to the relief to look after them?—I would suggest they should be just left as they are.

24372. Those hardened vagrants that waste a life of idleness, come through the country leaving black-mud?—If anything could be done it would be a good thing if they could be made work.

24373. Do you give much outdoor relief to your union?—Yes, we do.

24374. How do you find that works?—I think it works well. I would be in favour of increasing the powers of the Guardians, but I would be in favour of divisional rating instead of the present union-at-large; I think it would act as a good safeguard in regard to outdoor relief.

24375. But for no other purpose?—Of course the present system works well enough but I think divisional rating would be better for outdoor relief.

24376. Greater supervision and more care?—Yes.

24377. CHAIRMAN.—A greater motive for care?—Yes; I think it would be a great thing if the Galway

Hospital was abolished; it would be much better for the unions of the county if they sent on their patients—the few they do send here—on direct to Dublin and have them properly treated; they would come down sooner and be better treated.

24378. Dr. BAKER.—Why do you say that?—I believe the facility in Dublin are better able to perform operations in big hospitals than they might be in Galway.

24379. If the Hospital is well equipped it is a great inconvenience going so far?—They have to come into Galway now, once they are in the train an hour or two makes very little difference. We have to pay £150 to it. It would be much cheaper and I think it would be better.

24380. How many patients do you send?—Not many; perhaps twelve in the year altogether.

24381. Are you limited to that number?—We are not, but that is about the average; I don't know that we do send twelve, five or six, or seven.

24382. How are you assessed at £150, on your rateable value?—I think so.

24383. Is all the country assessed at the same rate?—Different districts have to pay more according to the rateable value I believe.

24384. But the poundage is not different?—No, in the £. all over the county.

24385. Mr. MURPHY.—Is it not a county contribution fixed on what the grand jury used to give.

CHAIRMAN.—No; a special Act of Parliament.

24386. Dr. BAKER.—Do you not think the benefit might be increased. For instance, if you could get nurses to Mountbellew and other hospitals, if there could be some interchange of nurses from the county infirmary, instead of when you want extra nurses in those districts, getting them from Dublin, if you had a staff at the county infirmary and you could get your nurses there at a nominal amount would you not get greater benefit for your contributions?—We get very little benefit from it.

24387. But might not the benefit be increased without any great additional expense; perhaps you have not thought of it?—I have not thought of it, but I don't see that it would be a benefit; I don't see why you could not get nurses in Dublin just as well as even Galway.

24388. When you get a nurse from Dublin it costs a guinea and a half a week and her train fare in addition and car hire, whereas if you get them in Galway they are in the county infirmary at a yearly salary of £35 a year; if you could get those nurses so how much cheaper it would be?—That is one consideration, but I don't think it would outweigh the other consideration. When we have a patient that has to be sent away it would be better to send him to one of the hospitals in Dublin.

24389. What do the hospitals in Dublin charge you at present?—2s. a day.

24390. Do you know that does not cover the cost?—That is what they charge and their charge is here, and also we have to pay 3d. in the £.

24391. 2s. a day does not cover the maintenance in Dublin, therefore you would be receiving benefit at the expense of other people.

CHAIRMAN.—You would not object to that?—I don't see why that is an argument against it.

24392. Dr. BAKER.—If it were proved the Dublin hospitals could not afford to do it; they are glad to get good cases for operation?—They are doing it at present. I do not see why they could not do it on larger numbers; the numbers at present from Mountbellew would be only five or six in the year.

24393. I thought you said twelve a few minutes ago?—I am not sure, indeed.

Mr. JOHN CONNORSHAM, Chairman, Mount Bellew Union, examined.

Mr. John Connorsham

24394. CHAIRMAN.—Is there anything you would like to add to Mr. Carr's evidence?—Not very much indeed. It is the feeling of the people there that they have managed their affairs very well, and taking a comparison with the unions around, although the unions are larger they treat their people even better, they have adopted the scale of diet approved of by the Local Government Board, and, in fact, improved on that diet. We are cheaper in the £ than any other union around us.

24395. If it were shown to you that amalgamation would save money what would your feelings be then?

I would be for that provided the people were treated properly; but regarding the proper treatment of the poor, I would be entirely opposed to going a distance.

24396. You would not like to send the sick a distance?—By no means; we have an up-to-date hospital.

24397. Supposing a hospital were left at Mountbellew, would you feel any hesitation about sending those who were able to travel a distance?—No; but we have scarcely any besides sick and aged and infirm, and I think, even with these, it is a great hardship; they are natives of the place.

Nov. 5, 1894.

Mr. John
Cecillngham.

24398. How many natives of Mountbellew would you have in the workhouse?—I don't think there are many outside inmates.

24399. How many are in the workhouse who live in, or adjacent to, the town or village of Mountbellew?—I think all the people living in the workhouse are natives of the union.

24399A. Of course; but how many people would you have in the workhouse who belonged to Mountbellew village or town?—Not very many.

24400. Then it is only the people who belong to the village or town who would have a different view from their windows. Have the others a greater affection for Mountbellew?—Certainly they have; it is the nearest centre to where they were reared; it is in the centre of the union, and they don't like to go far from Mountbellew.

24401. Take a person at Abascoagh; would he care a row of pins whether he went to Ballinasloe or Mountbellew?—No; but Abascoagh is not in our union; we go within a mile of it.

24402. Within a mile of Abascoagh; would they care whether they went to your union or Ballinasloe?—I don't know, it depends upon how they are treated; we treat them well.

24403. So far as locality goes there would not be much difference to a man living within a mile of Abascoagh whether he went to Ballinasloe or Mountbellew?—I really could not say; we don't wish to be amalgamated, because, if we are amalgamated with a larger union the Guardians won't attend, and even if they attend they will have no hearing; we would have taxation without representation.

Dr. J. F. Ryan, Loughrea, examined.

Dr. J. F.
Ryan.

24412. CHAIRMAN.—The Loughrea Board of Guardians have passed the following resolutions: "We consider the unions of Glenties, Gartullaghan, Glenties, and Portlanna ought to be amalgamated. Glenties with Glenties, Gartullaghan with Glenties and partly with Loughrea, Ballinasloe with Glenties, partly with Loughrea, and partly with Glenties, Gartullaghan with Glenties and Glenties, and Portlanna with Loughrea."—Those are the recommendations.

24413. The reason the Guardians made that recommendation about Ballinasloe was in order that it might be made from an auxiliary asylum.

24414. Owing to its proximity to the asylum?—Quite so.

24415. What did they recommend should be done with the workhouses of the other divided union?—My own personal opinion is that some of them should be made dwellings for artisans and labourers; they have very nice little plots.

24416. You would pull down the workhouse and build cottages?—No, but I would accommodate them as tenement houses.

24417. Flats?—Yes; and there could be workshops attached, and a library.

24418. That would be quite an existence in community; do you think it would work well?—It may.

24419. Would you be afraid of it from what you know?—I would be a little afraid, but I think to convert them into technical schools is rather a doubtful business too.

24420. They recommend the boarding out of all children up to ten years of age, and that when they reach that age they should be sent to one of the unions which may be converted into a technical school?—Yes.

24421. So that one workhouse would be an auxiliary asylum, another a technical school for children when they would be taught trades, and as regards the other workhouses they don't make any recommendation?—No.

24422. You suggest, personally, that they might be used for housing people who are insufficiently and badly housed. "We recommend that each electoral division be the area of charge for outdoor relief, and after three years' residence in any electoral division a person should be qualified to receive outdoor relief in that division?—I am not, personally, in favour of divisional rating.

24423. The Guardians suggested that but you think that union rating is better?—Yes; there is a considerable amount of clerical work connected with divisional working.

24424. It may be worth the work?—Scarcely; they are slower now than when they had divisional rating.

24404. What union was Mountbellew in before the union was built?—I cannot say.

24405. Well it was in the Ballinasloe Union some time?—It must be a very short time.

24406. What objection do you see to its going back to Ballinasloe?—Slight objection.

24407. It was there once?—There were in the old times and I hope it will never occur again; they would die at home rather than go there; it is only the demented go there from our charges. We board nearly all our children out and we find it a very good thing.

24408. Would you wish that the Board of Guardians had power to board out all the children that come into their hands, not merely the demented and orphans?—Not before they are four or five years of age.

24409. As soon as they have reached a suitable age would you like all children to be boarded out?—Yes; as soon as they are able to go to school.

24410. About the tramps?—They are an evil; it is very hard to know how to treat them, but I would much rather accommodate them in the union than having them roving about the roads and perhaps turning the neighbours' hay and sleeping here and there.

24411. Do you think the liberty of these people ought not to be interfered with?—I think so; if the police took the matter up and wanted to know if they were going into a certain place, for employment, to accommodate them, but to have them making a nuisance of it and going from one union to another, I would be for doing something to stop that.

24425. Your Board of Guardians is in favour of the inmates of hospitals and lunatic asylums being compelled to pay for their maintenance according to their means?—Those that were able to pay.

24426. That would be for the local body to determine. The Guardians are also of opinion that tramps or casuals should not be admitted to workhouses; what alternative would they suggest?—I think these young fellows that would get a certificate from a medical officer that they were able to work should be brought before a magistrate and sent to prison.

24427. Was there anything else that you would like, either personally or on behalf of the Guardians, to mention to us?—No; nothing else.

24428. Dr. Brogan.—What is your idea about the county hospital?—It was not very well equipped up to lately, but I visited the place recently and I saw they are making vast improvements; I think it would be a great pity to do away with the county infirmary.

24429. When it is properly equipped, and gets into working order, do you think its reputation will be improved and thereby its usefulness extended?—I would be decidedly in favour of retaining it; I think too, in connection with the Queen's College, if you have not a hospital the medical school would be done away with eventually.

24430. But apart from that, do you think it useful for the sick poor?—I think so.

24431. Have you any idea on the question of treating consumption?—That sanatorium treatment is merely on its trial; I don't think it would be well that there should be a large expenditure for a bit yet until we have some experience of that treatment.

24432. There has been experience now for a great number of years?—I have sent some men to the sanatorium in Wicklow, and I have seen others that have gone there and they have not been a bit benefited by the treatment.

24433. CHAIRMAN.—To what stage did you send them?—Some in the initial stage.

24434. Were you able to get them in in the initial stage or did you only make application when they were in the initial stage?—We made application in the initial stage.

24435. How long had they to wait?—Two months; some were chronic cases.

24436. They would be only fit for isolation not for cure?—Some of the cases that I sent should have improved, I think.

24437. How many have you sent?—Nine or ten; but I have seen others that had been there.

24438. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Do you think the results are not encouraging?—I think they are on their trial; they are not decidedly one way or the other.

24433. CHAIRMAN.—What is the general professional opinion so far as authoritative pronouncements are concerned? The general opinion is that they are favourable to those sanatoria.

24434. Mr. MURKIN.—Your own practical experience is not continuing?—I have not a very decided opinion one way or the other.

24441. CHAIRMAN.—You have an open mind?—Yes.

24442. Mr. MURKIN.—But you say you did not see or see cases there and did not get beneficial results?—Yes.

24443. Dr. BRIDGES.—Have you seen much spreading of consumption in your district?—No; our district is very free from consumption.

24444. CHAIRMAN.—Apart from the question of recovery from phthisis, you admit that it is of great importance to isolate them?—Yes I do; I believe in isolation.

24445. For the purpose of isolation, even if there is no cure effected, do you think it would be important to have a sanatorium for that purpose, to prevent the spread of the disease, apart from the question of curing the individual?—I think people's own homes should be made more healthy.

24446. You have a good many one and two-roomed houses in your district?—Yes.

Mr. THOMAS HIGGINS, J.P., Chairman, Tamm Union, examined.

24453. CHAIRMAN.—You have not passed any resolution?—One resolution. At that time we did not intend to send any witnesses; since then we changed our mind.

24454. "That we, the Board of Guardians of the Tamm Union, are of opinion that it would not be in the interests of the sick poor or the ratepayers to dissolve or amalgamate any portion of this union; the Guardians, however, would have no objection should it be thought advisable to have the outlying portions of other unions added to the Tamm Union, which is most central; there is accommodation in the workhouse and hospital for a good many more inmates than have been in the house for some years past." You go up to the Mayo boundary towards Claremorris?—Yes; we are on the boundary of Mountbellew and Glenties.

24455. You used to have a part of Mountbellew and Glenties before. You are a member of the County Council too?—Yes.

24456. Has the Council considered the question of amalgamation?—They have passed a resolution in favour of amalgamation; the Vice-Chairman of the County Council is here.

24457. Did you agree with the resolution yourself?—Yes, I supported it.

24458. That resolution was in favour of breaking up some of the unions?—On the general question of amalgamation; it was only on Saturday last we decided on sending witnesses to be examined, and I did not time to submit a statement of the evidence I intend to give; I wrote it out, and purpose reading it now; it may be the shortest way. Personally I am in favour of amalgamation. The Guardians of Tamm Union have repeatedly passed resolutions in favour of amalgamation. When the Tamm workhouse was built it was supposed to accommodate 600. I am since informed by the clerk, it was for 800. Now we have only 108. When I say I am in favour of amalgamation I am not in favour of curtailing the powers at present possessed by District Councils or Boards of Guardians of any union in the county, neither am I in favour of amalgamating the electoral divisions of one union with the other. The divisions of the several unions should be allowed to remain, as they presently are and the Guardians should be allowed to transact their own business in their own union. I am in favour of removing the paupers from four or five of the existing unions to a large and more central one, but the paupers to be removed should always be a charge on the rates of the union from which they came. I am in favour of maintaining a hospital in each union for urgent and temporary cases, but they should be only retained there until they were convalescent or could, with safety, be removed to permanent institutions.

24459. You say you are in favour of keeping the unions as they are?—Yes, for this reason; if the able-bodied inmates were removed from some of the unions that might be done away with some of the existing unions, that they should be charged on that union.

24447. Is isolation feasible?—It is not practicable in these cases.

24448. For such cases as those would you approve of a sanatorium for the district?—I think it would be a great benefit.

24449. Mr. MURKIN.—Where isolation is feasible you think the house is the place?—I should think so.

24450. Dr. BRIDGES.—Would not that mean a house with four or five rooms?

CHAIRMAN.—Or would it mean sending the patient to an institution to get accustomed to proper methods of precaution in the first instance?—Not necessarily.

24451. Can you, in your private practice, feel assured that the patients and their friends will follow your directions carefully about expectation and other matters necessary?—I am quite sure they do not.

24452. If they were sent to a sanatorium where they would be drilled into that observance, do you not think it would be safer for them to go back to their own homes?—They would be a better way to mind themselves afterwards.

CHAIRMAN.—Are there any witnesses from Gort.

Mr. BARK, Clerk.—None have attended.

CHAIRMAN.—The only resolution they have passed is "that it is not expedient, in our opinion, to dissolve the Gort Union."

Mr. BARK.—Yes.

24460. Take Tamm; what would you suggest, just for argument sake, should be done with the Tamm Workhouse in the future?—If it could be shown that by amalgamating Tamm with some other union there would be a saving, I would be in favour of doing away with Tamm.

24461. Would you use the workhouse for any purpose?—Some sort of factory; that might give employment to the people.

24462. Suppose you keep on Tamm and close Glenties and Mountbellew?—I would be in favour of keeping a hospital in Glenties, and also in Mountbellew; I would be for taking the able-bodied inmates into Tamm and having the ratepayers of Glenties and Mountbellew support them as heretofore.

24463. What would the functions of the Glenties and Mountbellew Guardians be?—I would not bring them into Tamm; that is the great objection.

24464. Supposing they met at Glenties once a week or once a fortnight, what would they do at that meeting?—They would always meet as a District Council, and also as a Board of Guardians, to see that a proper rate was levied for the maintenance of the paupers from Glenties and Mountbellew.

24465. Would they meet once a year to strike a rate?—They should meet oftener than that.

24466. What should they do at their meetings?—They should consider whether the paupers admitted from Glenties and Mountbellew were fit subjects to be admitted.

24467. The position would be that a man would come from the old Mountbellew Union to Tamm, he would be admitted as chargeable to the Mountbellew Union, and after he had been admitted and eaten his grub for a week or a fortnight the Mountbellew people could consider whether the Tamm people were right in admitting him?—Not afterwards. If it is an urgent case; if you want to send a man to hospital in Galway or Dublin, there are means by which he could be admitted pending a meeting of the Board; if it was not urgent the Guardians of the place he came from should consider whether he was a proper case to be admitted or not and then send him on.

24468. Take Pat Murphy, or anybody you like, he comes from Mountbellew into Tamm, is fed there for a week or so, and the fact of his admission is duly notified to Mountbellew; what power has Mountbellew over the case?—Why should he not apply to Mountbellew first for an order for admission.

24469. He should apply to the relieving officer to be brought up before the Board of Guardians and the Mountbellew people would give him an order of admission to the Tamm Workhouse?—Yes.

24470. If it were not near a meeting. Supposing the meeting at Mountbellew was on Saturday and he turned up on Monday for relief at the clerk's office or relieving officer's house?—I would give the relieving officer power to relieve him temporarily, pending the meeting of the Guardians. The same thing is happening now; if a man applies to the relieving officer for

Nov. 3, 1867.
Mr. Thomas
Byrne.

admission to the workhouse and the relieving officer thinks he ought not to be admitted he won't admit him until the meeting of the Guardians.

24471. Supposing he comes to the conclusion that it is a case for admission to the house and gives him an order to the Tuam Board of Guardians to admit him, then that order comes up before the Mountbellew Board, does it, for revision?—No, because I would not give the relieving officer power to admit him to the house except he had got an order from the Mountbellew Board of Guardians; I would give him power to relieve him temperately.

24472. Does that not appear to be a certain amount of awkwardness about that; a man becomes destitute, he says "I have neither home, nor shelter, nor food," he wants an order of admission to the house?—Have we not our relieving officer there with money in his pocket.

24473. He would have to support him in lodgings?—Even so, for a week it would not be much.

24474. Do you think there is not a certain amount of double parasitism involved in such a thing?—There is, but if, according to my idea, they are to be liable for their paupers in the Tuam Workhouse, they should first have the right of saying whether these paupers should be admitted or not. Supposing all the paupers of Mountbellew were coming to Tuam I say the Mountbellew Guardians should meet as heretofore, and if a pauper wanted to be admitted to Tuam Union let application be made in the first instance to the Mountbellew Guardians, and pending that application, if he is destitute, I would have the relieving officer have power to relieve him.

24475. Do the Guardians meet very often?—I was a member of the Mountbellew Guardians nine or ten years, and during that time there was a meeting once a week; I cannot say how it has gone on since, and after all if they don't have a quorum, and the relieving officer is maintaining a man in public lodgings, the ratepayers, who elected these Guardians, would soon see that they misused their business. And this would be the means of doing away with the upshot of four or five workhouses, with the exception of the hospitals, and the inmates transferred to other work-

houses could be looked after by the present attendants without any addition to their staff, if they were all as well supplied with attendants as Tuam. I mean we have a good staff, more than we require, and only for Major Fair and the Local Government Board we would not have so many. I must say I don't at all agree with some of the evidence given, particularly by Mr. O'Malley. The children should all be sent out on the nursing system; we have adopted that system in Tuam and find it a great success; none of the children boarded out ever return to the house; when they reach a certain age and are fit to do some work their ratepayers pay them a small yearly salary and then give them a start in the world, moreover their support costs far less outside than in-door. We board them and clothe them for 28, whereas it costs 213 in the house. In my opinion no child should be brought up in the workhouse; those who have can never be got to leave it; they may go out for a time but I think they always return.

24476. You would be in favour of enabling the Guardians to board out all children?—Yes. I know of children brought up in the workhouse, and although we found them situations, we could never get them to remain outside; they always returned. But children boarded out from three or four years of age, they never return, and it takes the police in the Tuam Union to get them brought back.

24477. About the tramp?—I have no sympathy whatever for the tramp, and I believe, if there was not workhouses for them to go to—they get sufficient money going along the road to pay for their lodgings; but they go from one workhouse to another, and owing to the defect in the law we cannot prevent them; but if they had not workhouses the money they get along the roads would pay for their lodgings. I agree, after they go from one workhouse to another, they ought to be taken up and put into some labour colony and the children taken away from them. I got a letter from Mr. Stephen McDonough in which he says: "amalgamation, of which I am entirely in favour, after an experience of forty years as a Guardian; I am satisfied that one-fourth of our workhouses would be quite sufficient for our present population, and a vast saving to the ratepayers, without inflicting any hardship on the poor."

Mr. Thomas
Byrne.

Mr. THOMAS BYRNE, Ballinasloe, examined.

24478. CHAIRMAN.—You are Chairman of the Rural District Council?—Yes.

24479. Now will you kindly let us have the views of your Guardians. You think it would be expedient to dissolve some of the unions in the county, and the dissolved unions should be amalgamated with the neighbouring ones, and a change of boundaries of the unions remaining would be necessary?—Yes.

24480. As regards the use to which they might be put, you thought one workhouse might be used as an auxiliary asylum for harmless lunatics, another for technical schools, and perhaps another as a sanatorium for consumptives. There was no other remark you had about the use to which these houses might be put?—No; my opinion is that a central industrial school might be established for workhouse children; that is, to give them a technical training and give them trades, making them useful members of society, and, in my opinion, it would take the bread of the pauper from them.

24481. Would you prefer that to boarding them out with farmers?—I don't approve of boarding them out at all, and we have only one boarded out.

24482. Perhaps you have not tried the system very much?—No, because we did not approve of it.

24483. You have had the advantage of hearing of the experience of Mr. Higgins and other gentlemen?—I have, yet doctors differ, and sometimes the patients die.

24484. If a doctor had not seen the patient you would hardly mind his opinion?—We have had information of its being tried and it was a failure; sometimes the children were treated badly and we thought it was in the interests of the children that we should not try.

24485. You say, on the question of some provision for old married couples, that you think the present classification is quite sufficient?—I think so.

24486. Do you agree with that personally?—I do.

24487. Do you think it is not a mistake to have a

number of different classes, old respectable people, people who are childless perhaps, and other people who are immoral, all herded together?—No; in our union, for the last three or four years, we had a separation ward.

24488. I mean in the same institution; not the same ward?—I am of opinion that for old married couples there should be a sort of central institution where they could be kept.

24489. Are you aware that there are very few old married couples relieved under the Poor Law?—I know there are a fair number in our own union.

24490. How many would you say?—About twenty.

24491. Forty individuals?—Forty.

24492. In the workhouse?—Yes; I can give you the statistics. In the first instance I desire to give you the area of your union in 1835, and I do that for obvious reasons, and then I go on at intervals of twenty years, showing you the population, the valuation, and also, the administration, the extent and internal charges, and the relative cost of the inmates as compared with the officers. I suppose that would be too voluminous to go into. Ballinasloe Union was created on June 6th, 1839, and calculating the acreage of the several townlands appearing in the Order it gives an area of 212,461 acres, or 489 square miles. After that time the boundaries of the unions were altered to form new unions as follows:—I do this to show that the Ballinasloe Union is the parent house. I have heard the evidence given by Mr. Cunningham, and I think he was a very ungenerous child to a parent. There was transferred in 1853 to Glensmaddy 1,108 acres, and to Tuam 1,070 acres, or 2½ square miles, to Louisa 9,958 acres, or fifteen square miles, to Fortunna 37,530 acres, or 86½ square miles, and to Mountbellew, which was entirely formed out of our union, 108,406 acres, or 246 square miles; that gives a total acreage of this union, transferred to other unions, of 258,294 acres in 1851, and that the Ballinasloe portion at that time was 160,217 acres.

In 1851 the acreage was adjusted to 180,528 acres. I would like to show, on a map I have here, the formation of the union in 1850 (shows on map). With regard to amalgamation, I am in favour of it; but I heard a gentleman give evidence here to-day that he would like to have one union for the whole county with a county-at-large charge. I need not tell you I am not in sympathy with that; that would be too sweeping a change, to my mind, and I don't think it would be convenient or effective, nor would it suit the administration of the county.

24495. What would you suggest?—My idea is, thinking over it for some time, that you should have a union for every division of the county. I will begin with Galway as a city. It is most important you should have Galway for the west, Tuam for the north, Loughrea for the south, and Ballinasloe for the east.

24496. You would do nothing for Clifton?—I think, taking as a basis the evidence given here to this, that, with the convenience of local hospitals, Galway would be convenient for that.

24497. It is over sixty miles away?—Yes; but you have the convenience of a railway.

24498. I don't see why you want three for the run of the county if you can do for the whole of West Galway?—That is only my opinion; I am giving one for every division of the county.

24499. The whole four you select are in the east and not one in the remote west?—None in the remote west. I quite agree with you; that does not prevent the possibility of your making a report in favour of one or two more unions.

24500. Your Board of Guardians was evenly divided as to whether union or district rating was the better?—I think the majority was in favour of union rating, and I am very much in favour of it myself. I think a uniform system of rating is very much the best.

24501. Would you have union rating for all purposes, outdoor relief and all?—Yes.

24502. You think there is no tendency to take outdoor relief a little too far with union rating?—I have heard some evidence given to-day that there is, but we have not discovered it, and I have a pretty close eye to what is done.

24503. You have no experience of that?—No; we have no experience of that. I might state that it is the opinion of the majority of the whole Board that Galway Hospital should be abolished. It is considered nothing less than a nuisance to have to pay for it; we had to pay to the tune of £211 last year, and, I think, £220 the previous year; it amounts to £d. in the £ on the rateable valuation. We think, whether rightly or wrongly, that if the local hospitals were maintained in a greater state of efficiency, with a saving margin of entrance to each hospital, it would do very much better than sending our people to Galway Hospital, for we have to pay 1s. a day for them as well as the £d. in the £.

24504. Have you many doctors in Ballinasloe?—There are; there are not many towns where there are a large supply of doctors where they could not undertake this duty.

24505. Take now Gort, Clifton, Mountbellew, and Glentiesaddy?—I think it would be very easy to have a visiting surgeon from Galway at Gort.

24506. That would cost a good deal of money?—I don't think it would. It would be very much less easily than the amount we have now to pay for nothing, because we send most of our cases to Dublin; we find the Galway Hospital is not effective enough for some of the cases we have.

24507. Did the Galway Hospital authorities know?—I am a member of the Galway Hospital committee.

24508. Were you ever told that an operation was of such a serious nature it could not be done in Galway Hospital; did they ever refuse a case on the ground that it was too serious?—No; but we have to consider where the case would be cured the quickest, and where we have the most skilful physicians.

24509. They would not undertake special eye cases?—No; nor they are not capable.

24510. Neither would your hospital at Ballinasloe do that?—We don't pretend to do it.

24511. Will the Galway Hospital do any severe surgical operation you send them?—They may be capable; the thing is, have we the confidence; you are aware there have been investigations from time to time with regard to that hospital.

24512. I never heard its competence to carry out operations questioned?—Their competence might not be challenged, but there have been investigations about the hospital. To put it shortly, my opinion is the gains is not worth the candle; the hospital is too costly an institution for the work it does. We can have patients in the best hospitals in Dublin, visited by the most eminent physicians and surgeons, at 2s. a day, while we are compelled to pay £211 from Ballinasloe to Galway Hospital, and get very little value for it. It is just like supporting an institution that you do for the honour and glory of, but get nothing out of it; people nowadays are too practical for that sort of thing.

24513. Dr. BROWN.—It is rather a detriment to the district to send all your cases to Dublin, because it deprives the doctor of the experience, and when a private patient wants a good doctor, he has not the experience in operations and such like?—I don't understand your question.

24514. How is a visiting doctor to acquire a high reputation if he has not practice?—We have several doctors with a good reputation.

24515. I suppose they are connected with some institution where they get good practice; but if you send all your cases to Dublin?—We don't send all our cases, but only cases recommended by the doctor as being cases that cannot be treated at home.

24516. You said you had not confidence at home?—I said we had not confidence in the officials of that Galway Hospital for serious operations and cases. I would as soon leave the patients in our own hospital at home at the mercy of the men we have locally then send them down to the Galway Hospital; we may not have the means of performing surgical operations that they have.

24517. CHAIRMAN.—Is that your own opinion or the opinion of your medical officers?—I have not heard the opinion of our medical officers; it is my own opinion and experience.

24518. Dr. BROWN.—What is your experience?—I am twenty years a member of the Board of Guardians.

24519. How does that qualify you to give an opinion?—Not from a scientific point of view, but I am quite open to have an opinion and some judgment of my own; it is a very curious thing if a man cannot come to a conclusion in this world without being trained in the science of a profession.

24520. CHAIRMAN.—But your statement was that you had no confidence in the treatment patients would receive for surgical operations in the Galway Hospital. I asked you whether that was your own opinion or the opinion of your medical officers?—I never elicited an opinion from the medical profession because I think it would not be quite adequate, but we have had opinions of Guardians and District Councils; and then we have the other side of the question to look to, the pounds, shillings, and pence.

24521. Your opinion is, of course, of great importance, but the opinion of doctors also is of great importance, and I wanted to know if you had had that?—I had not, but I can give it to you indirectly, in a great many cases for serious operations the doctors recommend that they be sent to Dublin.

24522. Would that be to a special hospital?—Well, yes, to a special hospital. More than two-thirds of our patients are going to Dublin, even since we became contributory to the Galway Hospital.

24523. As regards the question of payment by persons who get medical treatment in workhouse hospitals, would you be in favour of giving the local body power to charge such sums as they thought the patients or their friends could afford to pay?—I certainly am in favour of that, and I think it is a very necessary thing to do, for sometimes advantage is taken of that and people are sent in who could afford to pay and don't pay; we sometimes get repayment to a small extent.

24524. As regards the tramps?—My opinion is that you should either establish a labour colony or should use some deterrent to prevent the possibility of their continuing such a nuisance as there are at present.

24525. You have a great many at Ballinasloe?—We have.

24526. What would you suggest as a deterrent?—Either to utilise their services, compel them to stop to do work for two or three days, equivalent to their maintenance, or I would even say as much as a week.

Nov. 3, 1904.

Wm. Thomas
Esq. Town
Hall, Galway.

Nov. 5, 1904.

Mr. Thomas
Byrne.

24525. Giving the Guardians or their officers power to detain them?—Yes; and if there was amalgamation I would say the question is so important that if a labour colony were established you should have a labour master.

24526. Would you think it advisable to consider the

starting of a labour colony?—I would, seriously, that is in case of amalgamation. I think it is the only effectual means of stopping abuses, because they are lots of tramps who are young men and very well able to earn their bread, but they are utterly idle, and they go from one union to another, and live in that way.

Mr. T. B. HENRY, F.R.C.S., examined.

Mr. T. B.
Henry.

24527. CHAIRMAN.—Is there anything you would like to add to Mr. Byrne's evidence?—I hold different views to him; I would abolish the workhouse altogether.

24528. What would you do with the inmates?—I would leave the existing workhouses as hospitals for the sick and dying, and reserve a portion for contagious diseases and accidents, and leave the able-bodied outside under the care of local dispensary committees.

24529. Outdoor relief?—Yes. I would have a committee composed of two local magistrates, two District Commissioners, two clergymen of each denomination, and two of the larger ratepayers to be the relief committee of the district, that would meet, say, once a month and give old age pensions to old men and women who deserved them, and other relief, to come up at the end of each month.

24530. That seems a pretty complete scheme; there is a great deal of novelty in it?—I think it would be easily worked.

24531. And economically?—I think so; if you send able-bodied paupers from one district to another, the people they are sent from will object to pay rates for the support of an institution a long distance away; the poor themselves would object to go so far and would die on the roadside almost in preference. You cannot send away the sick or dying, bad accidents or bad diseases. It is stated you can send them by railway, but people won't go in carriages with contagious diseases, and you could not get them into them. This committee would relieve local wants; it must be done economically and honestly by appointing such a class as I suggest.

Dr. N. W.
O'Sullivan.

24536. CHAIRMAN.—You wish to give some evidence about the hospitals?—Yes. There was a point I wanted to bring before the Commission, and that was with reference to consumption. Consumption, as you know, is not a notifiable disease, and therefore the patient can remain in his own house without anybody knowing he is affected. Consumption at present in our district has reached quite an appalling magnitude; there were, at least, 300 patients admitted to the workhouse in the last two years; most of these patients are now dead, some died in the hospital and some went home to die. Of course you understand what it means, a consumptive patient going home to die; they are not an educated class, and in the hospital, before we send them away, we find the greatest possible difficulty in making them carry out the regulations for any sort of cleanliness, in fact when I go round the hospitals in the morning the place is covered with spots, although there is a nurse trying to keep things right, so you can understand the state of affairs at home. We get a number of consumptive patients, poor boys and girls returning from America to die; they come home in an advanced stage of consumption, and my experience is that they first go home and spend two or three months at home until they have got to the end of whatever little money they brought from America. During that time they are spreading the disease, and then they come into us to see can anything be done. Sometimes they die with us, and sometimes go back to die. Those patients at present have to lie in the general wards of the workhouse hospital, and I myself would most certainly not permit anybody balancing to me to sleep beside a patient dying of consumption.

24537. You have isolated them as far as practicable?—As far as practicable, but it is almost impracticable. Consumption is very much on the increase.

24538. You think it ought to be a notifiable disease?—First of all, and when it is a notifiable disease people will understand that it is quite as dangerous as typhus fever, except that typhus fever runs away

24532. All would be ratepayers?—I don't mind what they are; if District Commissioners, they are selected by the people; the clergy, the local magistrates, and two of the largest ratepayers as a check.

24533. If you have any further development of that idea would you mind sending a little statement of it to our secretary as we want to think it over?—Very well. There are three classes of tramps presently, the unfortunate tradesman tramp, and the professional tramp; you will dispense with him altogether when the workhouse closes; then you will have the army reserve tramp, the short-notice man—two-thirds of the tramps are composed of them; if they give trouble in the neighbourhood they should be taken up by the police. Then, on the other hand these tradesman tramps might get relief for a night or so—poor honest men, but unfortunate; but you will dispense with the army reserve tramp and the professional tramp if you abolish the workhouse, in fact they are the nucleus of them presently.

24534. Mr. MURPHY.—Some of the witnesses fear that if you do that you will endanger the farmhouses in the country?—The law is strong enough; they will diminish as the workhouses diminish, and you will have very little trouble with them.

24535. Do you not see anything in the point that they might go to a farmhouse at night and seek for shelter in a barn?—I don't think so; they might lie there and not do any harm, and if they are caught they are committed to the nearest jail in the morning. The next point is as regards women; there should be a lying-in hospital in each county for fallen women; the children might be detained there and then sent to industrial schools.

Dr. N. W. O'SULLIVAN examined.

with you in a few days or weeks while the other takes months and months. In every union there should be some sort of sanatorium or establishment where these patients would be glad to go.

24539. Not necessarily for each union, but for a district, taking in one or more as might be found necessary?—Yes; but taking into account the number of persons in this workhouse, I think we would want an institution of our own.

24540. Have you fifty on the books at present?—Not fifty—thirty or forty, and in the general hospital there were twenty-eight patients admitted in phthisis during the year; but the important question is that we have nowhere to send them. There is an institution called the National Institution, but we cannot get a patient in; I have known patients to die while waiting to get in. If any epidemic should break out here we have no isolation hospital equal to an epidemic; and then our fever hospital requires some reconstruction.

24541. You think you would want a new fever hospital?—Yes; but the Guardians are so good to us, and spend so much money, it is impossible to ask them to do a great undertaking at the moment, but the most pressing question is the question of consumption.

24542. That is what you come to mention to us to-day?—Yes. We will have to admit these patients; we know they go back and spread the disease at home, and we see members of the same family coming back with consumption.

24543. Do you know the plan of the workhouse buildings at Coughterard, Gort, Monastellon, or Glentiesmaddy; do you think they would be suitable for an experimental sanatorium? If one of these were diseased?—Before you could adapt one of these institutions you would have to alter it altogether, according to certain fixed rules; there would have to be the erection of verandahs, and plenty of light and air.

24544. It would not cost very much?—Not very much to begin with.

24543. Do you think it would be a decided advantage to experiment in having one of these old workhouses converted into a sanatorium?—In a suitable position it would be most proper; our own Board of Guardians, in order to meet the difficulty, got plans in which they could have twenty or thirty males and twenty or thirty females treated for consumption in the grounds of the workhouse, but it cost so much.

24545. What is shelter?—Shelters and property isolated and ventilated wards.

24547. You have not place enough for that here?—No; it is only a temporary thing.

24548. Dr. BROWN.—There was some evidence given here about the county infirmary; do you think its usefulness might be extended if you had some reciprocity between the hospital and the small hospitals in the county in the way of interchanging nurses?—We are starting a nursing institution, and then we will be able to supply nurses to the different hospitals in the district.

24549. Of course these nurses will be available for private practice?—Certainly, when they have spent a certain time; we limit it for six months; not for six months and the nurse undertakes private duty.

24550. CHAIRMAN.—Surely not as soon as six months?—Our idea is that they should leave the Galway Hospital to spend some time in the workhouse hospital while under training, and then go from there to the fever hospital to become thoroughly trained, and then we make use of them as private nurses, but they must have two years training at the very least.

24551. Dr. BROWN.—By allowing these nurses to go to small hospitals you will have fixed fees or charges

that will be in proportion to the cost of the hospital—in any case the county will get the benefit of it?—Yes; but I think the nurses will have a special charge as well.

24552. But that charge will be something like the amount of their annual salary; you won't charge as much as the Dublin hospitals?

CHAIRMAN.—Is the scheme on paper?—It is, to a certain extent.

24553. Has it yet gone to the Local Government Board?—It came down from the Local Government Board; I am not certain whether it arranged the fees.

Mr. McDONNELL.—Not the fee for private nursing, but all the other arrangements.

24554. Dr. BROWN.—The fee for private nursing ought to be on one basis and the fee for hospital on another scale?—Yes; the general fee a nurse gets is a guinea a week for private nursing.

24555. A guinea and a half a week?—I assure you I get nurses from Dublin for a guinea a week, except it is scrofula, measles, or fever.

24556. Would you give them at a less price to hospitals than to private cases?—That is a question that could be taken into consideration and decided.

24557. Beware some of the representatives of other unions are complaining that they don't get enough value from the county hospital?—I heard it stated here about patients going to Dublin; every medical man knows if a patient is sent away from a hospital with an unfavourable opinion he generally goes somewhere else; I have known them to come back with no practical improvement; human nature will try to do the best to get better.

Mr. J. O. MACDONNELL, Vice-Chairman, Galway County Council, examined.

24558. CHAIRMAN.—We have got the very interesting abstract of evidence you were good enough to furnish to the Commission. As regards the amalgamation of unions, the County Council were generally in favour of amalgamation?—Yes.

24559. There are ten unions in the county; about how many would be sufficient?—I think we might get rid of about four.

24560. That would leave six?—I am not in favour of very sweeping measures about reducing the number to one or two, or even three or four.

24561. You would not be like the witnesses who would abolish all?—No.

24562. What scheme do you think would be a good one; what workhouse would you close?—Well, Glenties and Oughterard would be two, and perhaps Clifden and some of the other small unions, either Gort, Monksheale, or Portlanna. I think, in going into a general scheme, they might be profitably done away with.

24563. You think the motor car, employed for ambulance purposes, would get rid of the necessity of keeping up a number of ambulances?—Not so much with regard to the hospitals, but with regard to cases that would not be contagious or infectious, and in cases of accidents; it was an idea that struck me.

24564. A number of witnesses have suggested it?—My idea would be, in the case of an accident, it would be quite possible for a motor service to reach a place twenty or twenty-five miles distant in the same time it would take to do eight or ten miles in a workhouse ambulance.

24565. Then you would have a special van for taking in sick patients suffering from infectious diseases?—That would be necessary.

24566. What would you do with the workhouses that would be closed?—I think that is dealt with with regard to what I say under sec. 75 of the Local Government Act, to have an auxiliary domestic system, and I would be in favour of using one of them as a central school for children.

24567. Do you think it is a good thing to bring up the little children of the destitute by giving them trades?—I do. I am entirely in favour of the board-school system, but I would take back the children at a certain age and get them into such an institution and give them an industrial training, to fit them for every position in life.

24568. Is not that an education better than the children of the poorer artisans would receive; why should you equip them to make a better battle in life than the children of the ratepayers?—I am of opinion that the children at present brought up in workhouse become very useless members of society.

24569. Supposing you board them out with farmers, don't you think it is giving these technical training or experience in the life of an agricultural labourer?—It may; but we look to something more in the future of Ireland than agricultural work.

24570. Are not agricultural labourers a class very much required and needed in the country at present?—Yes; but I would avail of the labour of those parties, and perhaps these children that would be boarded out, instead of giving their labour to their native country would emigrate; it is for the purpose of stopping emigration that I would adopt the system.

24571. How would it operate to stop emigration?—When they would be able to make a good living at home.

24572. May they not think they would make a better living abroad?—I don't think so. I am connected with a woollen factory here in Galway, and girls that are weavers can earn from £1 to £2½ a week; we give employment to seventy or eighty hands.

24573. What would be the lowest rate of wages?—There are different classes of work to be done; the lowest amount at the pay sheet, of some beginning to learn their business, is 6s. or 7s.

24574. Do they get so much as that?—What is the ordinary rate, without counting 25s., which I suppose only very expert people get?—It would be about the average that weavers earn; they are nearly all girls and women.

24575. At all events you would prefer to bring up the children of the destitute to a trade rather than to fit them out as agricultural labourers?—Yes. When you asked me the question about utilizing any of our disused workhouses I put that in opposition to the idea of sending children to an industrial school.

24576. Supposing you don't do either but send them to farmers to learn how to do agricultural work on farms, do you think that would be a good method of employing them?—Better than to bring them up in the workhouse.

24577. And don't you think it would be a fairer thing to the ratepayers to bring them up in an economical healthy way as agricultural labourers than to bring them up to trades?—I think anything that would tend to increase the wealth of the country would be desirable even at a little cost to the ratepayers.

24578. Mr. McDONNELL.—Do you not think that the farmer does as much for the wealth of the country as anybody else?—Unfortunately no, on account of the foreign competition and other causes; I happen to be a farmer, and it is very precarious.

Nov 3, 1901.

Dr. W. W. Galton.

Mr J. C. McDONNELL.

Nov. 4, 1901.

Mr. J. C.
MacDonnell.

24579. How could a country get on without farm produce?—Certainly not; but you can never have much wealth in the country if you are depending on the land.

24580. Is there not a great deal of it going to waste here in the West that it would be well to have under cultivation?—Things are changing now; when the people have the land there will be more cultivation.

24581. Is it not changing because help is so scarce?—Because they go out of the country, but people will remain at home when they have land to till.

24582. At present the farmers cannot obtain sufficient help to do their work?—That may be in some parts of the country.

24583. If you send the children out of the workhouse and distribute them amongst the homes of the farmers, would not they help afterwards to carry on the work in the fields?—I believe when they would be able to go away they would go to America, except when adopted as a member of the family.

24584. Don't you think it is a good healthy way to rease a boy or a girl?—I do.

24585. Do you not think it is better than in an institution?—Yes, as workhouses exist at present.

24586. CHAIRMAN.—You would be in favour of having old couples not separated in workhouses?—Certainly; I think it is a very cruel thing to do.

24587. You would also be in favour of largely extending the giving of outdoor relief?—Yes.

24588. What would you require as to the condition of the people to whom you would give outdoor relief?—I would give it to any people that otherwise might go into the workhouse; I think it is the best applied portion of the poor rate there it, and you would decrease the number of inmates of the workhouse when you adopt any kind of a liberal system of outdoor relief.

I have made some inquiries and they bear out this view. In Galway we give fair liberal outdoor relief; it comes to 25*l.* in the £ of the total rate. I believe a good deal of the rate is wasted. In Tuam, which is a very large union, they have only 202 patients and they give us to £1,800 a year outdoor relief. In Ballinasloe they give only about £500; I think it is a great mistake not to extend the system of outdoor relief.

24589. Mr. MURPHY.—Would you continue the present system of rating?—Yes, I am entirely in favour of union rating for all purposes, and I would make the charge for the sick and insane a county-at-large charge.

24590. CHAIRMAN.—In every hospital?—All even. There was something that was omitted in the draft of evidence, that is with regard to retaining the present union hospitals. I would be in favour of retaining the hospitals but I don't, at all, agree about the expense that would be necessary in connection with these. My idea would be to have a mission in charge of the hospital, and to have the dispensary doctor; give him a small yearly salary to attend at this hospital, and pay him by results; give him a consultation grant for all patients he would attend in the hospital during the year.

24591. Mr. MURPHY.—Do you think you would get better results by that?—I think so.

24592. CHAIRMAN.—You would not be at all afraid of a great crowd of patients coming in?—I would limit that to contagious and infectious diseases, because I think, if you adopt my plan, you can get all the other parties to the central place.

24593. Would that view of yours, making the sick a union-at-large charge, be approved of by the Galway Board of Guardians?—I think it would work out advantageously to Galway. With regard to union rating, my idea is that the rural portion of the Galway Union, or wherever there is a large city or town, suffers on account of the union rating, and with regard to Galway, it would be a great advantage to have it made a union-at-large charge, while it may be a disadvantage to some of the rural districts.

24594. You are not prepared to offer any very definite opinion as regards the treatment of tramps or casuals?—Well, no; I don't believe in the idea that is prevalent about treating these persons as if they were not human beings, with regard to cold beds and that sort of thing, except it could be established that they were of very bad character or of incorrigible habits, but it would be a useful thing if Guardians had the power of retaining these persons for a number of days, from three days to a week in the workhouse, and make them do some useful work. I also think there is a

great deal of neglect on the part of the police at present with regard to that; if it were shown they were ill-treating their children they should be prosecuted and have their children taken from them and brought up in some institution.

24595. But you would approve of stringent measures for those who were of bad character and were lazy and intemperate?—Certainly; a labour colony is a good idea. I might add, with regard to the evidence of Dr. Colahan, that it would be a desirable thing that one of our workhouses, in a favourable situation, should be made a sanatorium. I am here as Chairman of the Galway Hospital, and would like to give evidence about it. I may say that I think it would be a very great pity if the hospital were done away with.

24596. You would make it a county-at-large charge? I would; it is constituted under a special Act, and there are a great many defects in that Act of Parliament. The Board of Management have used their best exertions to try to make the hospital as efficient as possible, but they are hampered a good deal on account of the Special Act of Parliament. The Local Government Board did not alter the way of rating the rate for the upkeep of the hospital; it is still paid individually by each union; I would have it brought under the control of the County Council, and have a representation from the County Council, and perhaps some of the unions.

24597. You mean you would make it practically a county infirmary?—Yes, regulated by the conditions that would apply, rather enlarged, under the old Grand Jury system. One of the great defects of the Act is that we have no borrowing powers and cannot do much to improve the hospital except we take the money out of the annual amount supplied by the unions. At the present time we have just completed a very well-get-up operating theatre and we have a very good staff, and are starting a nursing school, and I think that gentlemen speak without a knowledge of the subject when they make any charge against the hospital. I think, where you have a county hospital in every county, but particularly the Galway Hospital, they should be maintained, and there might be some improvement made in the law to give the Board more power for borrowing and improving the hospital.

24598. Prior to the Act it was a county infirmary?—It was; it is quite a historic hospital with regard to that matter.

24599. There was a special Commission about it?—Yes, and a special Act of Parliament passed in 1878 was the result of that, and then it was put under a Board of Management.

24600. It used to be a county infirmary before that?—Under the Grand Jury.

24601. How did the infirmary come to an end; why was it necessary to have an Act of Parliament for your infirmary?—There was a collapse about the appointment of a resident surgeon; the Governors were equally divided; I believe the Lord Chancellor came down on foot and tried to settle matters and did not succeed. We have forty-nine members now all over the county, from each union according to its size.

24602. A good many of the extern members come in and don't say flattering things about it?—A great many don't attend at all and then they find fault with the people who do attend and try to do their best; I think it is a wrong system altogether, the idea of sending patients out of our county to Dublin.

24603. Have the Gort and Glensmiddy people to pay exactly as much per rate as the Galway people?—Our union pays according to its valuation, 2*l.* in the £, and then in addition, if they send in any patients from their workhouse hospitals, they have to pay 1*l.* a day.

24604. Dr. BOGGER.—Do you admit any other patients besides those sent in from the unions?—Yes, pay patients; they are admitted on a certificate of two doctors that they are fit subjects for treatment.

24605. CHAIRMAN.—How much do they pay?—3*l.*, and if they wish to get into smaller wards it is optional to pay 1*l.* a week.

24606. Do they get in at the same rate as the union cases?—Yes.

24607. And the unions have to pay 3*l.* in the £?—It comes to about £1,400 a year on the county.

24608. Dr. BOGGER.—Is the effect of the admission of pay patients that there are a number of cases admitted from Galway town, that don't go from the union, at 7*l.* a week?—All persons from the whole county can come in and they can be admitted on the

certificate of two doctors. We have five doctors on the staff of the Queen's College, and we have a resident surgeon. We cannot admit any infectious or contagious diseases.

24608. CHAIRMAN.—Except consumption?—That, I believe, is contagious.

24610. Mr. MURKIN.—What is the annual outlay on the institution?—The pay patients and the levy of £d. would come to about £2,500.

24611. Do you get a good deal for paying patients?—At different times of the year; we have accommodation for about sixty patients. In connection with our union we think to utilise the workhouse hospital and the fever hospital for the purpose of having a training school, otherwise it would not be recognised; but all the matters connected with the training of the nurses is regulated and approved of by the Local Government Board.

24612. Do private patients get preference in being received into the institution over those sent by the unions outside?—No.

24613. CHAIRMAN.—Are you ever quite full?—Not generally. The workhouse hospital in Galway was overcrowded and they had to send us up a lot of patients.

24614. At 1s. a day?—Yes.

24615. Dr. HUGHES.—In what way are your staff

appointed?—By the special Act of Parliament. Five are appointed by the Local Government Board, and they are the professors of the Queen's College, and then the Board of Management appoint a resident surgeon; but absolutely the appointment of the doctors is in the hands of the Local Government Board. The Local Government Board and ourselves have to agree about the appointment of the others. We had a great disagreement about the appointment of the head superintendent some time ago. We were getting in the same some time ago and the Local Government Board did not think they were qualified; we went to appoint a man but they would not have it, and we had to call her by another name—Lady Superintendent—and the Local Government Board assented to the appointment.

24616. Do you pay your staff?—No; they are honorary, but they will get something in connection with the training of nurses.

24617. There would be plenty of competition among the medical men in Galway to get on the staff?—If we had power we would add on a couple of our medical officers.

24618. They would not require any salary?—No, I think the honor and the experience they would get would be sufficient.

Mr. D. K. LYON, F.R.C., examined.

Mr. D. K. Lyon.

24619. CHAIRMAN.—The Galway Board of Guardians are not in favour of any amalgamation scheme?—No, I think not.

24620. They think it would not lead to a reduction in rates?—Certainly; they don't think it leads to a reduction in the rates.

24621. If it were shown to them it would lead to a reduction in the rates would they necessarily change their opinion?—But if it would not lead to the convenience of the sick poor.

24622. How would it affect the sick poor?—As a gentleman, who was examined here to-day, Mr. O'Hara, said, it would be very desirable to bring certain patients to Galway, and as you, yourself, pointed out it would be very inconvenient to bring them such a long distance; it would be a great hardship on the sick poor to bring them to Galway.

24623. Supposing the sick were left in their own neighbourhood, and the other classes alone should be brought away?—They have the impression that if the sick were left in their own neighbourhood there would be a good lot of the staff still kept on to attend them; they would have to pension off some of the existing staff, and have a doctor and nurses; there would be a hospital wanted in the locality for children.

24624. If a scheme were put before the Guardians, and the unions were shown that without obliging the sick to travel long distances a reduction could be made in the rates; if the other classes were brought elsewhere, do you think even then the Galway Guardians would be opposed to amalgamation?—If they see there would be a reduction in the rates and it would not lead to inconvenience to the sick poor they would be in favour of amalgamation, but not as they are informed at present.

24625. Your Board of Guardians are of opinion that an auxiliary lunatic asylum is not required in this country?—No, they think Ballinacree is sufficient.

24626. Your Board of Guardians are in favour of boarding out the children, but not old people?—They are; they have only two cases in the union, and the great difficulty they find is to get suitable people to mind these children, because often they don't be well treated; and another objection is that some of these people that get these children like to make a good thing out of them.

24627. They have not a wide margin for that?—They try to get as much as they can.

24628. The Guardians are in favour of enlarging the powers of the Board in the administration of outdoor relief?—I think it would be very desirable.

24629. They think the quarter acre section ought to be repealed?—Yes, and the section about the widows and the number of children, that might be enlarged;

there is too much saving of outdoor relief; it is cheaper to have them outside than in the workhouse, and for the sake of their moral atmosphere.

24630. The Guardians think that the union-at-large voting is not as beneficial as the divisional?—Personally I am in favour of the union-at-large.

24631. The Guardians thought it better to have divisional?—The majority of the Guardians come from the rural districts, and only sixteen from the town, and naturally the burden would be on the town, but I, as a representative of a ward in the town, am for union-at-large.

24632. Then it was a question between the country and the town?—They had fifty men to our sixteen.

24633. As regards any additional hospital in your unions, were you here to-day when evidence was given about a possible hospital at Castello?—I was; I would not be in favour of that, but I would be in favour of a hospital for consumptives, and I would agree with a gentleman here to-day who said he would make notification compulsory.

24634. About this hospital at Castello or Derryna, you don't think that necessary?—I do not.

24635. You think they have not too far to come to your union?—I don't think so, from Castello.

24636. What do you think about the accommodation for the sick at Arran?—It would be advisable to have a cottage hospital there; but I don't know whether the Guardians share my views or not—to have a small hospital there on a small scale because the weather sometimes prevents people being sent from Galway in the case of emergency.

24637. You also think a hospital, at a central place like Athlery, might be started for consumptives; did you think whether you would use a workhouse for a consumptive hospital if a union is broken up?—It would be a very good use to turn it into.

24638. You would also be in favour of giving the Guardians power to charge for the treatment of the sick in their wards, according to the means of the people, up to the full cost?—Yes, according to the individual case.

24639. You get about £200 a year in Galway?—Yes, in payments.

24640. Do you know what class you get that from—largely from policemen?—Yes, and pensioners.

24641. It would not be from what you call the poor?—No.

24642. As regards tramps, you would make them do heavy work?—No; I would be in favour of a labour colony, and in addition I would be in favour of better classification of cases in the workhouse. I think children ought to be brought away from those that come in morally depraved and vicious and intemperate.

S N

Nov 3, 1904.

Mr. MICHAEL McNEILL, P.L.G., examined.

Mr. Michael McNeill.

In order to shorten matters I agree with Mr. Lyden in everything he has said with the exception of divisional rating.

24543. CHAIRMAN.—Are you a country Guardian?—I am, but the divisional rating is for outdoor relief only; I think it would be a better check on the giving of outdoor relief.

24544. Do you think the Galway town Guardians are a little bit too generous?—They are not too generous, but a Guardian from the division would have more interest in looking after the relief given. And with regard to another matter, I don't agree with regard to the charge in the Galway Hospital, that it is the police or the passengers pay it; the pretty fair-to-do people pay.

24545. Are many of them paying?—Nearly the whole of them pay; the charge is 5s. or 6s. a week; they pay 2s. or 2s. 6d. a week, whatever they can afford to pay.

24546. Now as regards the Galway Hospital?—I have only to endorse what Mr. MacDonnell has said with regard to the hospital, and I cannot agree with a certain gentleman, who gave evidence to-day, and said it was only a nuisance to the county.

24547. The paying was a nuisance; it was a nuisance to pay?—And he mentioned other matters in which I could not agree with him, with regard to the medical gentlemen. I think with regard to the consumption hospital, I think if the Board of Management of the county hospital had borrowing powers; it is in a very healthy place and additional buildings could be put up there.

24548. You agree with your chairman that it would be a prudent thing to get borrowing powers?—Yes.

24549. What you would have to give as security would be the 2d. in the 21?—Yes.

24550. How far can you go with your county rate?—I think we could put on any rate we wish.

Mr. McDonnell.—We could not increase it to a penny without a perfect storm of indignation in the county. We would have borrowing powers under the Public Health Act, I should say.

24551. What would be your security—your rating power?

Mr. McDonnell.—The hospital is vested in the Local Government Board.

Mr. P. J. CUSACKHAM examined.

Mr. P. J. Cusackham.

24552. CHAIRMAN.—You are one of the Rural District Council?—Yes; I think there is nothing I can add to what has been said by Mr. McNeill; I too am a country Guardian.

24553. You approve of the divisional rating?—Yes; I don't exactly agree with Mr. Lyden with regard to the area of charge.

Rev. MURRAY FARRAGHER, P.P., Arran Islands, examined.

Rev. Murray Farragher, P.P.

24554. CHAIRMAN.—We have just now an opinion from one of the Guardians, that in his own individual opinion he thought a hospital at Arran would be desirable, but he was unable to speak for the Board of Guardians at large; he did not know their opinions. Could you tell us what is your opinion as to the requirements of Arran for hospital accommodation?—Of course we have no hospital available.

24555. Do you think it would be at all desirable?—I think it would be most essential; I have been trying to advocate that for years, ever since I came to know the island's necessity for hospital accommodation.

24556. Would you think that a hospital, with comparatively small accommodation, and built on cheap lines would be as much as you could fairly ask?—I think so; it would be unreasonable to expect anything of an elaborate style.

24557. Something cheap and small?—Say from four to six beds.

24558. And the dispensary doctor would look after it?—Yes, here is built at a convenient distance from his residence.

24559. And the nurse, when she was not fully occupied in the hospital, would have something to do outside, I am sure, as a district nurse?—Yes, the nursing question of course is new to us in the West of Ireland; we have not much experience, but the little we have makes me think that anyone who takes an interest in the poor people will admit it is the greatest possible advantage to the poor people, and a great assistance to the doctor. In the large island we have a population of over 2,000 people, and you are aware the distance from Arran to Galway is about thirty miles, and I need not tell you there is the greatest possible difficulty in getting people to come into the Galway Hospital.

24560. Some of the sick people would not be fit to travel by the sea?—Some of them might, but unwillingly, and very frequently an illness that would be of short duration if taken in time, and under fair treatment, goes on for a long time. Even within the last twelve months I saw two cases of men who got

fish-hooks into their fingers, and that they were disabled from fishing for nearly three months, and one of them lost two joints of one finger and another lost a joint; if you had anything in the shape of a cottage hospital where they could be dressed regularly—a fractured arm, or leg, or anything like that. I know two or three cases that came under my own observation and the result is, that while the patients have their legs still, they are certainly very imperfect. There are nearly 1,000 people between the other two islands.

24561. It would be useful for the other two islands in fine weather?—Oh, yes, they don't regard the distance as insurmountable; the same as the distance between Arran and Galway.

24562. They are accustomed to come into Kilbrannigan often from the middle and south islands?—They do, in fine weather.

24563. Is there anything you think about such a hospital that you would like to mention to us?—No; I have only just to say what I have stated; I am not in a position to offer any suggestions, but I would be glad to ensure a site if the thing took shape.

24564. The site ought to be somewhere at Kilbrannigan?—At Kilbrannigan, where there is a good water supply and a healthy locality.

24565. And plenty of stones?—Plenty of stones. I understand that the difficulty in erecting a hospital could be got over as far as the expense; it is not competent to borrow money from the Board of Works.

24566. I should think so?—At the amount that would be paid then would be so small I am sure.

24567. It would not frighten the Galway Guardians?—I think they would be well disposed when they found there was a reasonable case.

24568. You have always found these pretty generous in doing what you ask?—I would not go as far as that; however I hope better times are coming.

Mr. McDonnell.—It is only the District Council you have to fight.

Rev. M. Farragher.—I think you are nearly all the same.

The Sitting terminated.

FIFTIETH PUBLIC SITTING—WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 30th, 1904.

Nov. 30, 1904.

At the Courthouse, Ennis.

Present:—Mr. MICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURKAGHAN, and Dr. COVEY BAGGER.

Mr. P. J. HOGAN, A.B., Chairman, Class County Council, examined.

24566. CHAIRMAN.—You have been deputed by the County Council to give their views as to the question of amalgamation and Poor-law reform in the county?—Yes.

24570. Your Council, I understand from the notes that you have been good enough to furnish us, are in favour of amalgamation?—Yes.

24571. Did they go into it and express any opinion among themselves what would be the best workhouse to close?—Well, no, they did not.

24572. Do you personally desire to offer any opinion on that?—The only thing I would say regarding that would be that I believe, and I can say it is the opinion of the Council, that four workhouses would meet the requirements of this county.

24573. How many have you at present?—Eight, and the material for nine.

24574. That is including Limerick?—Yes.

24575. You think, really, you might have the number?—Certainly, without the slightest doubt, because when we had a population of over 200,000 we dealt with the Famine, and our workhouses were full, and now we have a population of about 120,000 in Clare, and the same number of workhouses are in existence.

24576. Some of the workhouses, as you refer to the Famine times, were not in existence in the Famine time—they were not built until after—for instance Tuila, Cratins, and Killadyerst—Ros Scariff, Ennis, Ennistymon, and Ennis were old workhouses, and dealt with the Famine and a population of 200,000. Now our population is going down by leaps and bounds, and I don't believe, nor any public man can believe, that the number of workhouses is required for the county—they are a burden on the people.

24577. You live at Rosscariff?—Yes.

24578. You are not, perhaps, prepared to speak with reference to Ballyvaughan—you would rather leave it to your colleague?—Yes. The Council suggested that Ballyvaughan would be utilized for young children and turned into an industrial school. I would say that it should be turned into an industrial school for girls, and there should be another workhouse turned into an industrial school for boys.

24579. Have you considered how very difficult of access Ballyvaughan would be to parts of the Co. Clare, Six-mile-Booie, Killadyerst, and Kilkee, and places like that?—Yes, I have, but it is one of the things we have to close up, if you close up any, Ballyvaughan or Killadyerst.

24580. Ballyvaughan is one of the places that seems to me to be rather a different footing to the others, it is so set off from the rest of the county, now that railways are running?—In East Clare you have no railways, Scariff and Tuila, are they not cut off just as much. Ballyvaughan is beautifully situated, a fine healthy place. It is one of the things you ought to consider.

24581. Scariff, that is your own union. Would you maintain Scariff?—I would not like to express an opinion as to those unions that ought to be maintained or not maintained, beyond the bare fact that four workhouses in this county are quite enough to meet the requirements.

24582. When you close a workhouse, do you think it would be wise to leave some small accommodation in the neighbourhood for those who would be acutely sick that could be looked after by the dispensary doctor and nurse in charge—a small cottage hospital?—Under certain conditions, but I would not be for closing up workhouses at all.

24583. Take the case now that you take Ballyvaughan into an industrial school for girls. That would not be closing up the house, but it would be closing it up as regards the sick unless you make some provision for

the sick?—Take Kilrush—in parts of Kilrush they have to take patients at present twenty-two miles to hospital.

24584. There is a very small population from Loop Head, and you could not help that; it is a tongue of land—almost an island stretching into the Atlantic?—Where it would be necessary I would be very much in favour of a cottage hospital.

24585. Supposing you closed the Ballyvaughan Workhouse for the sick where would you bring the people from round Blackhead?—If you had not a cottage hospital you should bring them to whatever workhouse you amalgamated them with.

24586. The nearest workhouse would be in another county, Gort?—Ennistymon, I presume; I will touch that point when I come on to deal with Limerick.

24587. That is the question of county union?—Yes.

24588. I have not quite got your idea about the sick—do you think it would be too great a hardship supposing, for instance, Ballyvaughan and Killadyerst were closed. Would it be too great a hardship to bring the sick the distance they would have to travel?—I think if there was a proper conveyance the hardship would be very slight, and they ought to be better treated in the main hospital than a cottage hospital.

24589. It is the question of the removal of acute cases?—If the distance was very long I would certainly be in favour of the cottage hospital.

24590. The evidence we have received is very much in accord with that last statement of yours—that where the distances are very long some small provision ought to be left in the locality, and that the people might be attended by the dispensary doctor?—Certainly, but when I say that I believe the workhouse should be kept open with another purpose—that a wing should be utilised for a hospital and not the whole workhouse.

24591. Then you don't propose to abolish and knock down any of the workhouses?—I believe not; I would turn them to another purpose.

24592. When would the economy come in—the chief object in sending us round here was to try and effect economy, and at the same time not to impair efficiency?—If you had an industrial school I certainly say the Government would pay their portion, and for all children that you could send there I hold the Treasury should make payment.

24593. Still you have a very large institution kept up mainly out of the rates of the county?—Yes, would, but that institution is being kept up at present, and only a portion of it would be kept up in the future because the Treasury would come to the rescue and keep up at least half.

24594. I would not be too hopeful about these grants in aid?—Are they not giving grants for industrial children at present?

24595. They are, but even with that you will have an institution that will cost the country a great deal of money?—The girls of the county certainly ought to be put together, and the boys, they ought to be brought out of the various workhouses.

24596. You think the workhouse is a very bad place for children?—I do, and there should also be compulsory power given to acquire land, because a lot of these children will afterwards turn out and live on farms.

24597. I don't know whether you have very much experience in your own union of boarding out as distinguished from institution boarding?—No experience of it at all, and very little is done in this county.

24598. Except in the Clare portion of the Limerick Union the Limerick Guardians began it a good deal over twenty years ago and have worked it with great success in Limerick. The idea of those who support boarding out would be that a child is sent out to a small farmer, taught to make himself useful, a boy

Nov. 30, 1904.

Mr. P. J.
Hogan.

or a girl as the case may be, and becomes an agricultural labourer or a dairymaid or a housemaid in the country, and supplies a want felt in a great many places of agricultural labour—I would not like to take the child out if he were kept in the union until twelve or fourteen years of age, and kept in contact with the worst possible class of people.

24700. You are quite right, but the idea of boarding out people is that the child should be boarded out as soon as it could use its teeth, and eat whatever food was going, say two or three years old. When a child is boarded out at that tender age with a family, they get very much attached to the child, and being it up nearly as one of themselves, and teach it to become an agricultural labourer; you have not had the experience to enable you to offer an opinion on that?—No, I could not.

24701. It is a scheme that has been tried largely in a great many cases, and Cardinal Logue, at Armagh, has a scheme in operation in his diocese, rather than put them into institutions he has tried the boarding out scheme and finds it works with great success!—One of the crimes then would not be required at all.

24702. You are aware, I suppose, that the cost of boarding out is very much less than the cost of rearing them in the house!—There are no officials, as a rule, with the boarded out, except an inspector.

24703. Have you thought of any other inmates of the workhouse that might, with advantage, be excluded from the workhouse to matter what is done as regards the clothing of workhouse or not. Take the question of lunatics; do you think the workhouse is a fit and proper place for them?—No; it is not a place for harmless lunatics at all.

24704. Have you considered what would be the best thing to do with harmless lunatics that are now in such great numbers in the Clare Workhouse?—We have been four years considering it. My idea from the very start was that one of these workhouses should be taken as an auxiliary asylum; four years ago we got our equity surveyor to go to the various workhouses.

24705. Did he make a report in writing?—Yes, sir. He reported Killadysert, Tulla, and Scariff.

24706. What did he say about Tulla?—That is built close to the parent asylum.

24707. How many would it accommodate?—He wanted to make some alterations to accommodate at least 300 patients; he estimated that the improvements would take £23,150, on the idea that everything should be similar to the parent house; that you should treat the patients exactly the same as you treat the acute cases.

24708. That, of course, you would not think of for a moment!—Not at all. The asylum committee considered this matter and felt, at the time, that they would be bound actually to provide everything as it is provided at the parent house, with the result that they considered the matter for two years and they agreed, in face of that £23,000, to build an additional wing to the asylum. That, I am glad to say, has not been done, and our Council are almost unanimous in taking up a workhouse for an auxiliary asylum.

24709. Have you formed any opinion as to which would be a good workhouse to take up?—I don't know that the Council have a definite opinion; my belief would be that Tulla would be a capital place for them. There is just one drawback that occurred to us about Tulla, and that was whether a sufficient amount of land could be got to profitably employ the lunatics who need occupation.

24710. Certainly, if you get compulsory power to take land!—You will get it nowhere without compulsory powers, and if you get it you can take it there as well as anywhere else.

24711. You suggest that the Government should give compulsory power to take land?—Yes.

24712. At Tulla there is a good house, a wall-walled institution, and it would require relatively less expense than any other workhouse?—Yes. I would suggest that some other workhouse should be taken up and compulsory power given to acquire land, and used as an agricultural college for the county, for agriculture is the only industry in the county.

24713. That is going a step beyond our province. What you suggest we should do would be to recommend that one of the workhouses might be used by the Department of Agriculture?—Yes; give us power to take the land—power, in the same way as for the purpose of an auxiliary asylum.

24714. Have you formed any idea of the workhouse that would do for that?—I have not.

24715. Scariff?—I have not thought out which workhouse, but on the principle of the thing, it is a matter absolutely essential for the success of farming in the County Clare.

24716. Have you any other project for any other workhouse, say Corofa, if it was closed?—No; the boarding out knocks me out a good deal in my calculation.

24717. There is one suggestion that has been made in all places we have visited. You are aware now that consumption or phthisis is regarded as an infectious disease, and all the doctors recommend isolation and treatment in some special building, of consumptive cases. If a suitable workhouse could be got among the Clare unions, such as Corofa, would you be in favour of having there an institution to be jointly maintained by, say, the adjoining counties of Galway, Limerick, and Clare?—Certainly I would, for I believe the adjoining counties should contribute towards it, for one adjoining county it would not pay.

24718. Oh, yes, of course!—Then I certainly would, and think it is absolutely necessary.

24719. I dare say we shall have some medical evidence on that subject; the increase of consumption is now one of the serious questions in the country!—I also think that mothers of illegitimate children should be really brought to one union and kept together.

24720. That is making it into a sort of penitentiary?—Yes; they should be kept together, and there should be power there to keep them for a certain number of years, and turn them to do some useful work for the country.

24721. Another suggestion was made to us on that question, that was that these women should never be admitted into the local workhouse or hospital when they are about to give birth to illegitimate children, but that they should, instead, be sent to some reformatory or institution under religious management, according to the religion of the woman, and that they should be there kept for as short a time as possible, and when reclaimed endeavour to be put forward and get a start, and the child should be boarded out at the expense of the father and mother!—Or else, if you keep them there as long as you can.

24722. Would not your object be to give the girl a fresh start in life as soon as she was fit to go?—That might give them a fresh start to do the same thing again.

24723. Do you think that is likely—after the first fall a girl feels rather sorry for herself then?—I think here chances are 50 per cent. more to fall again if she falls a first time and comes out immediately.

24724. Our experience of these cases in the workhouses is that when they are put into the workhouse and become associated with women who have fallen before, once, twice, or oftener, when they are they become demoralised and corrupted, but when a girl does fall first, if she is never put in with such companions, but is put under religious management for a month before her confinement and sometimes afterwards, the opinion of a good many people, who have given us evidence, is that it is likely to lead to the redemption of the girl!—Would it not be likely to lead to her redemption if she was kept there for eight years and knew, before she fell, that she would be kept six or seven years in that institution, and she could do useful work for the country; you could have a laundry that would do the various institutions of the country.

24725. Does it not strike you that that would be a very hard punishment?—Give them something that when they are leaving according to their good conduct while inside.

24726. You are taking a girl and sending her out a middle-aged woman into the world again!—Sometimes you must use pretty hard measures.

24727. Are you aware that judicious religious influence on these girls has been found satisfactory in a great many cases?—I am sure it has.

24728. If the expense would not be practically more than that of the present institution system would it not be a good thing to give these girls a chance of getting back as honest women?—It would be 100 per cent. better than keeping them as they are at present.

24729. Your first idea was that it would be more in their best interests to exclude them from any possibility of falling?—For a certain time, and make them do useful work and give them a premium for their conduct inside.

Nov. 20, 1904

Mr F. J.
Hoggs.

24722. That would require a very large interference with a person's liberty!—You interfere with a person's liberty when you send them to jail.

24723. Yes, but the moral offence has not yet been regarded as the criminal one let—I would certainly like that portion, Limerick No. 2, and add it on to some of the Clare workhouses, because some of the worst land in Clare is down near Limerick, O'Brien's Bridge, and Cratloe, and I don't think the rates of the county should go to maintain Limerick; we ought to maintain ourselves in Clare first.

24724. Supposing that district did come into Clare for Poor Law purposes, how would you obviate the hardship on people at Long Payment or Ordine getting relief for the sick in hospital?—There are plenty of houses I know of in that part of Clare, and I would utilise one of these; there are private houses which are unoccupied at present; I would utilise one of these for a cottage hospital.

24725. Or failing that what would you say to giving the people there a right of admission into the nearest hospital, which would be Limerick, to be paid for at so much a head per day or week by the County Clare?—I would much prefer to do the other thing—have our own institutions and manage them within our own county.

24726. Mr. MURKIN.—Would it not be well to have the alternative—I don't think so, sir; we are quite capable of managing it.

24727. CHAIRMAN.—Then as regards the aged and infirm, you contemplate that they should be kept in the workhouses that are not broken up?—Yes, certainly, and sent to these workhouses.

24728. Have you considered at all the possibility in order to save salaries and other expenses, have you considered the question that has been raised by a great many witnesses of having one institution for each county for the aged and infirm, where they had land and light occupation that would enable them to pass a more cheerful and useful life than they do at present?—I have not considered it, but I do think, from what I do know, that these very people require no land, and want no occupation beyond a pipe and to be let walk in an out.

24729. I may tell you that our unanimous opinion is very strongly opposed to yours; from our experience we think it is a very lamentable thing to go into the daymen of workhouses and see these old people—a great many of whom are quite as capable of doing a turn as the old men you see scraping the road, or the old women looking after children—it is a lamentable thing to see them in the workhouses; it is quite true if they have their pipe and cup of tea over the fire they are satisfied, but we think it would be more desirable to have them employed.—The reason they want to be because they would not scrape the roads and do light work.

24730. Then would it not be good business to make them do that inside as to keep them out?—Yes; and is not that power there at present, and why is it not utilized?

24731. That is a matter for Guardians; I would like to know that from you—I am not a member of the Board of Guardians.

Mr. MURKIN.—The power is very limited.

24732. CHAIRMAN.—It would save a great deal of money, it has been represented to me, if you could collect all the aged and infirm into one workhouse, say, Ennis, for the county; you would have there one management, and you would be able to classify the aged and infirm into various classes, according to their character, and different other considerations, not to separate man and wife, and so on.—Certainly if it was a saving, I would be very glad to do anything I could to assist it.

24733. That is one of our objects—that is, a reduction of rates; because I suppose you feel the rates are a little higher than you like?—A lot higher, and the tendency is that they are going up day by day, and as fast as the rates are going up the people are going down; they are running out of the country.

24734. And the power to pay the rates?—Yes, and a smaller amount of capital year after year in the county to pay the rates.

24735. If the bringing of the aged and infirm into one central institution were a decided economy for the county-at-large, would you be disposed to look at it with favour as far as you see at first sight?—Undoubtedly I would.

24736. Of course the argument that is put forward against that is that a great hardship is involved in moving the aged and infirm away from their own locality?—Yes, and those people who may visit them from time to time.

24737. We were greatly impressed by that argument and took steps to inquire, as regards the visiting of these people, and our experience, I am sorry, has been, while the sick are visited very frequently, the aged and infirm, who come in for life, are hardly visited at all—I thoroughly agree; it is a sentimental argument.

24738. Without much foundation. There was a question as regards chargeability. At present the chargeability for all Poor Law expenses is the union-at-large.—The feeling all over the county is entirely in favour of the electoral division charge, for many reasons.

24739. Is that for all purposes or only for outdoor relief?—For all purposes—all union purposes.

24740. You would give relief in some form to the tenant?—Yes, in some form, but at the present time it greatly tends to squander public money to have union-at-large rating.

24741. Do you think it does, under any other heading, except outdoor relief? If a person is willing to come into an institution, do you think the question of chargeability has really any influence on them?—Not the slightest on the person who would go in, but it has a great influence on the parties who are administering the relief.

24742. Do you think any Board of Guardians would refuse, or have refused, or do refuse applications for outdoor relief?—No, I do not.

24743. Is it not practically unheard of?—I am sure it is.

24744. So that really making indoor relief a local charge could not be expected to have any influence on the gross expenditure under that head?—Indirectly it has.

24745. You don't think the Guardians would change their minds if you went back to the electoral division charge; you don't think it would make them more careful in admitting people into the house?—Not with regard to admitting people into the house, but there are many things in regard to the working of the institution on which it would have a great influence.

24746. To what do you refer?—There may be changes to be made in the workhouse. There may be salaries to be raised, and if a Guardian has to go directly back to the people whom he represents, and to whom he would be responsible for that.

24747. That would be always a union-at-large charge—the salaries of officers?—And the building would be a union charge.

24748. Yes; you could not charge the establishment in any other way; it would be pro rata for the valuation of the contributing divisions?—I do believe, however, if they were directly responsible to the people who send them there, they would be far more careful, for they are at present, if such a thing occurred, "It is not my fault, a Guardian from such a place, that may be ten miles away, has as much influence by his vote on the Board as I have."

24749. I can understand how that applies to outdoor relief, but what I don't understand is how you bring that in as regards establishment charges?

Mr. MURKIN.—It would come in in this way, that a Guardian would find out, on hearing the list read of people admitted during the week into the house, whether any of them had means, and if so, mention the matter, and have inquiries made.

24750. And insist on payment when that has occurred?—Certainly. And also I have heard people against amalgamation simply on the ground that they happened to have, let us say, to illustrate the case, in their union a rate of 2s. in the £, while in the neighbouring union, for some cause or other, it was 4s. They say, "Why would we permit ourselves to be tacked on to that particular union and workhouse while we, by our economy, or some circumstances, are paying 2s." But it would meet it to a great extent if there were electoral division charges; their argument would be knocked out. Perhaps it may occur to-day before you that that may be one of the reasons why men are against amalgamation. They will say "We will fight to the death before we are tacked on to a

Dec. 30, 1904.
Mr. P. J.
Hagan.

union that is paying double our rates; if there was electoral division raising their arguments would be knocked out.

24756. I don't follow you there; it would only be knocked out to the extent of the paupers of the division—That is the very reason why the rate is low, because there are no paupers out of the division. There may be one union with 200 paupers, and the same-sized union, with the same valuation, with but 100; why then does not that argument stand good?

24757. It does, to a certain extent—I think it does to a great extent.

24758. Dr. Brogan—it would not apply to the districts inside the union; the rates on a district, if you have divisional rating, would not be for the number of inmates from that district; it would only be for their maintenance, not for the establishment charges!—But you would not want to vote as large an amount of money for two patients in a particular district as if there were four from that district.

24759. It applies to some extent, but it would not apply to the establishment charges—I am speaking of the inmates from this particular district.

24760. CHAIRMAN.—It would apply very seriously in the case of outdoor relief. If difficulties were found in the way of reversing to divisional chargesability for all purposes as before would you still advocate that you should go back to the electoral division for outdoor relief?—I would like to see what the difficulties would be before I would answer that.

24761. That would be rather a long story to go into?—Then you would not expect me to give an opinion on that.

24762. You must remember the Legislature quite recently changed the rating after considering the question thoroughly, and you will find the arguments reported in the debates in 1893; they changed the rating from divisional to union; if we were to ask them to go back to divisional it would be rather a quick change, and if a difficulty were expressed in getting such a quick change carried out as regards all Poor Law expenditure would you be in favour of making outdoor relief a divisional charge?—I certainly would; but I would prefer to get divisional charges for all. I would not be shy in asking the Legislature to change that. There are many things in the Local Government Act that should be changed. Does it improve the condition of the union to have plural representation; we have eighty representatives, and it is no small job to work with eighty men on a Board.

24763. Mr. MURPHY.—You could answer the argument by saying that union rating had never been experienced before, and after a trial of five or six years it was found rather extravagant, and you wanted to go back to the old arrangements?—Very true.

24764. CHAIRMAN.—But at any rate you would prefer electoral rating as far as possible, and if you could not get the whole you would take as much as you could of it?—Half a loaf would be better than no bread on that principle.

24765. You would not be at all in favour of making the support of the sick a county charge?—Oh, no.

24766. You would not consider it was as broad as it was long, practically?—I would not.

24767. As regards the county infirmary, you are aware that at present it is a county charge?—I am well aware, and I am well aware who utilizes it; 50 per cent of the patients are within eight or ten miles of it, and 40 per cent within a quarter of a mile of it.

24768. Would you think it a fair thing of your district, at Scariff, to ask, that as you are paying your share of the Ennis sick maintenance and the asylum that Ennis and the other unions should pay their share of your sick maintenance at Scariff that is to say, put all the risk on the county-at-large?—I understand we will get a capitation grant for those.

24769. No, no; only the acutely sick; you have only the acutely sick in the infirmary at Ennis. You were talking just now of the hardship of obliging distant parts of the county to contribute to the infirmary, from which they derived little benefit?—I don't say it is a hardship because it is the right thing to do, but we have not the advantage of sending our sick there.

24770. If you had the counterbalancing advantage of having your sick at Ballyvaughan, and Killybegs, and Killybegs, the acutely sick put on the county-at-large would be your opinion of such a proposal?—I would prefer leaving things as they are.

24771. And continue to pay for the county infirmary at Ennis?—Yes.

24772. The question has been put to your Council what do you think of the possibility of getting payments from the sick who are able to afford to pay something, and your answer to that is that you would leave it to the discretion of each governing body to fix the amount to be paid?—Yes, on the principle that they should be compelled to pay where they are able.

24773. I don't know whether you have considered at all that very small contributions might be got. We visited some infirmaries in the North of Ireland, where they have put into operation a system of getting very small contributions, even 6d. a week, from people who could afford to pay it. If a very poor man had a child who was sick it would, at all events, cost him 6d. a week to keep it at home?—More.

24774. So it was thought they might fairly ask what would be the amount saved by the withdrawal of that month from the family meals, and that system has been put in operation there and a large sum of money got, more than sufficient to pay the salary of the surgeon of the infirmary; and the experience there has been that the poor people too rub like the system; it makes them more independent; they feel they are not being pauperized or anything of that sort and they pay willingly in a large number of cases. Would you be in favour of a discretion being given to the managing bodies to charge such sums as they thought proper might reasonably, and without hardship, afford to pay?—Certainly; but I would also be in favour of there being some power to compel them. At present, if they are in an infirmary, they can come out and need not pay a cent.

24775. You would give the local authority power to fix the amount, and give them power to recover, a law, the amount due, up to the full cost. A comparatively rich man might go in and it might be necessary to have a special nurse employed for him; would you give the body power to meet the whole amount?—Certainly, if he could afford it, and when people can afford it, if they are inclined, as far as I know, to pay it; in some cases they are not; they will slide out of it, but if they look for a private room or apartment certainly they will pay.

24776. Apart from that a great many people prefer company when they go into hospitals. Have you had much experience of tramps?—So far as the experience of meeting them, I have a fair amount of it.

24777. What is your opinion of that class?—I think they should be discontinued in every possible way.

24778. Your County Council was rather in favour of abolishing casual wards in workhouses and not admitting them at all?—Yes.

24779. That is a negative method; is there any positive method for dealing with those that have occurred to you?—I would deal with them on a different principle. When these able-bodied tramps would come to look for anything, I would have the parties who would relieve them prosecuted; I would give a premium to the tramp who would give information to the police, and have the parties who relieved the tramp prosecuted instead of the tramp.

24780. You think you would not like strong corroborative evidence in support of the tramp's statement?—Certainly.

24781. A charitable man would take care that there were no witnesses present when he gave relief?—But no man who would give relief would deny it and swear he did not.

24782. He may sit still and say nothing? (Witness.—Let the onus of proof be thrown on him.) That would be reversing the matter of the criminal law. A suggestion has been made to us that it would be a good thing to take a workhouse, say one in each parish of Ireland, and then these tramps who go about—I don't refer to the old people who belong to the district and go about and are willingly and heartily given charity by those who know them in the neighbourhood, but I refer to the sturdy tramp going from county to county—it has been suggested that these people should, as far as they have children and are rearing them up in the same course as themselves, that their children ought to be taken from them, and even when they have no children, and are going about without visible means of support, that they should be sent, by legal process—magistrate's warrant—into one of these four provincial workhouses and there locked up for such length of time as might be found necessary. I don't mean short terms, but long terms, and that they

should be there brought up in habits of industry, with a view to giving them a start, as is done in Germany and other places?—I thoroughly agree with that, but you should have a thousand acres of land and make them raise vegetables and crops to supply Dublin and Cork and other places; it would be a paying institution then, and I would go for it.

24783. The broad principle that those who recommend that system go on is that these people are living absolutely on the public, and if they want to go on living by the public they should be forcibly detained and made give value for their support?—Certainly under these conditions I would be in favour of it.

24784. Are you in favour of out-door relief as a method of relieving destitution?—To a small extent I would.

24785. There are a great number of those old people who are in workhouses—do you think it would be possible to devise any scheme of out-door relief or boarding out old people that would cost less?—I hardly think you could board out some of these old people. If you board them out you have not only to board them out but nurse them.

24786. It would come very largely to boarding out with their own friends?—I am afraid they would not be as well treated by their own friends, who might take them simply because they were paid a certain amount of money for them.

24787. You would go to avoid that too many people might try to get their friends boarded out with them?—The tendency would be that way.

24788. Would not that be sufficiently counteracted by the electoral division chargeability?—To a certain extent it would, because everybody in that district would know who was the right person to give it to. The Guardians who did that would be soon told to get about their business; they would not be left these three years or three weeks; they would get a sudden notice to quit, and they would not get six months' redemption.

24789. You would not propose to have any method for shortening the Guardians' tenure of office—you would leave them three years with power to the locality, perhaps to make it unpleasant for them to stay the whole time?—Certainly.

24790. Is there anything I have not referred to?—I think my colleague is to deal with another portion of the question which I did not touch.

24791. It has been mentioned recently in Cork and other places that the distribution of out-door relief might be universally made in kind. Instead of giving money the relieving officers should be employed distributing bread or such other food as would be ordered by the Guardians?—The idea, I think, is a very good one. I know plenty of people that are getting out-door relief and the chief part is spent in the public-houses.

24792. And they would not take bread?—They would not; they would not eat it for you.

24793. If a scheme of that sort could be carried out you would be rather favourable towards it?—I would.

24794. Dr. Brown.—Do you approve of giving the clothing for children in the way of out-door relief?

CHANCEMAN.—Food and clothing—that is in the existing law. You could give bedding?—I am afraid if you got into that the tendency would be on the part of a great many to look for clothing. They would fight shy in the beginning, but I am afraid that would wear

off in a short time, and the inducement would not be so great to their parents to work for these children to get them clothing when they could get clothing by way of relief.

24795. Are you on the Committee of Management of the asylum?—Yes.

24796. You have already given us your views about the question of enlargements—an auxiliary asylum is what you are in favour of?—Yes.

24797. Managed on cheaper lines?—Oh, yes; I hold that at least £1,500 would put one of the workhouses in form for an auxiliary asylum, but what is wanted is proper treatment and light occupation; it is not beautiful dormitories and ornamentation in the latest style.

24798. That does not cost so much, cleanliness and polishing, that is what should be there?—Cleanliness, accommodation, proper diet, and exercise.

24799. Chargeability in the same way as in the parent house?—Chargeability in the same way; a capitation grant of 4s. and we will pay the balance whatever it is.

24800. Dr. Brown.—You understand that as the law stands at present you could not get the capitation grant of 4s.?—We want to change the law in that respect; the lawless lunatics has as much right to be treated well as the sane patient. There is just one point, where you have to dispose with officials in any union I would hold that the governing body or some body in the county should get the right to borrow money under the same principle as the Land Purchase Act or give them a gratuity, a lump sum, and it would come lighter on the county.

24801. You would give them their choice—you would not propose to touch any of those officials who had given long service or short service, as the case might be, you would not be disposed to disturb them without a generous provision, and you would give them a choice of either an annuity or a lump sum—nearly everyone would take the lump sum?—Yes; if I got the money at 3l per cent. on the same terms as given at present under the Land Purchase Act, and I think that would be the cause of immediate relief to the present generation.

24802. It would be a great relief to the succeeding?—Yes.

24803. And you would not haggle, owing to the great benefit ultimately to be recovered, with the officials—you would give them a reasonably fair remuneration?—Yes.

24804. Dr. Brown.—In the case of an auxiliary asylum would you have it as part of the parent institution, so that patients could be transferred from one to the other?—Yes, and the one superintendent could visit it.

24805. Yes, but still you would require a Resident Superintendent. Have they a Resident Superintendent in Youghal?—They have a Visiting Physician; I think the same thing would work with us here.

24806. With 300 inmates—that is a very large number?—There is another point, one, where we take away the workhouse out of the district and leave a distance of ten or fifteen miles; it would be strongly in favour of having a district nurse.

24807. CHANCEMAN.—In connection with the dispensary doctor?—Yes, and that would help to meet a great deal of the difficulties, and it would be a thing that would be absolutely essential in my opinion.

Mr. DANIEL O'LEAGHAN, Chairman, Ballyvaughan Union, examined.

24808. CHANCEMAN.—You live in the Lisdowry Union?—Yes.

24809. There was one question I said we would defer until you came up—that is the question of what you thought about the Ballyvaughan Union being continued?—It is the sense of the Board there that it should be amalgamated, but they did not state whether Ballyvaughan itself should go, or have another union amalgamated with it.

24810. Would they prefer to swallow the adjacent union or be swallowed themselves?—They did not define their position in that respect, but I think the sense of the Board is that Ballyvaughan should go.

24811. It is on the sea coast, and has only one side of the country behind it?—Yes.

24812. How far is it from Ballyvaughan town to Ennistymon?—Fourteen Irish miles.

24813. You personally don't see any reason why the Ballyvaughan Union should not be broken up?—Personally I was opposed to it.

24814. What was your personal opinion?—That it would not lead to increased economy; of course it would as far as the establishment charges were concerned, but then if we take into consideration the compensation to existing officers and the incidence of taxation which will follow from going to Ennistymon or any other union, and the expense of transit, I don't think it would be a material advantage to the rates.

24815. Mr. MURPHY.—The compensation of officers would be an expiring charge?—It does not so much apply to us because we have employed two or three of our officers on the ground that they would not be entitled to compensation if amalgamation followed.

24816. CHANCEMAN.—That was prudent, but would you stick to it?—That would be a matter for the

Nov. 20, 1904
Mr. P. J.
Hogan.

Mr. Daniel
O'Leaghan

Nov. 20, 1904

Mr Daniel
O'Leahy.

Board to consider; we would be acting within our rights, but I don't think we would adhere to it strictly.

24812. They have no legal right at present, but if you were going to carry a big scheme for amalgamation do you think it would be a wise thing to do it on harsh personal grounds where a very small amount was involved?—I would not be in favour of inflicting hardship on any individual in carrying it out.

24813. It would be a hardship on a man who had got an office, and for whom it would be rather late in life to start elsewhere?—It would, if they were a long time in office.

24814. Even a few years?—I agree with you, it would be a hardship.

24815. Mr. MURPHY.—A good deal of money could be saved in fuel and cost of maintaining the building?—I assume the building would have to be maintained in any case.

24816. CHAIRMAN.—What would you do with the building?—I have gone into the matter carefully. I consider Ballyvaughan could be used as a technical school for fishery purposes, being on the sea-coast.

24817. Mr. MURPHY.—That would not be under the Poor Law?—It would not.

24818. We are dealing with the Poor Law and how to effect economy?—In the event of its not being available for such a purpose I thought of a sanatorium for consumptives, which is a disease of recognized danger to the public now.

24819. CHAIRMAN.—How could you have a fishery school at Ballyvaughan?—You could; it is just convenient to the sea.

24820. The water is a good deal away from it often?—The workhouse is within a few hundred yards of the sea.

24821. You are not aware of any fishing school now doing any useful work?—Except Baltimore.

24822. It is an ordinary industrial school. The way fishery instruction is now given is by putting a trained hand on a boat to teach it on the water—it is not dry land teaching now?—That is the way it should be taught. Then if you convert it into a hospital for consumptives—

24823. It is not a very airy situation for that?—It is a dry place. However, I think the dryness is not very essential now; the colder the climate the better they like it.

24824. If no useful purpose could be got for that institution, you would not think of selling it for what it would fetch to the highest bidder and letting it go?—I think you would get nothing for it.

24825. Supposing you got next to nothing, might it not be the cheapest way out of it?—You would have to retain a portion of the hospital in any case.

24826. If a great portion of that is not much used it might not be a sensible thing to spend money on it in repairing and painting?—No; it would cost £250 a year to keep it up.

24827. We had one witness who advocated that these buildings should be sold for stones to be used on the roads or in other buildings as long as they would last?—I would be very sorry to see a building destroyed for the sake of material; unfortunately, we have plenty of stones in Ballyvaughan; we could give building material to the whole of Ireland.

24828. It is built of limestone?—I suppose the men who bring out turf would be glad to have the limestone some handy blocks?—They don't take it for any purpose.

24829. You heard the evidence given by Mr. Higgins at great length on different points—was there any matter that he referred to on which you held somewhat different opinions, or which you would like to amplify?—There was one point, the electoral division change; I think the only effect it would have would be it would lead to less out-door relief being given. Out-door relief is the only thing I am alarmed lately; there is a greater tendency and Guardians are more generous in giving out-door relief when it is not chargeable to any particular locality.

24830. You would like to make it a divisional charge?—I don't think it will ever go back to that again, but for out-door relief I would.

24831. Would you prefer it if it could be done for all purposes?—Oh, certainly; if it could be done, but it is useless to expect that now.

24832. About the auxiliary asylum?—My view was that Corcfin was the most suitable for the purpose, being in the centre of the county, and it is convenient of access from all parts. The only drawback is the fencing; it is not suitable at present.

24840. You know the Tulla Workhouse?—Not well.

24841. There is a fine wall there?—And in going through the figures I find that we have at present in the county 176 insane cases to March, 1903.

24842. More, I think?—We have ninety-four idiots who may be classed as insane.

24843. We would class any mental cases?—That would bring the number to 280 altogether.

24844. I heard at the asylum yesterday there were about 260 in the workhouse?—Those are principally confined between two or three districts, Ennis, Kilmuckish, and Tulla.

24845. And Ennistymon?—It has 48; I think the number has increased lately; in Ennis there are 73, which includes 72 in the asylum; in Kilmuckish there are 47, and 19 idiots.

24846. There are more there now, 100. As regards the children, have you thought what would be the best way for them, boarding out or institution?—The boarding-out system would be preferable to any institution. If you had a properly superintended boarding-out system the children would be ultimately absorbed into the general population of the district, whereas if you bring them up in the institution you will have to be seeking employment for them hereafter. Of course the boarding-out system under the present law cannot reach the whole of the inmates in any institution.

24847. No; I should have asked that question of Mr. Higgins. Would you be in favour of an amendment of the law that would enable the Guardians to board out any child that comes to be supported on the rates?—Yes, that is a great weakness in the law at present; it is most injurious that a bad parent should have the control of a child as the law at present enables them.

24848. If the Guardians were given that power, do you think that they or somebody should also have the power to detain the parents of the children that were so often taken from them, not to let them go off uncontrolled?—There should be some means of controlling them after or it would force them of their responsibility; that is the only drawback I notice in relation to that change.

24849. As regards tramps—have you many of them in your part of the country?—We have, unfortunately; I find that in looking over the average number of days in the Ballyvaughan Union, with which I am connected as Chairman, the average number of days for 1903 was only 42, which would lead me to infer, but of course, there is no data to work on, that 88 out of every 100 relieved were tramps. You have the numbers in the Poor Law reports for each year, but they are given in bulk, and the average is about 4,000 a day all over Ireland. In the Corcfin Workhouse the figures are, if anything, worse. The average number of days there are only 25, which clearly proves that 86 per cent. of those relieved are tramps.

24850. Ennis is the worst of all?—It is not in proportion; the average number of days in Ennis is 37.

24851. 1,010 is the annual number of days?—Get look at the use of the money, you must take it into account. Ballyvaughan and Corcfin are simply kept open for tramps.

24852. The chief tramp route is through Gort and Corcfin to Ennis?—The coast line evidently suits them when they go to Ballyvaughan.

24853. You are much smaller at Ballyvaughan and Ennistymon, and much smaller at Kilmuckish and Killybeggs?—There were 537 tramps relieved last year in Ballyvaughan.

24854. The main tramp route, except during the Lendormans season, by Corcfin and Ennis?—They don't pass so much lately through Lendormans; we take them up and prosecute them there.

24855. Would you be in favour of a scheme of arresting all those people who have not visible means of support, and putting them into a labour colony?—There is ample power already, not for the creation of a colony, but for dealing with vagrants.

24856. That is only for forty-eight hours' imprisonment, but for locking them up for months or years?—There should be something like that done when there are 4,000 people living on the country annually that way. I wish to point out the relative position of Ballyvaughan and other unions as far as expense is concerned. In Ballyvaughan the maintenance and clothing charges for inmates come to 3s. 5½d. a week; Corcfin comes to 4s. 6d.; Killybeggs, St. When you

Nov 30, 1904.
Mr. Daniel
O'Leahy.

comes then to the question of the general charge of inmates, taking establishment charges and all into account. I find Ballyvaughan is £19 each per annum, Corofin £21, Ennis £16 17s., Keshmystown £18, and Killybegs £23 each.

24567. Mr. MURKINAGHAN.—That is due to the small number in the house?—Yes, and the high establishment charges. Well, our cost is the lowest for maintenance; we have the lowest contract system, I think, in Ireland for milk, bread, and clothing, but still our expenses are high. Our contract for milk was as low as 5½d. and 3½d.

24568. That ought to show that it would be an economy to get the houses closed whenever you could?—It would, of course; that is the reason the Guardians have gone for that. There are three of the principal houses that can be spared, Ballyvaughan, Corofin, and Killybegs.

24569. You think these workhouses would be done without in the county?—I am sure they could; there are very few local institutions each year.

24570. Would you favour an auxiliary system in place of enlarging the parent asylum?—I would of course; it would cost less.

24571. You think the inmates could be maintained at a lower rate?—At little more than half the cost; the average cost in Youghal is about £13 each.

24572. CHAIRMAN.—Are you sure of that?—We have it from the figures of the Poor Law Conference report.

24573. Dr. BROWNE.—Do you mean the estimated figures?—The actual cost.

24574. CHAIRMAN.—The average cost under the auxiliary?—Yes.

24575. It has not been opened a year yet, has it?—Over a year.

24576. Dr. BROWNE.—It has not been admitted at all yet?—The figures are taken from the accounts.

24577. CHAIRMAN.—I think you may take it we have not got accurate information; we hope to get it when we visit Cork, but I think you may take it that the figures have not been ascertained yet?—They have given all their figures in the report.

24578. Mr. MURKINAGHAN.—Still it is true it does not cost anything like as much as the ordinary asylum?—The idea of calculating on the capitation grant is foolish; if we got 2s. where the expense is £13 it means more than if we got 4s. where the expense is £21.

24579. Dr. BROWNE.—Of course it is for a different class of inmates, and that class in the larger parent institution would be at a lower average than the acute cases?—They would not; there would be a general average there.

24580. Yes, but still at the same time they would reduce the general average cost there if so many of that class were put in it?

24581. CHAIRMAN.—The more you have the cheaper the rate per head?—It would tend that way certainly, but, on the other hand, if you increase the number you increase the staff.

24582. Dr. BROWNE.—If you take a class out of the asylum and put them into a separate establishment you would run up the average cost for the acute cases in the asylum—that would be no saving on the whole. If that class are kept cheaper in the parent institution and practically at the same rate in the auxiliary asylum?—We have not many classes as harmless as present in the asylum.

24583. But there are a great many inmates in the system of the same class as are kept in the workhouses in Clare. Your asylum is so crowded that if there is an admission there they must send one of their harmless lunatics to the workhouse of the district from which the patient came?—It would decrease the general average, of course, in the asylum.

24584. Mr. MURKINAGHAN.—Apart from the question of cost, don't you think it would be well to have a certain amount of classification in the asylum—that is to say the people who are harmless—that they should not be kept along with the noisy and turbulent class?—I think so; it would lead to improvement scenes.

24585. Then there is another class that is only occasionally dangerous—having for weeks loud intervals. Don't you think it would be well if there was some kind of separation for that class?—I am sure it would.

24586. That could not be done in the parent institution, because there is not space, but if there was an auxiliary for the mildest cases, the principal institu-

tion would be relieved?—You would have much better classification if the numbers were reduced. The object of having harmless lunatics put together is for the sake of cleanliness and attention.

24587. Dr. BROWNE.—If you had them in a large asylum you could give them more work than in the workhouse?—By acquiring ground in connection with the workhouse you could have as much employment. Farm work is all they have to do in the asylum, and you can have that in the workhouse too.

24588. CHAIRMAN.—And if you had the compulsory powers you could have more land?—Certainly.

24589. Dr. BROWNE.—You would have a separate establishment to keep up in the auxiliary, coat, laundry and fire, that you would not require in a central institution?—You would require the whole of them except that the cooking apparatus would not be required. We have a complete institution nearly; you are obliged to get a nurse for every ten or twenty patients.

24590. A certain staff, but not in the same proportion for your increase. For instance, if you put 300 or 350 more inmates in your present asylum, provided you had accommodation for them, you would not require extra attendants, an extra cook, or, perhaps, an extra matron?—No, you would not.

24591. These are establishment charges that you would not require to duplicate if you had a separate institution?—We would have applications for increased pay from all the officials if we increased their work.

24592. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think it is reasonable when you have a man's whole time to receive an application from him for an increase of pay?—We have the whole time as it is.

24593. Do you think it reasonable that he should be coming to you for every little increase in work?—I do not think it is fair to do so, but it is the tendency.

24594. Do you think it would be a good thing to make it understood that salaries, fixing them at whatever was right, that the salaries should be for all the duties that a man would be called upon to discharge?—I think so; his pension is based on the fact that his whole time is given to the ratepayers.

24595. In most branches of the public service, whether Civil Service, Military, or Naval, Police, Marine, or Customs, a man is called upon to give all his time, no matter how much duties new Acts of Parliament have imposed, he has to help in administering that without increased pay?—I am aware of that.

24596. Mr. MURKINAGHAN.—You think the same ought to apply in the public service locally?—I think it should, but I would not put an old official on a level with a newly-appointed man.

24597. CHAIRMAN.—You would like to have a fair salary, and then let a man give his whole time?—Yes; I would have a periodical increase up to a certain point.

24598. Dr. BROWNE.—That is a maximum and a minimum?—Yes. I would wish no alteration made in the County Infirmary, for we find it one of the most useful institutions for all parts of the county. I would be for extending the scope of that institution.

24599. CHAIRMAN.—At present you make a grant from the County Council to the Infirmary?—£1,400.

24600. How much does Ballyvaughan Infirmary get from the rate, the Workhouse Infirmary. I suppose it is as much as they spend?—We get a grant from the rate.

24601. Is it not for what expenditure is necessary?—Yes.

24602. Do you see any reason why the County Infirmary should not be put on the same basis as an ordinary hospital in treating the sick?—I do not; I think we should have power to contribute what is needed. I consider it the most useful institution in Clare at present. You could not think of bringing any local hospital up to the efficiency of the County Infirmary.

24603. You would have the local hospitals in touch with it so that without sending to Cork or Dublin you could get a nurse from them when required?—Yes.

24604. Would it not be an economical thing for the county to keep their head staff of nurses there, to have one nurse for each hospital, and if any extra nurse was required to send to the County Infirmary for it?—

Nov. 26, 1904. I think it is a great drawback that we cannot employ them; we have to pay them fully, and the recompense is not given us.

Mr. Daniel O'Loughlin.

24025. Dr. Broome.—What are the points you wanted to bring before the Commission?—I did not know whether you wished to go into statistics or not about the numbers of patients. I took the statistics from 1898 to 1903 inclusive. Our average number of intern patients during those years was 600. In 1901 we had 215 operations; that is major and minor; in 1902 we had 242 operations; in 1903 we had 191; in recent years we have increased the numbers of operations, having more facilities for the purpose, and also increased our nursing staff. All our nurses are trained purely and simply by ourselves under the supervision of myself and the trained matron we have. We have no nurse, and had not for years who has been trained elsewhere. At present we have ten nurses on our staff, but in 1896 we had two nurses and three probationers in addition to the matron. In 1897 we had the same number; in 1899 we had one nurse under pay and six probationers who were not under pay. In 1900 we had three paid nurses and a staff nurse, two assistant nurses, and five probationers. At present we have ten, that includes the district nurse; she is for the district of Kesh; the remainder in the infirmary, and the District Nursing Association pays so much to the infirmary governors for her board and lodgings.

24026. Dr. Broome.—Does she do any work inside the infirmary?—She does when not engaged in the district work.

24027. She then does relief work?—Yes, but that is not compulsory.

24028. Chairman.—Is she a highly qualified nurse?—She is qualified with us.

24029. Dr. Broome.—It is the same individual that is always doing the district nursing?—We have the same one when she is appointed until she resigns, but if she was ill we send one of our probationers.

24030. Do they send a probationer with her to let her see and increase her home training?—We do, and besides that our probationers have during the last three years taken on holiday duty in various English hospitals and district nursing work; that is to give them experience; they take their holidays practically as relief in some of these other hospitals.

24031. Dr. Broome.—You find that useful, too; it broadens their ideas?—Yes, and gives them additional experience. Recently we had a difficulty about those who were applying to become probationers; it has become rather popular, and some who were going up were unavailable; it was almost impossible to train them as nurses, not through any fault of their own, but want of education; but there has been a small literary examination required, and the Governors too have charged a small fee, 65 for the first year's training.

24032. Chairman.—To cover the cost of the uniform?—Exactly. As far as our expenses are concerned they have increased in recent years; that is due to two or three causes, first and foremost the improved feeding. You cannot feed people now, and they would not be satisfied, with the food they had twenty years ago. Most of the contract prices, in spite of the effects of the Committee, have risen in recent years; then again you have increased expenses in the way of surgical dressings. We do an enormous amount of external surgical dressings at the infirmary, that is locally.

24033. That is a heavy item?—It is, and it is very difficult to calculate that in our average expenses as far as the intern patients are concerned.

24034. Dr. Broome.—You cannot separate it from your intern expenditure?—No.

24035. Is your income too limited for your requirements?—It is in ways; we have in recent years been rather inclined to go beyond our income; at present the County Council give us the legal maximum, 21,400 a year.

24036. You would have local hospitals, so that they could either send, as a matter of course, cases to be operated on, or if the patient could not be removed, perhaps the County Infirmary doctor could operate in the locality if arrangements could be made?—That would be a county arrangement.

24037. In that way remote parts of the county would get the benefit of the County Infirmary?—Oh, certainly; it would be a great convenience.

Dr. GEORGE FAIRIS, Surgeon, Co. Clare Infirmary, examined.

24038. What other income have you?—There are about seven annual governors, and three guineas each paying patient, that comes to, roughly, over £100 a year. We have been sending out from time to time some of our nurses to private cases; that brings in an income of £30 or £40 a year.

24039. Dr. Broome.—Is that capable of much increase?—It is if we had a staff.

24040. Do you often have applications for nurses when you cannot supply them?—We have. It depends a good deal on an epidemic.

24041. In ordinary years do you sometimes have to refuse?—We have; there is hardly a year, or perhaps a month, that we have not to refuse.

24042. Do you often supply nurses for relief work in unions?—We have just had two at present that have been out, one at Ballyvaughan and another at Scarf.

24043. Is the custom increasing of sending to you for them?—It is.

24044. Do you often have to refuse unions?—Not often; the Governors make it a rule that you shall not refuse any union that comes to you, and if we are very much pressed, either by heavy surgical or medical cases where we must have special day and night nurses, we are limited then.

24045. You have heard the chairman's suggestion to the last witness about modifying the system in the county, making small cottage hospitals through the county in connection with the County Infirmary in the way of interchanging the nurses. What do you think of that?—I don't think it would be a bad idea at all.

24046. Do you think it would be very useful both for the outpatients and for the infirmary?—Yes.

24047. It would save the outpatients considerable expense in sending long distances to Dublin for a nurse?—Or Cork or Limerick. That means a good deal of expense, and costs a guinea or a guinea and a half for a nurse.

24048. At a guinea a week is the usual charge, and in a mental case a guinea and a half?—Yes.

24049. And sometimes in infectious cases one and a half guineas?—Yes.

24050. That would come to your infirmary, and therefore the county would get the benefit of that instead of giving it to a far away institution?—Exactly. But in order to do that we would require an increased staff of nurses.

24051. We are taking it that you would have a staff in proportion to your requirements?—Exactly.

24052. Chairman.—The point of view is that there are so many nurses at present in the county that the number is probably in excess of the requirements; if a systematized arrangement was made, if Kesh Infirmary was made the headquarters of the county, you would have one nurse in each local hospital, or whatever the necessary number would be, and if an addition was necessary owing to an epidemic or any sickness coming they would telegraph to you and you would send them one of yours, so that, possibly, a smaller staff of nurses might answer the purpose for the whole county?—Yes, I understand quite.

Dr. Broome.—And it might come that these districts would not pay for them because they would be paid by the county?

24053. Mr. MEMMOGHOON.—Might it not work the other way, and be keeping up a staff of nurses that would not be necessary for the local hospitals?—They might be.

24054. And would it not also interfere with the local management of Boards of Guardians, because they would be very touchy on that point?—That is the difficulty, going from one Board to another. Our Board is altogether distinct from the Board of Guardians—our Board consists of twenty-two members.

Nov. 20, 1904.
Dr. George
Harris.

24026. CHAIRMAN.—I don't quite see what you mean; if you had a staff of nurses who could be employed available for the sick that are kept up by the rate-payers of the country, and if you can get that at a cheaper rate by a systematic arrangement, I don't see how the Guardians would feel anything but grateful if they had to pay less for the nursing.—No doubt, but they would be under two sets of masters.

24027. No; the moment they would arrive at the local hospital they would be absolutely under the orders of the local doctor just as any private case.—I understand.

24028. Dr. BROWN.—You would not be in charge of them until they came back to you.

24029. Mr. MURKHAUS.—Might not localities be paying for these nurses in an institution, and yet not get any service from them? At present the whole county contributes to the infirmary independent of the number of patients or nurses.

24030. Then would not these outlying localities be paying for nurses for Banna, and perhaps they would never send them?—That is being done at present.

24031. CHAIRMAN.—I don't know whether you are aware that in a great many unions, workhouse infirmaries, and fever hospitals, especially fever hospitals, nurses are kept and sometimes not employed for months.—I was not aware of that.

24032. Where you has nothing to do except brush her clothes and go out for a walk, when there are no patients from month to month's end. Under this system that lady instead of enjoying her own time at the local places, would go back to the infirmary and do work for you until she was wanted.

24033. Dr. BROWN.—It was to get a smaller staff for the whole county and keep them practically employed the whole time?—That ought to be a good system.

24034. You would arrange their relief whether you had them in the place or not, and if there was any epidemic or rash on, the leave would be stopped?—Just as we do at present.

24035. Do you think there would be something gained by having the County Infirmary in touch with similar hospitals—that is that larger operations would be sent to you—those that would be able to travel. Of course the cases that could not travel long distances would be admitted to the hospital, and perhaps your services would be requisitioned by telegraph, and you would assist the local doctor in the operation?—That is so; that might be done with cases that could not travel.

24036. Cases that you might as well have at home to do as remove them a long distance—you might save a good many lives in the county that way?—Yes.

24037. Mr. MURKHAUS.—The relieving officer at present has power to call for any help he wants?—Yes, that is in dispensary work.

24038. Dr. BROWN.—But having nurses and doctors and everything more or less in touch they might be more available and to better advantage. The County Infirmary would be brought into closer touch with the small hospitals than at present?—Yes.

24039. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose it is the fact that a great many local dispensary doctors are not encouraged—their hands have got a little out of practice for operations?—Yes.

24040. And the power of the Dispensary relieving officer to call in the nearest medical practitioner might not be the best course adopted; he would not have the practice?—That might happen.

24041. I suppose the number in the profession who are willing to take instruments in their hands and conduct big operations are relatively few?—It is a thing that requires constant practice, and besides, the majority of men in dispensaries, not having a hospital, it rather checks them in that respect, no matter how willing.

24042. They would not like it themselves, but of course if it was a case of life and death they would undertake the operation, but it might not be the best course to adopt for the patient?—Particularly operating on them in their own houses, which is objectionable.

24043. Mr. MURKHAUS.—We have been told in some places that the patients would rather be sent to a large city hospital?—In recent years I cannot say that I have met many such cases. You occasionally meet a patient who will prefer going to a large city, especially in eye cases, but my experience is that a great many people say they prefer to stay near their relatives at home.

24044. CHAIRMAN.—And they have confidence in the infirmary?—I think they have, but independently of that they have a wish to be near their own relatives.

24045. Mr. MURKHAUS.—You must recognise that there are advantages in these large cities for surgical operations in serious cases that to county infirmary could have?—There are so many specialists in cities.

24046. CHAIRMAN.—The local hospital would not be nearly as efficient as yours, and yours would not be as efficient as one of the big hospitals?—That is so; but there is one great advantage we have over cities and that is the pure unadulterated air.

24047. Mr. MURKHAUS.—Don't you think it would be a hard thing for the localities that would take no advantage of the county infirmary to be compelled to pay for the upkeep of such an institution?—That is so; that applies to a great extent at the present time.

24048. But it would be still more accentuated in the suggestion of the Chairman?—Yes; and time after time that matter has been discussed at county-at-large Road Meetings in the old times.

24049. Dr. BROWN.—Would not the system suggested help to minimize that to a large extent—having your nurses available, and in that way having some system whereby a remote place would get some advantage from the county infirmary, more than at present?—The principal difficulty the outlying parishes have had has been the mode of transport.

24050. CHAIRMAN.—The union ambulances at present are not available for the conveyance of patients from localities to your infirmary?—No.

24051. Do you think it would be a good thing if they were?—I do. In a great many instances I think it would be a great advantage to the people themselves if it was available.

24052. Dr. BROWN.—That would be another branch of unifying the system?—Yes; there is the difficulty at present of borrowing the vans.

24053. CHAIRMAN.—Have you ever used one of the ambulances?—Oh, yes, I have.

24054. Mr. MURKHAUS.—Is it the fact or not that the class of patients who go to the county infirmary are rather well off and the class that go to the workhouse are very poor?—That is not altogether so.

24055. Is it largely so?—We would have a great many labourers now, for instance, coming into the infirmary, and their wives and children, and we have a lot of small farmers. I have been rather keeping an account of that, going by the valuations, though that is a very bad criterion. Our committee have made a rule that everyone with a valuation of £10 or over should be asked to contribute something more or less to their support in the infirmary, which money goes towards the general fund.

24056. CHAIRMAN.—You never refuse a person on the ground of poor circumstances?—Oh, dear, no; the main qualification is the disease, whatever it may be.

24057. Dr. BROWN.—And residence?—Residence in the county.

24058. CHAIRMAN.—As a matter of course an excess of people do apply for admission as patients into the infirmary hospital, and to that extent what Mr. Murkhaus says is true?—Honestly speaking, in recent years I find that is true.

24059. Mr. MURKHAUS.—Do you mean within the last five years?—I do.

24060. Since they have got to be popularised?—Since the workhouse hospitals themselves were so much improved.

24061. And the committee of the infirmary broadened it?—I don't know whether that has any effect on it; I thought it was the matter of the workhouse infirmary.

24062. Dr. BROWN.—With a certain amount of modesty you don't like to say it is due to the better reputation of the institution?—I must say the infirmary is improved in the way of accommodation—bedding and nursing.

24063. CHAIRMAN.—You have noticed a great improvement in the Poor Law infirmaries of the country?—Undoubtedly; you would not know them as the same institutions now.

24064. Dr. BROWN.—The people are much more inclined to go into the hospitals than they were ten years ago?—I think the people are beginning to see the real necessity, particularly in surgical cases, of being in a hospital, public or private.

24065. In a small hospital you can do things now that you could not attempt to do fifteen years ago, on account of the principles of surgery being so much better known?—Yes.

24066. Can you give us a suggestion about the treatment of consumption in the county?—I think a regular institution, purely and simply adapted for the treatment of tuberculosis, is needed in the county. It is a thing there is a great deal of in the county.

Nov. 20, 1894

Dr. George
Fenn.

24056. You think it is on the increase?—It is certainly not on the decrease; I have not gone into statistical figures about it.

24057. Have you noticed in your own cases an increase in the way of disease caused by tuberculosis in bones and joints?—An enormous amount of it.

24058. Is that on the increase?—I think it is; there is an immensity of that both in glands and bone.

24059. CHAIRMAN.—Is that somewhat incidental to phthisis?—Exactly; it is the same disease attacking a different part of the body.

24070. Should such cases as that be isolated?—I don't think it is very wise to have tuberculous cases in conjunction with medical or other surgical cases at all.

24071. Dr. Broom.—It is not communicated in the same way, that is, where there is expectoration; when the dressings are burned after they come off the patient you destroy the infection entirely?—Yes.

24072. But do you think a large number of these cases called tuberculous cases in bones and joints are perhaps separate from cases of consumption?—I cannot say that; there is always a tuberculous history.

24073. The reduction of consumption in the country would also tend to reduce the number of surgical cases?—Yes, people are gradually becoming educated to the fact that consumption is infectious.

24074. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think it ought to be a notifiable disease?—I do; at least it would be a great matter if everybody understood that young persons should not sleep in the room with a consumptive patient.

24075. Therefore you would make it notifiable that they should be instructed in that respect?—Yes, and an immense number of cases of consumption are those who have been in America one, two, and three years. They are sent home to their native air, to precisely die at home of consumption.

24076. Do you find your annual grant rather close; do you find any shortness of means for working your hospital?—We do, certainly; it is a matter that the governors are always trying to look into.

24077. Do you think the County Council would possibly, I don't say favourably, but would be disposed to consider, such a suggestion as Mr. O'Loughlin approved of, namely, that the county should pay all the necessary expenditure of the county infirmary and not merely give a grant but go as far as it could be necessary?—I must say, in recent years, that the County Council have given us every facility it could.

24078. Do you think it would be a good thing to give them the power of paying all the necessary expenditure of the infirmary, the same way as the expenditure of the workhouse hospitals are now defrayed out of the rates?—It just depends upon what confidence the County Council will have in the Infirmary Board distributing that money. The majority of them are appointed by the County Council.

24079. Dr. Broom.—In that way they would have charge of the expenditure?—Yes.

24080. CHAIRMAN.—Have you ever shut up portions of your house?—We never have hitherto.

24081. They do, in some counties?—We have not had to do so; we are, at present, a quarter in advance of our expenditure.

24082. Are there any urgently needed improvements and reforms in your infirmary?—Yes, the sanitary part of it.

24083. Is there any power, as the law stands, to carry out those?—There is not. For new building purposes the County Council can only give us one-third of any monies we could raise otherwise.

24084. Do you see any objection to the payment, by the county, of the whole cost of the necessary ex-

penditure made on your hospital?—The whole of the money is expended in the county, and it is all for the benefit of the county.

24085. If you had the county carrying on your hospital in the same way as the Guardians carry on their infirmary, you would be able to have those sanitary improvements, which are very highly desirable, but now you cannot have them. Do you see any reason why the county should not keep up their infirmary in the same way as the Guardians keep up their hospitals, that is, paying all that is necessary?—No; if it is a matter of expense, but I do not see any objection.

24086. Mr. MURPHY.—Do you see this objection?—The county infirmary is for the well-to-do, whereas the workhouse infirmary is for the poor; if the committee were given power to expend more money would not the rates go up?—The committee are all rate-payers themselves.

24087. But they are only a very small number of the ratepayers of Clare?—I know that, but everyone of our Infirmary Board, as far as I can see, are interested in keeping down the expenditure and keeping it within the bounds commensurate with the utility of the institution.

24088. You have made some improvements there of late years; if you were to keep on at the same rate would you not have the institution in fair condition in about ten years?—Oh, yes.

24089. CHAIRMAN.—You could have this average system done?—We could. In order to do the improvements we have done we got up a loan and got £500, and the County Council gave us a third of that—£166; that is how we did the improvements.

24090. Dr. Broom.—You say the district nurse is doing useful work here?—Yes.

24091. And in that way does she often recommend cases to come into the infirmary?—She does not interfere with the doctor in that respect.

24092. A person would come in more readily having a nurse first attending him in the district?—Yes; she works under the different doctors and carries out their orders.

24093. Works on the same principle as a Jubilee nurse?—Yes.

24094. In country districts—remote districts—would you approve of nurses there having medical and surgical training as well as midwifery?—I would; our district nurses does not attend midwifery cases.

24095. But in remote districts, where there are long distances to travel, she might be useful for both purposes, and, at the same time, always available for midwifery?—I think it would be very useful that she should have a universal training.

24096. And her time altogether set apart for the public service?—Yes. Our district nurse does not take remuneration of any kind.

24097. I know, but it is the practice of midwives to attend private cases, and they are rather inclined to want fees for all cases?—It is a pity the two could not be separated. In the infirmary it is very difficult to manage an institution with partly paying patients and partly free; everyone wants to be free, and the only thing we have to go by is the valuations, and I don't think that is a fair way of judging at all. I have known people, with very large valuations, downright poor.

24098. CHAIRMAN.—If you had a discretionary power with the assistance of the governor who knew the patient to fix the sum, and power to recover that at law, that would put you in a better position?—It would, decidedly.

24099. I don't know whether you are aware what Dr. Kidd does at Ennisallen—get people to sign a document when coming in?—So do we; we were forced to do so; people came in and promised to pay, and we had no contract.

Mr. MARTIN CONNORS, Chairman, Ennistymon Union, examined.

Mr. Michael
Condon.

25000. CHAIRMAN.—You are Chairman of the Ennistymon Board of Guardians?—Yes.

25001. What are the views of the Ennistymon Board on the question of amalgamation?—I must say they are in favour of amalgamation.

25002. Are they prepared to suggest any scheme for amalgamation in the county-at-large?—They did not think that matter over.

25003. What is your own view of any scheme that might be possible?—I would not like to offer an opinion about closing other houses.

25004. What is your opinion about your own house? I think, first of all, that the workhouse is not a proper place for lunatics.

25005. You would send them either to the Insane Asylum or an auxiliary asylum?—Yes, where there should be some occupation for them.

25006. Therefore you think some building ought to be set apart, or else an addition made to the existing asylum?—I would suggest that one of the disused workhouses, if any are going to be abolished, should be used for that purpose.

25007. Are there any other classes that you think might be dealt with?—I would say that only those requiring medical aid and nursing should be allowed to be in the infirmary. I think it is a great wrong on the part of the State to have to support people in the infirmary who, in my mind, are not entitled to be there—people who have squandered their means outside.

25008. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you mean in the hospitals of the workhouses?—Yes.

25009. CHAIRMAN.—You would only have persons in there who are really sick?—Who are really sick and require nursing.

25010. Who require treatment by the doctor?—Exactly.

25011. It is your opinion that there are people there who are more or less foolish old people and don't require such nursing?—Yes.

25012. Mr. MURKIN.—What would you do with them?—I would be inclined to have some institutions for them, or else have them boarded out.

25013. Some kind of a central institution?—Something like that.

25014. Board out as many as you could properly, and send the rest to a central institution?—Yes. I think the law relating to convicts should be changed, and, in my mind, any convicting officer should be empowered to refuse a trespass ticket for admission who was under the influence of drink, because I think that should be proof that the man was not destitute, when he had money to buy drink.

THE O'DONNELLIAN BLAKE FORTIN, & C., SHERRILL.

25015. CHAIRMAN.—You are Chairman of the District Council of Ennistymon?—Yes.

25016. Have you any opinion as to what would be a good arrangement to make as regards the Clare workhouse?—I heard our chairman put the question to the Guardians, and they generally, to a man, considered that workhouse would be sufficient for the county, and it is my own private opinion that we had better close them as much as possible, so as to have the young children who are in the workhouse put by themselves in some suitable place, and the imbeciles in another; and they think it will eventually tend to the saving of the ratepayers of the county.

25017. And produce a more efficient administration?—Yes; and a better class of people than are at present there in the workhouse would be produced from that source.

DR. JOHN F. COUGHLIN CHAIRMAN.

25018. CHAIRMAN.—You have been Medical Officer of the Kilrush Workhouse now for some time?—Yes.

25019. And you have had experience of the working of the Poor Law for a very long time?—A very long time.

25020. Your workhouse is broken up into two by the public road going between the hospital part and the able-bodied part?—Yes, the parent house.

25021. I believe there has been a feeling in Kilrush that the hospital part ought to be formed into a district hospital, and entirely cut off from the workhouse connection?—Yes, there is such an idea.

25022. Could you kindly give us your own view or the view of the Guardians as to what might be done to improve the medical and surgical treatment in Kilrush?—The institution itself might be greatly improved by the addition of a water supply.

25023. Taking it from an administrative point of view, would you wish to have it a separate institution?—I think, for the better working of the institution, it would be better.

25024. Would you classify the sick, leaving in the Ballinverne Workhouse the acutely sick?—Yes.

25025. And removing those who required only domestic care and nursing elsewhere?—Yes, to the parent house.

25026. Then you would keep in the Ballinverne building the acutely sick and the fever cases?—Yes.

25027. You think they would be better treated—better looked after?—I think so.

25028. Do you find that the overcrowding of the hospital with chronic sick and acutely sick indi-

25015. CHAIRMAN.—You would send him to the police barracks?—I would. As regards convalescents, I suggest that one of the disused workhouses, if any were abolished, ought to be used as a sanatorium for convalescents. I also think that divisional railing ought to be reverted to.

25016. For all purposes or only outdoor relief?—I think for all purposes, but particularly for outdoor relief, because it is the main cause of the increase that there is in outdoor relief, to my mind. Now in the union to which I belong I will give you a few figures as to how matters were carried out. It is composed of three dispensary districts; the valuation of Broadford is £13,446, of Milltown Malbay, £11,297, and Ennistymon, £15,445; though Broadford dispensary district is the highest in valuation, yet the outdoor relief only amounts to £1 16s. 6d., whereas in Milltown Malbay the outdoor relief amounts to £4 14s., and in Ennistymon it is £5 8s.

25017. Mr. MURKIN.—The principle is an important one, but the amount involved is very small?—It is the principle I am on. The Ennistymon Workhouse was built to accommodate 800 inmates; at present there are only 250 there.

25018. CHAIRMAN.—A good many of them lunatics?—I think fifty-three. We were led to believe you would have sent queries forms to us.

25019. I see you did receive them on 25th of April last, but they may not have been put before you?—We inquired if the forms came, but were told they did not; they may have come.

25022. What about the tramps?—They are an awful grievance; and they go through the country stealing and thieving; going to the workhouse at night for their lodgings; and I think, instead of going to the relieving officers for admission, they ought to be obliged to apply to the police.

25023. Do you think that would be sufficient?—I do not; but it ought to be done at all costs. Gentlemen of your experience can form a better opinion than I can, though I was sixteen years chairman, at the same time of the Ballyvaughan and Ennistymon Unions. Suppose a union is amalgamated, what will become of the District Council?

CHAIRMAN.—We have nothing to do with District Councils.

25024. CHAIRMAN.—You have nothing to do with District Councils. It interferes with the working of the hospital?—It interferes with the treatment of the really acute cases. When you get a number of beds occupied for months with chronic cases, it impedes the working of the hospital and the proper treatment of other cases.

25025. You would have your own staff of nurses better organized. You necessarily perform a great many operations in Kilrush, owing to its great distance from infirmaries and general hospitals?—Yes; it is the centre of a large district.

25026. And operations are necessary there?—Yes; there are frequent operations.

25027. Have you any idea about how many operations you would perform there in the year?—About fifty.

25028. That means a much larger workhouse?—I think than there would be in ordinary workhouses?—I think so. That would be increased very much. Being a workhouse hospital rather interferes with it. You would have more people coming in if it had the name of a district hospital.

25029. Dr. BRIDGES.—Where do those cases go at present?—They go to the county hospital, some of them, I suppose.

25030. They are not done in their own homes?—No; very few operations.

25031. CHAIRMAN.—Perhaps some of them not done at all?—Some not done at all.

25032. Dr. BRIDGES.—Do you think, from your knowledge, that there are many cases that should be operated on in the country that were not operated on?—I know there are.

Nov. 28, 1907.

Mr. Michael
Coady

The
O'Donnell
Blake Fortin,

Dr. John F.
Coughlin.

Nov. 30, 1904.

Dr. John F. Gresham.

25054. By improving the hospital arrangements, you think a number of lives might be saved?—Yes; it would increase very much the utility of the hospital for the district. I got the sister in charge to make out the number of cases in one year. There are 447 new cases.

25045. That is, medical and surgical?—Yes; that is apart from fever cases.

25046. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose half of these would be what you might call the acute cases?—Nearly the whole of them would be.

25047. There would be the ordinary run of chronic cases?—Yes.

25048. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Would your idea be rather to bring up the local hospitals to a high state of efficiency than to depend on the county infirmary?—It would be very inconvenient to depend on the county infirmary. There is a long distance to go, and you would not always get patients to travel that distance.

25049. CHAIRMAN.—You are such a long distance that you must have first-class, or at any rate, second-class, facilities for operations?—You must have it, if only for cases of accidents; you must have adequate means.

25050. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—It has been suggested here to-day that the county should depend largely on the central institution, the county infirmary, for surgical operations. Would your idea be that it would be better to improve the local hospitals and let them serve surgically the locality, than to have to depend on a central institution?—Of course, I may be a bit prejudiced, but that is my strong idea.

25051. It looks, from a layman's point of view, a better distribution of the benefits?—I did not think the question could be disputed.

25052. Dr. BOSSON.—Are there not a number of large operations that you could not perform in a small hospital; you have not the same sterilising apparatus?—I think we have the same means of sterilising as in other hospitals.

25053. What means have you?—Sterilising machinery supplied by the Local Government Board. It is enough to sterilise the instruments and dressings.

25054. CHAIRMAN.—You would like them better, at all events?—Yes.

25055. Dr. BOSSON.—Is there not room for both institutions? A large, central one must do a great deal of useful work, and not interfere with the local ones; and the local ones could do a great deal of the necessary surgical cases that must arise in a district, and smaller operations. We are not speaking of any particular hospital, but generally. It often happens that the doctor in the locality does not want to operate; he has not time; his reputation is not depending altogether on operations; he has to attend to medicine, midwifery, and mixed practice; he cannot have the same knowledge or experience?—That may apply to a small hospital, but Killybeg is a large hospital.

25056. I know it is, but the number of operations?—fifty in the year—is small, as compared with the county infirmary.

Mr. MURKAGHAN.—It is a fourth of the operations performed in the County Infirmary of Clare?—Yes; they are a great centre, of course.

25057. CHAIRMAN.—You would certainly like to have county and one workhouse perform one-fourth of the operations done in the county infirmary?—Yes.

25058. CHAIRMAN.—You would certainly like to have your hospital made more efficient. You have an unusual number of operations there for a workhouse infirmary; that is very largely due to your remoteness, and to the taste of the surgeon in charge, who is willing, and likes to perform the operations. You are, I presume, aware that in a great many union infirmaries the doctor in charge does not care to operate much?—He has not always the assistance; but there are a great number of cases that will not go to the county infirmary.

25059. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Don't you think it would be better to give the local hospitals the assistance they would require, instead of centralising all the benefits in one place that to many is inaccessible?—That is my idea.

25060. Dr. BOSSON.—You are speaking of Killybeg. In other districts, where there is only one doctor available, assistance could not be had conveniently for giving chloroform?—The ordinary dispensary doctors are available.

25061. You are fortunately situated in Killybeg to have assistance at hand?—Yes. Of course, Killybeg is rather singular in that. There are always a couple of doctors there.

25062. About the treatment of consumptives in the district?—I think there ought to be some better arrangements made for the treatment of consumptives.

25063. Is it on the increase?—I think it is. I think cases of tuberculosis are more or less on the increase in the district.

25064. Can you call to mind any cases where you have known the disease to be spread from a previous case in the house?—Oh, yes, I can.

25065. As far as you know, is it a common occurrence?—I know some cases myself. I should say it is not an unusual thing.

25066. That is partly through ignorance and partly because there is not sufficient accommodation to isolate the patient?—It is a very common thing, where the members of a family are huddled together in a small house, some sleeping in the same bed with the patient, for them to contract the disease.

25067. You have found other members of the family to contract the disease?—Oh, certainly. I know cases of where a husband has contracted it from a wife, where there was no history of consumption in the husband's family. The wife had been suffering from the disease, and the husband took it.

25068. Have you known of the children affected in the same way?—I do. I know of a whole family decimated by the spread of the disease.

25069. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Would you be a good situation for a sanatorium of the kind?—That is a matter for consideration, but there ought to be some central place for treatment. Either that, or some facilities for treatment than in district hospitals. Up to lately they were treated in the same ward with other patients.

25070. Dr. BOSSON.—Have you ever known it to spread in a workhouse in that way?—I cannot say I have known it to spread; but I know cases under treatment in the ward had been injured by the presence of consumptive patients.

25071. CHAIRMAN.—It is liable to spread?—Oh, yes. At present there is some attempt made to isolate consumptive patients, but it is a poor attempt.

25072. At Killybeg, you would really require buildings to do it properly?—Yes.

25073. Dr. BOSSON.—Even if you had that, it would only be for the purpose of isolation, more than cure?—If there was some kind of hospital for the case of consumption, it would be an immense benefit.

25074. CHAIRMAN.—It would be cheaper to do it by a central institution for the county, or group of counties?—It may or may not; it would take some time to consider.

25075. If you had to build consumptive additions to the existing hospitals it would mean a great deal of money?—It would mean something in each hospital. In our hospital it would be easy to convert or raise some place that would be very effective in the treatment of consumption; but whatever arrangements, there ought to be some arrangement for dealing with the disease. A great many people who show symptoms of consumption would, if there was an institution like that, go into it at once; they would not wait until the stage when it would be inoperable.

25076. Are they getting alive to the fact that it ought to be dealt with earlier?—Yes; that it is curable.

25077. Dr. BOSSON.—Of course, you have considered that a great deal of benefit would be derived from an educational point of view; a person going in would see how to prevent the spread of the disease, the usefulness of fresh air, and open windows, and sanitation, and would be able to carry on the same treatment after a few months in their own homes?—No doubt, it would be of the utmost benefit.

25078. CHAIRMAN.—You have a very large number of lunatics in Killybeg?—Very large.

25079. A great many of them are hardly to be distinguished from the ordinary lunatics in the asylums—turbulent and excitable?—Yes, and liable to fits of mania.

25080. You have to wait until they commit an offence to send them to the asylums?—When they really become unmanageable, or do something that requires special attention, you have to apply to the asylum, and get an order and send them over.

25081. You don't get a commitment?—We do, sometimes, when the delay would be dangerous.

25022. What do you think ought to be done about the lunatics?—I think they ought to be in a separate institution—the lunatic asylum or an auxiliary.

25023. Have you any opinion as to which would be the better?—It would be a matter of expense.

25024. If the arrangements were humane and proper in the auxiliary?—As a matter of opinion, I think they ought to be in a regular institution.

25025. Mr. McMAHON.—But if they could be kept at a less expense in the auxiliary, would you see any objection to it?—I would see no objection to it, because the lunatics sent to the auxiliary could be controlled, and treated far better than in the workhouse. At present they are in a deplorable condition. The children ought, I think, to be taken from workhouses.

25026. Have you any experience of the boarding out of children?—We have some.

25027. You are aware of the very long trial that system has had in the Limerick Union?—I don't know anything about it in Limerick. I know we have had

some cases in our union, where it has been very satisfactory.

25028. You would like to see the lunatics and children removed from workhouse?—I would.

25029. And the sick classified, so that the acute cases could be put in hospital and the chronic under domestic care?—Yes; but the domestic care should not be a nominal care, but a real one.

25030. You would have visitors in charge?—I would have visitors in charge. I think they require very nearly as much care as the really acute cases, some of them even more. The average age of the old people in our union would be over seventy years of age; some of them great age.

25031. What would you say about the mothers of illegitimate children?—I don't know, unless you send them to some asylum. Would you separate the children from the mothers?

25032. CHAIRMAN.—Have you thought it out?—I have not.

Nov. 25, 1904.

Dr. John F. Canavan.

Mr. MICHAEL MEEHAN, P.T.C., examined.

25033. CHAIRMAN.—You were Chairman of the Kilrush Union?—Yes, for eleven years, to 1901; and Chairman of the District Council to June, 1903.

25034. What is the opinion of your Board of Guardians on the question of amalgamation of unions?—Our Board considered the question of the amalgamation of their own union; the Guardians are not in favour of amalgamation with any other union.

25035. Not with Killybeg or Ennistymon?—Well, no. The question was put before a meeting of the Board of Guardians, and they decided that they were not in favour of amalgamation with any other union.

25036. Did they express any opinion beyond that they would be willing to cut off their hospital and make it a district hospital, as suggested by Dr. Canavan?—I don't understand your question.

25037. Dr. Canavan thought that the acutely sick might be kept at Ballyva, and no person should be admitted to that side of the house except the acutely sick and the fever patients?—I agree with that.

25038. Then the people who are the chronic sick, with not very much the matter with them, except old age and infirmity, that they should be allowed to go to the other institution?—Oh, I thoroughly agree with Dr. Canavan there, and I believe it is a practice already carried out there.

25039. Not quite, I think. As regards the insane,

would you think they ought to be sent away to the lunatic asylum?—Decidedly.

25040. As regards the children, are you in favour of the boarding out system?—Yes.

25041. Would you be in favour of an extension of the Guardians' powers to enable them to board out all children that have to be supported out of the rates?—Well, if practicable, I would, because we have some little experience of the boarding-out system in our union.

25042. And they turn out well?—Very well.

25043. And you like to extend that as far as you could?—Yes.

25044. Now, as regards tramps—you have not very many of them in Kilrush; you are off the line of tramps?—We have a fair number.

25045. What would you do with them—would you recommend any new legislation?—I would suggest that new legislation be enacted regarding the tramp system. That they would be taken up, and sent to some institution, where they would be more useful to the community than tramping about at the expense of the ratepayers of the country.

25046. They should be made work for their support?—Exactly.

25047. And, if possible, they should be taught habits of industry that would enable them to work when they got out again?—Yes.

Mr. Michael Meehan.

Mr. EDWARD O'LOUGHLIN, Vice-Chairman, Ballyvaughan Union, examined.

25048. CHAIRMAN.—You are one of the Board of Guardians?—Yes. Vice-Chairman of Ballyvaughan.

25049. What is the view of your Board of Guardians on the question of amalgamation?—We carried amalgamation by a majority at the Board.

25050. Were you in the majority or minority?—I was in the majority.

25051. Do you think it would be a good thing if you could lower the rates by joining some place else?—If I could find that out.

25052. We would not like to recommend it unless we saw an economy?—I think we would only suffer by it, because we are one of the lowest-rated unions in Clare, or Ireland.

25053. But you are in favour of amalgamation?—I would, if it could be shown it was a saving to the ratepayers.

25054. What would you do with your workhouse, if it was closed?—There should be part of it a hospital. We are twenty-four miles from Galway, twenty from Gort, and fifteen from Corofin. I think Ballyvaughan is carrying on well as it is, if it could not be shown to us that we would gain by it.

25055. I think you are really against amalgamation?—People rush at these things first, and don't consider them properly. It is a long time since that resolution was passed in Ballyvaughan, the 4th, I believe; but now that we are coming to learn more than we did—

25056. You are a little bit cautious?—I would be cautious. We are a low-rated union, and do very well as we are; and it would be a good thing to let very well alone.

25057. Now, as regards the boarding out of children—have you any experience of that?—I would be against it in Ballyvaughan. The population is small.

25058. Have you many children in the house?—I am not exactly sure.

Mr. Cowan (Clark).—Twenty-one.

25059. Are there any changes you think might be made in the law as regards Poor Law relief if the unions were kept on?—Well, I don't think there are.

25060. Would you leave the union-at-large rating as it is?—I would. I would extend the area.

25061. To the county?—Yes; and get some on Corofin.

25062. You would not like the rating to be county-at-large?—No, but union rating.

25063. You would not go for county-at-large rating?—No; I don't want to risk myself.

25064. What would you do as regards tramps?—If they got something to do just, they might not be coming as often as they are.

25065. Something to make it less comfortable for them?—Just so.

25066. You would not go beyond that?—I would not go beyond that.

Mr. Edward O'Loughlin.

Nov. 30, 1901.

Mr. Michael Garry.

25127. CHAIRMAN.—You are the Vice-Chairman of the Killybeg District Council?—Yes.

25128. What is the view of your union?—They are against amalgamation—unanimously against it. Their first reason is that they don't want to be amalgamated with unions with far higher rating than theirs.

25129. Your average cost is said to be highest?—That is a mistake; the general average cost is 3s. 7d.

Mr. MICHAEL GARRY examined.

25130. That would be only for food and clothing; that would not be under all heads?—I think so.

25131. Mr. MURPHY.—The poundage rate is the second lowest in the county?—Yes.

25132. CHAIRMAN.—You would rather keep things as they are, without any change?—Without any change.

25133. Is there any suggestion you would wish to make about any improvement in the law, or are you in favour of things as they are?—We are quite satisfied.

Mr. PATRICK GARRY, County Councillor, Killybeg, examined.

Mr. Patrick Garry.

I have only to repeat what has been said by the last witness. I endorse his statements.

25134. CHAIRMAN.—You don't want to have any change?—No; we are rated pretty low, and don't want to be tacked on to other districts.

25135. If you found there was a substantial saving, would you be more favourably disposed to any change?—I would, if it could be shown there was a saving.

Mr. PATRICK PUGH, Chairman, Scariff Union, examined.

Mr. Patrick Pugh.

25136. CHAIRMAN.—You are from Scariff. What is their view?—At the last meeting, on the 23rd inst., the unanimous opinion of the Board was for amalgamation.

25137. Do you think how that would best be carried out. You would have some place left for the sick to be treated in?—It is our opinion that it would ultimately contribute towards the relief of the over-taxed ratepayer, making all due arrangements for the destitute poor and sick.

25138. What would you do for the sick; would you have them treated still at Tenraganey?—We would be perfectly satisfied to have them treated there.

25139. Do you think it would be a hardship to move them from the workhouse—to send them off to some distant workhouse?—In the event of the Tulla Workhouse being removed, I would count it a hardship that anyone from that locality should have to come to Ennis or Portlanna.

25140. You think a little hospital ought to be left at the workhouse?—I do.

25141. You have a building at Scariff called the barracks building; would that be sufficient for the sick?—It would, by some means.

25142. And it is cut off from the rest of the workhouse altogether?—It is.

25143. And has some exercise ground attached to it?—It has ample.

25144. If the rest of the workhouse were closed, and the barracks made into a place for the sick, have you any suggestion to make as to what might be done with the existing large workhouse?—In the event of being dissolved—well, no, I don't pretend to be much of a judge.

25145. You did not hear any view expressed by the Guardians on that matter?—It would suit for any purpose—for technical education.

25146. It would be rather big for that?—The fact is, the representatives of the ratepayers did not think there was the slightest danger of its being closed up.

25147. But the Guardians are all in favour of its being closed up?—They were not.

25148. I thought you said they were unanimous in favour of amalgamation?—They were unanimous in favour of amalgamation of some two or three unions; in the judicious opinion of those that would know better, taking into account the geographical situation of the unions.

25149. I thought you said the Guardians were in favour of amalgamation, that is, of closing up their own workhouse?—No.

25150. Then they are in favour of taking in some of the adjoining unions and keeping up their own workhouse?—Well, we have no objection to their taking some of our union from us, and taking our papers.

25151. If you closed the workhouse then what would you do with it?—Technical education, or if anything else turned up. There is a great question as to whether it belongs to Poor Law business—crematoriums.

25152. Does your workhouse land go back to the river?—We have water there from the river. I think we own the land back to the river immediately in connection with the water business. The Board are in favour of disincorporating.

25153. For all purposes or outdoor relief only?—For all purposes, that would be applicable.

25154. You would rather go back to the old law about chargeability?—I fancy it would be best. My colleague, the Chairman of the District Council, and there was not a county in Ireland with as many workhouses as Clare, taking into consideration the size of the county and the distribution of the people; he fell sick and was unable to come.

Mr. PATRICK M'GRATH examined.

Mr. Patrick M'Grath.

25155. CHAIRMAN.—You are one of the members of the Tulla Board?—I am Chairman of the District Council.

25156. Has your Board considered the question of the amalgamation of unions?—They have; we discussed it.

25157. What is your view as regards the keeping up of the Tulla Workhouse?—The view of my Board is to keep it up; they are not for amalgamating with any union.

25158. How did they look at it?—We are the second lowest rated union in Clare, and we have low contract prices for all provisions, and it is in that view they looked at it; they think we could not be better off than we are.

25159. If it were shown to you that a considerable saving would result from a general scheme of amalgamation throughout Ireland, and affect their own rates in Tulla, would you then hold the same opinion?—Well, if it was shown to me that there would be a great reduction in the rates, of course I could not hold my views, but I don't see that there can be a

reduction, because all the officials that are there should be superannuated; that would be a heavy burden on us.

25160. You nearly finished your superannuation there; you superannuated them all nearly?—It was only two.

25161. Are they not nearly all young officers with you now?—They are young ones.

25162. It would not be such a big pull?—Should they not be superannuated?

25163. Personally, if you ask me, I think they should, but they would not have the same rate of superannuation; a man who served for five years would not get as much as a man who served for forty?—Certainly not.

25164. Mr. MURPHY.—Do you give much outdoor relief in Tulla?—Well, indeed we do.

25165. Has it increased much of recent years?—It did increase a little, and it is reducing again.

25166. Owing to what cause?—Owing to the economy of the Guardians—seeing who is in need of it and who is not.

25167. They are giving it more careful inspection?—I think so.

25156. Have you many children in the house?—Well, I believe we have more than a dozen.

25159. Do you board out any at all?—No.

25170. You have never tried it?—No, nor I would not approve of it.

25171. Why?—I think they would be brought up better in the house than by boarding them out.

25172. And why do you think so?—Because the parties that would take them would not think much of them, and perhaps ill-treat them.

25173. But Guardians would not allow them to ill-treat them; the Guardians would take them away at once?—They might be ill-treated before the Guardians were made aware of it.

25174. The neighbours would hear it very soon and report. It is found to work very well in other

unions; you have never tried it in Tufts?—Never tried.

25175. Then you could hardly express an opinion?—Well, I could not.

25176. Have you many tramps there?—We do have a good many occasionally.

25177. What would you do with them?—As far as the needy tramps are concerned I would not be inclined to treat them harshly, but I would like to put some restriction on the able-bodied tramps.

25178. Would you lock them up and make them work for their food?—That would be useless; they would not work. They would not do half the work required of them.

25179. There may be a way in a well-disciplined establishment to make them work?—It would be very good to make them work, certainly; I agree with that.

Nov. 25, 1904.

Mr. Patrick
McGonk.

Mr. JAMES O'DONERTY, Chairman, Tufts Union, examined.

25180. CHAIRMAN.—What is your view on this question; do you agree with the Chairman of the Rural District Council as regards the keeping up of the workhouses?—The Guardians were unanimous in passing a resolution opposed to amalgamation.

25181. Was that because they thought they would have to pay more rates?—Because the neighbouring unions pay higher rates than Tufts.

25182. If a scheme could be made that would result, owing to large changes in the staff, and a decrease in the use of fuel in the different workhouses, if a scheme could be devised by which all the unions would save; would you be in favour of such a scheme if it could be introduced without hardship to the sick?—Very much in favour of it as the county is already overburdened with rates.

25183. The objection is not to amalgamation, but to a change that might increase their rates?—Forcing an increase of rates.

25184. Mr. MURKIN.—You don't want to be joined with a union that pays a higher rate than you pay?—No.

25185. If you were allowed to manage your own union, as you do at present, what would be the need of any increase; you would not be liable to that danger at all?—No, sir.

CHAIRMAN.—How would you carry that out?—Mr. MURKIN.—By doing as at present.

25186. CHAIRMAN.—What are you doing at present, and what will you do in future if you make a great change with a view to economy, and let things remain as they are; how are you going to bring that to pass?—We could not do it.

25187. Mr. MURKIN.—You could do it in this way. The Guardians could pay for the boarding out of their children as they pay for them now in institutions for the blind; they could pay for the harmless lambs, and could carry out the same principle with other classes?—Well, we have no experience of boarding out.

25188. CHAIRMAN.—As regards lambs; do you think they ought to be left in workhouses?—No, sir;

I think their position could be bettered by having them in a house by themselves.

25189. Would you prefer to add to the existing Ennis Lurgan Asylum or to have an auxiliary asylum?—I would prefer to have an auxiliary asylum.

25190. If any scheme were devised by which economy could be effected, and some workhouses closed, including Tufts, do you think Tufts would be a good place to have as an auxiliary asylum?—From what I know of the other unions I think Tufts would be the most suitable one.

25191. You have a good wall round; that would save additional expense?—It would. There would be additional expense.

25192. I don't know if you were here this morning when Mr. Hogan made a suggestion that compulsory power could be given to acquire land?—I would approve of it.

25193. Do you think it would be almost impossible to get additional land at a fair price unless compulsory powers were given?—I am sure it would, because the property round that workhouse is nearly all sold; it was Captain O'Callaghan's property. If the tramps were taken up and put into some place where they would work for their support it would be much better.

25194. Do you see many of these people going about with their children?—That is the unfortunate thing.

25195. Children growing up like their parents leading a vagrant life?—Yes. Mr. Hogan was asked a question about these women who have illegitimate children; I would not agree with what he suggested—to close them up for six or eight years, as the case may be—I would be more in favour of allowing them out after a year or a year and a half.

25196. Trying to reclaim them as quickly as possible?—Yes.

25197. And leaving it to the discretion of the managers of the particular institution in each case how soon it would be safe to let them out?—Yes.

25198. And most of these girls, I understand, feel ashamed of their position after a first fall?—Of course they do. If it occurred a second time I would be for giving her four years.

Mr. James
O'Donerty.

Mr. MICHAEL GUFFY, Chairman, Corrida Union, examined.

25199. CHAIRMAN.—You are the Chairman of the Corrida Board of Guardians?—Yes.

25200. You have a beautiful house there?—It is healthy, well-kept, well-governed, with a good farm of land attached to it. Our doctor is here and will explain it better than I can.

25201. What are your views on the question of amalgamation of unions?—I have had an experience of amalgamation. I go back very nearly sixty years when we were amalgamated, and what was the result.

25202. You were then part of Ennis and Ennistymon?—Yes, and Gort, and I knew the result of it. Our union is sound and healthy and well-kept, and well-governed, and no complaints against any of the officials of it.

25203. Not lately?—Not lately. At one time our union was one of the lowest rated unions in Clare, and we export, very shortly, it will be the lowest.

25204. If a large economy, without any hardship to the sick, could be managed, would you then look more favourably on the idea of amalgamation?—Any union that has too many in it we have room for them.

25205. If the union were broken up, or the workhouse closed as a workhouse, it would be available, owing to the situation and condition, for some other useful purpose?—Certainly. It would be fit to be broken up, for many reasons.

25206. You could use it for an asylum or a sanatorium?—It would be a good idea.

25207. You have not a very large number of inmates there?—They vary from time to time; there are seventy-two in it now.

25208. That is a very small number to keep up a staff for?—There are other times it comes up to eighty. I remember, a few years ago, there were 110, and there are seventy-five cases of outdoor relief, whereas other unions don't give outdoor relief, and then they have more in their workhouses. For many reasons we would not wish it to be amalgamated.

25209. Why would you not like it to be amalgamated?—Because we would wish to have an eye after our poor and see they are well treated. We want them near us to visit them often.

Mr. Michael
Guffy.

Dec. 20, 1904.

Mr. Michael
Griffy.

25210. They would not kill them in Ennis or Ennistymon—I don't know that the Ennis people would, but plague and sickness would kill them. I remember when they were sent to Ennistymon, and Ennis, and Gort, and was not the whole country depopulated in those days.

25211. That was the Famine time!—That was the Famine time. And then there is the little village of Corofin there supporting the union, and it is very natural if there is any custom coming from the union that it should drop into the little village; and if the union is taken away it only drops into a richer village.

25212. If they had two or three hundred in that institution they would be better placed than if they had seventy!—There is room there for 280 to 300.

25213. If they started a big sanatorium or lunatic asylum—I suppose that would lessen the rates on the ratepayer; the whole thing is to reduce the rates.

25214. Do they think more of reducing the rates, or of increasing their own receipts?—Is there not a capitation grant for the lunatic asylum.

25215. As for madhouses and 4s. in the big house!—Any lunatic that is sent to our asylum we get nothing for them; that is not fair play.

25216. You don't do much for them!—There are five or six there at present.

25217. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Do you treat them well there?—They do treat them well.

25218. You have a large number of children in the house?—There is not; there are about twenty.

25219. Is not that a large number for so small a house?—It is.

25220. Could you not do something better for the children—beard them out amongst the farmers?—That would be better I suppose; but that would depend on the foster-parent that takes them out. There are some that would take them out, and we would not give the children to them.

25221. CHAIRMAN.—But you would give them to good ones?—We would, but perhaps the good ones would not be bothered with them.

25222. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—You never tried!—We did not.

Mr. PATRICK CASEY, P.L.C., Corofin, examined.

25223. CHAIRMAN.—You heard our conversation with your chairman; what is your view on the subject?—Of course the Board is not in favour of amalgamation on account of the rates.

25224. If the rates could be reduced!—If we get a separate charge, according to the number of inmates from our district, we are satisfied.

25225. If your rates were reduced you then would not have the same feeling against it?—They cannot possibly be reduced.

25226. If the amount of rates you had to pay was less than at present would you then prefer amalgamation?—Oh, certainly, and I hope it would be converted into something better than itself.

25227. We have seen the place, and it does appear to be a very exceptionally healthy and well-situated workhouse!—It is.

25228. There would be no difficulty about having it converted into an auxiliary asylum or sanatorium?—Well, of course, there would not.

25229. I suppose extra land could hardly be got there without compulsory powers!—To send consumptive patients among fine healthy people like this would be a pity.

25230. That would not do any harm!—It would not do much good; the district would be more or less freed.

25231. You would be afraid of their infecting you?—Yes.

Dr. BOSGRO.—There would not be any risk from the institution.

25232. CHAIRMAN.—These people would be all drilled into how to behave, and there would not be any risk!—It would be a fine healthy place for them, as good as I see anywhere.

25233. As regards children, you have not had any experience of boarding out?—No, but I took some myself on a few occasions, from the workhouse.

25234. Was that hiring out?—Yes.

25235. What ages were they when you took them?—Sixteen years; they were actually useless. I have one now; she is under age; I pay her a little higher.

25236. What inference do you draw from that fact?—That they should be boarded out and made useful at an earlier age. I have one little girl I have a wish for, and I took her out on hire; she is near fifteen years, and she will be very useful in a short time.

25237. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Because you got her young?—Yes; she was only fourteen when I got her out. Some steps should be taken to get them out in time; they are useless; they are not inclined to work; they are not able; their little bones are feeble.

25238. CHAIRMAN.—They soon become handy and useful about the place if taken out young?—They should be taken out at twelve years of age.

25239. I was going to say three years!—Then they would become as useful as country people themselves.

25240. And the people would become attached to them!—So they would. They get accustomed to the business. Now they get so tired of the business that they run back the first chance they get, no matter how well you treat them.

25241. A little experience, such as you have given us, is very valuable!—There should be some steps taken to make the children useful in their after life. Our average rate is high, for we have a high dietary scale. Dr. Macnamara is very kind and we don't begrudge it, and only for the number of tramps fed in the house during the year the rates would not be so much.

25242. They don't cost much?—No; there were 1,100 of them fed in the house last year.

25243. Would you go so far as having a labour place, where they would have to work for their keep?—That suggestion I approve of very much; we are a long time thinking of taking steps to punish them, but we think it is a hard thing.

25244. It is hard to punish an individual, but if the system was changed!—It is very hard to get evidence against them.

25245. But if the case was thrown on these people of showing what means they had for support; if, instead of proving they were rogues and vagabonds, they had to prove that they were good citizens in search of work!—That would be good enough to release poor parties on the road. There ought to be separate charges if Corofin was amalgamated. Before the Act of 1850, when we had separate charges, there were not so many on outdoor relief.

25246. You mean a divisional charge. Would you be in favour of that charge being for all purposes or outdoor relief only?—I would be satisfied in either case.

25247. Would you make a divisional charge for all purposes, or outdoor relief only?—I would sooner have it for all purposes.

Dr. G. U. MACNAMARA examined.

25248. CHAIRMAN.—Tell us what you think of Corofin as a site for some other purpose if the union were broken up as a sanatorium for consumptives, and secondly, as a place for lunatics?—I believe the site is an excellent one for any purpose of the kind.

25249. It is healthy?—Healthy.

25250. And the walls of the building are in good order!—Fairly good order.

25251. For converting it to any other purpose, I suppose, it would require internal reconstruction?—Yes; and I think the number it is reputed to hold would not be exactly correct, if it was turned into a sanatorium.

25252. Would it stretch up to 300?—I think about that.

25253. That is what would be needed. Do you think the place would be fairly suitable for a sanatorium?—Yes, I do; I think it is suitably situated for that purpose.

25254. You would be able to have two blocks, one for curable and one for incurable?—Yes; but I don't think it would be advisable to leave the district without a small local hospital.

25255. How far are you from Ennis?—Seven or eight miles by road. My district runs a good distance

Dr. G. U.
Macnamara.

towards Barron and Kinnarra, and the people over there would be awfully inconvenient.

25256. CHAIRMAN.—That is not in my district, but is adjacent to it. My district runs in the Gort direction for about ten miles, and the people over there would find it very inconvenient if the local hospital in Coochin was done away with.

25257. What townlands have you in your mind in speaking of the ten miles distance?—I have Ballybarna and Bolevan.

25258. How far is that from Gort?—Ballybarna is six or seven miles. Before my time the district I have now, which is continuous with the union, was divided into two, but they joined the two together in my father's time.

25259. The unions were first struck out and then the districts formed out of the union instead of first forming the districts and making the unions out of them?—My district comprises about two miles from Coochin on one side and eight or ten miles on two other sides.

25260. You think, if the workhouse is broken up, it would be desirable to have a small cottage hospital for the acute sick?—Yes; a few beds and an isolation ward or two for infectious cases.

25261. Suppose Coochin were converted into a sanatorium, you would be able to have two blocks, one for the curable and the other for the incurable cases?—Yes; besides the fever hospital, which is small, and detached altogether from the workhouse; there are three blocks in all and what they call the front house, which at present contains no inmates.

25262. Only tramps and the administrative officers?—Yes; I have nothing to do with the tramps, except they get sick.

25263. At present you have pumps for the water supply?—Yes; two pumps; one a force pump capable of forcing water to the second story; but of course if the house was turned into a sanatorium there would not be a sufficient supply of water.

25264. You want a gravitation supply; could that be got in the country?—I think so, by going a short distance away. There is a small lake three miles from Coochin, which is about 200 feet above the level of the workhouse.

25265. Is that a wholesome water supply?—I have not studied the matter; there may be heavier sources of supply, but that just struck me at the moment; it would not alone supply the workhouse but the town.

25266. How is the town off for water?—The people are depending on pumps; it is not bad.

25267. Does it at all become polluted?—In very dry summers it has to be cleaned out, and then I believe it is not a good quality of water, but it is the best water that can be got.

25268. It is a very hard water—limestone?—Very hard.

25269. Dr. BOGGER.—In the immediate neighbourhood of the workhouse, is it dry land?—It is; there is a sort of drainage in the workhouse at present of a very old-fashioned kind, but there would be nothing easier than to drain the place suitably.

25270. What is the nature of the soil?—Carboniferous limestone, but there is a sort of clay loam over that and sand between.

25271. Is it deep?—The clay is nine inches or a foot deep and there is sand below that; the drainage would be good; there is a splendid slope the whole way.

25272. The small stretch of water you have near the workhouse, does that cause any moisture or miasma?—There is a lake within less than half a mile, but that is at a much lower level; the workhouse is nearly 200 feet over that, or fifty feet at least.

25273. You have no drainage at present?—Except of a primitive kind. As far as I could I have got all those drains filled up and got surface drains constructed that can be kept clean. The old ones, masonry drains, were worse than useless.

25274. It does not run to the river?—It is supposed to go; there is an opening down near the river, but I don't think anything ever comes out of it.

25275. Supposing there were 300 inmates in the workhouse you would require a different system of drainage; where could it be drained to?—I presume a tank would be necessary, where the sewage could be properly treated.

25276. CHAIRMAN.—And a septic tank?—Yes, and submitted there to some process for disinfection.

25277. Dr. BOGGER.—Where would the overflow go to?—It would ultimately get into the river or lake, because there is a great fall in that direction.

25278. CHAIRMAN.—That would go to the Fergus?—Yes.

25279. Dr. BOGGER.—Is it far to where the river is tidal?—The tide flows as far as Etna.

25280. CHAIRMAN.—There is a fair amount of sewage in the Fergus?—Not in our place, but before it reaches Coochin there is a fair amount of it.

25281. Dr. BOGGER.—You have as much right, I suppose, to run it in as the Etna people themselves?—Yes.

25282. CHAIRMAN.—It would be rendered harmless by the septic tank?—Yes, there is a choice of means for doing away with it.

25283. Dr. BOGGER.—Taking everything into consideration you think it would be a suitable place for the treatment of consumption?—Yes, I do; it would be much improved however by the judicious planting of trees in the ground.

25284. Is there much consumption in your district?—I think looking back, there is a fair amount in it, but I don't think it is on the increase except with those parties who return from America and England; a good many of the subjects of consumption in my district are people who have contracted the disease in America and have returned home to die.

25285. We have had a good deal of evidence given us about the increase of consumption?—Looking back, I cannot say it is on the increase.

25286. Do you call to mind any case where it has been spread in the house or hospital?—I have seen a whole family swept away by consumption in a short time—not exactly in my district but on the borders of it. The first case was a young man employed in some public office in Woolwich; he came home with consumption; his father, mother, and brothers all died of it within about twelve months; they were swept off.

25287. And there was no appearance of it in the family before?—No.

25288. How long had he been absent from home?—For some years, but he came home in the very last stages of the disease; there were only two rooms in the house.

25289. Was this before it was as well known as it is now that it was infectious?—It was twelve or fifteen years ago this happened, but people did not understand it then, and would not believe the doctor if he told them about its being infectious. I believe the people nowadays are commencing to recognise that it is contagious, and they are ready, I think, to take all the means they can to prevent it; that is speaking generally.

25290. Of course sometimes houses don't lend themselves very well to isolation?—No.

25291. If there was a sanatorium, established at Coochin, do you think it would be availed of much for early cases of consumption?—I can only offer an opinion on that, I think it would.

25292. And do you think that persons would go into it who could pay for part of the cost of their maintenance?—I think they would. Very often the healthy members of a family get frightened when they see another member in a decline; in that way I think they would be very anxious to get them into an institution of the kind.

25293. Do you think that would spread when they got to look on consumption in the same light as they look on leprosy?—Yes; I should say according as the people get more enlightened it will act in a stronger way.

25294. The friends will be most anxious to get the consumptives into hospital?—I think so.

25295. Is the water from the river contaminated?—No; I think it is pure water.

25296. There is no village above it—no sewage?—No; there was a creek mill in former times.

25297. CHAIRMAN.—There is a great storage of water in Inchiquin lake?—Yes.

25298. Dr. BOGGER.—Would it be run by gravitation from the Inchiquin lake?—I think not; the fall is very little. If the lake is considered too far away, an alternative supply could be obtained from Shendungan (about an Irish mile distant from the workhouse in a straight line), and Ballyparry Castle, which is about eighty feet high, would make a good gravitation tower.

Nov. 20, 1904.

Dr. G. U. MEMBERS.

Nov. 20, 1894.

Mr. Michael Lyons.

Mr. MICHAEL LYNCH, Chairman, Ennis Union, examined.

25299. CHAIRMAN.—Are you the Chairman of the Ennis Board of Guardians?—Yes.

25300. Have the Guardians considered very carefully this scheme, or do they look upon it as one rather affecting the other unions than themselves?—They considered it carefully. The view is that we have too many unions in Clare.

25301. About how many do you think might be sufficient?—We consider four would be sufficient.

25302. Would you wish to indicate what four you think might be closed?—Tulla, Ballyvaughan, Corofin, and Killybegny.

25303. Not Scariff, nor Kilrush, nor Ballyvaughan, nor Ennis, of course?—No.

25304. Supposing the Ennis Workhouse to remain, did you consider what improvements might be carried out there?—No; we considered that all the children of the unions in Clare should be in one institution; some kind of a technical institution; something like Glm. We considered Corofin would be most suitable for that, being in a healthy situation.

25305. Did you consider at the same time whether boarding out or institution rearing would be the better?—We have three boarded-out cases, and these are satisfactory up to this.

25306. Have you tried to increase that system?—We advertised, but got no applicants.

25307. What amount did you advertise at—£5, was it?—£5 and £3.

25308. If you sent all the children in the county to Corofin, what would be done with them there?—Teach them some trade, that they would be useful in after-life.

25309. How do you think that would come to work out? You send some three or four hundred children there, and train them to become shoemakers, carpenters, and tradesmen of all kinds—how would they be worked off, how would you get them an occupation?—As for our own county, there is room for a share of trades at present in it.

25310. Would they fit into the trades, and be welcomed by the trades unions, and people who compose them?—There are a good many tradesmen through the country that are not in the unions—that is, outside the towns.

25311. And you would propose to increase the number, by instructing the destitute children in trades?—It would be a good way; they would be useful in after-life, what they were not up to this.

25312. Do you think they would be likely to be converted into good tradesmen?—I am of the opinion that a good many of them would be.

25313. Do you think it a wise or proper expenditure of the rates to instruct children who are the waste of society, and destitute? Do you think it a proper expenditure of the rates to instruct them in trades in which the children of small proprietors could not afford to be instructed?—Up to this, we had to support them up to a certain age in the institution; after that age when any of them were taken out, the majority of them have come back to the workhouses of Ireland. A good many of the people we have in our own workhouse to-day were boys and girls in it—they put in most of their life in it.

25314. Have you ever heard that said with reference to the boarded-out children, of their coming back?—Really, we have no experience of it in this county.

25315. You have not heard what they do in Limerick and other unions where they heard out on a large scale?—I heard it worked satisfactorily. The thing is to get proper foster-parents.

25316. At what ages are you trying to board out the children in Ennis?—From seven up.

25317. Did you ever think of it from three to four?—No; we did not think of it so young as three.

25318. I suppose from seven up they would not be useful for a little time after?—They would not be useful at all.

25319. And it is not the most attractive age for a child to come newly into the family?—Of course, the younger they begin the more fond they would be of them.

25320. You have not thought of boarding them out at a tender age, when they would attract love and affection?—No, sir.

25321. As regards the relative expense of boarding out and rearing in an institution, have you any idea of the relative cost?—I believe it would be in or about the same.

25322. I think the impression generally is that the cost would be very much less boarded out than in an institution?—I think it would take some time before we could get applicants to take them out.

25323. You have not tried at the most attractive age. If you take little children, who really are innocent and have no bad or dirty ways about them, people would be more ready to take them at that age than they will when they have learned evil and been contaminated?—That is a fact.

25324. Dr. BUCKEN.—But you say you advertised for foster-parents?—Yes.

25325. Did it strike you that foster-parents who would be likely to take the children would not see the advertisement at all?—It did not.

CHAIRMAN.—Posters as well as advertisements.

25326. Dr. BUCKEN.—Would it not be very much more likely to succeed if individual Guardians or a few ladies would take the matter in hand, and look about the district, and see who would make good foster-parents, and allow it to spread?—It would be the best idea; but my own opinion is that the general number of people round this country have an objection to take children out of the workhouse.

25327. Limerick is not very far away from you, and it occurs there; then why should they object in Clare. The same occurs round Dublin, where the people, perhaps, are better off. If you begin at the right age, and begin with one or two, planted here and there, where people will get to know what it means?—They don't understand.

25328. CHAIRMAN.—If people think they are going to get into their family a troublesome boy or girl, who knows a great many things that they would not like their own children to be taught, they won't have them, but if you begin at a tender age?

25329. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Do you give much outdoor relief in your union?—It has increased £200 a year since the Local Government Act came into force.

25330. Have you any ground for thinking what is the cause of that increase?—The town of Ennis is the principal cause, and Newmarket. I would be in favour of union-at-large rating. It is only fair that truly populated parts of the union should pay for the districts that are largely populated.

25331. CHAIRMAN.—It would not be fair to throw it all on the town?—I should say not.

25332. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Do you give the relief in money or in commodities?—In money. I know I would be in favour of giving it in commodities, for, no doubt, it is abused.

25333. CHAIRMAN.—You think that would be a more sure way of giving relief without abuse?—Yes, sir.

25334. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Children would get the benefit of it then more than they do now?—I should say so.

25335. CHAIRMAN.—You have a large number of tramps?—Yes, we have.

25336. You have heard the evidence about labour colonies or labour institutions?—Yes; I would approve of that.

25337. Committed there by magistrates's warrant—strolling men, who make no pretence of work?—Yes; going from one union to another.

25338. What do you think ought to be done with imbecile inmates?—There should be some place provided for them.

25339. Would you enlarge the existing asylum, or use a closed asylum?—The Asylum Committee went into that. There were plans prepared as between Tulla and Corofin, but when they went into details, they came to the conclusion it would be cheaper to build an addition. The staff would be less after a time.

25340. CHAIRMAN.—How did the matter impress you—what did you think would be the better things to do?—To build the addition to the asylum.

Mr. MICHAEL MACKAY, F.R.C.S., examined.

Nov. 20, 1904.

Mr. Michael Mackay.

25340. CHAIRMAN.—You have heard the evidence of Mr. Lynch—do there anything you wish to add to that?—Not a great deal. I agree nearly altogether with him, except on this question of out-door relief. I would be in favour of electoral division rating for that, particularly, because I believe it would cause a big saving.

25341. Supposing you had, as a general rule, that charge for out-door relief, you would see that there was some hardship to the town, I suppose?—Well, yes.

25342. Would you be willing to give them some relief?—I would, certainly.

25343. Under the old law they used to get some relief when the rate went above a certain thing. Supposing you got half or a quarter of the out-door relief divisional and the remainder on the union, would that be a sufficient check; not putting the whole of the out-door relief on the division, but a portion of it on the division and the remainder on the union?—If there was three-fourths on the division and one-fourth on the union, I think it would be a good check.

25344. The reason you would like that would be because of the more close supervision?—Certainly.

25345. More careful giving of relief?—Certainly.

25346. Do you believe that in some cases people get relief in money who would not take it if it were given in food?—I hardly think so.

25347. You think there is not much abuse in giving relief in your union?—I would say there is abuse in the way I say; but it would not be so badly used if it was electoral division rating; giving it in kind might work; I don't know.

25348. It was proposed lately, but not carried, at the Cork Union that all the out-door relief should be distributed by vans to the recipients by the relieving officers?—That he would go round with the food?

25349. Load his van according to the requirements before starting, and deliver at each place what was required?—That would require more relieving officers than we have at present.

25350. How many have you got now?—Four.

25351. Mr. MURPHY.—Goods can be bought much cheaper in large quantities. The recipients would get better value if it was sent by the van?—No doubt; but the difficulty of conveying the goods.

25352. CHAIRMAN.—Do these people, as far as you know, ever buy milk out of the out-door relief money?—They would.

25353. That would be the difficulty. They would be in a very bad way, indeed, if they could not earn enough to supply them with a perishable article like milk if they got the solid food?—I am sure they would be able to manage the milk.

Mr. WILLIAM HARTING examined.

Mr. William Harting.

25354. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the Ennis Rural District Council?—Yes.

25355. The matter we were just discussing was the question of out-door relief administration in kind. I don't know whether the idea is altogether new to you—whether you considered it at all?—I consider the out-door relief should be delivered in kind. A number of aged people would not use the food that an ordinary person would use—milk or porridge; and, then, a little money, of course, would buy fuel, and they must also pay rent.

25356. In Dublin the fuel is delivered by the Poor Law Guardians?—I don't think that would suit at all.

25357. Do you think there is any abuse in the giving of it in money—do you think people get it who, perhaps, would not think it worth their while to take money's worth in the form of food?—I don't know that.

25358. You think they would get better value?—I think they would get better value by getting it in kind.

25359. Dr. BOGGER.—You think they misapply some of it if they get it in money?—In some cases they do. But, with regard to out-door relief, I think that should be a divisional charge.

25360. CHAIRMAN.—So as to insure more close inspection?—Yes.

25361. Do you think it has been spreading widely since it became a union charge?—It has gone up in our union some hundreds of pounds.

25362. Do you attribute that to the change in chargeability?—Of course.

25363. You can see there would be a hardship in putting the full burden of the poor of the town on the town electoral division?—I see that.

25364. How would you meet that?—I don't know; unless you made some division; there should be some charge extra.

25365. You in some way would afford relief to the town?—Certainly.

25366. Mr. MURPHY.—A grant in aid?—Yes. A lot of people come in from the country, and drop down here.

25367. Mr. MURPHY.—Something in the way of an equivalent grant on a standard year?—Something of that kind.

25368. CHAIRMAN.—As regards lunatics. You are aware the asylum is overcrowded very much, and there is a necessity for providing accommodation elsewhere; which would you prefer?—I would prefer the present asylum being enlarged.

25369. Are you a member of the committee?—I am not. My reasons for believing that it would be much better in, of course, that the facility is very good for getting in; and, again, the larger the number, the cheaper you can support them.

25370. Is it possible for them, as far as you know, to extend the land?—They have extended it very severely—not many years since.

25371. Then it was cut through again by the railway, was it not?—They got a further extension three or four years since. They have got about seventy acres; I don't exactly know; but they have a considerable quantity.

25372. The committee are of opinion that they could extend profitably there?—Oh, certainly.

25373. And have sufficient land to employ the additional inmates?—Yes.

25374. What is your view on the treatment of children under the Poor Law?—I am in favour of boarding them out; but it is a thing that does not seem to take in this union. We had advertisements published for a considerable time, and only got two applicants, and I don't know did even one of them go.

25375. Perhaps it has not been energetically pushed individually?—It has not.

25376. In a great many unions that we visited all the children that were eligible for boarding out have been boarded out—that is, orphan and deserted children?—Yes.

25377. And these unions have suggested an increase in the Guardians' power—that the Guardians should be empowered to board out all children who came under their charge?—That is my idea that the law should be changed. I approve of that entirely. That illegitimate children should be allowed to be boarded out as other children, for it is not the children's fault.

25378. It was not so much a question between legitimacy and illegitimacy; but the orphan and deserted children are the only children who are now eligible for boarding out. The view that these Guardians took was that all children should be eligible for boarding out?—I fully approve of that.

25379. Are you in favour of reducing the number of inmates in the county?—Certainly, by all means. I feel quite sure they can be reduced where the population is so reduced in the last fifty years. I don't see why you want so many inmates.

25380. You are aware that there are a large number of officials necessarily kept up in each workhouse under present arrangements?—Certainly.

25381. If you had the inmates and the children taken out, and the sick remaining in the local hospital, the only class left in the hospital would be the aged and infirm. Would you be prepared to go a step further than the mere amalgamation of one union with the union next to it; would you be in favour of having a central institution for the county, receiving there all the aged and infirm of the county, say in Ennis, where they could be segregated according to their character and antecedents and conduct, and where they could be employed usefully at some little light work?—I would be in favour of that.

Nov. 30, 1904
 Mr. William
 Harding.

25382. And having only one staff instead of eight staffs?—Certainly. When you reduce the officials, you reduce the expenses of keeping those buildings up. We have a great experience of the amount of money that is expended on our union year after year, and we don't seem to be anything the better of it.

25383. I can tell you that I see the greatest improvement!—There is a great improvement, but we are never done improving.

25384. Would you be in favour, if possible, of getting all the aged and infirm of the county into one establishment?—I have not thought that matter out; but I thought it would be a very good idea, as far as I can see, to have them classified. With regard to the tramps, we get a great number of them in Ennis, and I think some stringent measures ought to be adopted with them. Even at the present time, when they apply to our relieving officer for a ticket for the union,

they come under the influence of drink. I say any man or woman who goes to the relieving officer with the sign or smell of drink, the police ought to be sent for to take them to the barracks. It is a very good idea that I have heard here, to make them work.

25385. Put them into a provincial institution?—Certainly, and make them work; for they are doing about the country, and they have to be fed.

25386. They are kept absolutely by the public?—They are kept absolutely by the public.

25387. And they sometimes take more than they get?—Certainly. Instead of allowing them to wander, notices ought to be sent to the police to get them arrested. I believe that is the case in England.

25388. Mr. MURKHAM.—In England they can detain them up to four days, and they have to give seventy-two hours' notice of desiring to have them. Something like that.

MR. MARSH'S CHAIRMAN EXAMINED.

Mr. MARSH
 Chairman.

25389. CHAIRMAN.—We have had a good deal of interesting evidence from Ennis Union already. Is there anything you would wish to dissent from?—There is not.

25390. As regards brancies, which would you be in favour of—an auxiliary asylum or an addition to the asylum?—An auxiliary asylum. I think it would cost a good deal less to have one of these workhouses turned into an auxiliary asylum than the present asylum enlarged.

25391. And managed at a lower rate of expense?—I think so.

25392. Under the existing law, you would only get 2s. capital for an auxiliary?—I am aware of that.

25393. Do you think with the 2s. you would do better?—It could be done just as well anywhere.

However, the law may be changed; I think we should be allowed 2s. of the grant.

25394. As regards the boarding out of children, you have not had much experience in this union?—They were trying to get foster-parents. It was a failure.

25395. But the age at which they were boarded out was rather advanced?—I think about five years, last time.

25396. As regards tramps, what would you do with them?—Some separate place should be established for them, and have them committed by magistrates' warrant, and kept there.

25397. And taught habits of industry, if possible?—Yes. I thoroughly agree with what Mr. Harding says. If a man applied for admission to the relieving officer, and had the sign of drink, the relieving officer should have him taken up by the police and prosecuted.

The Sittings terminated.

FIFTY-FIRST PUBLIC SITTING—THURSDAY, DECEMBER, 1st 1904.

Dec. 1, 1904.

At the Courthouse, Limerick.

Present:—Mr. MICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURTAGHAN, and Dr. COBY RIDGER.

Mr. JAMES HOGAN, J.P., M.C.C., examined.

25398. CHAIRMAN.—The County Council had the subject of this Inquiry before them, and queries were asked to them, and I think they did not answer. They sent us a copy of the Conference which you held. What is the opinion of the County Council as regards the number of unions to be maintained in the county?—Well, my own individual opinion I may give you first, is that I am in favour of amalgamation, because, as the population is now diminishing and these houses were built at an anterior date to contain so many, and there is not one-third in Ireland now. I am principally acquainted with Rathkeale since Glin was dissolved, of which I was a Guardian. I am in favour of amalgamation; I am also in favour of the boarding out of children.

25399. You had personal experience of amalgamation. The union in which you used to be a Guardian, some eighteen years ago, Glin, has been broken up—how has that worked?—Of the thirteen divisions that were in it, four went to Lismore and the balance to Rathkeale.

25400. Have you heard any complaints at all about the increased distances the sick would have to travel from places like Glin and Turlough?—Not a bit. There is a very improved mode of conveyance now, and an improved van.

25401. Do you think the people who are sick, and need nursing and attention, go as readily into Lismore or Rathkeale as they did before into Glin from the towns of Glin and Turlough?—I am quite sure they do. They had some in Rathkeale for a long time, and they were very well treated. They have left lately, but there is a better training system for nurses there.

25402. Are there any complaints about Glin and Turlough as to the distances which the sick have to travel?—Glin and Turlough are a good distance from me; but in my own immediate neighbourhood, about seven miles from Rathkeale, I find no hesitation at all in having the people go there. In any case, the time of going into the workhouse is not so long now as formerly.

25403. It is a question of distance?—I don't think there is any objection now to the distance. Glin to Lismore is about twelve miles; there is a very good mode of conveyance for the sick.

25404. What has been your experience as regards rates—was there much economy in the closing up?—You have the pensions of the existing officers in Glin and increased remuneration in Rathkeale, and that did not diminish it; but those things are dying out.

25405. But there is an economy?—Oh, I am quite sure it will ultimately result in economy. The second question that I have on my paper is that I am in favour of boarding out the children. I have also experience of the Glin School. I attended there for a season. Certainly, it is a very well-kept place, but I would much prefer the children to be boarded out in the country, for they become useful for servants in any department afterwards, and they are pretty well cared for. We have a ladies' committee in Rathkeale, and visiting officers and lady inspectors; they are nicely done for. I don't want to quarrel with Glin system, but when sent about their business at fifteen or sixteen, they are useful for anything.

25406. Do you think they are not useful in the country?—They are not. I have one in my own employment presently; it is no tramping whatsoever for farm purposes.

25407. What training do they give them in Glin?—Put them to various trades—carpentry, shoemaking; and I think they have a smithy there.

25408. What tradesman did you get?—He had not any trade; he was brought up by a neighbouring farmer to assist him.

25409. What was he doing in the school?—Nothing; he is a bit of an imbecile.

25410. He is not handy about mending boots?—No, indeed, he cannot mend his clothes. The general report is that they are unfit for farm purposes when they come out.

25411. What is your idea about the best business to put upon children left—A good deal will depend on the tests they develop when they are under the charge of the Christian Brothers.

25412. Taking them as a whole, the children that are in workhouses all over Ireland, what do you think is the best way to put them forward in life?—Board them out of the workhouses.

25413. Then make them what after that?—Their parents will develop after that. Some may become workhouse, and a good many I have known emigrated, and they were nicely taken care of in the country, and grew healthy and strong. I find they don't be so strong in Glin. They are healthy and well cared, but they are better off in the country air, and have more liberty and amusement.

25414. Some Guardians and witnesses that have appeared before this Commission said that they considered, owing to the dearth of labourers in many parts of the country, the best thing the Guardians could do would be to put their children out as labourers or servants?—I would not confine it to one particular parent, but would give them the chance of being reared in the country. Generally, they would adopt the parents of the person they were boarded with. I know them to be very useful members of society. The third is, I am in favour of harmless lunatics being boarded out with their friends.

25415. Have you considered that carefully?—Well, it is a delicate question, I know; but, all the same, I really think where they get a fairly good stipend to keep them, natural affection would spring up between them, and keep them in a better state than in the workhouse.

25416. There was another gentleman from Limerick who attended the Conference in Dublin who said the people's skin was on fire until they got rid of their lunatics?—I know very well that there is a little bit of lunatic management in our asylums in that way, particularly in Limerick. When they are not made to pay, they wish to get rid of them; but if we made them pay an average of £50 a year, they would be glad to get them. Of course, if there is a dangerous lunatic, you must put him in.

25417. You think the country people really would have time enough to keep these people clean and orderly, and watch them as they should be watched in the country?—Quite sure.

25418. Because there very many times in the country often?—You would not have very many.

25419. I mean one in the house?—That might be only one per cent. of the population. I don't think it would even be as high, those you would think of boarding out.

25420. You would like to see the system of boarding out lunatics tried with such cases as the Resident Medical Superintendent would suggest?—I would. I would like to have some experience on the subject. The fourth point is the tramp nuisance, which is certainly a great and crying nuisance. I assisted some time ago, representing the Limerick County Council, at the General Council meeting in Dublin, and the matter was very ably thrashed out, and I saw suggestions from various individuals, and the one that struck me as most admirable was Germany's. There they hire farms, and people convicted before magistrates are sentenced to six months, twelve months, or

Dec. 1, 1904.
Mr. James
Hagan.

two years, until they are brought into habits of industry; and I thought that was the best suggestion I saw thrown out.

25421. They are committed by warrant?—Brought before the magistrates, and committed by warrant.

25422. What term would they give them?—A good deal would depend on the subject.

25423. But they could give a very long term?—They could; and the experience, I think, was that they were able to pay for their maintenance as well as getting them into industrial habits.

25424. In Belgium they are said to be self-supporting?—I think so. There were reports from various Continental countries, but that was the one that struck me most. Another suggestion I have is single representation for divisions.

25425. We have received that widely. You think they are too many?—I think it is a farce. In Limerick 101 come into the Poor Law Board. In Limerick County you have no rural district work now or presentments; it rests with the county surveyor; it is all direct labour now; so that the Rural District Councils have very little to do in that respect; and as for crowding sixty or eighty people into one room to administer £10,000 or £12,000, it is not an easy thing to do.

25426. It must be very difficult for the chairman?—You will have the experience of the various Rural District Councils before you; I think it would be a step in the right direction. The suggestion I would put before you is, that if amalgamation takes place, you should reconstitute the unions. In Rathkeale Union you have Ballingarry, within three miles, coming into Rathkeale; other portions are fourteen miles; so, by reconstituting the unions, you could make it more convenient for sick people.

25427. You did not work that out in detail?—I was just sketching it on Rosser's Map of Ireland. It is very easily solved. Just take your existing line round the workhouses, without diminishing the staff of the other houses that you left in existence.

25428. Not breaking up the clerical divisions?—Well, take dispensary districts together. Shanagolden would easily fit in with Newcastle; you take a straight line from Newcastle to the Shannon, and then when you dissolve the eastern unions, you could take a corresponding slice, and give it to the unions the other way.

25429. Was it your idea to have the unions co-extensive with the county. Take the Limerick Union, which has a large portion of the County Clare and part in the County Tipperary, and so on?—And you say idea of that sort, or was it simply keeping up the present system of unions without regard to counties?—I would reconstitute them, if possible; each county ought to have its own.

25430. That would be difficult in a place like Limerick?—Yes, it is too near Clare.

25431. The Clare people yesterday expressed a wish to get that part of the county into their own hands as a unit in the Poor Law system of Clare?—And I think it is very much thought of now throughout the country—that you ought to have divisional rating instead of union rating.

25432. Would you go back to the old law, or only want it for some particular purpose? Would you go far making the indoor relief, for instance, a divisional charge?—I rather think it should be both ways. It worked very well, for it threw the onus on the Guardian of the division to see that he did his duty; but when it is union rating, and it is everybody's business, it is nobody's business. There is a resolution passed by the County Council with reference to rural district charges—that they maintain their own roads and bridges. It has been initiated as a step in the right direction, so I think the other would be a step in the right direction, also. You would be able to see how the thing worked out with the Guardian in charge. That is all I have to say.

25433. Do you think there has been any change in the administration of out-door relief?—I am sorry to say it has increased since 1898.

25434. Do you attribute that to union rating?—I would, in a certain direction.

25435. Do you think any increase of expenditure has arisen as regards indoor expenditure since 1898?—I don't think so.

25436. Then, would it be necessary to make any change in the administration of that?—I am not aware that there is any extravagance practised indoors.

25437. Would you still be in favour of making it a divisional charge indoors?—Where a person goes for sick treatment from a division, I would have it charged to that division. That is the only motive I have.

25438. You could hardly expect to reduce the total expenditure if a person is willing to go into the workhouse; you hardly know a case where relief is given?—I think not.

25439. So you could not reduce the total expenditure by changing the area of charges?—I don't know; it is very hard to say how the thing would work out; I would rather try.

25440. You had a long experience of the clerical division charge?—And it worked well.

25441. Do you think it worked well under all heads?—I think so.

25442. If you go back to the old system you will be taking away the benefits given to the towns by the Act of 1891?—I would rather not do that, for I think the towns were entitled to relief; people were bidden into towns from the country.

25443. How would you arrange that, to give the people of the towns the benefit?—Certainly; it is a hardship to cast divisional rating on a town, because a great many people were transported from the country into the towns; it is a question I am not prepared to see my way out of.

25444. But you think it would be just that the expenditure should be equalised, so far as the towns get?—I would; I would not like to do them an injustice in that way. There is another burning question, in fact, that is—where people from other unions come into a certain union, there is no way of sending them back to their own original union. I think the law ought to be altered in that respect.

25445. The law of settlement in England and Scotland brought here?—Yes, I would make that suggestion also.

25446. You would have a good deal of changing about all over the country?—Every other day.

25447. It would involve a great deal of expense?—I don't think so. It is not fair to the union to have strangers coming from another county into it, and settling down here.

25448. We find, in going round the country, numbers of distant places in all the workhouses; you may give a couple to one union, and get back a couple from another?—Well, let it be so; it would be the fairest in the end for the sick poor.

25449. You could not send away the sick—it is the healthy?—They are all supposed to be sick that are inside. That out-door relief system would want to be very cautiously administered.

25450. Did you see a suggestion made in Cork lately, that all out-door relief should be given in kind?—I did, and I would be very much in favour of it; because I am afraid some of this money finds its way to the publichouse.

25451. The idea there was that the relieving officer should have a van, and start with such commodities as were necessary?—It could be worked that way. I studied the out-door relief system very closely, and I could call it nothing but demoralising.

25452. You would be in favour of out-door relief if it could be managed without demoralisation?—I would. But I tell you my experience, that where a child of tender years goes for the stipend, the idea goes with him that that money should be continued to him. It demands supervision.

25453. If you had out-door relief administered in kind, and also had out-door relief a divisional charge, would you be afraid of any undue expenditure then?—I don't think so.

25454. There would be sufficient safeguards?—I think so, if the Guardians of the division would interest themselves in the officer who was distributing it.

25455. There are some articles, such as milk and potatoes, they could not be served round; but from your experience of the country, would the people be always able to manage a sufficient supply of milk?—I think they would; if they got the solid food, the others would be supplied. There are a great many charges in the Poor Laws that would be a great benefit to the ratepayers.

25456. As regards people paying for relief whom they are sick?—I was always in favour that a portion of the hospitals in the unions should be set aside for paying patients—people who own moderate-sized farms; and I think there should be some discrimination in the

class. Well-to-do people who, through stress of circumstances, come to the workhouse, I think they should be allowed to wear their own clothes, and live separate from the others.

25457. You would give certain privileges to well-conducted people?—Yes, and people of good antecedents. It would be too bad to have them mixed up with tramps, or people of the lower orders.

Dec. 1, 1904.
Mr. James Hogan.

MR. W. W. O'DWYER, J.R., Chairman, Mitchelstown Union, examined.

25458. CHAIRMAN.—You are also a member of the County Council?—Yes.

25459. Is there anything new that occurs to you on our queries that Mr. Hogan has not referred to, or on which you differ from him?—No, sir. I thoroughly agree with Mr. Hogan's evidence. I wish to add my experience from the east. I was chairman for years of the Mitchelstown Union. I saw you dwelling on the outdoor relief expense. Before the passing of the Local Government Act the annual outdoor relief was £235, and the annual cost since then was £276, that is for the whole union, and our valuation is £48,323.

25460. To what do you attribute the increase?—To union rating.

25461. Would you rather go back to electoral division rating?—Certainly. It is a premium, I believe, for raising the rates, because it is impossible to check it. A portion of my union extends near Mallow, another portion near Tipperary, and another near Kilmallock; I have no possible way of knowing whether the outdoor relief is properly administered in those districts or not. If you have divisional rating, you have personal knowledge of every person, and, another thing, you are more particular, having the man charged against you. Supposing a Mallow Greenan applied for the relief, I would not take the responsibility as chairman of referring the relief, as I might be doing injustice to that person.

25462. In the old times the Guardians were practically guided by the advice of the Guardian of the electoral division?—Certainly; and the ratepayers of the immediate district would come up, and say, "We are paying rates, and know you ought to get it," and nobody would be injured, because nobody wanting it would be refused.

25463. I gather you are not opposed to outdoor relief, but wish to have it safeguarded?—Quite so.

25464. What do you think about distributing it in kind?—By all means.

25465. Do you think there would be any practical difficulty?—None whatever. The relieving officer would issue his order, and let them take that to any shopkeeper.

25466. That is not what is proposed in Cork at all; that is a system that has been rather condemned. The system proposed in Cork is that the actual bread and food should be put into a van, and brought round?—

With all due respect, I think the other would be better, because the relieving officer of every district is a responsible party, and his order to any shopkeeper is as good as a bank note.

25467. Yes, but it does not follow that the party getting it would always get the proper thing; he may take it out in tobacco and porter?—It may be checked, by specifying the thing required.

25468. I don't think that would be any check. If there was an order for beef, and the man chose to take tobacco?—Surely, when there was an order for beef, he could not get anything else.

25469. There would be no difficulty about that?—That could be looked to, because the relieving officer would be on the spot; but, taking the broad principle,

it should be in kind. There is a great temptation in handing money to let it go into improper channels.

25470. In Mitchelstown you are in two counties. What do you think about having the Poor Law unions coterminous with the counties?—In cases where there would be a hardship, I would not go the length.

25471. Supposing they broke up Mitchelstown, what ought to be done with the County Limerick part?—Sent to Kilmallock, and some to Tipperary.

25472. Galbally?—That would be Tipperary, and the western side to Kilmallock, and the Cork portion could go to Fermoy, without any inconvenience whatever. These three unions are nearer than some of the districts we have coming into Mitchelstown. Knock-long is nine miles from Mitchelstown, while Kilmallock is nearer than that; Galbally is nearer to Tipperary than Mitchelstown; there would be no hardship on the sick poor.

25473. You would not care about having all the unions within the county?—I would not at all stick to the counties.

25474. Your idea is the idea with which the unions were originally formed—a central place was taken, and people were supposed to go from about ten miles round it?—Yes.

25475. And you don't see any necessity for making a change in that respect?—I do not; and especially in my own particular eastern district, where I am conversant with the circumstances; it is the better way. If we go by the two counties alone, we would be away from any centre whatever.

25476. Some would be going to Fermoy?—Yes, and the rest to Kilmallock, naturally.

25477. As regards justice in workhouses?—I agree with Mr. Hogan's suggestions, subject to the medical officer's examination, that they would be better, and in some cases kept better, because the Irish people are generally very fond of their people. Herding people together in those places is injuring them; it is miserable to see; they sleep about in dark cells, when they could be out in the sunlight.

25478. I believe the County Asylum is overcrowded?—It is, and no wonder; because a lot of people there ought to be paying patients, and they are not.

25479. What would you do to relieve the overcrowding?—If we amalgamated some of these distanced places they could be made use of.

25480. Would you prefer that to building at the asylum?—I would not build any more. What is the good of building with a population dwindling as we are. Mitchelstown was built for 600, and our average is only 155, and it is only by pressure it is kept up.

25481. Who puts on the pressure?—Interested people, I dare say; as you will see a recruiting sergeant anxious to fill the regiment. The tramp nuisance is a regular eyecore with us. There are a lot of deserving poor that must tramp, but they are natives of elsewhere, and they could get a pass from their relieving officer, and let them hand that to the relieving officer of the district, and if they are deserving, they will get relief; but with regard to the vagrants, I would carry out the law in their respect.

25482. As Mr. Hogan suggested?—Yes; the deserving poor tramp should be supported and protected.

MR. ROBERT FISCH, J.R., F.R.C.S., examined.

25483. CHAIRMAN.—You are the Chairman of the Rathkelsie District Council?—Yes.

25484. What is the view of your Guardians about the question of amalgamation?—They would be in favour of amalgamation as far as one union, at least; I don't think they would be anxious to go further than some one union in the county.

25485. You are only seven or eight miles from New-castle, and Croon is about the same?—Croon is nine Irish miles, a little bit more than Newcastle.

25486. What change do you think might be made in the west part of Limerick if there was amalgamation? Take Croon and Newcastle and Rathkelsie?—I

think Croon would be the more suitable one. It would be more convenient for an auxiliary asylum.

25487. What do you think about letting the other two stand?—I think the other two would want to stand. There is a big area of country occupied by Rathkelsie and Newcastle especially, portion of the old Old Union having been thrown into Rathkelsie.

25488. They are very close to each other?—In a way, but they have other wings very fair.

25489. If an ambulance arrived at one place, it would only have to go six or seven miles further to get to the other?—Irish miles.

25490. It is hardly necessary for us to go into the

Mr. Robert Fisch.

Dec. 1, 1904.
Mr Robert
Pigot.

boundaries of the unions; we have, of course, the maps with us. The next matter is the necessity for dispensary accommodation, and the lessening of the number of hospitals, having regard to the distance to be traversed by patients and the shortest available time and the quickest and most level roads; we have nothing to do with dispensaries. Do you think there is any hospital that could be removed in West Limerick except Croon?—I don't think there could be; it would be very serious for the sick poor to remove them a long journey, although we have a new mode of conveyance. Still, it would be very hard to take a sick patient twenty or thirty miles.

25491. The third matter you call attention to is the anomalous condition of the Glm District Comond; where the District Council is subject for rating purposes to the Limerick County Council while its urban business is conducted in the Listowel Workhouse. How would you meet the case of Limerick, where a large portion of the County Clare is in the union?—Well, it is a very peculiarly situated city, and the union workhouse is in the County Clare, properly speaking.

25492. You have no suggestion to make about that?—Not about that.

25493. You say economy could be practised in the present institution by providing fuel and labour-saving appliances, and also disinfecting; steam under pressure is the best?—I think if there was amalgamation you would require something that way in the union.

25494. Of course, when you closed a workhouse like Croon, you would save a good deal in fuel as well as in officers' salaries?—Yes, after a time, and maintenance of buildings and everything.

25495. What is your view about rating?—I was always against union rating from the very start; it is a great injury to the ratepayers of Ireland.

25496. Would you go back completely to the old system?—Yes, I would go back for all purposes.

25497. Are there any changes you would recommend in the existing system of the Poor Law? Supposing you were keeping on Rathkeale and Newcastle, would you suggest any change in the administration, or would you let the present system go on as it is?—Well, I think the present system should go on as it is.

25498. Would you keep Janitors, for instance, in the workhouses?—Oh, no, it is a great injury.

25499. What is your view about the children in the workhouses?—I think it is very demoralising to have them in the workhouses.

25500. Are you satisfied with their going to Glm, for instance?—Up to a certain age they should be removed in the country, I think five or six or seven years' old, and then sent to a place like Glm; because you won't

get the respectable small farmers in the country to take up these children, and they fall into the worst hands—poor people that probably are getting out-door relief, and want to make something by them.

25501. How do the Limerick Guardians manage—have they not got foster-parents? They have been working it for thirty years?—I don't know.

25502. In your union what do you do?—There was very little until lately boarded out. There is a ladies' committee, which looks after them as well as they can, and they are better off than formerly; but, at the same time, you have not the proper class of people to take them up; only the very poorest.

25503. If good homes could be found, you would be in favour of boarding out?—Certainly; if you could get respectable farmers to take them up.

25504. Why would you not allow the children to remain on with these people?—Because they won't teach them anything; if the small farmers took them up and reared them they would be taught something.

25505. Supposing a small farmer could be induced to take them up?—They could learn some farm work, and I think it would be more beneficial than trades.

25506. That is what has happened with boarding out in various parts of the country—small farmers do take them at three years old, and keep them on until they are men and women?—As far as my experience goes, unless they are orphans, and are very poor friends to the small farmers, they would not look at them at all.

25507. At what age have you tried to get homes for these children?—Some are taken out very young—sometimes a half or three.

25508. What is the general age?—That would be the general age, and six or seven sometimes.

25509. You could understand, perhaps, people being unwilling to take a child of six or seven or eight who had been, perhaps, with big associates?—I would not like them to get too old in the workhouse by any means.

25510. But children going out at an early age, would there be the same objection to take them?—They would not like to take infants too young; three or four years old, I am sure there would be no objection to them.

25511. What would you do as regards tramps?—We had a system fifteen or sixteen years ago in Rathkeale. A policeman used to attend the workhouse every morning to take them before the magistrates, and give them a week or a fortnight in jail, and we had no tramps for two or three years. Of course, it was rather a harsh treatment. There should be some kind of a home for tramps, and make them work laboriously.

25512. Send them there by warrant for three months, six months, or twelve months, and make them do hard labour?—Try to teach them a trade for labour.

Mr. JOHN FITZGERALD, P.L.C., examined.

Mr John
Fitzgerald

25513. CHAIRMAN.—You are Vice-Chairman of the Rathkeale District Council—do you generally agree with Mr. Pigot as regards the keeping up of Rathkeale and Newcastle Unions?—I think it would be advisable.

25514. You don't think you could do without one or the other?—I don't think so; the distance apart is so very much.

25515. It comes to a question of six or seven miles?—Yes.

25516. You have great distances at present in some places; how far, for instance, is the most remote part of your union?—Fourteen miles.

25517. Then if they had to go on they would have to go twenty-one?—They would.

25518. If there was a great deal of economy to be gained by the breaking up of one union, if you could save a good deal of the rates, what would you say then; and if a hospital for acute cases could be left at a place that would be closed, say Newcastle or Rathkeale, then, what would you think, provided the sick would not have any additional distance to go, but only the shill-boddy?—I think there would be some gain by it to the ratepayers.

25519. If there was a gain would you be disposed to regard that favourably?—Yes.

25520. What is your opinion as regards rating—union or electoral division?—Electoral division, I am entirely in favour of.

25521. Are your Board practically in favour of it?—They are altogether.

25522. Do you represent a town?—A small village.
25523. Do you think towns ought to have some assistance in the outdoor relief?—I don't think so.

25524. You would throw the whole burden on the towns?—I would; there are not so many coming into towns as formerly; there is more employment in the country.

25525. Still the outdoor relief is mainly paid in towns, and a great many of the people who get the outdoor relief in the towns are from the country?—Yes; but there are not as many now as used formerly come into the towns.

25526. Still the town has a larger proportion than the country?—It has.

25527. Would you allow for that and give them some general assistance?—I don't think so.

25528. As regards tramps and vagrants, what do you think would be the best way of dealing with them?—I think there should be a special place for them.

25529. Such as has been mentioned by other witnesses?—Yes.

25530. You would confine them there under a magistrate's warrant?—Yes.

25531. And these people who tramp through the country with children, would you take away their children from them?—I think so; it would be very much better for the children's sake.

25532. What is your opinion about dealing with children generally; would you board them out or send them to an institution?—I would board them out for some time at all events.

25533. With the object of turning them into labourers?—Yes.

25534. Is there anything else I have not asked you that you would like to mention?—I don't think so.

Mr. TIMOTHY COOMBS, Vice-Chairman, Rathkeale Union, examined.

25535. CHAIRMAN.—You are Vice-Chairman of the Rathkeale Guardians?—Yes, sir.
25536. You have heard the evidence of your colleagues just now?—Yes; I am in thorough accord with Mr. Pigot, only on divisional rating I don't agree with them.

25537. You are in favour of letting the union rating stand?—Yes; I live in a town.

25538. And you don't see things quite in the same way?—No. The population of our town is very large, and all the country people from outside are gathered in there, and are there for the last thirty years. I would be in favour of divisional rating if there was a limitation put, say where a person was born to let that division support him.

25539. If you could trace back to where they came from?—It could be done quite easily.

25540. I wonder what would the country Guardians say about that? would they agree with it?—I don't think they would.

25541. What do you say about children?—I would be in favour of keeping them in the workhouse until four years old, then I would send them out to the cottiers and board them out there; I see them and they are very well treated and looked after.

25542. You have a ladies' committee to look after them. As regards the amalgamation of workhouses, what workhouse do you think might be broken up?—The general opinion of the people in the division is Croon, and I would be in favour of that.

25543. Do you think it would be impossible to break up either Rathkeale or Newcastle?—It would be quite impossible.

25544. Even if a hospital were left in one or the other?—It would not do.

25545. You have a good many tramps in Rathkeale?—A great many.

25546. Do you think the time has come for dealing with these people?—Undoubtedly.

25547. You would not, of course, touch the poor people who stay in their own neighbourhood and get charity from their friends?—No.

25548. But you mean the regular tramping vagrants?—Yes.

25549. Some of these people have families; do you think it is desirable that the families should be allowed to remain with them tramping through the country?—I would take the children from them.

25550. And shut up the parents in a workhouse place?—Yes.

25551. Are you on the Lunatic Asylum Committee?—No.

25552. You have heard, I fancy, that there is a movement for increasing the accommodation?—I would be in favour of an empty workhouse.

25553. Supposing Croon was closed; would you rather give them Croon than build more?—I would. I agree with what Mr. Pigot said except as to the rating.

Dec. 1, 1904.
—
Mr. Timothy Coombs.

Mr. THOMAS HURLEY, J.P., Chairman, Newcastle Union, examined.

25554. CHAIRMAN.—You are Chairman of the Newcastle Union?—Yes.

25555. Your union goes to the bounds of Kerry and Cork; it does not take in either?—Yes. Our union and Rathkeale comprise half the county of Limerick.

25556. Do you think it would be possible to break up either Newcastle or Rathkeale?—I cannot see how it could be done; it is nearly twenty miles to the bounds of our union, and add to it six or seven miles further going to Rathkeale; it would be quite too much.

25557. What is the most distant part of your union?—Beyond Moostooline; three parishes come together in one point there, and we have another very distant point in our union within two miles of Listowel, near Kilmorra, beyond the village of Atha; there is an electoral division that runs along that way for a long distance.

25558. There are not many people in that division?—Not many, but it embraces the village of Atha, which is fourteen miles from Newcastle.

25559. What is your opinion about rating?—It should be, as at present, union rating. It would be very unfair to towns and villages that get no grant from the Government as the farmers do, that they should be saddled with the whole support of the poor, who, as a rule, come from the adjoining country.

25560. Mr. Coombs said he would be satisfied to have electoral rating if the people from the country districts were thrown back on the division from which they came?—Yes, but I don't know that the grant would be worth the candle.

25561. Some of your places you say are very distant; do you think any additional cottage hospital is necessary in your union?—As far as what there is railway accommodation through most of the union to the Kerry side.

25562. I mean for the sick who cannot take advantage of the train?—I don't believe there is, because we have got a very good ambulance lately, the best one our inspector, Mr. O'Connor, could recommend we have got, and they are just as comfortable in it as if in bed.

25563. You would not like to send them six or seven miles further?—I would not; it is bad enough as it is.

25564. Do many people in your workhouse pay at all for their maintenance?—Yes; a good many of them, especially since the advent of the Duns; one time, there was a great prejudice against people going in there, but that has worn away now and an immense number of people come in who pay for their food, and others pay half.

25565. It has been suggested that it would be a wise thing to give the governing bodies of these hospi-

tal power to recover such sums, as they, in their discretion, thought the friends of their patients could pay; would you be in favour of such a change in the law? If a poor man had a child of his own in the hospital getting treatment, if you thought that man could afford as much as the child cost him at home, say 6d. a week for food, so as to make all the people who come in pay as much as they could without hardship?—That is in practice in a small way in our hospital. Whenever a patient enters himself, by way of a loan, we charge the full amount, or whatever in our discretion we think the man should pay, and it is paid.

25566. Do you get much under that heading?—We do, considerable sums. I endorsed a cheque the other day for £15 for one man that was made payable to the Chairman of the Board of Guardians.

25567. If the people objected to it you very often could not recover that?—We have recovered it.

25568. You could if you declared it in time as a loan?—The relieving officer does declare them in time at the next Board day, and he gives his opinion whether they should be charged or allowed free.

25569. What could you recover from such persons?—It is not done unless there is no doubt that they can pay.

25570. What could you recover?—The average cost.

25571. That is very insufficient in a great number of cases. Supposing a comparatively wealthy person, or some member of his family, went into the fever hospital, their treatment might cost a couple of pounds a week and you could only recover 6d. a week, would you be in favour of giving the Board of Guardians discretion in any application to them, to charge as much or as little as they, in their discretion, thought fit, up to the total cost of maintenance?—Undoubtedly I would; but I may mention at one time there was a great reluctance on the part of the people to go into the hospital, and fever and contagious diseases were conveyed and kept at home, and so as to encourage them in at one time we made a rule we would allow all fever cases in free; we did that in the beginning, but it is departed from now.

25572. It was with a very good object you did that?—To encourage them not to conceal it outside.

25573. As regards bringing up children in the workhouse, what is your view?—Our view is to send them out to nurse at a very early age—as early as possible.

25574. What is your practice in the union at present; say an infant is born in the house, when do you send it out into the country?—As soon as possible.

25575. A couple of years old?—Sooner, if we possibly can; when the doctor approves of it. I am

Mr. Thomas Hurley.

Dec. 1, 1894.
Mr. Thomas
Hurley.

sorry to say the nurses we get in these cases are people who are in receipt of outdoor relief; it is for the sake of a few shillings a week.

25576. They cannot give them milk?—The relieving officer will look after that.

25577. At all events they have not got a cow of their own?—I believe they have not; and we are also deterred; we cannot leave one of these children in a town or village; it must be in a country place; they might be very well cured for by a tradesman living in a town with his own family, and they might learn a trade by-and-by.

25578. You think it would be wiser that the Guardians should be allowed to send them to either town or country, as they thought best?—Yes.

25579. How long does the child remain there?—Until it comes of an age to go to Glins.

25580. What time does it go to Glins?—I really forget the age.

25581. Six or seven?—Something like that.

25582. But the child is always taken away from the foster-parent as soon as it reaches that age and sent to Glins?—Yes; it is not so long in operation in our union that it has become a practice, but that is the course we contemplate.

25583. Then you have not much experience of taking away those children from their foster-parents yet?—No; we have not.

25584. Do you anticipate much difficulty about it?—If the foster-parent is inclined to keep on the child I think we would have it with her.

25585. Do you agree with the gentlemen who gave evidence this morning about having a separate place for tramps?—Yes; I would be in agreement with any well-considered means for putting down the tramp nuisance.

25586. You have a great many cramps moving about?—Yes; it is in the high road between Lincolns and Kerry.

25587. Also there will be a number of old people moving about among a parish or district?—I would not designate those as tramps at all.

25588. Has any other reform in the Poor Law been suggested to you?—There is one thing about the administration of outdoor relief. It often comes under my notice that a very deserving case of a man, who may have a quarter of an acre of land, cannot get relief and he would be really entitled to it.

25589. Would you suggest the repeal of the quarter acre clause?—I would give a discretion about it in some cases.

25590. Have you ever been obliged to refuse relief to a widow woman with one child?—We have a case exactly at present; she is a widow of a man who had a cottage; her husband died of consumption, and all they had in the world was gone to sustain him in his last illness. He died; the cottage had to be given up, and here is this woman, probably having the germs of consumption in her, with one child; she is not able to work and she is not a fit subject for a hospital.

25591. You would be in favour of that being enlarged, so that a widow, with one legitimate child should get relief?—Yes. It may happen that a person having a quarter of an acre of land might require relief from time to time, and so a widow with one child might require relief from time to time.

25592. Would you go beyond that?—These two cases, one of each kind, struck me very forcibly lately, and that is why it is in my mind. I would not be in favour of giving this relief out in actual goods, because the majority of the people in our district that are getting relief are old residents of the place; and I will certainly speak for the neighbours, that as a rule they are very good to them; they could not live on the 1s. or 2s. a week that they get, and the neighbours will give them potatoes and flour, and a little ready money is what they would want perhaps to buy groceries and milk.

25593. You would rather give them the money?—Yes; and it would go further; they are better able to use their own pence than I or the relieving officer, and stretch it further.

25594. Mr. MURKIN.—You say it would go further with them; don't you think the Guardians, by buying in large quantities, could provide necessaries at a lower rate than an individual buying in small quantities?—Yes; that would be the principal thing, such as flour and potatoes.

25595. Tea and sugar, and almost anything that a person would want to eat?—I go for the heavy things

—the potatoes and flour; as a rule any poor person that is reduced to get 1s. or 2s. outdoor relief, the neighbours of the poor person will relieve him with potatoes and flour, and give him plenty of it, and all that they would require would be the little groceries—small necessaries—and a bit of soap that a halfpenny or a penny would give them.

25596. That would be given in kind and at a less cost than a person would buy it?—You cannot give it to them as cheap as what they get for nothing.

25597. Perhaps all over the country people are not so charitable?—I am only talking for my own place.

25598. CHAIRMAN.—Does that small outdoor relief payment ever go for rent?—I believe in some cases it does—in towns.

25599. It goes through the recipient in every case; it does not go direct to the person who rents the house?—No. The recipient gets it and will pay 6d. or 1s. rent, and buy a bit of groceries and other small things, but so far as the principal portion of his subsistence—bread and potatoes—he never has to pay for them in our locality.

25600. Do many of these small payments go in rent?—Not exclusively.

25601. In some cases the outdoor relief practically pays the rent?—It does; but then the person is begging the whole time.

25602. Have you that class with you?—Very few, and they are a class we discourage as much as possible.

25603. Mr. MURKIN.—If the relieving officer supplied them with the commodities they need would not these people be better off than they are?—Yes; but look at the cost to the ratepayers; a woman getting 1s. 6d. or 2s. a week, could be supplied by the relieving officer with all her necessaries for that?

25604. She would get 1s. 6d. or 2s. worth of much better value than she gets now?—That she must sell what the neighbours give her to provide the ready money. She would want to mend her boots, or buy under-clothing that she would want a few pence for.

25605. You know they all earn something?—I don't believe they do. The majority of the people on outdoor relief in our district do not earn anything, they are so old and feeble.

25606. You don't give it widely?—Not widely, although it has increased.

25607. How much do you give a week?—1s. 6d. or 2s.

25608. Don't you think they would have to do something to supplement the 1s. 6d. in order to live?—But the secret is they are not in the neighbourhood.

25609. CHAIRMAN.—Charity?—Not exactly charity; they won't go begging for it.

25610. Mr. MURKIN.—You say you object to doing away with Rathkale or Newcastle owing to the distance the poor would have to go; do you see the same objection if a hospital was continued in those places; where would the hardship arise then?—I heard no complaints of either the management of Rathkale or Newcastle Unions as a whole, and none of my people are advocating the abolition of either of the unions. I brought it before the Board of Guardians on several occasions, and they said they did not want any changes.

25611. If the hospitals remained would there be any hardship then to the poor?—The sick poor; I don't think there could, for all they want is hospital treatment.

25612. When you said there would be a great hardship you were under the impression that the hospital would be closed and there would be no accommodation for the sick?—I am not prepared to go into these questions; my people, whom I have consulted, said they did not want any changes.

25613. Personally do you see any hardship?—It is impossible there could be any hardship because if there is a hospital there the person requiring hospital treatment would get it whether the union was amalgamated or not.

25614. You expressed assent to give the Guardians power to charge small sums to people who go into the hospital; do you think it would be right to ask agricultural labourers, or people of small means, to pay anything?—I would be sorry that I had expressed myself in that way; I do not agree with that; that is very poor people—struggling people.

25615. CHAIRMAN.—Not unless they could afford it?—Unless they could afford it and were accustomed as such by the relieving officer.

25616. It would be in your discretion, and if a poor struggling person came in you would not charge him?—Naturally not.

Mr. CHARLES MCCARTHY, P.L.O., examined.

Dec. 1, 1904.

Mr. Charles
McCarthy.

25617. CHAIRMAN.—You are also a member of the Newcastle Board of Guardians?—Yes.

25618. You heard the evidence of your Chairman. Is there anything you would like to add from your own point of view?—I don't agree with him on the outdoor relief question.

25619. You would prefer having it a district charge?—I would. Outdoor relief has gone up considerably in the Union, and in the town of Newcastle it is nearly doubled.

25620. What part of the country do you live in?—The most eastern part of the Union adjoining Crook.

25621. You have not many persons in receipt of outdoor relief?—It is about 12s. a week.

25622. Do you think if you had a divisional charge that amount would be reduced?—I don't think so; it is about the very same in our division as when the Act was passed; we did not increase it.

25623. You think it would be reduced in Newcastle town?—I think so. I know in certain divisions the sum is as high as 1s. in the £ for outdoor relief alone.

25624. What division would that be in?—Athen. There are several other divisions too where the outdoor relief amounts to 1s., and in other divisions it is only 6d. or 5d. I think there is a great hardship in that.

25625. You would put the charge back on the division as it used to be before the Act of 1891?—Yes.

25626. Would you give any relief to the towns?—I would not, because they take advantage of it, and people, perhaps twenty miles away, would be paying for it.

25627. If these were people from your part of the country in the town would you approve of their shareability being thrown back on your division?—Persons who had been living in Newcastle, say for a few years—would you approve of your having to pay the outdoor relief in your division?—I think that is a very exceptional case; there is not a single person from my division in any town. The parties who are getting outdoor relief have spent their lives working in the towns perhaps. No one leaves the country to go into the town to get relief because they could get it at home. Another question about outdoor relief. I would not give it in kind, but in money; it won't work in a country district where you have five or six persons all over a division.

25628. You give very little?—We have not the power.

25629. You don't give much to each person?—About 2s. a week.

25630. It is only a small sum towards their support?—Yes; I agree with the chairman's evidence.

25631. You think they make out the rest of their living from the good nature of their friends?—Anyone who is not a professional beggar will get plenty from the neighbours, and then want little things, so that a couple of shillings a week comes in handy.

Mr. JOHN BRADDOCK, P.L.O., examined.

25645. CHAIRMAN.—What is your view on the question of union as distinguished from divisional rating?—I would go for union rating.

25646. Are you looking at it from a town point of view?—Yes; I think so; I don't live in a town myself, but it is too bad to want these small towns.

25647. You think it would be fairer to leave things as they are?—I think so.

25648. I suppose a great many of the townspeople who get relief do come from the country?—I don't think they do. I live in a western division, next to Listowel Union, three miles from Abbeyfeale, and thirteen miles from Newcastle.

25649. Do you think that either Newcastle or Rathkeale could be closed as workhouses?—I don't know about Rathkeale, but we could not manage if Newcastle was closed; we would have to come twenty miles to Rathkeale.

25650. Mr. MURKIN.—If you had a hospital there would not that meet your objections?—I don't see how it could; you want your union every day in the year; it is not for the hospital alone.

25651. Would not a healthy person be able to travel five or seven miles further without any inconvenience?—He might, and you might meet another person who could not endure it.

25632. Mr. MURKIN.—Don't you think that children of the recipients of outdoor relief would be better fed under the charge when they get commodities instead of money?—I don't know of any case like that in our division.

25633. Can you not picture to yourself that they will get better value from the Guardians purchasing the goods at wholesale prices than they can possibly get in drabbers in country shops?—I don't know how that would work in a village; they may want coal, and underclothing, and silly things.

25634. CHAIRMAN.—You think the people could not tell the relieving officer this week what they would want next week?—They might not know what they would want next week.

25635. The outdoor relief you give is never meant to support a family?—It is a help to support them.

25636. It is a sort of pocket money to find the extras that they won't get a present of?—They have a little money in their pockets to buy the odds and ends. You know they will never get cutlery and sugar and milk, which they get from the farmers; they will buy groceries then like soap, a bit of tobacco, underclothing and coal.

25637. Mr. MURKIN.—These things could all be given by the relieving officer?—I suppose they could, in a town, but I don't think in a remote rural district it would work so well.

25638. Does not the relieving officer visit the people to give them money?—He does.

25639. Could he not as well give them the provisions?—You may be right, but it is my opinion it would not work.

25640. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think many people would go off the outdoor relief but if they did not get money but got it in kind, which would they rather have the money or the food?—I am sure they would rather have the money.

25641. Even though they might get better value from the relieving officer—more stuff than they could buy in a shop at retail prices?—I think all the same they would rather get the money and let them buy what they want, that is in a country place; I don't know how it would work out in a town.

25642. Is there anything you would like to add to what the chairman said?—If any union was abolished I think they should be better constructed than at present to ensure the least inconvenience.

25643. Would you take any divisions off Newcastle and throw them to any of the unions around?—I think not; the unions are long distances. There is a part of Crook which belonged originally to Newcastle, it was partly adjoining the division I represent, and it is nearer Newcastle than my division, and it is in Crook.

25644. That, you think, ought to go back to Newcastle?—I don't know about that, but it would be no hardship.

25652. I am not talking of the sick but of the healthy; would it be any hardship to them if the workhouse was away and the hospital retained?—I don't know, but I think it would be very unfair to do away with Newcastle and under to our division.

25653. If you have hospital accommodation what unfavourable is there?—If it was nothing but coming to the Board once a fortnight; you meet the people and effect a good deal of reduction in the rates.

25654. If you did away with the officers of the house proper and reduced largely the coal bill and upkeep?—We would rather have an additional burden on the rates than knock down the Newcastle Union.

25655. CHAIRMAN.—Why would you rather keep it?—Don't you think a Guardian who has to travel once a fortnight thirteen or fourteen miles has a very long journey, not to mind adding six more miles.

25656. Have you many tramps passing through Abbeyfeale?—Very little; they generally make for Newcastle.

25657. Do they make from Listowel to Newcastle in the one day?—A good many of them would.

25658. How many miles are you from Listowel?—Eight miles.

Mr. John
Braddock.

Dec. 1, 1894.

Mr. John
Hartigan.

25559. And thirteen from Newcastle?—Yes.
25560. Which union would you rather belong to?—I would not have anything to do with Lisfawel. The rates there are twice as high as Newcastle. Kerry is always in debt; they are very extravagant with roads and malicious injuries. In our western divisions they would agitate before they would go to Lisfawel.

25561. Although it is the nearest to you?—There is only about three miles of a difference, but they would travel ten miles before they would go to Lisfawel.

25562. There are not people often taken from Abbeyfeale to Newcastle Workhouse?—There are.

25563. Is there any difficulty raised about that; do you know of any sick people left at home who would go into a hospital if it were nearer?—Oh, no; there is a great convenience; Abbeyfeale is only ten miles from Newcastle on a good road.

25564. Are you in favour of boarding out children?—I don't know much about that, but I coincide with Mr. Hurley's opinion, which, I think, was very fair. With regard to the relief in kind. There are several cases where it would be impossible for a relieving officer or any man to supply all the things wanted. There are a good many in the division in which I live, and the first thing they take out of the relief money is to or so for a donkey load of turf; they are all buying turf.

Mrs. HARTIGAN, P.L.O., examined.

Mrs. Hartigan.

25572. CHAIRMAN.—You have come from the Croon Union?—Yes.

25573. Are you a Guardian?—Yes.

25574. You have heard the proposals to abolish Croon?—Yes, they all seem inclined to abolish Croon.

25575. What do you think?—I am the representative of the Guardians here, and they are totally opposed to it, and so are all the ratepayers; they don't see any cause for it; they think they will be paying more rates, but my fellow Guardians will explain that our union has been the lowest rated until Kilmallock got the Agricultural Grant.

25576. From your point of view what makes you think it would be desirable to continue Croon?—It would be a very great hardship on the people for sick people to have to go ten or twelve miles into Limerick, or Kilmallock, or Newcastle West.

25577. If a small hospital were kept at Croon?—I suppose if the hospital were there it would not entail any great hardship, for we have very few able-bodied people in the house.

25578. I mean if a hospital were kept, not for all the people dressed as sick, but for the acutely sick?—Yes.

25579. There are a large number of persons dressed as sick at Croon who are really chronic cases?—Some years there are about 400 on the doctor's books; those are chronic cases.

25580. I suppose the most he would ever have on the acute list would be from 15 to 20?—I suppose so.

25581. If a hospital with a dozen or more beds were kept there, do you think it would be much hardship to the sick?—It would be a great hardship to very old people to be very far removed from their friends; some of them are there since the workhouse was established, almost blind people and people bedridden for twelve or fourteen years; it would be a great hardship on those old people to send them to other unions, and we would reap no benefit from it.

25582. If a distinct benefit were to arise in the form of lower rates would you change your mind?—We could not be convinced on that point of lower rates; we think we would manage our own rates with more economy than any other body of Guardians, and we would only have a small representation on the Boards when we would be divided amongst the different Boards.

25583. Now the boarding-out of children—have you had any experience of that?—No; we have only one child boarded out, but lately the schoolmistress retired, and we are sending out the children to the National School every day.

25584. Would you be in favour personally of boarding out the children?—Yes; I would have no children in the workhouse; board them all out. Our experience is that they are nice healthy children until they reach three or four, and then they commence to fail in mind and body. They are not obliged either to exercise their

25585. They don't get a bit of turf back themselves—there may be a few of them get it, but more are destitute and feeble.

25586. And they have to buy their food?—They have a donkey load that would cost 1s. or 1s. 6d.; they would pull on with that for three weeks.

25587. Mr. MURPHY.—Don't you think they could earn enough for that?—There are some of them that would not earn 2d. in a month; they are not able to earn.

25588. The person must be very helpless that could not earn a little?—There are some of them very old and feeble; they don't scarcely get outside the door; they don't go for the relief, but send someone belonging to them, or that takes an interest in them, for it; all of them are bedridden and get things in the line of potatoes and new milk or tea. Sometimes, of course, they have to buy a share.

25589. CHAIRMAN.—Do many of them have to pay for a cottage or room?—Some of them have houses almost free, and others are paying 6d. a fortnight for small little houses.

25590. The relief goes to pay that?—Of course it does; some of them pay a shilling a month. Of course the week of the relief, they will beg around for that week.

25591. Are any of these people on relief in the labourers' cottages?—Oh, no; they are not any of them destitute in labourers' cottages that want relief.

25592. And their habits, and the result is that they become almost incapable of providing for themselves. And then when they are sent to Glina, the Sisters of Mercy and the Christian Brothers do all they can to try and fit them to cope with the world afterwards, and it is an utter failure with the materials we send them. They cannot make them see that they are obliged to do for themselves. And then when they leave Glina School they know no one outside the school or the workhouse, have no friends or acquaintances, they are sent out to service, and, of course, they don't like to work.

25593. You have traced some of these children after they left the school?—Yes; of course there are exceptions, but as a rule they are perfectly unfit to earn their bread. The moment they get into any difficulty they return to the workhouse again.

25594. Even after having been at Glina?—Even after having been at Glina; they are sent to Glina at eight or nine. They know what it is to be supplied with food, and driven in and out to the refectory, but they don't know where the bread comes from. They are driven in like sheep and out again, and the result is that when they have to do otherwise they don't like it, and return to the workhouse or go on tramp. And then we are sending children in order to keep up a supply to the workhouse, and to keep the ratepayers occupied trying to support them; that is about it. I am strongly in favour of boarding them out, and very young children too.

25595. As early as the medical officer would say they are fit for it?—Yes, and then there is the Lady Inspector, and as I mention the Lady Inspector she would be also very useful in inspecting the domestic arrangements of the workhouse. Of course you cannot understand the domestic arrangements, or whether there is economy or otherwise.

25596. You would be surprised how much they know!—I think there would be room for improvement in that way. And also another question about illegitimate children. They are under the influence of the mothers for a number of years in the workhouse; you cannot have classification in these small workhouses, and these children are under the influence of the mothers, who are often half idiots, half imbeciles, and who are so imprudent to the children one way or another. We would have boarded out all our children if it were possible, but we have those children whom we cannot board out.

25597. Would you be in favour of an enlargement of your power so as to enable you to board out all children?—I would keep no children in the workhouse; perhaps if they were exchanged and sent to a distant workhouse to take them from the influence of the mothers and their surroundings.

25690. Have you thought at all of keeping the mothers out of the workhouse—Oh, no; I would keep the mothers in the workhouse.

25691. Have you heard any suggestions about keeping the mothers out of the workhouse?—I don't think it is any good to allow the mothers out; our experience is that they come in again.

25692. The suggestion we received was that instead of being admitted into the workhouse they should be admitted into a penitentiary or reformatory managed by whatever religious persuasion they belonged to.—Certainly, that would be very good for the first offenders who could be let out again after a time.

25693. Keep there until the managers thought it safe to let them out?—Yes, but those who come in again and again?

25694. Don't you think the fact of their coming in again and again is largely the result of their remaining bearded together in the workhouse?—I don't think so.

25695. Their mode of life is not improved there—they is no attempt to elevate them?—Well, no, and you can only judge; when they do go out they return again; whether if they were kept under different circumstances that would have a good effect, I don't know.

25696. If that class was altogether excluded from workhouse—if a girl instead of coming to Croon, Newcastle, or Rathfriland, went to Limerick or some place where the Good Shepherds or some other similar body would take charge of them?—That would be a very good thing, but not for a young girl on her first offence.

25697. I am looking at it chiefly from the point of first offence?—They would look upon themselves and everyone would look upon them as being bearded as bad characters; they are looked on as hopeless.

25698. Are they generally kept there always?—They do mostly stay there always.

25699. That is a different system to the one suggested; it was suggested that they should go into some institutions where they should be kept. I suppose these things always get known where a girl would be?—We very often have them coming from distant unions, Newcastle West and Kerry; they are obliged to be admitted by the relieving Officer, and they stay in Croon; I mean the old ones that come in again and again.

25700. But these girls that come in for the first time are kept in the same room and associate with women who are respectable?—Yes.

25701. From that point of view, do you think it would be good that first offenders should never enter a workhouse if an institution could be found that would take these girls and keep them any for some months, or as long as might be considered necessary, and try and send them home or elsewhere for a fresh start?—Certainly; I have seen some of these girls turn out excellently; sometimes the children are paid for in Glin, and the mothers go to service or go to America.

25702. How do the girls do at Glin?—The same thing applies to the girls as to the boys. What we want are servants and agricultural labourers; there are plenty of tradespeople in the country. They are physically unfit to earn their bread from the system of training in this institution.

25703. They are not fit for family life?—I would send them to Glin after being reared in the country by mothers. Then I would send them to Glin to be trained as servants and labourers.

25704. In an institution like that could they train children to be useful about a house or farm as well as a child that was boarded out for ten years, and went to the National School with other children, and saw how the work of the place was done?—Then Glin School would be a benefit to it.

25705. How would it be benefited?—They would be trained in intelligence, and be capable of receiving the instruction they get there.

25706. What would they be taught there?—I think labour on the farm and trades; they have workshops where they make clothes.

25707. You don't want a labouring man to make a suit of clothes for himself?—I know it would not be such a success for a labourer, but the school is there, and that fact in connection with Glin would be excellent.

25708. And would that be the kind of training that would be useful to a farmer on getting these boys out again?—If they did as farmers do—have the same class of implements of labour—not having machinery or things that they will never see again.

25709. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Do you find any trouble in

getting horses for the children?—We have had no experience of that, but I am sure we would not; I am sure we would get places with respectable labourers for them; with two or three little boys at home they would find an advantage in being paid for another.

25710. One of the witnesses expressed a doubt about getting suitable homes?—They find no difficulty in Limerick, and I scarcely think the same thing would apply to us.

25711. You say you don't see any advantage in any change in system about Croon—you agree the children should not be kept in the house?—No.

25712. What about the inmates—should they be kept there?—They are just as well off as in Limerick. Dr. Courtney visited us a short time ago and reported that they were quite as comfortable as they could be; he advised some changes, which the Guardians made. Of course if there was some little work supplied to them it would be better.

25713. Do you not find them confined in a small yard walking about or closed up in the house?—Yes, but somehow they seemed quite happy.

25714. Don't you think it is a very helpless condition for these people—ought they not to be on a farm where they were doing something?—Certainly; for, of course, they all come from farms and are used to agricultural work.

25715. It has been suggested to me that it would be well to put them in an auxiliary asylum with a large amount of land attached to it, and they could be made self-supporting in that way—their cost of maintenance would not be as great as in an asylum proper?—Would a large colony of them together be any advantage to them?

25716. You would not have a large number in Limerick—not more than 300 or 400?—They could all be bearded in our workhouse; there is a large wing idle, and there could be plenty of land got in our neighbourhood.

25717. Would there not be more discipline and order if they were in a home by themselves?—If they had separate wards and separate attendants.

25718. You have hardly room at Croon now for any kind of treatment such as that?—There is a great part of the building unoccupied, and land enough to be got in the neighbourhood, I think, if necessary.

25719. Still the assistants could not have the knowledge of the treatment of these cases that men trained in an asylum would have?—I suppose you would have to get there.

25720. Would not that be a costly thing—would it not be better to send the inmates to an auxiliary asylum?—Would not another auxiliary asylum cost us as much as, and a great deal more than, part of our building; they would be more at home, I think, in a country place, having a farm and some land attached, where they would be under conditions they were accustomed to.

25721. If the auxiliary asylums were in a country place, which it probably will be, for instance, if established at Croon, would not that be a good location for the auxiliary asylum?—I am only representing the Guardians and ratepayers, and they are quite opposed to amalgamation.

25722. Perhaps they did not look at it in every light?—They looked at it in every way they thought it fair when the rates would not be in their own keeping.

25723. Supposing the Guardians still managed their own union, attended to their sick, and paid for the children bearded out, and for the lunatics in the auxiliary asylum?—Do you mean some of our union would go to Limerick and come to Kilmallock?

25724. I mean that your union would be of the area it is at present, but your house instead of having six or seven different classes would have but one class?—It was not put before the Guardians in that light, and I was only deputed to oppose amalgamation. About district rating, I would be for district rating; it would lead to far more economy; what is everyone's business is no one's business, and if each division had to give outdoor relief to its own poor.

25725. CHAIRMAN.—Would you care to see divisional rating for any other purpose than outdoor relief?—Yes, and labourers' cottages.

25726. With that we have nothing to do, but for outdoor relief you would like to see it. Do your Guardians care whether it is divisional or union rating for indoor relief?—I did not hear that discussed; I don't think they would mind that, but of course the

Dec. 1, 1904.

Mrs. Hartigan.

Dec. 1, 1904.
Mrs. Harding.

towns should get aid; it would be a very great injustice if they did not, for a great many country people go to settle in towns where they can get one room near the church; some of them are getting help from friends in America, and some of them getting outdoor relief; nearly all the old people are getting outdoor relief; they can all get a room cheap.

25727. What do they pay for a room?—In a great many instances a shilling a week.

25728. Dr. Brogan.—Do many patients come from Croon into the County Infirmary?—Very few, scarcely any.

25729. Of course Croon pays the same proportion to the County Infirmary as the Limerick district?—Yes, but it is not availed of as all; sometimes the doctor of the Croon Workhouse sends them in for special treatment—an operation.

25730. You never get nurses from the County Infirmary?—Yes, we have had nurses from the County Infirmary.

25731. Was that a satisfactory arrangement?—Well, yes; we don't require nurses except in the case of contagious diseases, perhaps.

25732. On relief duty?—Yes, but they generally relieve one another. We are well supplied with nurses.

25733. Have you thought of the subject of getting greater benefit for the money you give to the County Infirmary?—I don't know; as a rule people don't care to come into the County Infirmary from our district.

25734. Your district pays for your own sick, in your own Infirmary, and you also pay for the sick of other districts in the County Infirmary; what would you think of having a county rate for the support of the sick of the whole county, and in that way each hospital, however remote from the County Infirmary, would be supported by the county rate; your acute sick at Croon, or Newcastle West, or Balthakeale would be supported by a county rate?—We don't get benefit from the County Infirmary at all.

Captain O'BRIEN, R.R., F.R.S., examined.

Capt. O'Brien.

25741. CHAIRMAN.—You are one of the witnesses deputed by the Limerick Guardians?—Yes.

25742. Have they looked at the matter of emigration as affecting the whole county?—I don't think they have; I think the only idea they have with regard to utilising some of the widows in the county is to get rid of our harmless lunatics and epileptics. We have been looking forward to that for a long time, ever since the new Act came into force, because we have a good many of them in Limerick Union and the premises are not at all adapted to them; they are over-crowded.

25743. Did the Limerick Guardians come to any opinion as to what workhouse might be got for that purpose?—It was always suggested that Croon would be the most suitable, but in any case I suppose part of Croon would still have to be left as a district hospital for the infirm and so on; they could only utilise a part of it for harmless lunatics, I imagine.

25744. The number of beds for the acute sick would be very small?—What would become of the infirm?

25745. What would you suggest might be done with the infirm?—I am afraid they would have to remain there too.

25746. Or go to some other institution?—I am afraid we could not do that; in Limerick we have 225 infirm women already; they have increased largely.

25747. You have got a very large number in Limerick at present?—A very large number.

25748. If your schools were practically closed and you lost your lunatics, then you would have a great deal of additional space?—Oh, we should; we might be able to classify the inmates then.

25749. Then the only view so far as you are aware that was taken about consolidation was an anxiety to get a building cheaply for housing the harmless lunatics of the county?—That was it.

25750. Do you think the children might be more largely boarded out than they are? Under the existing law you can only board out deserted and orphan children; would you be in favour of an extension of the law that would give the Guardians power to board out all children who fell on the rates?—I would be strongly in favour of that.

25751. Dr. Brogan.—There would be some cases possibly where it could not be done, but, speaking generally, you would be in favour of power being given to board out?—Decidedly.

25752. I know, but to equalise it over the whole county; if the County Infirmary were supported out of the county rate?—I would say that would be very good indeed.

25753. Do you think that would be equitable?—Yes; a great many people from our place are sent to Cork, and they are sent to the Mater Hospital in Dublin; they are unwilling to come into Limerick.

25754. You think it would be a desirable arrangement if all the sick were supported of the county rate that there would be no preference given to one district; it has been contended that round about a County Infirmary, within a few miles, the sick go into that County Infirmary, and of course that district receives a larger benefit than a district ten or twenty miles away?—Yes, that is a very great hardship, we paying where we have no benefit.

25755. Has that been discussed by the Guardians at all?—I think it has, but they did not discuss it for this particular meeting.

25756. And if there was some institution established for the treatment of consumption it could be supported also by the same rate?—Yes, that would be very much wanted; consumption is very much on the increase; I heard a person say lately that Croon is full of consumption.

25757. In the Workhouse Hospital, although you may separate them, you cannot do much to cure them?—No, they don't get any benefit, for when they are commencing to get well, they go out to the same house and place and they lose whatever benefit they gained. Something is very much wanted for consumption; I know whole families die of consumption, and out of one house, a slatted house which cannot be disinfected, no light and no air, most valuable lives lost in that way. What adds to our sick are people coming from America broken down in health, and also they are sent home from America.

25758. You have had the boarding-out system for a long time in this union—you were one of the earliest unions to take it up?—I have only been a member since 1898.

25759. As regards the cheapness of relief, how you formed any opinion on that?—I think district rating as the fairest thing, for if the city has to pay more rates they get the benefit of all the money spent in the Union; certainly as regards outdoor relief it ought to be so.

25760. About how much do you pay for children at nurse?—I am not a member of the Boarding-out Committee; I have not gone into it.

25761. As regards tramps, would you be in favour of strong measures being taken with them to remove them from their tramping life if possible?—I think it is an evil that is decreasing very much; I don't think we are nearly so bad off here as in England.

25762. No, but still there is a large floating population continually on the march; would you be in favour of strong measures with them?—Certainly.

25763. Have the Limerick Board of Guardians considered the question of providing a sanatorium for the treatment of consumptive patients?—I don't think so.

25764. Have you any personal views on the subject?—I think it would be most desirable; the number of consumptive patients is on the increase; whether the patients themselves would object to being removed far from home—

25765. Of course it would be optional with them; you would not remove them by any compulsion whatever; do you not think any person once they go there suffering from a disease that is largely curable, would they not be willing to go under conditions where there would be a chance for their lives?—I think so.

25766. You say it is on the increase?—So the doctor told me a short time ago, and he can give you particulars.

25767. That is in your workhouse; of course although you may isolate the case you can do little towards benefiting the sufferer—you may prevent the spreading of the disease from those patients, but that is about all. Personally you think it is a most desirable thing?—I do.

25752. You think the ratepayers would not object if an institution were established as economically as possible, say perhaps for two or three counties to start with, not for your union by any means, but for a larger area—a couple of counties—Gloucester, Limerick, and perhaps Galway. What would you think of such a thing?—I think the ratepayers would object to any very large expenditure.

Mr. PATRICK BURNS EXAMINED.

25753. CHAIRMAN.—You represent the Limerick District Council?—Yes.

25754. Now we will be glad to hear your views on the question of amalgamation?—I have not any very definite views with regard to the unions we would abolish or amalgamate with; I have not worked it out.

25755. Do you think it desirable that there should be fewer workhouses in the county than there are?—I am quite positive about that. I believe our maximum expenditure is far and away too much at the present time.

25756. You would like to reduce the expenses of the staff?—I think there should be some limitation to the establishment charges. I have proved that already by going into the books of the union. Ten years ago we had in the Limerick Union 1,600 people; we had then eight officers less than we have now, although we have now only 1,000 people on an average, and we were paying in the year, in the aggregate, 2700 a year less salaries to the officers than now. I have gone into the question of the numbers in the house, and, on investigation, I find that we have on an average at the present time 1,000 people in the house and on inquiry I find that 163 of those were servants. I have computed that if I add the servants to the officers and their salaries, one-fourth of the entire number in the house were officers and servants. I am convinced that there should be some better supervision over this, and I don't think there should be such a large expenditure of money under existing circumstances.

25757. In what direction do you think economy might be started?—I believe there should be some definite system, by which duties would be allotted to officers, and there should be some limitation as to the number of officers in the house, and there should be some rate by which they would be paid—some definite rate. There is no finality; there is no fixed salary. I believe it is necessary we should have some sort of Civil Service system. At the present time it is not the best that gets the position vacant. It all goes, as is generally admitted, by favour and influence. That is admitted on all hands; I don't take it on myself to say that alone.

25758. You would have the vacancies filled by competitive examinations?—Yes, and I would have the posts graded. If a responsible position was to be filled, I would have the man in the next position to fill it. That is, by competitive examination, because, really, it must be admitted there is no defining what the abilities of an officer to take up an important position should be. I saw a case in point myself where a very expert man was required for a position vacant in the union, and a very expert man came forward, and all the votes he got were eight, as against thirty-four given to a man who knew practically nothing at all about the business.

25759. I hope you were one of the eight?—I was one of the eight, and the proposer. I don't attribute any blame to the officers; I am a bit indignant myself to get all I can for as little work as possible; it is a failing of human nature, but should be restricted by some means or other.

25760. Do you think the Guardians would agree to have the appointments filled as you suggest—by competition?—I don't see what really honest objection there could be to it. I don't think there is a sufficient watch at all upon the materially interested Guardians. I will instance that for you. In our board there was a strong rumour that a certain proportion of the Guardians were contractors to the board; I had no positive proof of that until very recently, when one man took it on himself to stand up at the board, and point out four of the Guardians that were contractors to the board.

25761. That is a matter we can hardly look into, because that is illegal. We are not here to look into

25762. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25763. A large number of cases might wish to go into it that could pay for their support, and in that way bring down the cost of the institution to, perhaps, a small thing?—Yes.

25764. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25765. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25766. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25767. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25768. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25769. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25770. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25771. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25772. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25773. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25774. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25775. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25776. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25777. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25778. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25779. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25780. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25781. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25782. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25783. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25784. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25785. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25786. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25787. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25788. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25789. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25790. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25791. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25792. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25793. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25794. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25795. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25796. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25797. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25798. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25799. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25800. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

Dep. 1, 1904.
Capt. C. Trevel.

Mr. Patrick Burns.

25771. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25772. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25773. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25774. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25775. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25776. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25777. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25778. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25779. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25780. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25781. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25782. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25783. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25784. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25785. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25786. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25787. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25788. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25789. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25790. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25791. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25792. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25793. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25794. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25795. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25796. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25797. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25798. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25799. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25800. It would not be a large expenditure when you consider the large area—it would be a very small expenditure—I am sure they would not object.

25774. Don't you think it is largely the interest of the local body?—It is the local body; but in the wind-up the union will rest with the individual. And if he does bring a charge against such a man as I have pointed out, it is not from any disinterested motives he does so.

25775. Your suggestion is that the Local Government Board should take steps for watching in every union. That would mean a tremendous lot of money?—I don't think it would require a lot of money. An example should be made here and there, and that is as much as the law can do in any case. People evade the law every day, and are only deterred by examples made from place to place. As a matter of fact, what I contend is, that there is no proper economic supervision over the unions, and that the representatives of the people are not sufficiently interested in making the working of the union economic; some other system must be adopted.

25776. What system would you adopt?—I would have an expert appointed to go in, give him a month's rest, and then give him twelve months to work our union in the most economic manner, and then show—"I can work this union several thousand pounds less than you," and lay that down as a standard that we are not to exceed per rate. No man has a sufficient interest in the union to do that, or, if he has, he is in a van minority.

25777. Mr. MURKIN.—Every year does not require the same amount of money?—Pro rata, I say. If an expert worked the union for so much with so many patients, I don't see why we should exceed that afterwards.

25778. That man might run it on close lines, and be very hard on the poor, in order to establish a character for economy—he would be himself interested in having a low figure?—I quite agree; but if there is a standard of dietary, it would be highly immoral to deprive any man of his due proportion of dietary.

25779. But there might be no improvements needed or improvements done in that particular year?—I say pro rata, putting everything down at the proper rate. I believe there is an unaccountable waste.

25780. CHAIRMAN.—Have you gone into that yourself to try and cut it down?—I have gone into it to seek an extent that I have knocked my head against a good many. I have been trying to retrench for a long time, but up to the present I have not succeeded. I have caused some minor reforms, but I have caused a lot of displeasure, and I have been knocking my head against deep-rooted prejudices. I cannot eradicate the old system.

25781. Mr. MURKIN.—Really, what harm has been done? Are you not aware that within the last five or six years the condition of the inmates of these institutions is very much improved; they are getting better dietary and more careful nursing, and the houses themselves are improved beyond recognition?—I

Dec. 1, 1904.

Mr. Patrick
Borke.

don't question that at all. I quite agree that the conditions of the inmates of unions have improved, just in the same proportion as of outside people, for the working people are somewhat better off just now. I don't say in Limerick; the people in Limerick are not so well housed; but the inmates of the unions should not cost on an average £23 a head; that no mechanics or man in the city can allow his family to cost.

25792. That is undeniably a very high figure, and I agree with you that it is quite too high.—But, then, you will take children on the breast on that; they will be reckoned against you, and foundlings. In our union we have at present, on an average, 1,000 inmates, and it costs about £28,000 a year. Of course, you have out-door relief, which amounts to somewhere about £3,000, and you have to pay on losses; but I have made up my mind that, one way or another, our cost is on an average £23 per head.

25793. Dr. BOORM.—Tell me how you make it up?—I have not the figures exactly. If you take the total and take the out-door relief, and take the loans and one thing or another from it, you will find that coats, provisions, and clothing, and one thing or another, will amount to what I say, and you enter for 1,000 for £23,000.

25794. Mr. MURPHY.—You cannot charge out-door relief?—I am not charging it; I am taking the out-door relief from the £23,000.

Mr. GUINNESS (Clerk).—£27,000 odd, and out-door relief is about £5,000.

Dr. BOORM.—There are the medical officers' salaries, of course!

Mr. GUINNESS.—Yes. The average weekly cost in the house is only about 3s. 5d. or 3s. 6d. a week.

25795. Dr. BOORM.—Now we have brought it down to £23,000?—I am not taking those figures; I am taking it from the investigation that took place in Dublin a short time ago, and I will give you the pamphlet on it, where the inmates of workhouses in Ireland are mentioned.

25796. We don't want those fancy things. When you are talking about a particular union stick to the figures of it. You are living here, and you could get the figures of it far better than to make a broad statement of £23 per head per annum. It shows it could not possibly cost that. You have the relieving officers' and lots of salaries outside the workhouse out of that £23,000—the clerk's salary. You are putting everything down to the cost of the inmates; you would need a clerk if you had not a workhouse here at all—I say the upkeep of the union costs that.

25797. Medicine for dispensary doctors; vaccination for a district five miles away from Limerick should not be included in the £23 per head!—That is the way I am looking at it; I say the upkeep of the union costs that.

25798. Now you are talking sense. If you say the upkeep of your union costs £23,000, and your inmates vary from 1,000 to 1,500 a year, and at the same time you have a lot of other expenditure included in the £23,000, that will not bind you to £23 per head?—No, it is taken from the report of the Dublin investigation.

25799. If you investigated it a little further you might find it to disappear—I am taking the opinion of experts on the thing.

25799. CHAIRMAN.—At all events, you will see that it is not fair to take dispensary expenditure under the head of indoor cost!

Dr. BOORM.—And sanitary officers' salaries!—The union costs close on £23,000 a year, and I say those things ought to be covered by £5,000 or £7,000 or £8,000 a year. If you, gentlemen, go into it yourselves, you will find that establishment charges and everything connected with the upkeep of the paupers amounts to

far and above what a tradesman or any mechanic outside can afford to spend on his family. I am not saying what is unreasonable, when I say the people in the workhouse are costing far more than a working man outside can afford to have his family cost him.

25799. Dr. BOORM.—A large proportion of your patients and inmates are sick patients; they require a large amount of attendance and nursing!—I don't question that at all. I am quite disposed to give everything that is essential to the inmates; I don't want to retrench in that direction; I think it is quite the wrong way to do things.

25799. I might say with you, to some extent, that in certain ways these might be economy effected if there was closer supervision, but I would rather you would indicate these points?—I am not bringing any specific charge; I believe it is a system that has been allowed to creep in, and I don't say the present officers are any more responsible than the officers who went before them. I say it is a system that has been allowed to creep from day to day. I say we have 600 people less now. I have proved this. I have taken it from their own books, and we have eight officers more than when we had 600 more inmates.

25799. Did you inquire what class those patients or inmates were—those they may not have been sick, and the proportion of sick might have been altered considerably?—We have one-third less now; that would hardly account for it.

25799. I would like to follow the class of inmates a little further?—Certainly.

25799. The nursing has improved of late years; you must improve with the times?—I am speaking within ten years; I am not going back to ancient times, when things were done in a primitive way; and I took it from the books, that while the numbers have fallen away by over 600, the officers have been increased, and the aggregate of the salaries have increased by £200 or £700 a year. Is not that inconsistent?

25799. Who raised the salaries?—I never raised one.

25799. CHAIRMAN.—At all events, you would very much prefer to see a scale of salaries and appointments made by competition, and economies introduced?—I certainly would; and I would like to see every man paid in a public employment at about his market value in the outside world, and I don't think he should be made any better off than the people who are keeping up the union, and have to compete in the markets of the world for their maintenance. I don't think there is anything unreasonable in that.

25799. I don't think there is; but we do not agree with the way you work out the calculation. We have been making these calculations ourselves as we went round, but there are a number of items that should be included?—That is where we disagree; of course, I may be wrong.

25799. The only thing is, if you are keeping people in the workhouse, you cannot put on the cost of their maintenance what you would pay for out-door relief?—I say in Doon?—Certainly not.

25800. You have to see how many items ought to come off before you divide it by the number of inmates?—Supposing I allowed £7,000 or £3,000 for that; but any way you bring it down it will cost £17,000.

25801. These general statements are not safe. You can easily do it. Get the actual cost, and divide it by the number of inmates!—I have taken off nothing. I confess, but the out-door relief and some sanitary officers, and then I thought everything that occurred after that was chargeable.

25802. It would not look to me as if you made all necessary deductions, but still you are quite right—there is room for economy!—Yes, without doing anybody any harm.

Mr. JOHN B. BARRINGTON, *c.r.*, examined.

Mr. John B.
Barrington.

25803. CHAIRMAN.—You considered the number of unions that might be broken up in the county?—There was a meeting of District Councils here conjointly with the County Council, but they really did not come to any definite conclusion. Individually, all are in favour of amalgamation, provided it would mean a reduction of the rates; personally, I think there is room for a great deal of amalgamation everywhere.

25804. What unions did you yourself think might be broken up?—Looking at the map of the County

Limerick, Cross is forced on your mind as one at once, but there is a question whether the Limerick part of Mitchelstown should not come into Kilmallock. Swansdale, too, possibly might be broken up; but there is room, undoubtedly.

25805. Where a union is broken up, do you think it desirable to keep a small hospital for the acute sick?—I think there should be some provision for the acute sick or accidents; but the railway accommodation is very good, as far as Limerick is concerned.

25806. That does not help the acute sick?—No.
25807. The chief matter that taxed this subject on the attention of the Guardians and Council is the necessity of providing additional accommodation for the lunatics?—Yes.

25808. Are you personally in favour of the enlargement of the asylum, or the provision of an auxiliary workhouse?—I am strongly in favour of as least being left in any workhouse; it is a perfect scandal.

25809. Where would you remove him?—I think to an auxiliary, if it could be established under the asylum; a sort of branch, it seems to me, would be the most feasible, and the medical superintendent should have a certain control.

25810. And maintained at a cheaper rate?—Yes; but the ratepayers are frightened with the idea that the auxiliary asylum would have to be equipped; I don't think it would be necessary to have it expensively equipped as a first-class asylum.

25811. They should have had to work on?—Occasionally.

25812. You are chiefly connected with the Limerick Workhouse. If you got the lunatics out of the workhouse, that would give you a good deal of extra room?—It would.

25813. Do you think it is a proper place to keep children?—I think it is the last place. However, Limerick Union is very good about boarding out; every child that the present law allows to be boarded out is boarded out; but it might be extended, I think.

25814. Would you give the Guardians discretion to board out all children who come into their hands to be maintained out of the rates?—I would give them that power.

25815. Do you think that would be largely used in Limerick?—I think it would. Cases arise here where everybody wants to board out the child and it cannot be done.

25816. What do you think about the mothers; you heard the suggestion about having them in a different institution, a sort of reformatory?—I think that would be the proper sort of thing—a penal settlement of some sort.

25817. Rather a place where first offenders might go, not as a penal settlement, but where efforts might be made for their reclamation, and after a comparatively short time in those institutions they might get a fresh start?—That is what I mean; penal was the wrong word—a home.

25818. Do you think it might be possible in that way to close a workhouse altogether to women who enter it for the purpose of having illegitimate children?—I think it might.

25819. They could be taken into a district hospital or some larger hospital for maternity purposes, and as soon as the child was born they could go back to the penitentiary?—Precisely, and take the child from them, because we have instances of a girl born in the house that has married and had a baby, and the father and mother were both in the house; we are rearing a population.

25820. We, ourselves, have seen four generations in the same workhouse?—The children seem to be at the bottom of it.

25821. That would diminish the number in your workhouse enormously?—It would.

25822. If you had the lunatics, the children, and the mothers removed, you practically would have nobody left except the aged and infirm and the sick?—It would give a lot of room for the redistribution of wards.

25823. In that way you would have room in the Limerick Workhouse for the aged and infirm, perhaps of the whole county?—I don't know that we would; we possibly would; a considerable portion from the city comes in; that depends upon whether the Clare portion remains with Limerick.

25824. Are you prepared to speak about that?—It is very hard to speak about, owing to Limerick being situated on the bounds of the county; it seems unique, but how are you to deal with the Clare portion.

25825. It was suggested to us at Ennis that a cottage hospital might be started at Clonbeg, to which all the Clare sick should go, and the able-bodied and aged and infirm should go to Ennis?—There is no objection to that.

25826. Do you see any advantage from having the unions portions of the county—not going outside the county?—Except for the matter of clerk's work in the various offices and rating; it makes an enormous number of difficulties in rating.

25827. It has been suggested in a great many places that it would be wise to have the unions exterminate with the counties?—Except from that point of view I don't know that the thing struck me.

25828. If you could take all the able-bodied into one institution in the county; that would cause the greatest possible reduction in the staff outside; all the persons employed outside the workhouse, taking care of the aged and infirm, would cease to be officers, and that would mean a very large reduction in the rates?—They would all have to be pensioned.

25829. But that is a terminable charge?—It would mean a reduction.

25830. Do you see any disadvantage in bringing all the aged and infirm in the county into one institution in the county; it has been put before us that there is a hardship in bringing people so far from the place where they were reared?—As a certain extent, with respectable people, it is a hardship; their friends are not able to visit them.

25831. We have made inquiries about the visits of friends and find they are made largely to the sick, but very rarely to the aged and infirm?—I don't think any real hardship would arise.

25832. If such arrangements were carried out it might be possible to classify the aged and infirm, according to their character and conduct?—That certainly should be done, and I think there might be something in the nature of a privilege given to old respectable people of wearing their own clothes, and perhaps getting out.

25833. If one workhouse in the county were made into a large almshouse for the aged and infirm of the county, and the only other persons in the neighbourhood of that building would be the chronic sick of the union, you might have a great many privileges given owing to the different blocks of the buildings you have got?—Yes, you could, certainly.

25834. As regards chargeability, what do you think about that?—I think we ought to go back to the divisional; union rating has led to great extravagance. No Guardian is ever interested in any division now.

25835. Some Guardians say they are now all trying to pull as much out of it as they can?—Yes, they say somebody at the other end of the union has got something; why don't you get something too; you are no good as a representative.

25836. How far would you carry the divisional charge?—Outdoor relief ought certainly to be divisional.

25837. Do you see any advantage in making indoor relief cases a divisional charge?—Not very much.

25838. If they come into the house it is a severe test; you are not likely to reduce the number coming in by making it an electoral charge?—People would like to say that there was no one from the division in the house; but it is as important as outdoor relief.

25839. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—It sometimes happens that people come in who could afford to pay, and when it is not charged on a particular electoral division the Guardians don't look after it?—I don't think any person comes into the house who can afford to keep out; certainly divisional rating had a great effect.

25840. CHAIRMAN.—Would you not, in any way, give the towns any relief?—I think you would have to do something that way.

25841. Have you thought how far you would go?—No; I thought about it but did not arrive at any solution, unless something in the nature of a grant from the whole county.

25842. Different suggestions were made that, say three-fourths of the relief of the towns should be met by the towns, and the other one-fourth spread over the union?—You would have to give them some grant towards it; some proportion on these lines.

25843. Another suggestion was, that a close inquiry of some sort should be made to find out what, having regard to the past expenditure and the present circumstances, was about a fair amount to pay as a standard for each electoral division of the union, that as long as that standard was not exceeded it should be union-at-large, but the moment there was anything over it that it should fall back on the electoral division?—The only thing about that is in the case of exceptional distress in the city, and it was necessary to give outdoor relief, they would be tied to their standard; it would be severe on the city.

Dec. 1, 1904.

Mr. John B. Harrington.

Dec. 1, 1904.
—
Mr. John B.
Harrington.

25844. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Is there not the other danger, that each division would qualify for the full amount?—There is.

25845. CHAIRMAN.—It ought to be so low that they would not aim very high!—Yes. I think there should be some absolute law on the subject against outdoor relief being given to people who drink. I would like to see something in the nature of two convictions in twelve months disqualifying for outdoor relief, and then the auditor could come on it at once.

25846. Somebody would bring that before the auditor!—I would make it the duty of the relieving officer, who could be surcharged, or if he had the authority of the Guardians it should be surcharged on the Guardians.

25847. Do you think a relieving officer would continue to give relief if he knew it was misapplied?—I have heard a relieving officer asked, "What sort of people are these?" "They drink it a bit." There is a feeling against being too hard on them and cutting them off.

25848. What do you think of the Cork Guardians' idea of distributing it in kind?—I don't think there is much in that.

25849. Sending round a van?—Giving it in kind from a shop only opens room for speculation.

25850. That was inquired into and considered a very undesirable method, but distributing bread and potatoes in kind?—I think a poor person, with 1s. 6d. a week, would take out what the van for 10s. would not bring; they can work with some small sum per week.

25851. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Can you not see that these people could get more for 5s. furnished at wholesale rates than they could possibly get buying in pennyworths, besides it would do away with the danger of some of them spending the money in drink?—If they want to spend the relief in drink they will convert the goods rapidly into drink; I don't think I would be in favour of the van.

25852. Take the Charitable Associations, for instance the St. Vincent de Paul; don't they give their help in kind, and not in money?—I believe they do.

25853. And you may be sure members try to make the money go as far as they can?—They do; but that is more for the sick; not necessarily for the people who are really hungry.

25854. Guardians do it in Dublin?—I don't know about a country district; it might be more applicable to a city; but I don't think it would work in the country districts.

25855. You also think that power should be obtained to send inmates to their own homes or unions?—Yes; I think that ought to be.

25856. That is, people who are in the union would no longer be a charge if you could incur a small expense in sending them to where they belong?—Yes; people come into the Limerick Jail, which is the jail for Tipperary, Clare, and Limerick, and they are discharged and come into the workhouse; we have no power to send them away.

25857. You think that power might be given?—I think it ought to be. I think there ought to be some power that where there are respectable people in the house with children, and the mother wants to go out for work, that the children might be detained in the house for a specified time while the mother or parents are endeavouring to get work; discretion might be given to the Guardians. It is impossible for her to start again with the children trailing after her.

25858. That might lead to people leaving their children behind with you?—Yes; but the Guardians would know the people; cases do come up of respectable people who have got into trouble. And there ought to be power to give relief with a free hand to people before their home is broken up; a little at a particular period might keep the home together, and keep them there, and they cease to be a charge on the rates, whereas if there is a rule to give them nothing until they are absolutely destitute they can never get on their legs again.

25859. It has been suggested to us that poverty should be the test, not destitution. The question is whether such cases might not be left to the charitable?—What are you to do when they creep up at the Board, as they do; I think the Guardians might have a freer hand in that.

25860. Could you draw the line so that it would

not lead to widespread extensions?—I don't know that it would lead to a very widespread thing.

25861. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Would not an electoral division charge and giving goods in kind be sufficient checks?—That would not pay the rent; suppose someone would be fired out next day if they did not pay the rent, the van would not help that.

25862. CHAIRMAN.—The electoral division charge would operate as a good check?—Yes.

25863. Dr. BOGGIN.—What class of cases do you refer to?—From time to time there is an application, the Relieving Officer says some calamity has come to a family; perhaps the father has died; that if they could keep the home together for a week or two they would get work.

25864. They are out of work?—I don't know that; that would be simply out of employment, but cases do crop up from time to time that are very hard.

25865. You think that these cases come into the workhouse on account of the want of a small allowance?—I think they do; the home gets broken up, and they remain on the rates for long periods.

25866. So you think it would be true economy?—It would.

25867. You say children of weak intellect are not fit subjects for workhouses, as they drift into the infirm and lunatic wards?—Yes, if there was some institution for all Ireland to take them.

25868. One for all Ireland ought to be quite enough?—I should think it would be quite enough.

25869. In the same way one for the same epidemic?—Would be sufficient.

25870. CHAIRMAN.—You think a sanatorium for consumptives is necessary?—I think a workhouse is a reasonable place for them.

25871. We had evidence yesterday in Ennis. One suggested for Galway, Clare and Limerick is a very good central situation at Corofin?—It is a good busy spot I should say.

25872. Neither consumptives, children, nor lunatics you think should be left in the wards?—Yes; there are 200 lunatics in the County Limerick unions.

25873. As regards payments by persons who are able to contribute some little or all the cost of their maintenance?—I should think that would be very desirable.

25874. Would you give the body power to declare how much was reasonably payable and power to enforce it at Petty Sessions or in a summary method?—I would.

25875. Leaving it to the discretion of the local body?—Yes.

25876. You say you have not many tramps in the Union Workhouse, but you have a great many in the country, as you are aware?—A great many, but I think it is entirely attributable to our Master in the Limerick Union.

25877. He gets them to pass on?—They don't like him; they don't like his methods.

25878. What does he do?—I don't think he does anything cruel, but does not let them out until they do a certain amount of work; he does not pamper them.

25879. Do you think it would be a better thing to have some system for all Ireland so that a man tramping round the whole country should be looked up and made to work?—I think there ought to be; we should distinguish between the man going about trying to get work and the man who is an idler from his birth.

25880. That could be managed by a certificate from any recognised person—the Relieving Officer could certify?—I think that would be very easily done; that would be very desirable to put a stop to them.

25881. And a man who had not such a permit would be liable to go to the labour colony?—Yes.

25882. You would approve of that?—Certainly.

25883. You would like to see the number of Guardians lessened?—I certainly would, one to each division. And in order to bring on lady Guardians—there might be a difficulty in getting ladies elected—I would like if there was power to put on so many ladies in proportion to the number on the Board, power to co-opt and combine a number of electoral divisions together to elect lady Guardians and return them at the same time? Is there any reason for going to that extent?—I think the simplest way would be to give the Board power to co-opt five; some ladies won't go forward in a contested election, and they are the most useful.

25884. If they were co-opted would you give them the full power of membership?—I would, the full powers.

Mr. JOHN M'LENNY, J.P., Chairman, Limerick Union, examined.

55885. CHAIRMAN.—We need hardly ask you—you are Chairman of the Limerick Board of Guardians for a considerable time?—Yes, I had that honour while you were our Inspector.

55886. What is the view of your Guardians as to amalgamation?—We took no view as Guardians; we did not meet on the subject at all, but they sent us here just to give our views.

55887. What are your own views?—I am for amalgamation if economy can be effected.

55888. Without hardship?—Yes, but I am not for auxiliary asylums. We at the Rennie Asylum Board instead of going in for an auxiliary asylum went in for building apartments for 450 new patients.

55889. At an expense of £50,000—£55,000; but I think they want to bring in some new arrangements. 55890. £45,000 has been sanctioned?—It has been sanctioned, but the new Council again are going to kick up a row about it.

55891. You personally would be in favour of an extension of the existing asylum?—I would on the ground of expense; I think if you take up an auxiliary asylum you will have to pension off the officers and then have a new staff; it might do later on when the county could better afford to pay, but at present we cannot.

55892. But if there was economy?—If there was economy I am with you.

55893. Do you think that an auxiliary asylum would cost more, counting the cost of building and interest on money, that it would cost more than the existing asylum?—That was our opinion in Ennis.

55894. The latest estimate is £45,000 for the erection, and that has been sanctioned by the Lord Lieutenant?—It has.

55895. Then it has to go before the County Council to see whether they will apply for the loan?—They have refused it once.

55896. If they decline to apply for the loan the whole matter falls through?—Yes.

55897. Do you think the addition to the asylum would cost less in the way of staff and other expenses than the auxiliary?—It would.

55898. And you would get 4s. a week instead of 2s. 7?—That was another reason that the Asylum Board went in for building instead of taking up this old house in Corvagh.

55899. You yourself belong to Class 1?—Yes.

55900. What do you think of the idea of Poor Law Unions being certificate-holders with counties?—Well, if we were commencing to build unions at the present time it would be all right, but considering the mileage, the way the unions are now fixed you cannot do it very well; if you were to separate the Clare portion from Limerick Union it would be twenty-five miles from Ennis.

55901. What do you think of the suggestion made at Ennis yesterday that a hospital sufficient for the society sick should be started at some central place in the County Clare part of the Limerick Union?—I was thinking first to myself that it would be more saving to us because we have been well visited under the Act. For instance I pay 1s. 3d. and 1s. 6d. more in my division than I did before the new Act on account of union rating. On the other hand if we were sent to Ennis we would have no representation there because the fellows would not go twenty-five and twenty-eight miles away to a Board every day.

55902. Where does your District Council meet?—At Limerick; we meet in the union.

55903. If Poor Law matters remained with your District Council, and if your District Council was part of the Poor Law system of Clare?—You mean to cut us off altogether; oh, capital; we would be getting rid of the big screw of the city.

55904. You would be quite willing if you had a hospital at some central part of your union to go to Clare?—There would be the bother if we had to meet at Ennis.

55905. If your Rural Council was made the Poor Law authority for Limerick No. 23—if it were I would be for it.

55906. You would not have to go to Ennis at all, but would deal with Poor Law matters in your own District Council?—I would be delighted with it; it did not strike me before now.

55907. As regards the children being boarded out?—I am heart and soul with it; I have been thirty-two

years a Guardian, and I find the boarding out of children is the proper thing to do; they only cost you £28, while in Glins they cost £14, and while I say the Glins business is being capitally managed I find the children coming out of it are no good for an agricultural constituency like ours, and if they were boarded out they would know how to work on a farm as agricultural labourers and servants, whereas we require more than anything else. I had one myself out of Glins within the last two months, and he could not tell me the right or left side of an ass, and as far as the trades they are getting there they have no trade at all; they come out from there without knowing anything. I am not saying anything against the monks and the nuns.

55908. They are taken care of there capitally?—Yes, but for outside purposes afterwards they are no good, and that is the opinion of every man I meet; they are capitally taken care of; there is no doubt about that, but we find they are no use to us; they turn out in the end to be soldiers, and the girls as a rule soldiers' wives. A fellow ran out of my house; I happened to be ill and was away; he would do nothing for anybody.

55909. Where did he go?—I don't know where he went, we have not found him; he belonged to Limerick Union; he was an orphan, a foundling, a nice little boy I thought; they said he was one of their best boys in Glins, but he did not know anything, you should lead him along; he did not know how to tackle a donkey; he was like a boy you brought out of a hand-bag, but he was a nice gentle boy.

55910. Have you seen anything of the children at Clarina and elsewhere?—Yes, my wife happens to be one of the Ladies' Committee, and has charge of the Clare side; I drive her along and look after them, and they are carefully minded and are mixed with the community that they will have to live with.

55911. Do they ever turn up in the workhouse again?—Very few.

55912. There would all be children boarded out late in life?—Yes.

55913. They would not be as satisfactory as children boarded out young?—No; I should board them out from their youth—as soon as they are able to eat; I am dead for boarding out; from what I see they will be useful members of society after fifteen or sixteen years of age.

55914. You would not have any lunatics in the house?—I certainly would not.

55915. You would send the Clare lunatics to the Rennie enlarged asylum?—Decidedly; our idea is to send all to the asylum in Ennis—that was the reason we enlarged it.

55916. As you are so much in favour of boarding-out would you be in favour of an extension of the law so as to enable Guardians to board out all children that have to be supported out of the rates?—Yes; we can only board out foundlings now, and the mothers won't let us board the others out without their consent.

55917. That would again clear out your workhouse of children very largely?—Yes; they ought not to be brought up in the union at all.

55918. Then the other class are the mothers of these children—you heard the discussion here to-day?—I did, and I agree that something ought to be done—some change ought to be made.

55919. So that they would not be reared together in the workhouse?—Yes.

55920. In the workhouse you necessarily have to keep together the first offenders and the old hardened offenders?—Yes, they are all alike; it demoralises the whole lot; I find that we have people from Galway, West Clare, Kerry, and County Limerick Unions coming in here to Limerick with children to hide themselves; they go out for a time and come back again, and we have them all the time in the union; there ought to be something done in that line.

55921. The girls coming to be confined from distances are those first offenders?—Yes.

55922. If these girls had an opportunity of going to a penitentiary?—Yes, but the Magdalen Asylum has a bad name and people don't like to go there; there should be some institution for first offenders.

55923. And those who have fallen more than once should go to the Magdalen?—Yes; I would not mix them up with the young ones.

Dec. 1, 1904.

Mr. John M'Leanny

Dec. 1, 1904.

Mr. John
McInerney.

25924. You would have mothers and children and lunatics all taken away out of the house—then you would only have the sick and aged and infirm. Would you be in favour of having the aged and infirm for each county placed in a central institution where they could be chained?—There would be an objection to that—that the friends of those people could not go so far away to visit them; they would rather have them nearer home.

25925. I am speaking of the aged and infirm rather than the sick; that objection was made in places we visited, and we got information that these very old people who come in there are personally neglected and not visited. The sick possibly are visited?—I agree with you, they are neglected, but they are not a big number.

25926. So the question of removing them from their own neighbourhood would not arise in many cases, and if it did arise, do you not think out-door relief would be a way of dealing with it?—No; nor I don't believe in having insane people boarded out, it would not do at all.

25927. It would hardly do in most cases?—No.

25928. Their habits and customs would not do at all?—No; they should be in some place where they could be looked after by trained people.

25929. Then you would also have the vagrants and tramp?—I would take the tramps, and do the hardest thing you could with them; they are an idle, reckless crowd. If there could be some colony or farm, where they would be all put in together and made work, the same as if they were in penal servitude, it would be just the price of them.

25930. Possibly that might lead to their getting in-door habits, and then they could get permission to go out, and be brought back again if they did not get on well?—Yes. I should like that we would have the power of sending from our union people that belonged to another union. We have people here from different unions. They come here from the West of Clare, not so many now, a great number of Kerry people, West Limerick, and Cork; they come in here to Limerick; it is a big place, and they can get a job; they throw themselves on us; we want power to send them back to their own unions; we have hundreds of them turning up. Mr. Barrington gave evidence a while ago to the same effect; they turn up every day.

25931. I suppose the Limerick people turn up at Cork?—We would rather have our own, and transfer the others; we would run the chance of being at the best side.

25932. I dare say you could get some of the officials to make out a list of the number of persons who are

from a distance outside the union at present in your workhouse?—Our clerk would do that very easily. I may say I am for divisional relief.

25933. Would you give any relief to the towns?—I would, such as was suggested a while ago. There ought to be some scale for the town. I would not be too hard on the towns, business, up to the present, a great many people have been hunted from the country into the town. That won't happen in the future. Formerly the landlords hunted a number of people into the towns, and there they and their descendants are. But when people work all their lives in the towns, and get to be paupers, the town merchants have a right to support them, as much as we do in the country.

25934. You would give them some relief—I would; something fair.

25935. About consumption. You know the County Clare?—It was suggested it would be a good thing to put one of the workhouses apart—Oarefin—which could be used as a sanatorium for consumptions?—It would be a capital place—excellent air and a fine house.

25936. Do you see any objection to that?—No. There is one objection I have to all new plans, and that is expense.

25937. You would have an institution there, where there was an institution before, and you would have the area of charge over three counties?—That would make it very small. Something like that would be a very good thing. I am for a single-member division.

25938. What would you think about the ladies?—I should say if you co-opt members five or ten, let them be ladies, and let the men fight their own battle, and get in or out.

25939. You would not oblige the ladies to go up for election?—No; I would have a certain amount of co-optation on every Board for ladies. I find them very good.

25940. You would not think it necessary to have any scheme of election by which ladies would only compete for certain divisions?—Oh, no.

25941. Supposing you had three groups of electoral divisions for the County Clare side of the union, and were able to elect three ladies for that, and only ladies were eligible for those divisions, would you see any objection to that?—I mean with a view of keeping up the idea of election and not of co-optation?—I understand you there, but I think it would be better if you went on the old system of one Guardian for every division, and for the whole union a certain amount of co-optation for ladies, and have no election for them. One for every dispensary district is the fairest way. I don't think it is right for us to put ladies to the trouble of a contest.

Mr. T. D. CLIFFORD examined.

25942. CHAIRMAN.—You read to be Chairman of Oron Guardians long ago?—Yes.

25943. Do you share the opinions of the other Oron witnesses that have been here to-day, that it would be disadvantageous to Oron to break it up?—I do, certainly, on the ground of inconvenience to the poor and economy.

25944. If the sick were treated in Oron, do you think there would be much inconvenience?—I do not think there would, if you had a hospital there.

25945. Then it would be a question of economy, and you would be guided in your opinion as to whether there was a substantial saving to the ratepayers or not?—I am confident there would not. On the contrary, I believe it would be a very large expense.

25946. If it turned out there was a substantial saving, would that alter your view?—In might, if you want the Oron Union, not to leave it idle. Oron is the lowest-rated union in the county. In Glin you have a rate of 4s. 1d. in the 2, while Oron is 2s. 1d. You have in the rural division of Glin a rate of 3s. 7d. of county rate.

25947. Not county rate?—Union and all. In Oron it is 2s. 1d.

25948. We have no power as regards county charges, but the union only—you have not the union charges?—I have not those.

25949. If Oron Union were, to a great extent, left idle, do you think it would make a suitable place for an auxiliary asylum, if the Limerick people wished to have an auxiliary instead of an addition?—I think it

would; but I would rather prefer to have the lunatics together under one control.

25950. You would rather have one complete establishment in Limerick?—One establishment. I think it would be far better that all three would be kept together. You have a regular staff of physicians and doctors which, I think, would be a very great expense; I don't see how it could reduce the rates whatever. I think there would be an increase, and then the doing up of the house would cost a lot more. You thought you had got a house that was to do Glin, but it cost 24,000; still, it is a very good institution, and doing good work.

25951. What do you think about the chargeability?—I think it is fair, and should remain as it is. I live in a congested district, I am sorry to say it is not so congested now, but I don't see why outside divisions should see those labourers all their lives, and then, when they get sick, send them back to the Fodanore division.

25952. You did not suffer from that at Skibb?—Yes.

25953. But your district got relief just the same as a town?—Not so much; but it was relief. I would much prefer to remain as I am, compared with joining Limerick, and so would the whole of the ratepayers of Oron, I think.

25954. Have you had much experience of boarding out?—Not very much; but I think it is very good; they ought all to be boarded out at a most tender age.

25955. Are you one of the governing body at Glin?—Yes.

Mr. T. D.
Clifford.

25956. What do you think of the arrangements there?—I think it is very good; but I am afraid the children are not learning the trades as they ought; they are taken away too soon at sixteen; they have a right to be left for two years more.

25957. Have you had any experience of those children after?—Yes; I saw some of those children very good, indeed, as farm servants.

25958. You heard Mrs. Hartigan's evidence?—I did.

25959. You don't quite agree with her?—No; what I saw of those, I think they do their business fairly well; but I must say I never knew any of those to stick to the trade, whatever little trade they got.

25960. You think their education in trade was not any value?—I don't think it was much value; still, the moral training the little fellows get stands to them well.

25961. So Mr. Minnery said about his little boy, but he was not handy?—He could not be handy about a farm.

25962. What do you think is the best thing to do with destitute children who have to be brought up by the Poor Law?—First of all, they ought to be sent out to nurse, and after that I would send them at the age of from twelve to eighteen to Glin.

25963. Why would you do that?—Because I think they have some sense then to pick up anything they see; but I would not send them in tender years.

25964. With you the children have only gone from one institution to another?—Yes.

25965. You are not able to say what has been the result when children have been taken from the foster-parent and sent to Glin?—I am afraid they are left too long before they are sent to Glin, and I am afraid they are trained in the unions, and a young impression cannot be removed afterwards; it is not easy.

25966. Mr. McGinnis?—You don't think your workhouse could be done without as a workhouse?—No, I do not; I think it will be a hardship on the poor and an expense to the ratepayers.

25967. I suppose you are aware there is a general impression over the country that there are too many workhouses?—That is the impression.

25968. And the consensus of opinion of the representatives of Limerick here to-day is that Croon Workhouse could be done without?—That is what I expect, because they are going to gain something by it.

25969. What hardship do you see on the poor if a hospital were retained at Croon?—That would minimise the difficulty. I have nothing to complain of there but the water; they would be increased.

25970. How would they be increased?—By pensioning the present staff and employing another.

25971. In no case could the pension exceed two-thirds of the present salary; in many cases it would not come to more than one-half, and in every case it would be an expiring charge?—I don't see how you can dispense with existing officers at a less remuneration than at present.

25972. You would not be asked to dispense with them at more than two-thirds of their present salary?—But you have a precedent in the Local Government Bill.

25973. In any case it would be only temporary?—It may expire in a lifetime.

25974. In that case it would be possible to classify the inmates by distributing them about—the children boarded out, harmless lunatics sent to an auxiliary asylum, and other classes sent to places where they would be better taken care of; do you not think there would be something desirable in such a plan as that?—There may be.

25975. You expressed your opinion that it would be better to keep the inmates in the asylum proper than to send them to an auxiliary asylum?—I think so; that is my opinion.

25976. Do you not think that it is not a good thing to have a number of men cooped up in a small area without the proper opportunities of giving them work; and don't you think it would be much better to have an auxiliary asylum for the harmless, where they could be employed at useful occupation on a farm, making themselves, to some extent, self-supporting, and, being occupied, their days would be more happy than in idleness?—But you have got all those things in connection with the asylum, more than you have at Croon.

25977. How much land have you got at your asylum?—Twenty-five acres.

25978. Suppose compulsory powers were taken to enlarge the area around the house, don't you think it would be a good thing?—Compulsory power to take land is very expensive.

25979. These people could be kept at a lower cost, and also classified. Are you aware that these inmates are cooped together—the violent with those who are peaceful, and quiet people have to associate with violent people?—As far as I am aware, they are very well treated always at the asylum.

25980. By having an auxiliary asylum, you might be able to classify the inmates very much better, and their days would be happier than at present?—No doubt of that.

25981. And I suppose you are aware that some of these inmates have long intervals that extend to weeks and months; don't you think it is a hardship to have those people associating with the violent, and dangerous cases?—I know it; but if you sent those people to an outside asylum, wouldn't you have people of the other class associated with them there, too?

25982. Not necessarily. In an auxiliary asylum, it will be possible to separate different classes, and, perhaps, people with long intervals treated differently?—They would be very few.

25983. Even if you had only ten or fifteen of the class, don't you think in common humanity and the hope of restoring them permanently, some change should be made?—Certainly; no doubt of it.

Mr. PATRICK HAYES, R.I.C., examined.

25984. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the Killmallock Board of Guardians?—I am.

25985. What is the view of the Guardians on amalgamation?—They are against amalgamation.

25986. Would they be willing that some classes in the workhouse should be moved elsewhere—the lunatics?—No, they are not willing. I think they are as well treated there as in the asylum. What they want in Killmallock is a better ward for them and better food. There was a great improvement made there within the last two years.

25987. We are at the other day; it is not up to the level. You would not even like to let the lunatics go?—I think the harmless lunatics are as well off there as where they would be sent to.

25988. And the children?—I would have them all boarded out, and inspected by the medical officer every seven months, and reported on how they are treated. You could not expect any respectable person to maintain them for 2s. a week.

25989. You would raise it up to a proper figure?—Yes. There are 280 persons in the house, and these are small sheds; they are not a place to put human beings in at all, so I don't think you could put any additional people in there.

25990. You would get rid of a good many by boarding out the children?—We would; but still we would not have extra accommodation. First of all, where the consumptives are located is upstairs; and other people sick are under them.

25991. You would approve of a separate building for consumptives?—Certainly, out of the place altogether, instead of being mixed up with the inmates inside; it is very dangerous.

25992. Is there any other class except the children you would like to see going out of the workhouse?—I would like to board out all the aged that would be healthy with their friends.

25993. Would you be afraid that that might be abused?—I think not in Killmallock, as far as my experience goes. They have administered the last Act, up to the present, so well, it is not likely they would abuse the power in the future.

25994. What should the area of charge be?—I would leave it a union charge, except for sanitary works, which I would make divisional charges.

25995. All Poor Law expenditure you would make union-at-large?—I would leave it as it is. I want to get power to transfer people from one union to their own unions.

Dec. 1, 1904.

Mr. T. D. O'Shea.

Mr. Patrick Hayes.

Dec. 1, 1904.
Mr. Patrick
Hayes.

25096. You have a good number at present in Kilmallock?—We have a good number from Kerry, Tipperary, and Limerick. Some of them go there to be confined, and they are ashamed to go back to their own places.

25097. There was no place where we saw such a shocking number?—Yes, because they come from Cork and Tipperary and Limerick side, and we have no power to turn them back. I would not be for any change in the present representation.

25098. Would you have the two members?—Certainly.

25099. You don't find the boardroom too crowded?—Half of them don't attend; they attend from time to time.

25100. Except when there is something on?—Yes; as in the time of the old ex officio Guardians—when there was a job on. I know Croon, and I think it would be very hard to break it up. I think an auxiliary lunatic asylum at Croon would entail extra expense. You would have to get rid of the old staff

and get a new staff. The cost of the new staff would pay for the interest of the new addition, where there would be proper supervision. You should have a resident medical superintendent in Croon and a staff, the same as in the present asylum.

25101. You think it would be more costly?—I do, the same as the Glen School; it means increased taxation.

25102. Your evidence is leaving things as they are, except giving power to board out all the children?—Yes, and to have the children examined every three months, and see the state of their health, and give them sufficient money to get respectable people to take them.

25103. You have that in your power?—But the auditor would come down on us.

25104. No, you have absolute discretion to increase the amount?—The majority of the Board are not aware of that. Then you would get respectable people to take them and board them out.

Mr. MARTIN MAHER, F.R.C., examined.

Mr. Martin
Maher.

25105. CHAIRMAN.—Do you agree with what the last witness has said, or have you views of your own?—I do not agree entirely with him; I think the representation ought to be cut down by half; there should be no co-opted members.

25106. Not even ladies?—Except for ladies, and I think that could be done by a resolution of our Board of Guardians to have it agreed to co-opt ladies only; and then as to the area of chargeability, I think it ought to be an electoral division change in all cases and for all purposes.

25107. You think that would tend more to economy?—It would undoubtedly, and put every member on his mettle.

25108. Would you give any relief to the towns?—All the money that is expended in relief would ultimately come into the towns; it is there that all the goods procured by the poor people would be purchased, and there is an inducement somehow or other to poor people to go into the towns to live, and I think that is a very unhealthy condition of things; it would be better for the poor people to live in the country, and this inducement would cease if the townspeople were punished by having a high rate and in the course of time things would equalise themselves. Of course there should be some residential qualification, or some time after which they would be chargeable, these people brought into the towns not to have them chargeable to the towns unless they were there for two years previous to the application for relief living in the town. Of course the several witnesses have suggested many things to my mind.

25109. Just tell us anything that occurs to you. I remember when I was at Kilmallock you took a considerable interest in the girls who were coming in with children, and the numbers are still large. Would you be in favour of excluding that class from the workhouse?—I think there ought to be some central place in the county set apart for their benefit. I am in favour of having an auxiliary asylum for lunatics in case the hospital was maintained at Croon or other union, but the difficulty is that there would be no administrative authority for it such as the Board of Guardians.

25110. If you had the Rural District Council and put that Poor Law on them?—That would work well—that would be a fine suggestion, and I think it would

be in fact very desirable from every point of view to have some central place for the treatment of harmless imbecile people, such as I saw at Kilmallock, who are apparently neglected, with no one to attend to them except the workman, and he is not trained. A few days before the office became vacant he had not an idea in the world he would fill the position. Some people are fitted by nature and others by education for this position, but he by pure accident became an official.

25111. You think it would be wise only to have trained people in charge of the insane?—Certainly.

25112. As regards tramps?—I think the tramp question could be met long ago by the different Boards of Guardians if they set an investigation on foot regarding the antecedents of these people. These tramps do not give their proper names when they apply for admission to the workhouse, and if they made inquiries they could prosecute these for obtaining their support on false pretences and get them punished.

25113. That would be a costly job?—I don't know; I often thought the investigation was not complete enough.

25114. What would you think of removing these people off the road on a fixed date, and make them give an account of themselves, and if they want to live by the public put them in a place where they will have to work for the public?—The man would be a benefactor to humanity who accomplished that.

25115. You know there are a great many consensaries in Kilmallock Union—do you think it would be a proper thing to have a hospital where they could be removed from the danger of infecting other people? I think it would be desirable.

25116. Not on an expensive scale of course?—I always thought Kilmallock Union was built for the purpose of relieving the destitute poor within the union and all round, and I think it is a hardship that we have to relieve people who don't belong to the union, but of course people who come into the union for the purpose of settling down should not be treated as outsiders.

25117. A great many of the outsiders you refer to are people who come in as temporary servants?—I am sure they are.

25118. The girls from Kerry and West Cork?—Those are the class I object to.

Mr. S. P. HANNE, F.R.C., examined.

Mr. S. P.
Hanne.

25119. CHAIRMAN.—Are you a Guardian from Kilmallock?—Yes, I was one of the Guardians appointed to come in and give evidence. I agree with Mr. Hayes about union rating.

25120. You would keep on union rating?—Yes, I think it is the fairest way all round.

25121. You think it would be too hard on the towns?—I do certainly. As an instance of it myself, I was paying rates in the Kilmallock Division and also the division where I live; the rates were three times as high in Kilmallock as they were in Ugarra, and of course the old people go into the towns. You cannot prevent them, and I think it would be hardly fair to

the towns to have to be paying the rates for that class of people who gave their services to the whole country when they were able to work.

25122. When they had been a long time in the town the case would be different?—Of course; if they had spent the useful part of their lives in the town the case would be different; but, as a matter of fact, I think a great many of those old people have a habit of going into the towns and living there; they like the sociability of it.

25123. Would you break up the Kilmallock Union?—I think the Kilmallock Union is very useful as it is there, and almost absolutely necessary for the use of the country it has to cater for. I don't see that there

could be any better arrangement made than there is at present for the Kilmallock Union except in the way that Mr. Hayes says of boarding out these children.

25034. Would you agree with him or differ from him as regards keeping lunatics in workhouses?—I would think that a workhouse is not a proper place for lunatics. I think they should be under expert management, but of course where there are harmless lunatics I think it would be a very good thing, as suggested, to have some kind of work for them to do. I think it is very hard on the infirm people not to have some little employment of some kind; they are all sitting together and practically have nothing to do to employ their minds.

25035. Did it ever occur to you that it might be a good thing to have one central institution in the county for the aged and infirm where they could be employed in light work and only that class put there?—I think it would be a very good thing if something of that kind could be done, or else have a workhouse as at present arranged in some way that they could be better employed than they are now, that time should be made not to hang so heavy on their hands as it does at present.

25036. You have five workhouses in Limerick?—Michelevarren takes in part of Limerick.

25037. But you have five workhouses in the county?—Yes.

25038. If the aged and infirm of those five could be put into one, and only that class, do you think it would be beneficial to the rates, and that the people could be better treated?—Of course, I could not say about the rates, because I don't know what plan would be adopted, but I think it would be very much better for the infirm people themselves; their lives could be made pleasanter for them.

25039. At present you are keeping up the staff in five workhouses for taking care of the aged and infirm, and you would only keep it up in one in the future; that staff would be somewhat larger of course, but not as large as the five staffs, therefore you would have a saving there?—I think that would be a good plan, but what would you do with the other people that are in Kilmallock for instance?

25040. If you put out the lunatics and boarded out the children, and if the women and children went to institutions or penitentiaries under religious management, then you would only have the sick and aged and infirm, and you would still have a hospital in Kilmallock for the sick?—I think the hospital should be there anyhow.

25041. You would have all classes except the sick removed?—That ought to lighten the expense very much in some way, and having the infirm from all over the county in one institution would lighten the expense as far as they are concerned and make it better for them—that would be my opinion. About those tramps, the master of the workhouse suggested that those tramps should get a certificate from somebody leaving the workhouse that they were going to look for work, or as to their character, and it would be a good way of letting masters of workhouses know when they would arrive there whether they were really worth being taken care of for the night, and they could treat them accordingly and make them work if they were regular branks.

Mr. ALEXANDER W. SHAW, J.P., examined.

25042. CHAIRMAN.—You appear on behalf of the County Indemnity to give us some information about it?—Yes, sir.

25043. Dr. BROOKS.—What were the points that you wish to bring before us?—I have nothing very important to bring before this Commission, but I am prepared to answer everything I can of interest to you.

25044. How do your funds stand?—We are practically out of debt.

25045. Are you able to carry on the work with the grant you have got?—Not to our satisfaction; we have one ward closed.

25046. That was on account of want of funds?—Want of funds, and with an addition to the nursing staff we could run those ten beds; we don't want another matron, or cook, or porter, only the usefulness of the institution is impaired for want of additional funds.

25047. You could run it at a very little additional cost?—Yes.

25048. As regards any man who could not show bona fide that he was looking for work, would you be in favour of putting him into some institution where he would be made work, committed under a magistrate's warrant?—I don't know that I really would, because the tramping is more or less the result of our landless system here which has been such an injury to the country.

25049. Other people say it is the result of the short service system?—Everyone has his own opinion.

25050. At all events the tramps have been very much reduced of recent years—within the last twenty or thirty years—from what they used to be?—I would like to give them a chance of working out their own salvation by putting them to work.

25051. That is to give them habits of industry?—Yes, and if they were not able to do that after giving them a fair chance it would show that they were not inclined to exert themselves to make a living.

25052. It would only be in the case of men who were not really anxious to work that they would have to go into an institution if they wanted to live on the public?—But at present those men have not really been tried, and to take them off-hand without giving them a chance—

25053. What chance would you suggest?—Something like these colonies.

25054. That is what I mean?—But I think they should not be treated as criminals.

25055. Certainly not, the object should be reclamation not punishment?—I think most people in the world if they get a chance will use it and become good citizens; I know it often surprised me to see the result of the world going to America and how they became assimilated there when they saw a prospect of making a living, and people that would not do any good at home were good citizens out there when they got a prospect of living, and I think there should be a chance given even to tramps in the same way to work out their own salvation in this country as well as in America. I would not approve of sending them to America—it is a wonder they have been receiving such people so long and working them up as good citizens.

25056. Dr. BROOKS.—Were you ever in America?—I was there eight or nine years.

25057. Mr. MICHELEVARREN.—Is it the custom that goes to America?—What I mean is that anyone who has done anything wrong in this country or in any country has to America, and a great many of them become good citizens there; the social conditions I suppose are different in a good many ways; there is a better prospect of making a living there.

25058. CHAIRMAN.—You would not treat those men as criminals, but as men with some good in them that might be brought out?—You can make a man bad by treating him as a bad man. I think they should be treated as rational beings that would work for their living if they saw they had a prospect of making a living by their work, and they should certainly get that chance before they would be forced to do penal servitude in any colony; they should be put into some colony and paid wages for working.

25049. What would you suggest to remedy that?—I think the County Council ought to get power to give us a larger grant or bring up some scheme whereby the nursing of the sick of the whole county should be worked from a central body. I heard some of the evidence given this morning, and one or two of the gentlemen I thought made very good points that way.

25050. That is put all the sick on a county charge?—Yes.

25051. And have your County Indemnity out of the same rate?—Yes.

25052. Do you approve of a consumptive hospital?—Decidedly; it is very badly wanted.

25053. Do you know if consumption is on the increase at all?—I cannot say, but I would risk a rough opinion that in the last ten years there has been an increase.

25054. We know that in most of these surgical hospitals there are a large number of cases of tubercular joint disease?—We have to refuse them frequently; we cannot take in any consumptive patients.

Dec. 1, 1904.
Mr. Alexander
W. Shaw.

25055. That is from the same cause—it is consumption in another form. Do many of your nurses go to nurse in union hospitals throughout the county?—Up to the present no; one of our qualified nurses went to England; there is one in Cardiff.

25056. That is when they leave your institution?—Oh, direct from us. No, we have no spare nurses.

25057. So that the county gets very little benefit from your trained nurses?—Not much at all.

25058. Would you approve of an extension whereby the county might get more benefit—not only the institutions but perhaps private patients?—Yes. Barrington's Hospital works on these lines; they have a number of auxiliary nurses that they send out to cases, and I think the thing has worked very satisfactorily; I wish we could do that.

25059. And they have a number of nurses trained there that have gone into institutions throughout the county?—Yes; there was a fear that the Local Government Board would not sanction the nurses from our institution.

25060. Your institution has been sanctioned for qualified nurses?—Yes, but only a short time ago.

25061. Two years ago. However, if there was some county system you think more benefit might be received by the county?—I think we could do a lot more work in the county infirmary for a little more money, very valuable work too.

25062. It was suggested yesterday, and it was suggested before, that if the county infirmary kept a larger staff—a sort of headquarter staff—that when a nurse was wanted for relief duty, or for sickness in the workhouse, she could be provided from the county infirmary?—We would have no objection to that.

25063. And when her services were no longer required she could be sent back?—I don't see why we should not work that system.

25064. A few nurses could do that for the whole county, which would be a distinct saving to the county, because they would be on a yearly salary instead of being paid a guinea a week?—We have to be very careful of our funds lately; we were afraid to take on one thing or another thing for fear of extra expense, and the initiation of the plan you suggest would cost a certain amount of expense, but once it was going it would be all right.

25065. It would be economy to get as much benefit out of the institution as possible?—Yes.

25066. CHAIRMAN.—But I gather you would be in favour of having all necessary expenditure of the county infirmary defrayed out of the county rates?—I think so. I would not altogether like to lose the annual governors, who are very useful members.

25067. Dr. BROOKS.—You get a large amount from paying patients?—We do.

25068. You would never think of doing away with that?—No, because there is a little profit on that.

25069. Mr. MURPHY.—Members nominated by the Governors would be a thing of the past?—I suppose they would, but I should be sorry to lose them.

25070. Don't you think the change would increase the rates of the county?—I am afraid it would.

25071. That is what we are here not to do?—But I think there is a bit of overlapping as it is.

25072. Dr. BROOKS.—And you would save under other heads the increased expenditure?—I think so.

25073. CHAIRMAN.—The old plan of the grant to county infirmaries was a very ancient arrangement, and as regards the Poor Law hospitals, the Poor Law Guardians defray all the cost; do you see any reason why a similar arrangement should not be adopted in both?—No, I do not.

25074. Mr. MURPHY.—Is it not a fact, that the class of patients that go to the county infirmary is a different class to those who go to the workhouse?—Well, yes; a little higher grade.

25075. The reason of the county rate is to make provision for the poor unable to provide for themselves in sickness?—Yes.

25076. CHAIRMAN.—How much does the infirmary make from paying patients?—£211 last year.

25077. That would go a very small way, and, in practical terms, that is the difference between the charges of inmates in the workhouse and in the infirmary?—Of course the paying patients are the best class.

25078. £211 is what they represent?—It is.

25079. That is the difference between the two classes, who use both hospitals, in money?—It is.

25080. Dr. BROOKS.—It is also true that you don't refuse admission to any person on account of their poverty?—Certainly not; we admit any one at all as long as it is suitable for the hospital.

25081. CHAIRMAN.—It is not a class hospital in any sense?—Not at all.

25082. Dr. BROOKS.—Your admission is according to the disease and not according to the circumstances?—Yes; the previous year, from paying patients, we got £172.

25083. CHAIRMAN.—It varies a good deal one year with another?—It does.

25084. Dr. BROOKS.—You do a large number of operations?—We do; probably more than most of the South of Ireland hospitals; a very high average of important operations.

25085. CHAIRMAN.—Are there any suggestions you would make apart from what we have asked you?—I don't think so, sir.

Mr. CHARLES MCCARTHY, P.L.G., examined.

Mr. Charles
McCarthy.

Are you in favour of putting all the aged poor of the county into one institution and all the children of the county into another institution?

25086. CHAIRMAN.—No; boarded out?—And all the women of the county into another?

25087. Not at all; one institution would hold enough for a great many counties?—Then how would you fix the area of charge?

25088. So much a head; when there were so many counties concerned it would be a small thing. What you are afraid of is that the same number of institutions would be still kept up, but applied to different purposes?—You save by sending all the aged poor of the county into a central place.

25089. Say Limerick?—Limerick would not be central; I am from the County Cork; how would you fix the area of charge?

Lady MONTAGUE examined.

Lady Montague.

25090. CHAIRMAN.—You have heard the various suggestions to-day that have been given; was there anything that occurs to you to say with reference to them?—Well, there are two or three things I should like to say. I do not intend to give any evidence on subjects on which the opinion of experts would be necessary, though, of course, anyone who has had any

experience of hospitals and workhouses—and I have been interested in them in Ireland for twenty-five years, and, to a certain extent, in England too—must see what a tremendous boon it would be if district hospitals could be established in accordance with the provisions of the Act, and auxiliary asylums for the insane and the imbeciles and the feeble-minded, and

symptoms for consumptives. The changes I want to speak about are rather those that could be carried out without any structural alterations or almost perceptible increase of expenditure. There has been a great deal said about paying wards in hospitals, and I think there is just this to be remembered, that a good many people do pay to the hospitals now; they don't pay much, but they pay something, and at present they get absolutely nothing in return for that payment, absolutely nothing different from those who do not pay. I think that is a little hard. I think they should not only have the sentimental privilege of not having the stigma of pauperism, but they should have some slight material advantages, and those they could get without any great expense by allocating some wards with somewhat different surroundings as private wards for paying patients; they can be worked by the same staff. In many workhouses I know such wards could be arranged without almost any expense, and it would be a great boon to the patients if in return for payments, they could get some privilege; especially I think this is the case in fever wards. Many people are stricken down by fever who would never enter a workhouse otherwise, and they may be put in the next bed, so I have seen them, to people with whom outside they would never think of associating.

25095. The difficulty of separate wards in fever hospitals is considerable; different wards have to be kept for different classes of fever—I am talking of the country workhouses.

25096. I am speaking now with Rathkale in my mind; you could not do it there?—There are three fever wards there, two are generally allocated to typhoid and one to scarlet fever; one of those typhoid wards could very often be kept for paying patients. When I have been there I have very seldom seen more than two typhoid patients.

25097. Is generally comes in the form of an epidemic?—That perhaps the difficulty comes, but often you have only one or two cases of fever.

25098. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—I suppose you are aware that the Guardians cannot charge more than about 6s. a week?—I know they cannot, and of course it does not cover the extra cost, but if they are paying anything a week means a good deal to them.

25099. CHAIRMAN.—Would you be in favour of giving the Guardians discretion to charge patients as little as they could pay or as much as they could pay up to the full standard?—Well, I don't think so, because I think the full expenditure would mean such a sum that anyone who could pay so much would never go into the workhouse hospital at all.

25100. It would hardly go up to £2 a week?—If they wanted to have a private nurse it would go to one and a half guinea a week, to say nothing of buying medical appliances; I think that would be hard. We have a paying ward in our hospital, but it is being kept for an imaginary wealthy patient who never comes; if they can pay largely they go somewhere else.

25101. You mean in Rathkale?—Yes.

25102. You have no power to charge more than the average cost?—We have no power; it was suggested that they might like to pay more and get into this ward, and it has been kept for them, but they don't come. Then I should like to say that I think that the maternity ward should always be considered part of the hospital, not as it is too often at present, no man's land in the body of the house. The head nurse ought to be always responsible for the supervision of it; I think that is really very important.

25103. She is responsible for the supervision?—She ought to be, but I don't know that it always gets quite the supervision it ought; it is often the most dreary of all the sick wards; the least cared for, and when one considers that sometimes respectable married women come into it—

25104. You are speaking of Rathkale now?—No, Rathkale is not bad; but sometimes the conditions are really unsatisfactory as well as quite unfit for the reception of respectable married women. I have had a case brought under my notice only the other day of a union in Ireland to which a very good maternity nurse has come, and in nine months the confinement cases have risen from four last year to twenty, because there has been a good nurse and the maternity ward is improved.

25105. There is evidently not any feeling there such as one would expect that women would be unwilling to let their children be born in the workhouse?—Not if the conditions are known to be satisfactory. It has been a kind of outpost place, separated from the

hospital, with a very bad name, and hitherto it has been shunned. The greatest blot in the workhouses, as I think you said yourself, are the nurseries, both from a moral and physical point of view; they have been a simple disgrace—the breeding together of these innocent girl-mothers with all the old offenders has been quite dreadful.

25106. They are sure to fall to the same level?—Sure to, and to my mind it has been, for a very long time, a very potent factor in infantile disease. These distracted girls would rather do anything than enter these awful nurseries.

25107. What arrangement now do you think would be possible?—I should be certainly inclined, if they must come into the workhouse, to keep them entirely separated from the others.

25108. Suppose some arrangement outside the workhouse could be made?—I heard that suggested for the first time to-day so I have not had time to think over it; the only experience I have had of that has been in England, where the conditions are different; we found the best means of reformation for the girl-mothers was the love of their children, not to separate them from the mothers too soon, and as soon as the child was old enough to be separated from them to send them to service under the supervision of people who take a personal continuous interest in them and make them pay part of their wages for the support of their child. We followed up many of these cases for years and found them more successful than those sent to institutions.

25109. Do you think it would be possible, instead of having institutions for such girls, to board them out?—No; I should not do that.

25110. Would you not want to seclude them in some way?—I suppose so, at least for a time, and to train them.

25111. As a rule they come in two or three months before the child is born?—Then they must be kept separate from the others, and that is the difficulty in the workhouse.

25112. That is impossible?—I suppose there should be some institution, only an institution that should allow them to keep the babies for a little while until they have time to become fond of them, and able and willing to work for them; if they go to an ordinary penitentiary they are separated from the babies when they are three weeks or a month old. The condition of the children in the nurseries is often very bad; they don't require exactly a doctor's care, but there are many symptoms of discomfort and misery and improper feeding and all kinds of trouble which any trained eye could detect, but which it is nobody's special business to see, unless when they are under the charge of a maternity nurse, or some trained nurse, as they ought to be.

25113. The health of the children is absolutely under the doctor of the workhouse?—The doctor asks if they are ill and they are not actually ill.

25114. The doctor has his limbs and eyes to go and look after them, and he is responsible for their care?—I suppose these little details are more of a woman's business, so many little things for a nurse's eye or a mother's eye.

25115. In a great many workhouses the nurseries are under the maternity nurse?—Yes, a very good plan.

25116. And she would bring the doctor to see?—If necessary, but very often she would be quite sufficient herself to see what was necessary. It is not only that the poor little ones are suffering now, but they are laying up a store of ill-health for the future. And yet I do not think they ought to be placed out as nurses before three years old; I don't think outside they can get the proper care which they ought to get.

25117. It is really a matter for the doctor to decide when they should go out?—He could not secure proper care outside, and the staff of the workhouse ought to be sufficient to give them the care they need up to that age.

25118. We are supposing that the mothers go into some institution or into seclusion in some way until they can be started, as you describe having been done in England. As regards the children, how would you deal with the children from the date of separation from their mother. The mother has gone out to earn—the management of the institution considering that the mother is fit to go to care—would it be possible in any of these institutions to have a crèche of some sort where the child could be kept until it could be boarded out, never going near a workhouse or institution of that kind?—I scarcely like to say, in view of the dangers of aggregating young children.

Dec. 1, 1904.

Lady Montagu.

Dec. 1, 1844.
Lady
Montagu.

26119. What would you do with the child from the time the mother and it were separated?—The mother ought to make herself responsible at once for its support.

26120. Where would it actually stay—in whose charge?—It should be put by the mother into the charge of a nurse.

26121. You would not let it go to the nurse outside in this case until three years old. It would be boarded out as soon as it was three years old, the mother continuing to pay until she could resume charge or care of it—that I take to be your idea?—Perhaps really I did not quite explain; I would not allow a child to be boarded out from the workhouse until three years old. The case of a child for which the mother is directly responsible is different.

26122. We are trying to get rid of the workhouse idea for children altogether?—It would be very difficult to get children under three years of age taken care of.

26123. Suppose if in connection with the institution where the mother is placed in seclusion for reformation there was a crèche or place where the children could be maintained until they were of sufficient age to be boarded out?—That might meet the difficulty; I only mean that I don't think people outside for the money that they would get could afford to give the child the necessary care and attention.

26124. Would you be in favour of having the child elsewhere than in the workhouse—that is that the workhouse should never receive a girl mother or her child?—It would be a very desirable consummation if it could be attained.

26125. Do you see any difficulty—it would most probably be under religious management according to the religion of the mother?—Of course the expense comes in there.

26126. But the expense after all might not be very much more, because there are institutions already existing under the different religions in Ireland?—Very few where they take the child.

26127. But the question is if they could be stretched so as to receive the children, would you approve of that?—If they could, yes; I know in London often it was exceedingly difficult to find any institutions where they would take the child.

26128. It would be a very good and noble work if they would take it up?—I am sure it would. It has answered so well that it is spreading in England. After three I am all in favour of boarding out. From eight years' experience I am more and more in favour of it. As to the aged and infirm I think their lot could be lightened very much at once by having the "privilege wards" which have been found to answer very well; the more respectable ones are classified;

they have slight privileges of food, surroundings, and clothing, which they value very much.

26129. Would you approve of a central aged and infirm almshouse or institution for, say, a county where they could be separated into different blocks and treated according to their conduct and character?—I am afraid they would feel leaving their surroundings even if they had not friends to leave.

26130. You have an experience of that at Glenties?—Did they feel that very much there?—There is no doubt they did.

26131. But they got over it—have you ever seen them afterwards?—Constantly.

26132. I remember workhouses that I have seen closed, and it was so bad as an emigration scene when the workhouse was being broken up, but very soon after when I met the transferred inmates they were comfortable and happy in their new conditions—in fact perhaps even better. Mr. Murnaghan, Chairman of a Board of Guardians, received some of the inmates from a closed workhouse, and when I visited his workhouse I found the people delighted with the change. They had become somewhat reconciled, I suppose, and no doubt would become so, if in such a central workhouse there could be some arrangement for allowing some of the respectable old married couples to live together.

26133. That is quite possible?—Yes, with some structural alterations, but meantime I think that small matter of classification would make the lot of the respectable aged poor more tolerable than it is; it is very hard at present; that might also apply to the blind, who certainly ought not to be penalised for their affliction. They should have special privileges, as they have no other treatment. This classification would not be so difficult in small country workhouses.

26134. It would be almost possible under the existing state of things?—Quite; I think in fact it has been done in some places. I think many of these difficulties could be got over if the rules were not quite so extreme as they are; they were drawn up for a perfectly different period, and apply equally to a workhouse that contains 100 people or 2,000; if a little more elasticity were allowed in the internal arrangements of the workhouse as there is in a dwelling-house.

26135. You would like a certain set of rules common to all workhouses, and additional sets of rules for each workhouse as could be arranged?—I should like to see that.

26136. The rules, after all, when one looks into them, would almost apply anywhere—does any rule strike you particularly?—No; but I think Guardians might, subject to the Local Government Board, be allowed some discretion in dealing with their special requirements.

LADY EMY examined.

Lady Emy.

26137. CHAIRMAN.—Are you a lady Guardian?—No, I am not.

26138. But you take an interest in Poor Law administration?—The interest I take is in boarding out children. I am President of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, which works here in Limerick.

26139. There are a large number of children boarded out near your own residence?—I have not very many; I have nine to look after.

26140. It used to be a place where a great many were boarded out?—Yes, some time ago.

26141. Do you find the system works well?—Oh, splendidly, and everywhere, I think, because ladies who write to me, who belong to my committee, tell me how satisfactory it is.

26142. Do you think it would be a good thing if Guardians were given power to board out all children who come to be supported out of the poor rates?—Certainly, because they lose all knowledge of the workhouse, particularly when they come there young. I find that the foster parents treat them exceedingly like their own children and take the same interest in them; I mean the labourers.

26143. From your experience of the system is there anything you could suggest with a view to improving it?—I think it works very well, indeed, but I am afraid I don't quite agree with Lady Montagu about the age. I should like them to be sent at once, as soon as possible.

26144. Then there is the danger of injudicious feeding?—I think if there is a lady to look after them, if the children boarded out are in her neighbourhood she looks after them. I have had children who had been sent out at three months old, or two even.

26145. And they were brought up with the bottle?—Yes, because the lady has to guarantee that the foster parents would supply the necessities; I have always found it very satisfactory; they can generally get some milk.

26146. They have had good health?—Very good; they come wretched from the workhouse; one child I thought would never live, and I find it is very healthy now.

26147. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—Do you find any difficulty in getting foster parents?—If there were many it would be difficult, but we have very few; the Guardians don't give us many at that age; I had only two of that age in my district. I do like them as young as possible for myself to look after.

26148. What would you suggest should be done in case foster parents could not be got for very young children?—I have never had a case of that, for I am always asking for children, and never can get enough; it is just the contrary you see.

26149. CHAIRMAN.—The system has been so long working here that the country people are quite used to it, and look for the children?—They like having them very much, in fact I am always asking the Guardians to let us look for more. I have nice people about me, and they are anxious to have the children.

26150. Dr. BRIDGES.—Are those foster mothers mothers themselves?—I have two who are not, but they take right good care of their children.

26151. How young do you sometimes have them?—Mrs. O'Shaughnessy has had those two children for four or five years; they must have come to her as infants almost; it was before I took up this work.

26152 CHAIRMAN.—In your own time some infants have been sent out?—Oh, yes; two have been sent out as infants, three months and two months old, and then some two years old.

26153 Dr. BROWN.—Your experience of the very young perhaps is not sufficiently large to form an opinion regarding the death-rate?—Oh, no; I only know my own little district. Certainly they are treated as well by their foster parents that I don't believe the children themselves know they come from the workhouse.

26154 That might be all right in a district where you have a proper supervision and look after them yourself, but in a large district or a large city, round a large city such as Dublin, that sort of thing would be very hard to get, and a proper foster mother?—Then I think the ladies of the district should look after that.

26155 Any inquiries that have been made regarding the death-rate amongst that class have shown that the death-rate is very large amongst children under six months old?—Who looks after them—is there a committee for looking after them?

26156 I think so, but the lady may not be there for three months?—Oh, that is quite different with us; we see them every week; not a week passes that I don't see them.

26157 I am afraid the ladies in a large union could not possibly do that with a large number of children scattered over a large area?—In Limerick we have a lot of ladies working.

26158 There is a great difficulty in getting ladies to work and in getting the right class of foster parents for the very young. After they get to be nine months or a year old the death-rate does not seem to be any more than the average?—I suppose they come from the workhouse and are very wretched.

Miss BARRINGTON, R.L.S., EXAMINED.

26159 CHAIRMAN.—You are a Poor Law Guardian?—Yes, in the Limerick Union.

26160 You have heard the evidence of Lady Montagu and Lady Emily?—Yes; I entirely approve of boarding out children, but it seems to me, from my experience of Limerick, that the sooner they can be sent the better. We send them out from the union as young as we can if we can find foster parents, but there is a difficulty in getting suitable foster parents for young children, but still we do it.

26161 Do you happen to know what is paid for infants going out?—£8 a year, and for the older children it is £8. There is a great mortality amongst infants in the workhouse; I think the foster parent is much better and gives them much better care than they can possibly get in the union, where there are a number of children with pauper women to look after them.

26162 Dr. BROWN.—How young do you know them to be boarded out?—Lately we sent one out a month old.

26163 How many under a year old can you remember having been sent out?—I am sure I could not say.

26164 Has there been sufficient that you could form any estimate of the death-rate amongst them?

26165 CHAIRMAN.—Have there been a dozen or so? I am sure there have been, under a year.

26166 Dr. BROWN.—Under six months or four months?—I could not say.

26167 CHAIRMAN.—Have you known of any deaths among the babies?—No, I have not, but there may have been; I don't think myself there have been many deaths during the time I have been a Poor Law Guardian.

26168 Dr. BROWN.—Have there been six or eight children under six months old boarded out?—I am sure there have, but I am not prepared to say; I have not gone into the figures.

26169 Had you any difficulty in getting good foster parents for those very young children?—It is difficult; some of them don't seem to have them so young.

26170 Do you make a difference between them at all—as you choose the foster parents for the very young children more carefully than for the older children?—That is left for the Visiting Committee.

26171 CHAIRMAN.—Would it not be better if you gave the full amount, £8?—Then they might be more willing to take them. I think the union is not a good place to have them. If there was, say, a couple for the young children that would be better, where they would

CHAIRMAN.—Very often deserted children picked up in the street. Dec. 1, 1904.

26172 Dr. BROWN.—I think the death-rate is larger outside than in the workhouse; something like 75 per cent. or 80 per cent. of those boarded out under six months old die?—That sounds dreadful, but would they not have died in the workhouse too?

Dr. BROWN.—We cannot tell that.

26173 Mr. MURKIN.—One would think that the foster mothers had a material interest in keeping them alive?—Of course they have.

26174 CHAIRMAN.—But they have not the knowledge to clean bottles?—I should think unless they were looked after by a committee it would not answer so well.

26175 Dr. BROWN.—If you can get the class of parent that will really look after the foster child, the same as their own child, it may be very good and better than the institution?—My experience is very small.

26176 Mr. MURKIN.—Do you know of any orphanage in the county that take children in that way, founding hospitals?—No.

26177 CHAIRMAN.—The Convent of the Good Shepherd?—They have schools of course.

26178 In Cork they have an asylum for women?—So have the Sisters of the Good Shepherd here.

26179 Would it be possible for them to have a nursery or crèche for children?—I don't know, but they have got a very large number of children who live in the convent. An Industrial School I think it is called, and they take them at four years old, but I don't think they have got any infants; it would be very difficult to manage that. I never heard it suggested even, but I think they take them from three years old.

26180 And then they remain at school there?—They are brought up there altogether.

be under the supervision of a nurse trained to look after the children, but they are not in unions. Miss Barrington.

26181 Dr. BROWN.—Sometimes?—Well, not in our union.

26182 You are speaking of the present arrangements—that is, that you would rather have the foster mother to take charge of them at a very young age sooner than have them in the workhouse as at present?—Yes.

26183 But if there was a better arrangement of the workhouse where children would be looked after by a trained person who would understand the feeding of very young children?—Then perhaps they would be better; but at present the young children are in the hospital ward where the air is bad.

26184 And very much overcrowded—the place we saw was not fit for children or grown up people?—Children do not live there very well.

26185 CHAIRMAN.—I understand you to be strongly in favour of the boarding out of children?—Yes. Then in the schools—I think the imbecile and weak-intelligent children should not be left there; there should be some central school where they should be sent; I don't think they can be properly taught or trained here.

26186 Mr. Barrington suggested one for all Ireland?—I would approve of that if it could be had.

26187 Are the children you refer to backward children or distinctly mentally weak?—There are some almost idiot children, and some are more imbecile children, and perhaps some of them could be boarded out, but it is rather difficult to get foster parents for them. The children who come in and out, I think they should be taken from their parents if possible.

26188 What class of people do they belong to—are they chiefly from the city?—Yes.

26189 Thieves and people of drunken habits who come in and out?—Yes, the children are in the schools for a few days and then taken out.

26190 Do you think the parents of these children are really fit to have charge of children?—I don't think they are, but then I suppose it is difficult to take them from them unless they would pay for them.

26191 The reason they are in the workhouse is that they are not able to pay their own way, and therefore could not pay for their children?—Yes.

26192 Do you think these people are people who might with advantage have their children taken from them and themselves put under restraint in these labour

Dec. 1, 1896.
 Miss
 Harrigan.

places until they were broken off their bad habits and taught habits of industry?—I think that would be a good plan. And then there are the children of respectable parents who could perhaps get out if they had not to take their children with them; if there was some plan by which they could leave the children for a short time until they could get work they could start again; perhaps the father is dead and the mother comes in with the children.

26193. That would be one of the strongest cases one could imagine for outdoor relief?—But even so she has to take all her children with her when she goes; if she could get out a week or a month in advance of the children.

26194. Mr. MURKIN.—Would it not be better not to have her coming to the house at all—for the Guardians to be empowered to give her outdoor relief?

26195. CHAIRMAN.—That is a case that comes within outdoor relief. If she had only one child she could not get it—she would propose to extend the outdoor relief to mothers of one child?—Yes.

Mr. FRANCIS HARRIGAN, R.R., examined.

Mr. Francis
 Harrigan.

26196. CHAIRMAN.—You have acted as architect and engineer for a number of local bodies?—I am engineer for Rathkeale principally, Glina and Croon. I made this map from the county sheet (explains the divisions of the unions on map). As far as I can gather among the people of Croon there is a consensus of opinion that the union should be dissolved.

26197. You think they are getting reconciled to it?—Yes, the Croon people don't like any connection with Limerick; they would like to go to Kilmallock.

26198. The rates are cheaper there?—Yes, and the people are more of the same type as themselves—country people don't like to associate with city people. If you notice the faces of the children in the Glina Workhouse there is a remarkable difference in the children who come out from Limerick and the other children—their eyes seem to be suffering from ophthalmia.

26199. And the country children look like rosy apples?—They do, sir, and that is the reason the Croon people would prefer being joined to Kilmallock.

26200. Have you any idea what it would cost to put Croon Workhouse into the condition for an auxiliary asylum?—It would make an ideal sanatorium—it is about the only workhouse in Ireland where there are pine trees.

26201. How much would it cost to make it a sanatorium?—I suppose if you spent £1,000 to £2,000 according to the way you would like it.

26202. They ran up to £4,000 for the Glina School?—It was the sums and the Christian Brothers, and they built a church there, and we divided the buildings into compartments for the Brothers and got a good deal of furnishing for the schools.

26203. You think you could really put Croon into order for £2,000 for a sanatorium?—I think so.

26204. Would it be about the same for a lunatic asylum?—It would, I suppose; I don't see that the change would be much difference, except that you would have to raise the walls.

26205. That would be a big item?—I don't think the inhabitants of Croon would bless the Local Government Board for making it an asylum.

26206. Perhaps they would rather have an asylum than a consumptive sanatorium?—I suppose it would be better. While Rathkeale and Newcastle are only six miles apart it would be a very long distance for anybody about Fallowfield to have to go to Newcastle, or on the other hand from the opposite end of Newcastle to go to Rathkeale.

26198. Mr. MURKIN.—And to husbands temporarily deprived of work to keep the home going. The Guardians might have power to give temporary aid so as not to compel them to go into the house at all?—Then the old and infirm ought to be classified.

26199. What would you suggest about them?—I think the old married couples ought to be allowed to live together, and there should be privilege wards for the others.

26200. That would be quite impossible in the Limerick Workhouse as things are at present?—Unless the lunatics and children were removed.

26201. And mothers with children—if those classes were taken out then there would be room to separate and classify according to character and condition?—I think as far as possible the children should be left with the mothers for a time. And then there should be a sanatorium for consumptives.

26202. Yesterday there was a suggestion that Croon would suit—do you know it?—No, I do not.

26211. Mr. MURKIN.—Not a healthy person—the suggestion is that the hospitals should be continued; it would not be much hardship for a person in health to go six miles further?—I think it would be a great wrench to leave their homes.

26212. We have all wrenched to our sentiments sometimes—some have to leave the country and others go to many places where they don't like to go?—Well, sir, of course that is the chief reason—it is a sentimental reason, if you like, but after all no matter in what portion of life you are sentiment counts for a good deal, and these poor people, I know, like to have the idea that Paddy or Johnny, wherever it is, is not too far away from them, and can come to see them. The conditions of life in our workhouse in Rathkeale for the last six years—thanks to Lady Montagu and the Ladies' Committee and the country ladies around, who have given women's service—the whole of the Rathkeale Union has changed its face, and after a couple of years more when we get our water supply and some more things we will be the best-equipped institution in the South of Ireland.

26213. CHAIRMAN.—You have a good deal of levy to make up yet before you get level with the average workhouse?—We made tremendous strides for the last six years.

26214. Don't put them down too high?—Another point also I would like to mention—the great necessity there is for a dispensary in that district.

26215. That we cannot go into—it is not under the Poor Law but the Medical Charities Act?—About framps—in the summer time they are a perfect nuisance to us.

26216. Would you like to see them put under restraint in some labour place?—I would like to have a portion of the workhouse set apart for them where they would be made to do a certain quantity of stints every day.

26217. That would not be a good way of raising them to better things?—If they did a small bit of work I believe it would physically invigorate them.

26218. They get too much leg exercise and not enough arm work?—The master of the workhouse can get a ready market for broken stones. The only other use I see is to take a batch of them off before old Dr. Hagen for choice, one of the magistrates, and give them a month in jail, but that hardly improves their moral nature.

The Sitting terminated.

FIFTY-SECOND PUBLIC SITTING—TUESDAY, JANUARY 17TH, 1905.

At the Courthouse, Tralee.

Present:—Mr. MICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURKAGHAN, and Dr. COTY BIGGER.

Mr. WILLIAM McMAHON, M.C., R.E.C., REMOVED.

26225. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the County Council?—Yes, sir.

26226. The warrant appointing this Commission and the queries we issued were sent to the County Council, and considered by them, I dare say?—I don't think I was present at the meeting.

26227. You have seen those queries yourself?—Yes.

26228. What is your own view on the question of the amalgamation of unions in the County Kerry?—I was present at the County Council when that was discussed, and the opinion of the County Council was unanimous that there ought not to be any amalgamation in Kerry; that the distance from each union is so long, that it would not be advantageous to the poor or the sick.

26229. And the shape of the county is so peculiar, with those long arms stretching out into the sea?—Yes. For instance, if you take away Liswell Union, you would have to come from Tarbert thirty miles to Tralee, and the same applies to Dingle, you would have to come thirty-six miles.

26230. Supposing, as has been proposed by a great many witnesses, that in each of these remote places a small hospital should be left and maintained to treat the acutely sick, who could not be removed, what would your view then be?—My view would be that you would have too many coming here; that is, if all the Guardians of the district had to come here dealing with the general work of the union; you would have too many entirely, and that the work could not be properly done; it would take too long a time to go through the business; you have too many in the Board, and it would be a great inconvenience also to the Guardians at long distances to be coming here to Tralee.

26231. Suppose the District Councils remained locally, suppose the District Council of Listowel remained as it is, and the District Councils of Dingle, Glenties, and Keemans remained as they are, and do all your Poor Law matters that would come under their immediate notice, such as outdoor relief, and other matters, and the sick had a hospital in their district?—With the management of the rates?

26232. And the management of their rates, so far as it would properly come under them; under the changed course of procedure, what would your view be then?—If the managing authority at the central place would not be increased?—My idea would be that we are to look out for our own side, and that Tralee would have a great advantage, and they would manipulate a great many of the advantages themselves to the detriment of the other districts.

26233. If we start with the supposition that we are able to have what you might call the able-bodied and infirm centralized, and that if the result of such centralization would be a great diminution in the rates, would not that be a benefit, to start with, for the whole county?—Would you do away with all the existing officers of the unions, or would you materially reduce the expense of the existing officers?

26234. We are not suggesting that ourselves, but we have seen in various parts of the country that we have seen through, we have received statistics from a great many witnesses; of course the staff that is now maintained for looking after the able-bodied would be pensioned off, and no further appointments made to such staffs, and those staffs would cease to exist except for the life interest of the pensioned men?—Well, there is at present in nearly every union, at least in the Listowel Union, a great deal of the work done by inmates—the cleaning and white-washing, and the management of turf and other things, and a lot of labour outside.

26235. That, of course, would continue in the large central house; you would have inmates employed to do a great deal of the manual and drudgery work about the

place. If you have a hospital maintained in each place for the sick, you don't have much work to do in the hospital; all the nursing, of course, is done by nuns or trained nurses?—I really think, sir, that it would not work so well.

26236. What objection do you see in your own mind that makes you come to that conclusion?—In the first place, we will have to pay nearly as much in pensions as in the existing officers.

26237. Surely not; surely you would not pay a man his full salary?—Well, no, but very near.

26238. You could not pay him more than two-thirds?—Then the expense of keeping up the remainder of the institution would be more again. You might get rid of some officers, but you would have to create new positions.

26239. In the central place?—No, but in the local places.

26240. The local places would be closed, according to the evidence that has been given to me, except the hospital?—Oh, of course, the hospital should remain; that is a matter of necessity. The hospital and infirmaries should remain, because many a poor crippled fellow cannot come a long distance, and many an accident occurs that must be treated locally.

26241. They would only have, say, in Dingle a hospital as the only Poor Law institution there; all the other people would be capable of being removed; they could come by rail. Would you see any hardship to the poor, or would you see any other disadvantages to either Guardians or ratepayers?—I would. I think it is a very long distance to be coming thirty miles for a poor person to come into the workhouse.

26242. How long does it take—an hour-and-a-half coming by rail from Dingle here?—It takes about three hours, I think.

26243. I suppose I must have had pleasant companions, but it did not seem so long when I went there?—I am not clear on that point, but I heard it was from two-and-a-half to three hours. Say from Tarbert, where there is no railway for ten miles, and Ballyvaughan the same.

26244. And Beale?—Strictly, longer again from Listowel. These poor people may not have the means of travelling by rail.

26245. That would be, of course, a charge on the rates?—The relieving officer should supply tickets and travelling expenses.

26246. He would supply travelling expenses?—Would he bring them from the different districts.

26247. They are now obliged to make for the workhouse; they might, under the new system, be obliged to make for the railway station?—I think it would be as expensive, and the ratepayers would not be as well satisfied with it.

26248. What makes you think they would not be satisfied?—They would be satisfied in a manner if they saw there was a saving.

26249. But I am not going on the basis that there would be a substantial saving, applying the scheme to all Ireland?—We can only speak for our own union.

26250. What is your own union?—Listowel. I would think it a great hardship on the poor in general, and I think on the whole we would not save much by it.

26251. Was there ever any question of a second hospital—since the abolition of the Glenties Union was there ever any question of a hospital at Tarbert?—No, only an infirming hospital.

26252. That is for the shipping?—Yes; we have a very good ambulance.

26253. How far are the sick obliged to come to Listowel Union from the most distant part?—Beale, about twelve miles, is the furthest, and Causeway is the same.

Jan. 17, 1905.
Mr. WILLIAM
McMahon.

Jan. 17, 1905.
Mr. William
McMahon.

26348. Is it not a good deal further, part of the Glin Union that you got, up to twenty miles?—Mr. FitzGerald could tell us that.

Mr. FitzGerald.—I think from seventeen to eighteen miles is about the furthest point; that includes portions on the County Limerick.

CHAIRMAN.—Would that be Loughlin?

Mr. FitzGerald.—That is the division bounding Loughlin.

26349. CHAIRMAN.—They come now that distance. Have you heard any complaints from the sick in those districts as to the journeys they have to make?—Not to the extent of the journey, but there was some time ago, when the man that had the contract of the ambulance was not bringing them in carefully, there were complaints then, but I have not heard any since we got our own ambulance—any complaints as to the distance.

26350. And they come twenty or twenty-one miles; do you think that is rather far to oblige sick people to come?—I do.

26351. Do you think it would be a judicious thing for you to have a hospital in a more central position for these people that would accommodate Bunde, Ballylengford, Glin, and Tarbert, and to put up at Tarbert a small hospital for ten beds?—I think it would be a great convenience to the poor.

26352. To be looked after by the dispensary doctor?—I do.

26353. That would be a comparatively trifling expense; the dispensary doctor could look after it?—He would be expecting a rise of salary.

26354. You don't think he would consider it a case for reducing his salary, on the ground of bringing his patients all together under one roof?—He would not apply for that; he would apply for a rise.

26355. At all events, supposing there was a small rise, you would have the doctor and the nurse?—It would cost £200 or £700 a year at least.

26356. How could it do that?—Between the nurse and keeping up the institution and repairs of the institution and all that.

26357. Supposing it was £250.—Dr. Figger seems to think £350 would be nearer the mark for a cottage hospital?—Well, he knows better.

26358. At all events, if a cottage hospital could be put up, if the expense would come to £250, that would not be so serious a thing?—I don't think it would be money thrown away, and it would be good accommodation to a large district.

26359. Dr. Broom.—It would be an accommodation too, for patients that might require operations, that are not fit to be removed, and at the same time could pay for their support there—it would be a great convenience for that class, too.—That is one of the things I would like to refer to. A good many respectable patients come into our hospital in Liscarrow, and as far as I understand, they cannot be charged more than 7s. a week, when, of course, it costs a great deal more, and those that are able to pay, I think, should be made to pay.

26360. CHAIRMAN.—It is one of our questions. The evidence that a great many Guardians have given is this. They say the infirmity of the present system is that they cannot charge people who are well able to pay; and what they suggest is that the Guardians should have power, in their discretion, to fix how much a person claiming admission should be obliged to pay; and that they should be empowered to recover that by summary procedure at petty sessions. Would you be in favour of giving the Guardians such a discretionary power—power to fix the amount up to the full actual amount expended?—Yes; but I think it ought to be recoverable by law from them.

26361. The suggestion also would give the Guardians power to recover the amount?—I would sooner fix the actual expenses to be recovered than leave it to the vote of the Guardians.

26362. You would be in a difficulty. Supposing a poor man sent his child in, and that the sending of that child in, at all events, saves him 6d. to 1s. a week in food, you could not ask that man to pay the full cost of maintenance?—No.

26363. But he might be very glad, if he had a little independent feeling, he might be very glad to pay as much as he could, say 6d. or 1s. a week, and all those little sums would come to a good deal?—If it were discretionary then with the relieving officer or Guardians.

26364. But my point was, where there are respectable people who are able to pay, but might not be willing

For instance, if a respectable shopkeeper, who was a man of substance and means, got fever, and went into your fever hospital, you might be obliged to have a special nurse for him at 14 guineas a week, and yet you would only be able to get back 8s. a week from him?—We have some of the doctors themselves going into our hospital at Liscarrow when they get sick, from cases. We charge them 6s. 10d., about the average cost.

26365. You would be glad to be able to charge the full amount?—Yes.

26366. Don't you think it would be a wise thing to give the Board of Guardians power to recover even small amounts?—Well, I would.

26367. The Guardians would be more likely to act on the side of generosity?—That is the reason I mentioned a while ago—that I was afraid they would.

26368. It has been tried in some county infirmaries, and the experience there was that the poor people, after the first expostitions, fell in with it, and were very glad to be in a position to pay a little, and in that way to be considered independent, and not come under a pauper arrangement?—Of course my idea was that those who were not able to pay would not be asked to pay; but you mean where there is a medium, where a person might pay a little, in that case it would be discretionary with the relieving officer of the Guardians.

26369. On the recommendation of the relieving officer, they would consult him, and the doctor, and the Guardians of the district, who would know?—Yes.

26370. Your opinion is still that you would not be in favour of amalgamation in any of the Kerry unions?—I can only speak for myself; but I know a resolution was passed here by the Council; it was discussed, but they did not go into minute details, as you are doing.

26371. You have had an instance of amalgamation in your own time and experience in the Glin Union—what has been your view of the amalgamation of the Glin Union?—I think Mr. FitzGerald could answer that better.

26372. We will have Mr. FitzGerald presently, but what is your own view?—I don't think it has lowered the rates 1d. in the Glin Union; and, of course, it has got them to a great deal of inconvenience.

26373. Your own opinion is that anything on the same lines would be a mistake?—Yes.

26374. Have you taken any interest in the question of lunacy administration; are you on the Asylum Committee?—I am not.

26375. Do you know whether the asylum at Kilmurry is full or overfull, whether there is any question of obtaining extra accommodation for the inmates?—There had to be an addition put to it last year.

26376. There is no further necessity for an addition, so far as you are aware?—I suppose not at present. But we complain that there are lunatics sent from other places into our asylum, but we have no satisfaction to get.

26377. Do you think a workhouse is a proper place to keep lunatics in?—There are a great many harmless lunatics that may be left in the workhouse.

26378. Have you considered this question carefully?—I think it is cheaper, and they are generally as well off.

26379. Do you think they are as well looked after?—I think in Liscarrow they are pretty well looked after.

26380. What arrangements have you made for their supervision?—We have a separate room and a caretaker, a night watchman and a day watchman, and the same for females.

26381. What experience have those people of the care and charge of lunatics before they entered on their duties?—None.

26382. Do you think that is a satisfactory system for people who require special care, and persons to look after them who have special knowledge; do you think that is a satisfactory state of things?—I would not, unless they were confirmed imbeciles.

26383. You will find in every workhouse lunatics who do require a certain amount of looking after?—Have magistrates the power to commit harmless lunatics to the asylum? Most they not commit some others first?

26384. I don't think we need go into that. We are dealing with the lunatics we have in workhouses; we are not empowered to go into the general question of asylum management at all, and the general evidence we have got all round Ireland is that a workhouse is not a fit and proper place to have lunatics. I wanted to find out what your personal view is, if you have

considered the question?—My view is that a great number of them ought to be sent to the asylum in the early stages, but those confirmed and harmless imbeciles would be just as well looked after in the union, if not better. I have not a thorough knowledge of the system of the asylums. I must tell you that, and, therefore, I cannot give you clear evidence on it.

26280. Have you considered the question of rearing children in workhouses?—Yes.

26281. What has your view been on that?—In my opinion—and I have studied nearly since I was a child—I don't see healthier children reared anywhere than in Linstown Union. Much more clean and cleanliness than they will get in any home outside, and much better educated, because my idea is that when they are boarded out the people they are boarded out with will make the most they can of them, and keep them from school, and things they cannot be deprived of in the workhouse, and their dietary is much more wholesome, and there is greater cleanliness than they will get outside.

26282. Mr. MURKIN.—You have very little experience of boarding out in your union; you have one case only, so you could hardly speak with experience?—Not experience of my own; but seeing the way their children are so badly neglected, and rearing of baby-farming in England.

26283. CHAIRMAN.—I am glad to say that we have not had any experience in the rural parts of Ireland of baby-farming?—No, we have not. But still I hold a very strong opinion that they would not be so well cared for—as well fed, as cleanly kept, or as well educated as in the workhouse.

26284. Mr. MURKIN.—You have not tried it?—No; we have only one or two cases in our union.

26285. The same paid under that head is £44?—It is only tried in Linstown, where children are left orphans, and some near relatives would take care of the children. That is all we have tried.

26286. CHAIRMAN.—As a Board of Guardians, you have hesitated in putting into force the boarding out provisions?—Yes, we did.

26287. Are you aware that the boarding out Act has been largely availed of in unions not far from your own, in Limerick, for the last thirty years, and Rathfriland did not see how it worked there.

26288. We did receive evidence of the most encouraging kind from those unions as to the result of the boarding out system, and not merely from Limerick, but all parts of Ireland?—Of course, if there was an improved supervision, but I am afraid new the supervision would be very slight.

26289. You would first have the relieving officer, and then you would have the Ladies' Committee?—We have very few ladies there, with the exception of, perhaps, one or two, to take any interest in it.

26290. If they were energetic, that would be enough?—Of course.

26291. Do you think the ladies are not sufficiently energetic in Linstown?—I do; in fact, I know it.

26292. Then if you had a ladies' committee, you are afraid that would not be very effective?—Yes, I am.

26293. Then there are also lady inspectors appointed now, and I can tell you they are most efficient; they really let into the thing very closely—Miss Fitzgerald Kennedy and Mrs. Dickie?—We have very few ladies of any standing, only small shopkeepers' wives and that; and their time is taken up. We have no ladies in our locality with time enough; they are not there at all.

26294. But still any sensible woman who has had experience in bringing up her own children would be a good woman to look after children. You don't want people who have not had experience of the ways of the country; there would be no woman better than a sensible farmer's wife?—But you would not find them stirring enough to carry out ideas or report; they might scold or advise, but would not report. That is a good deal. I would rather have a person get a thing done by their influence than report on it. I am afraid they would not pay enough interest; you would want an intelligent person of standing.

26295. You are not aware of the favourable results of boarding out in other places; these children have

really been absorbed into families; they have become contributing members of families, even after the Guardians' payments ceased; these children have continued in those homes as virtually adopted children, and have contributed to the support of the house in a large number of cases as they grew older?—That would be very good.

26296. And they did not come back again to the workhouse; they were out off from the workhouse, and never thought of going back there?—In Linstown we have the Glin Industrial School.

26297. As regards children reared in workhouses, what is their after-history?—Upon my word, as good as those reared in some of the lower houses in town and country; and I have seen a good many getting good situations out of the workhouse.

26298. Have you known cases coming back, and remaining in the ranks of pauperism?—Not lately. I don't see any of the children returning back to the Linstown union now. I know a long time ago they used; and when their friends took them over to England, they would get into the workhouse there, and be returned to Linstown Union; but that is not the case for many years.

26299. About tramp?—Oh, they are a nuisance.

26300. What would you do with them?—By Jove that is hard to say; of course the law at present is not carried out on them. There was a resolution sent down to keep them in until 12 o'clock, and I think it would be a great lot of them, but a lot of them come round—singers and others—and though they earn money they drink it and go into the workhouse, and where they get good accommodation in a workhouse they are sure to make that place a resort. I think they should be made to work and get but very poor food.

26301. You would make them work and keep them in longer?—I would.

26302. The English law has been lately changed and gives the Guardians power to detain them one, two, three, or four days if they think it necessary?—I would not like to be keeping them too long.

26303. It would be discretionary?—And there is one thing about giving them a night's lodging; very often they do damage outside if they are not let into the workhouse. I had a case myself where young lads set fire to the workhouse and burnt a lot of hay and straw over me. We, in Linstown and other parts of Kerry, complain a good deal that we have to contribute to the maintenance of the Tralee Fever Hospital, and Killarney Fever Hospital, and also to the county hospital, when we have those institutions, each in our own union.

26304. That you don't use the so-called fever hospital at all?—No need in our union anyway.

26305. You do use the county infirmary sometimes, I suppose?—Very rarely; we have as good nurses, and as good doctors, and as good accommodation in our own union as in any in Kerry.

26306. I am quite aware of that; I know what a good hospital you have?—And the nearest part of our union to Tralee is as near to Linstown, or very close on it; it goes near Garrymore, but Orlery and Ardara are in the Tralee Union. I brought out a patient myself from Linstown to get a ticket in Tralee and got him in, and he was turned out of the infirmary in two days after.

26307. As incurable?—I deny; he could not tell me the reason; he made some excuse that I did not believe, and I won't give it in evidence.

26308. Dr. BAKER.—Did he leave of his own accord, do you think?—Oh, no; it was the eyes that were bad, and I think the excuse was that they were not treating the eyes here, or something like it. In my opinion when a county infirmary is not able to take up all general cases there is no use of subsidizing it.

26309. CHAIRMAN.—The eye is not a general matter; it is a special case?—Even so; a county infirmary ought to be able to deal with it.

26310. I don't think you will find any county infirmary with full apparatus; I suppose you do send your eye cases sometimes to be treated in special eye hospitals?—In Dublin or Cork.

26311. Did you send these cases subsequently?—No; I think Dr. Dillon did not think it a case that could be cured.

Jan. 17, 1906.

Mr. M. J.
Flavin.

Mr. M. J. FLAVIN, M.P., EXAMINED.

25317. CHAIRMAN.—The Commission have been asking your colleague on the County Council what his views were about the amalgamation of unions, that is to say, the breaking up of workhouses, leaving however, at each place, adequate provision for the acute sick of the neighbourhood, and we asked him what his opinion would be of such a transaction, whether he would be in favour of removing those sick who could easily be removed, provided sufficient accommodation was left for the sick; what would your view be?—Of course, Mr. Chairman, I can only express my individual opinion, because, in the first instance, I have had no experience of the Poor Law system either under the old Board of Guardians or the Rural District Council.

25318. You are a County Councillor?—Yes, and my only qualification is my experience on the County Council, and therefore I would not like to express a decided opinion on the Poor Law system, but I do believe, that owing to the extensive area of Kerry, and the distance the unions are separated, it would be almost impossible to amalgamate one union with another. I have been thinking, but I have not consulted the Keshmone people about it, I have been thinking that there would be a possibility of abolishing Keshmone Union and making a sanatorium of it. From my knowledge of the County Kerry I think some active steps ought to be taken before now, or by you if you have power, to make some recommendation for a sanatorium in Kerry.

25319. You think Keshmone would be a suitable place?—In the first place I am not a medical man; I am simply expressing an outside opinion, but having had a considerable experience of life in Kerry I think either in Keshmone or somewhere convenient for the people. I think it is absolutely necessary because I believe consumption is on the increase instead of on the decrease, and as far as we are locally concerned I don't think it is our fault, because we are doing all we can to raise the standard of living and improve the habits of the people, notwithstanding the fact that I believe we are one of the heaviest taxed counties in Ireland.

25320. I believe the heaviest, but that is largely owing to your railway guarantee?—Yes, largely. They were £27,500 or £18,000; they have been reduced under the Local Government Act. Mr. Bullock was kind enough to put a clause in the Local Government Act which gave us a rebate of about \$5,000 a year. This year our rates are rather low although they appear large because there is a reduction of \$7,000 on account of money we got out of the purchase price of the Waterford and Limerick railway, but that will be only a temporary thing. I fear our rates must be higher than they are in the present year.

25321. If some attempt were made to centralise the poor of the county and to dispense with the staffs that look after the able-bodied, as distinguished from the acutely sick, that would mean a considerable economy?—If such a thing could be done; of course you have a wider experience of Kerry than I have, and a wider trained knowledge of the Poor Law system.

25322. The Poor Law system, but I wish I had your personal experience at the back of it?—I am afraid you would not carry my position; I would yours.

25323. Keshmone, at present, is the only one that occurs to you?—I don't know whether I am correct in saying so, I think Keshmone has the smallest number of inmates.

25324. Cahersiveen is small?—But it is so much further removed from any central place; either Dingle or Keshmone; I express a preference for Keshmone, but I have not consulted any of the Keshmone people about it and they may be quite opposed to it.

25325. You are merely offering that as a personal and not carefully considered suggestion?—Certainly not; and it is more because I spent a fortnight or three weeks in Keshmone, and I think the situation of Keshmone Workhouse, with considerable internal arrangements, is very suitable; there may be more suitable places in the county, I don't know; that would be a question more for expert medical opinion.

25326. You know Cahersiveen?—Fairly well.

25327. You know where the workhouse is?—Yes.

25328. About two or three miles out from the town; are you aware that there was a fever hospital in Cahersiveen where now the meetings of the Guardians are held; it is the Rural District Council office now

and where the dispensary is?—No; I could not say that I have an intimate knowledge; I have seen the building. Having lived the greater portion of my life in North Kerry, even the Kerry people have not the same intimate knowledge of other parts of the county that people might think they ought to have.

25329. When we were inspecting Cahersiveen, and seeing that very good shell, for it is as well as far as hospital purposes go, it occurred to us that we might possibly receive evidence to show that if the workhouse were closed that the sick could be amply accommodated in that building which used to be the fever hospital?—I would not care to express an opinion; I have only been asked by the County Kerry Infirmary to give evidence, but Col. Bowen is here who has the whole financial matter in his possession, and my evidence I give would be only expressing my personal opinion.

25330. You are the County Councillor for the Sween District?—Yes.

25331. Taking the stretch of the country from Keshmone round to Cahersiveen you go through Sween?—Puckinella, Cahersiveen, to Waterville.

25332. You have a dispensary doctor at Sween and another at Waterville; the rest of the Sween District have a considerable distance, I should say about sixteen miles, to go to Keshmone?—Sixteen or eighteen miles, but there are no railway facilities, you know; they must go by road.

25333. If a small cottage hospital, that would hold about half a dozen beds, to be looked after by a resident nurse and the dispensary doctor, provided the cost could be kept down to something like \$200 or \$250 a year, were established, do you think, in the event of amalgamation, that would be a fair and prudent thing to do for the good of the sick?—I think so; a great many of the extremely sick people have to be removed at the last moment a considerable distance over roads to these hospitals; I think there is a considerable danger to their health.

25334. That is as regards the situation of Sween to Keshmone; then when you come to Waterville you have pretty much the same condition there with regard to Cahersiveen?—Not so far?—About twelve miles.

25335. But then there is a great stretch of country up the lake from Waterville, and these people have to be brought all round from Waterville to Cahersiveen, which would make a considerable stretch of country, fairly populous; would you think that a similarly small economically-managed cottage hospital should be established at Waterville under the dispensary doctor there with a resident nurse, who could also act as a district nurse if the hospital were for any time empty?—I thoroughly agree with you in the suggestion; I think it would be most wise, but eventually I greatly fear that if this occurred as the result of the amalgamation of two or three unions, after these hospitals were in existence for ten years, instead of a reduction of taxation our taxes would be quite as high. In the first place you have to build your local hospital, equip it, have your medical officer there and one or two nurses, furnish it, and have attendants.

25336. Such a hospital as is contemplated would mean three or four beds for males or females?—If you place one in Sween and one in Waterville, surely if you give them facilities down there you must give other parts of the county the same facilities.

25337. Where else should you do so except at Tarbert?—Between Tralee and Dingle, at Cahersiveen or Annascaul; just look at the great stretch of country from Tralee to Brooma, or Killarney to Brooma.

25338. You have a hospital at Chailisland?—But it is twelve or fourteen miles to Brooma, open country. I am afraid they would make a claim for the same treatment as other parts of the county.

25339. The population of Brooma is nothing like as thick?—It is; I think it is a congested district, but I would not say it is so congested.

25340. Conception does not mean over-population?—Not necessarily; for instance, I think we, in North Kerry, the Limerick Board of Guardians and the Rural District Council, have done more to improve the condition of the working classes than any union in Kerry, but still we have more inhabitants employed under \$4 valuation than any union in Kerry, notwithstanding the fact that we stand very high with the number of labourers' cottages, and I don't think we can get more money for houses.

25341. We had evidence from the last witness that the sick have to be removed twenty or twenty-one miles in parts of the Listowel Union, and then the question arises whether a cottage hospital at Tarbert would not be a desirable change so that the sick of Ballylongford and Ballyvaughan could be taken to the sick of Glenties and Glenties, and on the other side of Glenties could be treated there; what would your opinion be of that?—Even admitting, for the sake of argument, there was a possibility of amalgamating one or two unions.

25342. Apart from amalgamation altogether, do you think it is a hardship that the sick should be obliged to come such a long distance?—I certainly do; if it could be avoided with a minimum increase of taxation.

CHAIRMAN.—It would have to be on a very moderate scale; the difficulty is when witnesses say "We don't think a cottage hospital is necessary at Tarbert, twenty-one miles away"; that would be an argument in favour of amalgamation, because if twenty-one miles does not matter in one case it does not matter all round.

25343. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—The expense of such a hospital as the Chairman has outlined would be very small; you have already a medical officer and the district nurse.—We have invariably been told, in older times in Kerry when anything was proposed, that there would be a very small cost on the rate-payers, but, from my experience in financial matters coming into a public body for the first time in my life, under the Local Government Act, I found the taxation has been going higher and higher in connection with guarantees of railways and the building of the Strand Pier which we thought would be a financial success, but we find a portion of the county that has no benefit from it has been taxed three or four thousand pounds.

25344. Our object in coming here is to try and keep down taxation, and you may be perfectly satisfied that this Commission will not recommend anything that will not lead in that direction.—I am entirely in favour of that, but I would not cut down taxation to an extravagant amount if I thought there was going to be any injury to the poor.

25345. What the Chairman has suggested is to give to neglected places the benefit of a hospital, because people living twenty miles from a hospital get very little benefit from it, and the desire is, without adding anything to the rates, to establish, in places like Sneem and those places mentioned, a local hospital that would cost a very small sum of money; there could be, in some respects, some saving that would meet the expense of the institution; don't you think it would be a useful thing for the community?—I certainly think it would be most useful.

25346. There is a good deal of expense in connection with small workhouses; for instance take the workhouse of Dingle, the inmates there cost per head, under the head of salaries alone, twice as much as they do in Tralee. In Tralee the cost is £3 per inmate under the head of salaries, in Kilmurrah the same costs £3. Our object is to devise a plan to get rid of this unnecessary expense and bring additional benefits to the sick poor at the same time. Now if some scheme, such as has been outlined, was adopted in the Co. Kerry—a system of separation—for instance, if the children were removed from the workhouse, which everybody admits is not a good place for them, if they were distributed amongst the farmers, a very considerable sum would be saved, because they already cost £4 or £5 more in the house than they do outside. Then take out another class, the harmless lunatics, and send them to a place where they would have better treatment; there might not be any saving under that head, but certainly there would be more humanity and more efficiency. Then, again, you could make reformations in other respects. If something of that kind could be done would it appeal to your sense as a representative man?—Unquestionably. Speaking generally I have had no experience of children being taken out to farms, but I would be strongly in favour of it with proper supervision, and I think, in an extensive county like Kerry, supervision would be very hard to maintain. I don't think, myself, the workhouse is a suitable place to train up any young children. I would prefer to have them out of doors, and give them, in the first place, plenty of fresh air, which is absolutely necessary for any Kerry boy or girl, or any boy or girl, and give them a fair amount of work. I believe they have tried it in Tralee.

25347. They have quite a number in Tralee and in Kilmurrah; boarding-out is not tried in Listowel to any extent, or Cahersiveen?—Looking at it from the taxation point of view there are portions of Dingle which pay for that Dingle Railway alone 1s. 6d. in the £.

25348. CHAIRMAN.—The Blackets?—No, but between Tralee and Dingle on the mainland, between Kilmurrah and Headford Junction the average rate for that railway is about 9d. in the £, and only for the grant we get under the Local Government Act it would be, perhaps, 1s. or 1s. 4d.; the average rate is 2s. 6d. in the £ on agricultural land, and then a rate of 8d. or 1s. in the £ for the railway on some of the poorest of the poor people.

25349. I suppose the Blacket Islands have to pay these charges?—I suppose so, but Mr. Quinlan, the Secretary of the County Council, can tell you. As Mr. Murtaghan knows, for six months I am away, and perhaps don't attend more than one or two meetings of the County Council.

25350. You seem to have been doing good work for them while you were away?—I endeavor to do it; I have seen the burden of taxation so high my object has been to reduce the taxation but at the same time not to see the poor suffer. I am prepared even to increase the taxation by giving greater facilities for the housing of the poor people.

25351. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—The Dingle poor rate is very high, the second highest in Ireland.—3s. 1d. in the £ last year.—Speaking roughly I should say the rate in the urban district of Tralee is fully 10s. in the £. I remember one time in Listowel the rates were 12s. or 13s. in the £, owing to a scheme of water works proposed.

25352. CHAIRMAN.—That would be under the Public Health Act, with which we are not concerned.—The whole thing proved a fiasco and the people have to pay for it. We are rather chary about promises; our experience in Kerry is that lots of works were proposed, and the taxes were to be nil, but we found that the taxation has gone up by leaps and bounds. I quite agree that your only object is to cut down taxation and in that I am quite with you.

25353. You mentioned that one of your objects in coming here was with reference to the county infirmary and that Col. Rowan would go into the details; is there anything you would wish to say about the county infirmary?—I don't think there is anything in particular, but I would agree with what Mr. McMahon said; it is hard on North Kerry, but it is not so poor as other parts of the county; it is very hard on an impoverished place like Sneem to say they should bear as high a burden of taxation as the rural district of Tralee or Listowel.

25354. Did you ever hear the question raised whether the acutely sick might not be made a county-at-large charge, as a class that would not be increased by anything except what we might call a visitation of Providence, would you consider the question of making every hospital in Listowel, Dingle, Tralee, Kilmurrah, and everywhere else, making the support of the sick a county charge?—What do you mean by the sick?

25355. The acutely sick; those cases that would go into these small hospitals if the small hospitals were left; I don't mean all persons that would be classed sick under the existing system, but merely those that would be acutely sick and in for curative treatment.—I would be in favour of course, if you had a county institution, the same as the Killarney Linsell Asylum, of having that institution a county charge.

25356. The only reason I put you that question is that you are pointing out the hardship of people from a distance like Listowel, Dingle, and Kilmurrah, paying the same per £ of valuation as they are in Tralee; the County Infirmary then would not be the only county place for the sick, but every place where the acutely sick are treated, as in the infirmary, would be a county charge all over the county?—Then you would give no relief to these very poorer districts by that suggestion; Sneem would have to pay for Tralee, and Tralee for Sneem, and you would have a universal rate over the county. If a large number of patients came from Sneem to the County Infirmary they ought to pay for any patients they send; I am in favour of that.

25357. That would rarely come into operation, because you will not have many people from Sneem coming to the County Infirmary.—You would not. I must say under the *Non-Resident* condition of every-

Jan. 17, 1902.

Mr. M. J.
Finn.

Jan. 17, 1908.
Mr. M. J.
Flann.

thing in the infirmary is far improved over what it was three or four years ago.

26356. Do you think that instead of being a relief to Smeem or Listowel to have the support of the sick made a county charge, it might result in being a still greater injury to them?—I am afraid it would.

26357. Then there would be more sick in Tralee, and therefore when you came to tot up the total amount of expenditure on the sick and apportion it over the whole county, would you be afraid that the rate for the sick under the new system might be more than the rate for the sick under the present system for a place like Smeem?—I think so. Take Kinnaree—they have no county institution, and they have to contribute to every county institution; the same applies to Listowel, Cahersiveen, and Dingle.

26358. Dr. BROOKES.—Under the system the Chairman mentions the Tralee people would be helping to support the small hospital at Smeem, supposing there was one there.—The size of the hospital in Smeem would be very small as compared with the one in Tralee; then if you take the poverty of the district and the poverty of the people themselves, and their present high rates, for the rates at Smeem at the present moment are far and away higher than in any part of the Tralee Rural District, and that on the poorest part of the county.

26359. Unless you establish some such system it will be awkward to establish a small hospital at Smeem unless you put it on another district?—If the Chairman's suggestion was carried out they could not be worse than they are now.

26360. CHAIRMAN.—They might be worse off; we will say there are only fifty sick treated under the new system, a daily average of forty or fifty sick, which would be excessive under the new projected system; in the Kinnaree Union the cost of these forty sick would be a county charge. Then when you come to Tralee you would have perhaps 120, and Smeem would have to pay their share of the 120; you would have 160 sick, and Tralee and Smeem would share according to the valuation?—Quite so, and then take the poverty of one district compared with the wealth of the other.

26361. You would fear it might be a serious injury instead of a benefit making it a county charge?—That is outside the question altogether, and I know it does not come within your Commission; I don't want to discuss the land question, but fully half the tenants round Smeem have never got any hands from the Land Purchase Act, and, being agricultural capitalists, necessarily the taxation must come on them, and they are not able to bear it. I have no hope for the future of some of the congested districts in Kerry.

26362. Mr. MURPHY.—And there is the further danger of want of supervision; if it was a county charge no one would be interested in seeing what patient was able to pay—many people who go to public hospitals are well able to pay?—A great many are. In many cases we find the greatest difficulty in getting anything from people who are well able to pay, with the result that we have to tax the poorest people in the county. My impression was that a County Infirmary was for the poorest of the poor, but people who can pay ought to be made pay something reasonable to meet the rates.

26363. Dr. BROOKES.—You mentioned about a sanatorium for the county—is there a very general expression of opinion about the matter?—I don't think people generally in the county have considered the question seriously. I know at a meeting of the fever hospital twelve or eighteen months ago the Committee of which I am a member—I am very seldom asked to attend the meetings, why I cannot say—but there was a resolution passed in favour of it. From my knowledge of the County Kerry I certainly think the time has come—in fact the time has passed—that some steps should have been taken in my judgment.

26364. You know there is a great deal of consumption in the County Kerry?—I believe there is a great amount of it, I am sorry to say.

26365. Have you any knowledge where consumption has been spread by one patient to another in the same house?—I think amongst the medical profession themselves they are decidedly of opinion that it is not hereditary.

Dr. BROOKES.—Oh, there is no question; it is beyond that now.

26366. CHAIRMAN.—It is generally accepted as infectious?—In my opinion that is so, and consumption in a great many cases can be prevented if taken at its initial stage.

26367. The institution would not only cure so many cases, but would prevent the spread of it to others?—In my opinion, yes.

26368. Would you put it on the same basis as the County Infirmary, and make it a county charge?—I certainly would make it a county charge; I believe one portion of the county will suffer as much from consumption patients as any other portion, and the most likely to suffer are the poor places who can pay the least.

26369. Or possibly you would make it a charge embracing two or three counties?—I would like to spread the cost, because it is a question that the Local Government Board or some of the many bodies we have in Ireland ought to take up and insist that the Government should take an interest in it, and have a Government contribution.

26370. You think a Government contribution might fairly be asked for it?—Unquestionably; I have often heard Mr. Wyndham say he has been inclined to help those who help themselves; I think we in Kerry have helped ourselves, from the taxation point of view, more than any other county in Ireland, and some portions of it have received no benefit.

26371. As regards your lunatics—is your asylum large enough?—It is only lately it has been increased.

26372. And there is no question of any further increase?—I am afraid there will have to be.

26373. Have you formed any opinion whether workhouses were proper places to keep lunatics?—I should not object to see a separate ward in the workhouse kept for harmless lunatics.

26374. You have not studied the question personally?—No.

26375. Because the members of this Commission, I think, are impressed with the great weight of evidence given to them that the workhouses are not desirable places?—If you take them out of the workhouses they ought to be put in some institution and not allowed to wander at large.

26376. Then you have not considered the question of whether it is wiser to extend the lunatic asylum by further building, or whether it would be possible to keep as at Youghal, Co. Cork, an institution on a more moderate scale of expenditure such as would be obtained if a workhouse were closed?—If it were possible that one of the workhouses should be closed I should be in favour of putting harmless lunatics there and making that a general institution.

26377. In the first place you save the extra expense of additional building in the County Asylum, and you will have one class of harmless lunatics practically all in the same state of lunacy, and all more or less incurable but harmless, and who can be treated with a nominal expense. You are aware that in the last Session of Parliament Bills were brought in, I don't know how far they went, for establishing labour colonies or places for vagrants or tramps who obviously were not doing anything to gain a subsistence for themselves?—I am not aware of such Bills.

26378. I may tell you the scope of the Bill, as far as I understood it, was that power should be given to create, Petty Sessions Courts I suppose, for remitting to such labour colonies or workhouse persons who were going about the country obviously in order to get their subsistence out of the public, and that there they should be taken and placed to work, and efforts made to put them in the way of industrious habits, as all events keeping them from preying on the community by wandering about?—Speaking without knowing the details of the case, I would be largely in favour of it. I have been always in favour of anybody that can work being made to work.

26379. We have a large class of people in Ireland who keep walking about the country caputally avoiding anything in the way of work and obtaining their support partly in workhouses and partly by mendacity?—I think emigration would be a very good cure for that; if they were sent to America they would be made work.

26380. You are aware there is an Act of Congress prohibiting the landing of such people?—I know, but the people who go to America have to work there.

26381. If we could not dump these gentlemen on some foreign territory do you think the next best thing would be to provide some place where they could be kept at labour at home?—I would be in favour of it, but I have not heard the question discussed before, and therefore would not express a decided opinion. Even a limited amount of work will do gentlemen like these more good than harm.

25384. They might be put into industrious habits, some of them?—Certainly.

Mr. Walsh (Solicitor).—I am anxious to ask you a question.

CHAIRMAN.—We are here to ask questions, I am afraid, not to answer them, but there is no harm for you to put it.

Mr. Walsh.—How are the officers to be dealt with?

CHAIRMAN.—That is a matter for the Legislature.

Mr. Walsh.—I mean officers whose positions have been abolished?

CHAIRMAN.—That is a matter for the Legislature; we are not empowered to deal with anything, only to make a report, and on that report legislation will be founded. I may say that I think we are all pretty well of opinion that it would be very unjust to take away a man's living from him without adequate compensation; does that answer your question?

Mr. Walsh.—Would that apply to the case where a teacher in the workhouse has been deprived of his position?

CHAIRMAN.—I should think it would apply to any officer who received a salary.

Mr. Walsh.—In the case of an officer whose office has been abolished, would you give a recommendation that he received some compensation?

CHAIRMAN.—I am sure we shall; personally I would.

Mr. Walsh.—Otherwise it would be very hard on men that had been all their lives there.

CHAIRMAN.—It would be inconceivably unjust that anything should be done except to make such a recommendation.

Mr. Quillen.—The County Council have passed a resolution on this subject, which I will hand in (produced).

Jan. 17, 1866.

Mr. M. J. Flavin.

Mr. PATRICK FOUNT, Vice-Chairman, Dingle Union, examined.

25385. CHAIRMAN.—You are Vice-Chairman of the Dingle District Council or Board of Guardians?—Of both.

25386. What resolution have the Dingle Board passed on the subject of amalgamation?—As far as I am aware they have passed no resolution whatsoever.

25387. What is the general opinion of the Board on the question of amalgamation?—I would not like to venture to speak in the name of the whole Board.

25388. Was there a division on the subject without coming to an actual decision in numbers—was there any division of opinion on the subject?—No; I think the question was not considered, only marked read and persons nominated.

25389. What is your own personal opinion on this question of amalgamation?—I say that it is expedient to dissolve the whole of the Dingle Union except the hospital, which could be converted into the district hospital, possibly under Section 90 of the Local Government Act.

25390. You would close the workhouse except for the purposes of the sick?—I say cut away two-fifths of the union and amalgamate it with Tralee; Tralee would be as convenient for the sick part of two-fifths of the union as Dingle. I refer to Castlegregory and portion of Anascahan Dispensary District, because that chain of mountains is very troublesome, and it is one of the highest in Ireland, and I think the District Committee would manage the hospital.

25391. Then for the sick of the country to the west of the range of mountains you would keep the hospital in Dingle?—Yes.

25392. You would let the sick of Castlegregory and the northern part of Anascahan district go to Tralee?—Yes.

25393. As regards the able-bodied for the whole of the present Dingle Union you would let them go to the central house at Tralee?—Yes.

25394. And you would only keep up wards for the sick of that portion west of the mountains?—Yes. There are four dispensary districts in the Union of Dingle—Ventry, Dingle, Anascahan and Castlegregory. Anascahan and Castlegregory are on this side of Dingle. I am sure you know the district.

25395. I have a sufficient general knowledge to follow you?—The Castlegregory patients sometimes have to go back to the Junction and then to Dingle. The Relieving Officers are compelled to send them that way, and when they get to the Junction they would be much nearer Tralee. The Relieving Officer at Anascahan has to travel nine or ten miles by rail to attend sick at Dingle every Board day, and it would be almost as convenient for him to attend in Tralee. Most of the Anascahan district lies near to Tralee—in fact nearer than to Dingle. Now, taking Castlegregory, I have already pointed out to you about the difficulty of crossing the hill. I would have the whole of the old and infirm at present in Dingle Union treated as hospital inpatients.

25396. Where?—In the Dingle Union; I would have them classed as hospital patients.

25397. You would have a very large number, more than three-fifths of the inmates?—Yes.

25398. Did you make an estimate from the register or through the Master of the number of infirm and sick you would have?—Yes. Let me draw your attention to the expense of maintaining the Dingle Union. The population of the union in 1851 was about 1,200, but according to the present day requirements of the Local Government Board it is capable of accommodating 853

inmates. Now I wish to draw your attention to that number. We are required to keep up a building at considerable cost to accommodate 853 inmates; that was taken by me in the week ending December 15th. I find that the state of the workhouse for the week ending Saturday, 14th December, 1866, showed that only 150 inmates were in the workhouse, and of that number 70 were in the hospital. At present very few able-bodied persons visit the workhouse excepting night lodgers or casuals. It would appear monstrous that a poor district so heavily taxed as the Dingle district is, should be asked to maintain such large buildings. The average cost of maintaining these buildings and keeping them in repair amounts to £200 a year. I beg to state for your consideration that two and a quarter hours in a train from Dingle to Tralee is not too much for any able-bodied person. I cannot say what the accommodation in the Tralee Union is.

25399. We will have the figures and can apply them for you?—I am sure they could accommodate all the able-bodied men in the Dingle Workhouse here in Tralee. I would send all the able-bodied persons of this district of twelve months' residence thence into the Tralee Workhouse, and I would reserve the Probationary Ward for urgent cases. I would have the Dingle Hospital under a District Committee, in connection with that point I would wish to say that in case of contagious diseases I would have the Medical Officer to use his own discretion as to whether it would be advisable to send such persons to Dingle or Tralee.

25400. You don't contemplate sending the sick anywhere except to Dingle from the two-fifths?—I do not, but in any case where the Medical Officer of the district in the case of contagious diseases in the three-fifths would think it convenient to send them to Dingle, to let him use his discretion.

25401. What has you in your mind?—A fever case in Anascahan or part of Castlegregory.

25402. Which would be the worst institution?—Dingle would be the nearest, but it is very often the case that you could not enter Connor Hall, and in that case I would allow the Medical Officer to send them to the nearest place; I would like to impress that on your minds; that would remove all hardship, and to remove the Dingle Hospital managed by a District Committee appointed by the Board of Guardians of Tralee.

25403. Do you contemplate the breaking up of the Rural District Council as distinguished from the Board of Guardians?—No; I would abolish the Board of Guardians at Dingle and substitute a Committee of Management.

25404. Why could not you let the Rural District Council of Dingle manage it?—I would have different men altogether for Guardians; the representation at present is too large.

25405. Would you trust the Tralee men more than the Dingle men?—No; I would have representation from Dingle in Tralee by converting every three electoral divisions both in Tralee and Dingle into one rural district electoral division, each division to have only one representative elected.

25406. Would not that make the attendance very slack?—I think that would hardly interfere with us if we had the hospital as a district hospital.

25407. You would have the district hospital managed from Tralee?—Only by a District Committee appointed.

25408. I don't quite see the advantage of having the district hospital managed by people resident in Tralee who know nothing about it?—I would have it

Jan. 17, 1903.

Mr. Patrick
Foley.

composed of men of the Dingle district, but nominated by the Trades Board of Guardians on the same principle as committees are appointed by the County Councils for the management of railways, hospitals, &c.

25409. Why would you not have the Rural District Council of Dingle manage the hospital?—I think the number entirely too large.

25410. Mr. MURPHY.—What is the average attendance at Dingle?—It is very small, not over six or eight men on an average?—Yes, on the average I think it is, but you will find it is the same members almost that attend to their duties sweating after meeting. The majority of the others come for some special purpose, and, after disposing of that, run away; and therefore I think the men from the town of Dingle would be better able to manage it.

25411. CHAIRMAN.—Have you fifty District Commissioners?—Forty-four.

25412. There are ninety-three in Trades?—I think the representation all round too large.

25413. If you think you have too many in Dingle you would be going to ninety-three instead of forty-four?—The law should be altered so as to reduce it all round.

25414. What is your next head of evidence?—I wish to point out to you that if we keep the Dingle Workhouse in its present state it cannot be worked at all. I think it is a waste of time to ask forty-four men to assemble Saturday after Saturday in Dingle Union for the admission of 151 patients, considering that 178 cases, embracing 311 destitute persons, are relieved outside the workhouse. I wish to direct particular attention to this paragraph about the workhouse for the Dingle Workhouse—your Board is continually hammering at us to bring water to these buildings.

Some years ago it was proposed to bring water to this hospital from the springs at Ballyhea, but here it was found that two mill rights were concerned and should be compensated. Your Board has been continually coming very hard on us, and your Inspectors daily repeating, but I regret to say they have never suggested anything like a practical remedy, and in that way we have been put to unnecessary expense; and I certainly say if it was any other Board in Ireland with the same powers conferred on them as is conferred on your Board with power to surcharge, they certainly would have surcharged you, because you have had all this information before you.

25415. I am not sure that I understand the position correctly—the position is there is a deficient supply of water for your workhouse?—Yes, owing to the height of the buildings.

25416. You have not a sufficient supply of water?—Nor so easily means of getting it.

25417. Have you ever consulted any engineer on the subject?—Yes, and even your Board advertised an inquiry to be held into it, and the Inspector never turned up—the people petitioned against it.

25418. Did you ever get any engineer?—Yes, we got Mr. Goodwin, the County Surveyor.

25419. What did he say?—He said that it could be; I have his report; he estimated the cost at something like \$5,000, that and the sewage of the workhouse, but it was found then again that his estimate was not sufficient, and besides the source of supply runs short there owing to the height of the buildings. I say that there is no remedy at all if we are to comply with the requirements of your Board; I don't see how it can be done unless you sink the whole district, or the workhouse must go.

25420. Your evidence will be on record, and you may be sure it will be carefully considered?—It is a great expense to our union to be losing so much money in getting plans and specifications and sending them up and down, and paying engineers, and this scheme has no earthly chance of being carried out owing to the height; it is utterly impossible to get a certain supply of water for the sewage of the hospital. Several attempts have been made, and large sums of money have been expended, in formulating schemes and proposals, and they were all blocked. Some years ago it was proposed to bring water to this hospital from the springs at Ballyhea, but here it was found that two mill rights were concerned and should be compensated, apart from the difficulties arising from the question of costs, source of supply, and mill rights. I see another great objection, namely, where the sewage of the workhouse would be discharged. There is no doubt in my mind that, in consequence of the water in Dingle Harbour being so dead, and

the mud banks so numerous, but that all the sewage matter would be thrown up into the town by the tide and would create an offensive stench when discharged so near the town. Therefore it would be necessary to convey it in pipes beyond the Dingle Pier, and there erect a tank that would discharge with the ebbing of the tide, or, as an alternative, it should be conveyed a mile and a half beyond the town, otherwise the inhabitants of Strand-street, Quay-street, &c., would resent such a scheme as that proposed by the county surveyor. After giving this matter my most careful consideration, to the best of my judgment and ability, it would cost the ratepayers at least \$20,000, before it could be considered as satisfactorily completed. Of course I may err in that estimate, but it is the best I can give; you will observe, that that sum, with interest, would be a crushing burden upon a poor district like Dingle. I have already pointed out to you the source of supply, the situation of the workhouse buildings, and the height of them over the sea. The springs in the workhouse, which were pointed out to you, with a small scheme of waterworks near the town, in the land of Misses, would be sufficient for the flushing of a district hospital. Remove from the orphan and deserted children the gutter brand by boarding out as many as circumstances would admit, of course under proper supervision of the police and the relieving officer, and send the remainder to some central institution. I am under the impression that children brought up in the workhouse are unfit for the outside world; of course I observe the difficulty in trying to get illegitimate children boarded out.

25421. Some difficulty in getting proper homes?—I think no person would take out illegitimate children.

25422. Our experience is very different to that—I don't think in the Dingle district you will find any proved.

25423. All over Ireland they do so!—When they arrive at fifteen years?

25424. No; when they are two or three years old!—That won't work in the Dingle district. I believe those children in the workhouse learn everything by rote and they are quite useless for the outside world. Then in the Dingle Union, if that scheme were carried out, I would abolish the office of master, matron, schoolmistress, and baker, subject, of course, to pension and compensation for loss of pay that would have to come some fine day whenever it would be abolished, and transfer the office of clerk of the Guardians, at reduced pay, to that of the district hospital committee. By taking away Anneson and Castle-gregory you would be able to reduce the staff in the hospital. I would have the management of the hospital in the hands of a district committee and medical officer. At present the hospital is under the management of the medical officer, and, of course, with a district committee checking him I think it would be sufficient. Great care should be taken in providing the proper supplies for the hospital. Food stuffs should be inspected by officers from the Local Government Board or subjected to some test before being taken into stock. I should think that that would be the most important part of the business.

25425. You might generally trust the workhouse nurses—the man in charge—not to receive bad food for her patients; they are very particular on that subject?—Ah, yes, but there are very often so many flaws left in the specification, and in the form of tender that those things could be put in spite of them. Contractors will try, it is only natural, to send in inferior things. That has been my experience, in fact it has been the most impudacious thing, and you may remember that two inquiries have been held in connection with the meat, and even at present the contracts are not satisfactory. I think if those food stuffs and supplies were inspected by some officer and subjected to a test that there would be as earthly chance of that being done. I would be in favour of converting the office of master and porter into that of a storekeeper, who would be a porter in the hospital.

25426. If such an officer would be necessary at all?—I think some person would want to look after the stores, and also over the admission of patients into the workhouse. Idiots and lunatics should be sent to some central institution; this would reduce the expense, and they would be better cared for. The present state of the law, requiring outdoor relief to be raised wholly at a union charge, is most objectionable. Since outdoor relief was raised as a union charge it has considerably increased, and in this re-

Jan. 17, 1902.
Mr. Parker
Foley.

agent Guardians are inclined to support all applications from the electoral divisions they represent. If these cases were charged to the electoral divisions which these gentlemen represent I am of opinion many of them would never find their way into the relief list.

25427. Would you have the cases of outdoor relief dealt with at Dingle only, those west of the mountain?—Yes.

25428. The others would be dealt with in Tralee?—Yes. On this matter I beg to refer you to the report of the auditor for the half-year ending 31st March, 1901.

25429. If you give me a reference to the date of the report we can refer to it ourselves?—"Banner's Hotel, 2nd September, 1901." He says: "I notice that the expenditure on outdoor relief shows a decided tendency to increase, the amount so expended this half-year being £335 10s. 10d. as against £256 18s. 8d. in the corresponding period of last year. I cannot ascertain what any greater distress prevailed in the half-year under notice as compared with the half-year immediately preceding it, still the relief given is £78 10s. 10d. higher than any half-year since March, 1900. I would ask the Guardians to be very careful in the granting of outdoor relief, as, unless carefully looked after, the expenditure in this respect is apt to increase very quickly."—C. H. O'CONNOR.

Of course the system of raising outdoor relief as a union-at-large charge materially benefits the poorer workmen. In order to prevent an abuse of the outdoor relief I would suggest, as a remedy, that supplies be contracted for by the Board of Guardians and inspected by persons to be appointed by the Local Government Board, then let the relieving officer issue a ticket to the shopkeeper having charge of these supplies, with directions to give relief in kind, to the amount allowed by the Guardians or committee appointed by the Guardians for that purpose.

25430. At Dingle only?—Yes.

25431. So people from Smerrick would have to come into Dingle for their relief?—Yes; I should think there would not be any hardship at all; they would send persons in. At present the relieving officer does not go ten miles to the west of Dingle; they send in their passbook with some friend of theirs.

25432. Are you not aware that the relieving officer notices himself liable to demand if he does not visit these people periodically?—I fear many would be dismissed, and I think there is no necessity for such a strict rule.

25433. Are you aware, when visits are not paid, that people sometimes die and the relief is continued to be paid to the dead person's representatives?—I am glad to say that does not occur to my knowledge, and I never heard of a case occurring.

25434. You would not look on it with favour that a relieving officer should not carry out the instructions under which he was appointed—to visit the people periodically?—They go through the district very often, and they know the district very well and Dingle.

25435. I am only taking the most extreme case when I say death; there are plenty of other circumstances; if they get a resistance from Amos or something that would make them, independent for a long time of any relief, would the relief go on as usual?—I am sorry to say in the present state of the law it would go on.

25436. Not under the present state of the law, but under the present state of the administration of the law?—It will go on no matter what we think of it, I fear.

25437. Do you think the union-at-large charge is a waste charge?—I do.

25438. What save would you have?—Of course I would have, first of all, a certain scale laid down to run as a union-at-large charge, but any part that exceeded that I would have the excess charge put on those portions, except in case of epidemic or some exceptional circumstances.

25439. Take the ordinary relief, so I understand you to say that you would first have a portion of that a union-at-large charge?—Yes.

25440. And anything over that amount per annum or per week; anything that was over that you would levy it off the electoral division?—That is my point.

25441. What do you think would be a fair proportion between the union-at-large and the electoral division, would it be half and half, or three-fourths and

one-fourth?—I would take the average rate for three years before the passing of the Local Government Act, and I would take that altogether as the union-at-large charge, and anything exceeding that I would have an electoral division charge except in cases of exceptional distress.

25442. That is dealt with under a special clause of the Act of 1898?—Yes; but I think it is the County Council has the levying of it and it must be raised as a county-at-large charge.

25443. Partly, to the extent of 5s. 6d.—Take for instance that a tradesman from the parish of Dranganee was drowned at sea, or two or three people, it would be very hard to raise that excess on the electoral division, but I would give power to the ratepayers of that district to petition the Local Government Board and have that levied as a union charge.

25444. Mr. MURKIN.—What benefit do you see in that?—It would check the present tendency to increase the relief.

25445. Don't elaborate so much, I want to know what benefit you see in that; do you not see that every electoral division would rush in and qualify up to the standard?—Oh, no.

25446. Would not every electoral division insist on what they are getting now?

CHAIRMAN.—There would be no motive for economy?—I think there would.

25447. Mr. MURKIN.—Would not the representative of each division insist he would get his present benefit?—What I propose is to raise a regular rate all over the union and then the excess—

25448. I know; you would suggest that the average for the last three years should be taken as the standard, and anything over that should be an electoral division charge?—Yes.

25449. I ask you where you see the advantage; would it not happen that each representative of an electoral division would try and qualify to get as much for his division as would bring him up to the standard; otherwise his constituents might very well say he was neglecting their interests. Perhaps there is another way of doing it; your object is to benefit the towns, to give them the advantage they possess at present?—Oh, no.

25450. CHAIRMAN.—Your object is to reduce expenditure on outdoor relief, or rather to prevent its increase?—An abuse of the present system, because I believe it is abused; every man will rush in, and when they see one man getting in from one division he will say he himself is entitled to it also.

25451. Coming to the root of the matter, do you think there has been a little but over-generous administration of outdoor relief since 1898?—I do.

25452. Therefore don't you think the expenditure since 1898 has been excessive?—I do.

25453. Why then would you take an average of three years since 1898 as the proper standard for outdoor relief?—I say before 1898.

25454. Mr. MURKIN.—May it not happen that, though the amount has increased, the number in the house has diminished and the people now are living outside on outdoor relief at a less cost to the union than would be in the house now; may not that happen?—I don't know that.

25455. Cases where it does happen could be cited, where, though the outdoor relief has increased, the sum total has decreased, because the cost outside is much less than the cost of in-maintenance; that is a matter that would have to be inquired into.—Taking the number of patients in the workhouse before the passing of the Act, and afterwards, I took a note of them last night and I find the number is exactly the same.

25456. Perhaps some of the people in those days were fairly well able to support themselves and during the process of time got old and feeble and were not able to do so; while outdoor relief might appear to increase, the general cost of the Poor Law to the union might not, because those people, if they did not get outdoor relief, might have to come into the house?—My point is that we have the same number still in the workhouse that we had before the passing of the Act; the same number just as we have to-day, and outdoor relief is increasing.

25457. I am afraid the average standard would be of little benefit to check expenditure on outdoor relief, because every electoral division would insist on qualifying up to the full quota?—They could not

Jan. 17, 1895.
 Mr. Patrick
 Falvey.

quality. Then they would not expect it because they would know they would have to raise the charge on that electoral division.

25458. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Marzaghian's point is that at all events you would stereotype the outdoor relief as it was for the three years before 1893; if you go on the other plan of saying that a proportion, say half and half, that half should be paid by the district and half by the union-at-large, there you would have a motive for making the expenditure as small as possible?—That would not benefit so much the poorer parishes, but I would agree to three-fourths.

25459. You mean where the population is most numerous; there you might have the old provision that was in the Act before 1893 for a rate in aid for those who were most highly taxed; you are aware that before 1893 there was such a provision?—I am not aware exactly of that provision.

25460. There was such a provision, and that added the towns and populous places?—That is what I would like.

25461. That would naturally come back if divisional rating came back in any form. If you adopt a standard the tendency would be that this expenditure would never go below that standard?—I certainly believe that, while the Guardians all round the union would be inclined to keep it down, a man representing a certain division, when he knew he would be responsible if the rate on his division was raised, he would make sure not to allow them to succeed; that is my point in case you should not adopt giving relief in kind.

25462. The suggestion of relief in kind has been made already; there is a good deal in the suggestion, but how far it is practicable is another question. It is easy enough in the towns; all the outdoor relief in Dublin is given in kind?—I would not have it in any town given in any other way. I am sorry to say that I believe some of the outdoor relief is drunk. The law excluding the child of an able-bodied person from entering into the workhouse at the death of its mother, or refusing to grant outdoor relief, should be altered and amended. I consider it the greatest hardship on any poor man, with seven or eight in family, whose wife is dead, and has left seven or eight children—the youngest probably only six months old—and cannot find any person to take charge of such child unless he comes into the workhouse, that he cannot be relieved in any way. The mother of children can travel about, but the poor man so circumstanced is the very hardest case I ever experienced, and in many cases I thought it right to err on the side of mercy and strain the law and relieve the applicant.

25463. At present I suppose he is driven to the hazardous experiment of a second marriage?—I don't know that at all. What I wish to impress on this Commission is that a poor man so circumstanced, after losing his wife, cannot be relieved. The law that gives auditors power to surcharge the Guardians in such a case, which they will always do, is a very bad law.

25464. The auditor is bound to surcharge?—And he does it. I would suggest amending the law so as to enable destitute fathers, having the care of children under three years of age, to be relieved inside or outside of the workhouse. Also I would be in favour of enabling farmers, whose wives should die, to send any child under three years of age to the workhouse, there to be relieved by way of a loan; I say children under three years of age; a farmer would not get any servant to come to the house; that is my experience of the West. When one or two cases of this kind occurred the doctor, I think, did strain the law by giving certificates of illness to the applicants for the hospital, and the Local Government raised no objection.

25465. They know nothing about it, I suppose?—The matter was referred to them. Now in connection with the auditors; if it comes within the scope of your inquiry I would like to bring it under your notice because it affects the starving of paupers for outdoor relief; the proper persons to be appointed as auditors are the clerks of unions, provided that they are good accountants and possess sufficient knowledge of the Poor Laws. It is of the utmost importance to all the public bodies in Ireland that the present law, regulating the surcharging of Guardians who sign the treasurer's authority for the payment of goods delivered in pursuance of a resolution adopted by the majority of the Guardians, is defective. In my opinion the Guardians refusing to accept the lowest tender for the best value ought to be the par-

sons surcharged, and not the three men who sign the authority as is now the custom. If auditors continue to surcharge such persons it will be the cause of leaving the authority for outdoor relief unanaged. Power of taking the auditors before a county court judges with a right of appeal ought to be allowed persons surcharged. I think it is a hard thing that a person has to go before the Local Government Board.

25466. He has only to sign a petition?—It is carrying the auditors before his own court after all.

25467. If you look to the statistics of decisions you will not find much in that; you will find the number of reversals is very large; we have your suggestion anyway?—I would certainly wish to impress this point on you, the outdoor relief will certainly be brought to a standstill if the men who sign the authority are surcharged. It is a monstrous thing to say that a man who goes into the union; all the information he has is from the clerk; the resolution may have been passed at a previous meeting; he has no reason to think there is anything wrong, yet, when he signs the pay-sheet, he may be surcharged. If the person who supplied these goods, even if not supplied strictly in accordance with the law, still the contractor will take a person into the county court and secure him, and then the auditor will turn round and surcharge the person who signs the paying authority. I think the proper persons to be surcharged are the persons who were the cause of having the goods supplied to the workhouse. The Commissioner of Valuation can be taken to the county court, and it is strange to say the auditors of the Local Government Board cannot be taken.

25468. A court of law has to deal with legality and legal questions; we have a note of your suggestions, but I don't fancy you would gain very much by an appeal on legal grounds, because an auditor will not make a surcharge until he is satisfied in point of law?—Both in law and in fact, I think it ought to be carried out.

25469. You don't give legal tribunals those discretionary powers conferred on auditors?—Parliament would not be very long in doing it.

25470. Parliament does not customarily do a thing of that sort; legal tribunals are confined to legal matters?—If the auditors are allowed this fall upon the Boards might as well not be there at all. The principal point is the treasurer's authority; the clerk, who knows all about the resolutions that are adopted, and does not point this out to the person who signs the treasurer's authority before signing it, ought to be made accountable and surcharged.

25471. I think the clerk would be acting very improperly if he did not put that view of the case before a Guardian?—But they don't do it.

25472. I think they do it as a rule?—A resolution might never be rescinded; then it is binding on the Board. A clerk should, at any rate, satisfy the person signing the treasurer's authority of all the circumstances connected with the case and make some minute of it, which he should produce before asking it to be signed.

25473. You have it in your own power to ensure that. Instead of having cheques presented during the hurry and scurry of a Board meeting, if you had a finance committee, who had nothing else to do, to come there an hour or an hour and a half before the meeting of the Board of Guardians and go carefully into these things?—That has been done.

25474. Then it is very queer you would get surcharged without knowing the whole story?—Let me take a printing contract.

25475. I don't think you need go into details; we have your suggestion, and that is quite enough?—In my opinion the proper persons to be inspectors of workhouses and hospitals are the masters of workhouses. Every other day we have inspectors visiting our union and finding fault, but never suggesting any practical remedy. In case of elections, and the appointing of a person to any pensionable office, I would be inclined to have him elected by ballot; this would ensure the election of better officers, and remove corruption. In the case of tramps and casuals, I would have those go to the police barracks for tickets of admission to the probatory ward instead of going to the relieving officer; it would discourage those who go to the workhouse, and prevent drunkenness, and lead to the detection of criminals. The police need not be called to the workhouses for the purpose of ascertaining whether any criminal was admitted. In connection with the county infirmary and fever hospital, I protest against that being charged to our district.

Mr. THOMAS O'FLAHERTY, P.L.O., examined.

26476. CHAIRMAN.—You have been here during portion of the evidence of Mr. Foley?—No; I have not.

26477. Apart from what he stated, perhaps you will kindly give your own views on the question of amalgamation of unions in Kerry?—So far as amalgamation is concerned, and so far as Dingle is concerned, I think it would be altogether unsuitable.

26478. Would you make any change in the existing system or allow matters to proceed as they are?—To proceed as they are; the only change I would make would be with regard to the pumpkins brought up in the workhouses. "The subject of the moral and intellectual culture of workhouse children, as well as of their industrial training, is one that demands the serious attention of the public, affecting, as it does so deeply, the question of the education or perpetration, perhaps I might have said propagation, of pauperism in this country. Whilst it must be admitted that a good deal has been done in the line of minimising the helplessness and improving the general condition of the class above indicated, it cannot, at the same time, be denied that in our system there is still a void that requires to be filled up before anything like results, satisfactory and permanent, become discernible. Howard's labours in the reformation of a class, the members of which were the immediate cause of their own sufferings and miseries, have, and justly so, gained for his name immortality; but who will deny that there is as much, if not more, real philanthropy in devising and adopting measures calculated to prevent the orphan, the deserted child, the other unprotected offspring of our race, from being, as they advance in years, dragged into the vortex of crime and its consequences? It is true that, during the years of their helpless childhood, maintenance, clothing, and housing in the workhouse are provided for those advanced to; but when they pass that age what provision has been made to so educate them that instead of continuing in after life a heavy, permanent burden on society, they may be converted into intelligent reproductive citizens, looking upon labour, not as a slavish drudgery, but as an honorable, invigorating occupation? As matters stand at present, the workhouse-trained child, when he passes a stated age, is launched on the tempestuous voyage of life without chart or compass to guide his course. Brought up as he has been, in comparative isolation from the outside world, possessing no acquaintance with, or experience of, how he may raise himself above the condition of absolute dependence in which he has hitherto, as it were, reposed, he leaves, what he looks upon as his natural home, as aimless and helpless as the very infant. To remedy this state of things several plans have been from time to time proposed; but, beyond more speculative suggestions, no tangible steps have, up to this, been taken to carry into practice any of the various proposals. The workhouse training, if training such discipline may be called, is as confined to prepare the proper child for the ordinary duties of life, as are the mechanical contrivances that enter into the construction of an automaton, to endow it with feeling and thought, and reasoning faculties. How long, it may be asked, is this stereotyped unprogressive condition of affairs to be allowed to continue? Have philanthropy and humanity as well as another noble trait in the Celtic character, namely, an innate tendency to sympathise with and relieve the distressed and the belated, vanished as an attribute of the disposition of the Irishman of our day? I believe not. The question now arises: What are the most effective and economical means that suggest themselves to so raise the status of the workhouse-trained child, that, instead of looking to the workhouse as a permanent home, and pauperism as an inheritance, he may be transformed into a self-reliant, reproductive member of society, according the idea of living on the wages of industry and mendacity—public or private charity. What a blot on civilisation, what a blot on humanity, that the condition of a creature, formed after God's own image, should attract so little interest. The destitute and infirm members of our population that need relief are, unfortunately, only too numerous. It is then, let me ask, a wise policy to raise up a reserve to recruit the ranks of destitution as they become thinned by death. Our present elementary

system has no better tendency." I have not finished the paper; I have not made suggestions.

26479. I must say it is a very finished production?—What I would suggest is this, that for these children, when they pass a certain age, that a district school be established within the ambit of a limited number of unions, Tralee, Listowel, and Dingle might be combined for this purpose.

26480. Would you not be at all afraid that the machinery for producing an automaton might operate there too?—It is possible it may, but it is possible not; I would combine these three and establish a district school, that the children from the three unions would attend, and I would further have a pretty good-sized farm attached to this where the children could be taught agriculture or other industries, if necessary, according as they had a taste or a talent for them, and then send them on the world when they pass sixteen or seventeen years, and they will be prepared to earn a livelihood for themselves. As it is all known that workhouse children are quite useless. When they leave the workhouse they become nothing else than tramps or vagrants, and then something should be done, and I consider it is quite necessary, in fact it is philanthropy to do something to rescue these children from future misery.

26481. Don't you think that it is a little bit too gloomy a view to take of the way in which workhouse children turn out?—I don't think it is; I have seen some of them leave the workhouse and they were as useless in the world as infant children.

26482. They are not handy or self-reliant?—No; they would hardly know the horse's tail from the horse's head if taken in by a farmer.

26483. Mr. MURKIN.—Why do you not send some of the children into the country to learn the habits of ordinary life?—I cannot say what is the reason.

26484. Your Board have never done anything in that way?—No; I say children are brought up quite useless in the workhouse; they are like a sort of laboratory to change food into nutriment, but so far as amalgamation is concerned—

26485. CHAIRMAN.—You would let things remain as they are except as regards the children?—Except as regards the children.

26486. What would you do as regards outdoor relief?—I think as it is given, it is given very economically in our union.

26487. You don't see any necessity for safeguarding it any further?—I do not indeed; I don't think there could be more economy practised than there is in our union.

26488. As regards tramps, do you think anything might be done to prevent the supply of tramps continuing or increasing?—My suggestion would be that a tramp be not allowed into the workhouse without an admission ticket from the police.

26489. What instructions would you give to the police?—If the tramp was able to work I would send him to jail.

26490. You would have to supply some place to which these people could be sent, the ordinary jails would not be sufficient?—I think they would; in Kerry at least they would.

26491. You would make them ordinary prisoners? Undoubtedly.

26492. You would not put them into a labour colony?—After they were sent to jail I would make them break stones.

26493. You would put them into some place where they might be trained, and, if possible, give them an inclination to industry?—Most of the tramps I see are beyond training.

26494. You would be afraid that they are incurable? Yes; incurable; I know it is a great nuisance.

26495. Mr. MURKIN.—The younger ones might be cured?—They might, certainly, when they are under twenty years of age, but when they pass twenty I do not see that it is possible to cure or reform them.

26496. CHAIRMAN.—At all events if you caught the young ones you would stop the further supply.

Jan. 17, 1905.

Mr. Theodor O'Flaherty.

Mrs. FORAN, P.R.C., Listeral, examined.

Jan. 12, 1906.

Mrs. Foran.

25497. CHAIRMAN.—Will you tell us your views, please, on the question of amalgamation?—My own personal views are that I would wish amalgamation, but the Board does not desire it.

25498. The best plan is for you to give us your personal views. What would you suggest as regards the part of the county you are acquainted with?—My suggestion would be to abolish workhouses as they are at present.

25499. Are you speaking generally of all Ireland or the County Kerry?—I am speaking of all Ireland. The idea is that there should be no longer establishments in which different people of different classes are huddled together; and I think that people requiring specific treatment of one kind or another should not be in the workhouse altogether. The strongest of my views is about children. I think, as a gentleman who sat here just now said, that children reared in the workhouse are absolutely useless for anything. They are reared in an atmosphere that is bad in every way—morally and physically.

25500. Not made useful or handy, no initiative?—Yes.

25501. How would you propose they should be brought up?—I think by a system of district schools. 25502. Such as Glenties?—Such as Glenties; but there should be different methods; there are several complaints about Glenties. No later than a fortnight since I heard a tiler and bootmaker, who both had children from Glenties, complaining that they did not know how to do anything. I am very sorry for that, because I thought Glenties was a very good establishment.

25503. We were through the shops, and they looked very workmanlike, and the boys seemed to me to be working very well?—I am afraid in schools like that the environment is too narrow; and they are not in sufficient touch with the world.

25504. For a little boy learning to make boots—that comes to the concrete. They seem to be making boots there, and the tailors seem to be making clothes; we stood sufficiently long to look at them doing work?—Were you satisfied with it?

25505. We thought the boys were doing good work?—Those might be individual cases to which I referred. I went to Glenties once or twice, and thought it was a very good school; it certainly is a very great improvement on rearing children in workhouses. We adopted a system of boarding out about two years ago. It was passed unanimously; and then one of the Guardians, I think, Mr. McMahon, got the idea into his head that people would take these children for baby-farming and he asked to have the resolution rescinded.

25506. Was it?—No; we came to an understanding that the children would be boarded out with relatives, but I am afraid it has not been very successful; we have not tried very much.

25507. There is only one child boarded out at present?—I believe if we could find places like they do in the North of Ireland, and in the West, where it has been very successful, and if we could find respectable people to take them, we could have them all boarded out, but we find it very hard to find people that would take them without being well paid. We have really made no strong effort there.

25508. You know the country people, and how important it is to most small houses in the country to get a jump 48 a year in cash?—We allow 48 a year.

25509. Even take 48, you know what tremendous advantage a 48 note is in cash to a family?—Yes, but somehow it does not appear to be a sufficient inducement.

25510. I can understand people in the country being unwilling to take a child who has learned bad ways, but most householders would be glad to take little children of three or four?—It would be an excellent thing if we could do so; it brings the children in touch with the world.

25511. And they become reared as agricultural labourers. Would that system be even better than institution rearing?—Infinitely better. I think epileptics and idiots should not be kept in the workhouse. We have in our workhouse, certainly, a very excellent female attendant, and a good male attendant, too; but certainly it would be better that these poor people should be in separate institutions, and have specific treatment.

25512. They have no exercise ground and no occupation?—No; and the scale of dietary laid down by the Local Government Board is not satisfactory for them.

25513. That is laid down not for the insane but the ordinary poor inmate. You would prefer to have these people brought to a place where they could have some occupation?—Yes, and have the treatment of a specialist.

25514. Is there any other class you would remove from the workhouse?—Yes, the old and the infirm. We have not any married couples in our union; but if there were, I should say we should keep them together, and if possible extend their privileges. In the case of epileptics, sometimes there are some wealthy families who are unfortunate enough to have an epileptic or an idiot in their family, and I think these people should be made responsible for their maintenance according to their means.

25515. That power exists at present, it is merely the administration that is defective. Most of the aged and infirm who go into the workhouse remain there for life?—I think there is a great deal of money mis-spent over the treatment they get in the workhouses. The strictly inmates we have cost £1,060. I think that £1,060 is very badly spent. These people have no occupation or special treatment; and I think if they were put under the care of the nurse—

25516. You have power to do that as it is, as the law stands; and in a very large number of workhouses, such as Galway, that is done?—But I would have them removed from the workhouse. I think they should have a special place for themselves, and special treatment, and be allowed greater liberty. The female infirm in our workhouse are locked into a ward two or three stone stairways up, and the greater part of them never see the outer place of all. I think they should have greater liberty.

25517. If they are well-behaved?—Yes, and then have privilege wards, as a matter of after-consideration. Each workhouse hospital should be made a district hospital, so that persons who would be able to pay would be charged for their treatment and maintenance as in private or ordinary hospitals.

25518. You would give the District Council power to fix what should be paid by each person, according to their means, and power to recover?—I would prefer that it should be fixed by law, by Act of Parliament.

25519. It would be very difficult to fix it by law; you would be bound to fix limits that would not fit all classes; the full average cost is ridiculously small for some persons and a great deal too high for others?—If the workhouse hospital were made a district hospital, it would remove the ban of respectability, and it would be on a broader basis, and be more satisfactory all round. I should think that cottage hospitals would be very necessary.

25520. Where would you say in the Listowel Union?

—Well, Tarbert, and a sanatorium for consumptives.

25521. That would be for the county or a larger area?—For the county, one sanatorium. Consumption is very much on the increase. I don't know if you know that in the ordinary farmhouse you have a number of people sleeping in one apartment.

25522. We are aware how favourable the conditions are for the spread of it?—Usually, they sleep in a bed with a number of curtains round, and probably leave the microbes of consumption for years in the apartment. I think it would be very necessary to take the strongest possible measures to instruct the public as to the great danger there is in proximity to persons so affected.

25523. Make it a notifiable disease, and have separation?—I think the strongest possible measures should be taken about consumptives. It is one of the worst things that has come under my observation. I think tramps should be placed under the absolute control of the police.

25524. And taken from the Poor Law?—Yes; also the law as regards vagrancy, as to strengthen the hands of the local authorities.

25525. Where would you authorize the police or magistrates to send them?—To the police barracks.

25526. That would be for the night. You would make vagrancy an offence. Where would you place them that committed that offence?—In a place set apart under the supervision of the police.

25527. It has been suggested that four for all Ireland—one for each province—would be sufficient?—Surely a tramping union up in Listowel!

25528. Send him to Cork, or wherever the place would be, and keep him there for so many years?—Yes. In our union it is one of the greatest misdeeds.

We have the same tramps coming in this week and next week; they seem to make a home of it; they get nothing to do; they simply come in, and have their food, although perhaps it is not of the best quality, and does not cost very much, yet they give a louse to the rest of the establishment.

26529. And not a very high tent?—Not a very high one. Likewise, I think, would afford you most material statistics on the subject of amalgamation. The average in our union is 270 inmates; it costs £2,422. That seems a great deal. The rates are being paid without any real advantage to the poor people, especially the old and infirm.

Mr. O'Flaherty.—Would it be out of place for me to

make one observation with regard to Dingle. Amalgamation would be very inconvenient with regard to Dingle. Dingle is thirty-one miles from this, and there is another district about nine miles to the west of Dingle. You would have to pay the train fare and expenses of the pauper coming in here, and when he wanted to go out you would have to pay it backwards again. The provisions supplied to this Dingle Workhouse are bought from the Dingle shopkeepers; they pay a great part of the rates, and it would be very unfair to take this little advantage away. So far as the tramps are concerned, there was formerly in Dingle a house of correction; that is available still; and if they were sent in there with a person in charge of them, it would suit very well.

Jan. 17, 1896.
Mrs. Fenn.

Mr. FRANCIS FITZGERALD examined.

26530. CHAIRMAN.—You wish, I think, to mention to us some of the results of amalgamation on portion of the old Glin Union now attached to Limerick?—Yes, sir. As to the question of amalgamation, I am in favour of amalgamation generally. At the time the Glin Union was amalgamated, there were seven divisions joined to Limerick and six to the Rathfriland Union. Since then the rates in the Glin division—that is, the four County Limerick divisions—are 43 per cent. higher than any of the neighbouring unions.

26531. That is a tremendous increase?—They were in one year, I think, 1892, 130 per cent. higher than in Rathfriland and Newcastle.

26532. That is owing to the very small valuation?—Of course, it is on account of the district charges principally, not so much the union charge.

26533. We are only sitting as regards the Poor Law, but you want to point out that the result of the Poor Law change and the breaking up of the Glin Union was to put a tremendously high cost upon your neighbourhood under other Acts?—Yes, most oppressive. Then, speaking about the management of unions generally, I would be in favour of paid Guardians for every county.

26534. You would be in favour of—?—Abolishing the present system of management. In the first place, the Boards are cumbersome; you will have forty or fifty or eighty Guardians in one Boardroom.

26535. Or ninety-three in the Tralee Union?—You have very nearly ninety in Limerick, and half the time it is not the business of the union or the poor ratepayers they are thinking about at all, simply that there is some job on. They are quarrelling, and business is not done; but three paid Guardians could do the whole work of the county, supplemented by electing three highly-qualified Guardians in each union.

26536. Three representatives of the ratepayers?—Yes, on a very high qualification; and I would go for co-opting a few lady Guardians in each as well. There is a system of jobbery; it was bad enough before the Local Government Act passed, but it is seven times worse now. I am speaking from twenty years' experience.

26537. Mr. MURRAY.—That is a very strong statement for you to make. You make a very sweeping charge requiring proof; would it not be well to give some instances of how the increase comes about, or how the rates have increased generally, because they have not increased over the county-at-large?—They have increased in our district.

26538. That may be the case, for reasonable cause, in a particular union?—Now you have half the rates paid by the Government, and still the rates are as high as before the grant was given.

26539. If you confine yourself to Poor Law expenditure you will find that the increase in the Poor Law expenditure is very small in the last six or seven years; in fact in some cases it has decreased.

Mr. THOMAS O'CONNELL, A.P., Chairman, Limerick Union, examined.

26540. CHAIRMAN.—You are Chairman of the Limerick Union?—Yes.

26541. We would be glad to hear your views on this amalgamation question?—In the first place, I am opposed to it. As regards divisional rating, I would go entirely for it, because I believe plural rating is a waste.

26542. What do you mean by "plural rating"?—That is, two Guardians for one division.

CHAIRMAN.—That is over Ireland, Mr. Fitzgerald?—Well, I am speaking of the two counties I have knowledge of.

26540. And you are considering all rates, not merely the rate for the relief of the poor under the Poor Law Act?—I think the relief of the poor is abused. Why, when the Guardians of one portion of the Guardians recommend relief for their friends, the other Guardians say, "We will do the same for ours;" there is no check on it. If you have divisional rating there will be more caution.

26541. That is the evidence we have received very generally—that a great many of those who aim at a very economical administration of the poor rate say the present union-at-large rating is productive of extravagance, and suggest going back to the electoral rating—you are in favour of that, too?—I am in favour of that. But I think the valuation of the divisions should be nearly equalised; because if you have an electoral charge, the low division is pressed very heavily by the establishment charge of the house.

26542. I don't know how you would propose to equalise the valuation?—By amalgamating the lower-rated divisions.

26543. You would not make an electoral division unless it was a proportionate value of the entire district?—I would bring the divisions to the valuation of £4,000 or £5,000.

26544. That would be the standard valuation in your neighbourhood?—Yes. I agree with almost all Mrs. Fenn said. I am thoroughly acquainted with the working of the Glin School, and I have seen from time to time for the last eight or nine years a great many boys and girls turned out, and taking up situations, and becoming very useful servants. I know some of the boys earning £1 or 30s.

26545. You think that school is a good institution?—An industrial school should be in every county, if possible.

26546. On the lines of Glin?—Yes; nothing could be more satisfactory than the way the Glin School is managed.

26547. Mr. MURRAY.—It is certainly a great improvement on the present workhouse?—A great improvement; because the ladies there look after the orphans once they leave the institution, and keep trace of them as long as possible. As a rule, they see they get proper situations, and look after them even after leaving the place. Then, where that could not be met by the establishment of schools of the kind, I would be for the boarding out of children in the workhouse, removing them away from the bad influences of the workhouse.

26548. You would exclude children from the workhouse?—Yes; the Parish Committee could see that they were sent to some thrifty, tidy people that would teach them good habits.

Mr. Francis Fitzgerald.

Mr. Thomas O'Connell.

26542. You would halve the size of the Board of Guardians?—I would reduce them by half, because I believe it increases out-door relief by having—

26543. More to recommend it?—Yes. As far as expenditure in other ways, for waterworks, they should be charged on the dispensary district. Sanitary purposes—

26544. We are not dealing with the sanitary expenditure, but I understand what you mean?—As for tramps,

Jan. 17, 1896.
Mr. Thomas
O'Connell.

we should impose some penalty on them, that may improve their condition, and cure also.

25555. Would you be in favour of the Guardians getting power to charge patients admitted into their infirmary such sums as the people might be considered reasonably able to pay?—I would. But those who are

able to pay, I would charge them up to the full amount; and then I would suggest they should be charged according to their circumstances.

25556. Giving the Guardians discretion to look into their circumstances, and charge them accordingly?—Exactly.

Mr. William
McMahon.

Mr. WILLIAM McMAHON, M.C.C., F.L.C., further examined.

We feel a great deal of difficulty in dealing with the surcharger, and very often with the auditor's report. In the beginning, after the Local Government Act came into force, we were under the impression, and I think the auditors acted on it, that it would be the proposer and secondor and the party that voted for these illegal acts or contracts, whichever they may be, who would be surcharged; and it is still the opinion of the County Council and the Listeral Board of Guardians that that should be strictly enforced.

25557. CHAIRMAN.—You would like to put the saddle on the right horse, and make the man pay who initiated the illegal expenditure?—Exactly. In this Council and the Rural District Council we place a great deal of confidence in our officials; they make up their quarterly payment or half-yearly payments. Say it is for roads. We ask, "Has the county surveyor certified for these roads?" We were told "He has," and we, believing that once the county surveyor gives a certificate the contractor can recover payment, and then, in order to save expense, and not knowing that it was illegal at all, we signed the cheque.

25558. These District Council matters are outside our function?—I have been surcharged myself as not being present at a meeting of the Board of Guardians for signing a sheet for £725, and there were three items picked out of that, and I was surcharged; and, as reported to the public, it looked as if I were guilty of a gross fraud in favour of some near friend of my own. The whole of the items picked out only amounted to £37, and the excuse given by the auditor was that I was not present when these sheets were signed. My name appeared in the minutes voting and carrying a resolution, my name appeared in the partners' books, and still I had no remedy, only to appeal to the Local Government Board, and they remedied it. I will deal with the case of the printing contract in the Listeral Union.

25559. You have only shown us in that instance that the right thing was done?—I want to show that the Local Government Board don't always know what is the proper thing. Now, after the Local Government Act came into operation, the Listeral Board of Guardians advertised a yearly contract for the printing, and it was taken for £50; the next year it was advertised again, and the contract was given at 1½d. a line, and

I think it amounted to £200 or £250. Well, we came to the conclusion that the Press in Kerry—there were three papers there—had joined, for the purpose of getting as much as they possibly could. The next year they wanted 1½d. a line, from four newspapers, and it was refused. The contract was re-advertised, and the *Limerick Leader*, circulating in Limerick, but not having much circulation in Kerry, was declared contractor for £50. Then the Kerry Press would not send a reporter to the union to report the proceedings.

25560. I suppose you considered that an advantage?—No; the people looked against it, and said we were this and that, so we had to give in. Then, at some suggestions of the ratepayers, another paper was started, which did away with the combination; and, knowing that the paper would break down the combination and enable us to get our contracts cheaper, not alone in our union, but in the County Council as well, in order to try to break down this combination we did give, in some cases—the old contractor began to cut down his prices for the sake of breaking down the opposition, as tradesmen generally do—we did give, for the purpose of cutting down our rates, bigger prices to the new people, and we have been surcharged for that; so that it is not at all times that the Local Government Board can grapple with local circumstances, and be properly represented.

Mr. QUINNELL.—Is any ratepayer entitled to ask Mr. McMahon a question? Mr. McMahon says the cost of advertising has been reduced, not only in his own Council, but in the County Council. Are you aware that when the County Council started the cost of advertising was £200?

Mr. McMahon.—I could not tell you what it was the first year.

Mr. QUINNELL.—Do you know now that it is £200?

Mr. McMahon.—I know you had a tender in here for £2,500, and it was cut down to £200.

Mr. QUINNELL.—That was not the tender at all. I am asking you for positive figures now.

CHAIRMAN.—I presume, from what has occurred, that you have been the contractor. We are not here at all to go into questions of that sort.

Mr. QUINNELL.—He has been giving evidence—

Mr. McMahon.—I gave the figures of the Listeral Union; those are all the figures I gave.

ff
r
-

Mr. St. JOHN HENRY DOWNMAN, J.P., M.C.C., examined.

Mr. St. John
Henry
Downman.

Shortly, I am in favour of amalgamation of the unions. With regard to the County Council, they passed a resolution against amalgamation; I was not present, so I cannot speak on behalf of the County Council, but my personal view is that we should amalgamate.

25561. If you could effect a substantial saving, and at the same time not inflict hardship on the sick poor? Yes; but outside even the actual saving, I think the advantage would be to the children; to have a place for them separate from the grown-up people would be a very great advantage to these young people coming out afterwards. My experience of these children who have been reared in the union is not favourable to them. If you take an industrial school, they bring the children up in such a different way; they are useful men, and respect themselves better.

25562. Are you aware of many instances of the after-life of children from industrial schools?—I have had experience of about twenty individually.

25563. And those have turned out in an average way well?—Yes; good tradesmen, or labourers, or servants.

25564. What do they turn out as generally?—I know one who is a tailor, another is a carpenter, some of them are farm labourers.

25565. Have you ever considered the question of the expediency of turning out those that you may call waste and strays on society, giving them trades

such as you have mentioned, equipping them with trades that could not be aimed at by small ratepayers for their own children?—That is the advantage for these poor people, who have no resources.

25566. Is there much necessity of agricultural labourers in this country?—Oh, yes.

25567. Do you think that the better course for paper of children, or children that we to be supported out of the public rates, do you think it might not be sufficient to aim at putting them forward as agricultural labourers and not as tradesmen?—Possibly, that might be the best, if they were properly trained and in a position to follow that.

25568. What do you think would be the best training for children as agricultural labourers?—I am not sufficiently familiar with the subject to say that.

25569. We have had evidence that the best possible training for an agricultural labourer would be to be trained up from early youth in a farmer's family and obliged to take whatever share of labour came to him or her?—Of course that is one of the ways. But there is a lot of technical knowledge now that is coming out, even with regard to farming work, that you would not learn in an ordinary place.

25570. They will get that too in this way—if they are boarded out in a farmer's family they have to go to the National School and receive such technical instruction as the other children in the community get?—

When they are in a farmer's family they are not treated possibly the same as farmers would treat their own children.

25571. There would be a degree of feeling there certainly, but hardly of treatment?—Well, not exactly treatment, I suppose, as you say, but there would be a strong difference of feeling.

25572. The evidence we have got from a great many quarters is that those boarded-out children were virtually absorbed into the family—they became in after-life often the support of the family?—That has not been my experience.

25573. Have you seen many cases?—Only a few, five or six.

25574. The evidence we have got has been very considerable—and one interesting experiment that has been made in that respect was made by the Cardinal Archbishop, Dr. Logue. He has founded boarding-out for his diocese from a fund placed on his hands for charitable purposes, and there he, in conjunction with a committee of parish priests of the Archdiocese, has children boarded out with families, and the Cardinal has appointed a young lady who acts as inspector of those children, and the result we learned, what up there, has been most satisfactory?—Well, that is very important; we have not that system down here.

25575. You have been connected with the administration of the Kilmaley Lunatic Asylum?—Yes.

25576. Is there any possibility of further accommodation being wanted—for instance, if all the lunatics in workhouses in Kerry were discharged from the workhouses—do you think they ought to be kept in workhouses?—I do not.

25577. Would the asylum be sufficient for their reception, or would it be necessary to consider whether an institution such as that at Youghal or a further extension of the asylum would be the better policy?—I think we should have a separate place for the imbeciles, set the lunatics, the violent lunatics who are treated in the asylum. Where you have idiots I think you should have an idiots' home.

25578. You would have the curable in an asylum, and those who were incurable or required comparatively small attention could go to the auxiliary?—Yes, that would be my view.

25579. At a much lower cost in the auxiliary?—Yes. You would not have the same medical staff or require the same number of attendants.

25580. As regards the system of payments or contributions in all institutions supported out of the county rates, would you be in favour of giving the local managing body power to ascertain what the patients or patients' friends could, without difficulty, pay, and oblige them to pay such amounts from a very small sum up to the entire cost of maintenance?—I would be in favour of making them pay, and give power to recover. In some of our hospitals we do get donations from people who go in, but that is voluntary.

25581. Mr. MURPHY.—Would you not insist on the managing body seeing for themselves who were able to pay?—It should be compulsory on them to pay.

25582. At present it is optional, and there is a tendency on the part of some members not to make a charge—to be generous at the expense of the ratepayers—do you not think it would be proper to make a provision that those who had means should pay?—Certainly; I know I am connected with the Fever Hospital and Infirmary, and always try to get money out of the people, and do get something a week out of them when they are able to pay. If a farmer comes in who has twenty or thirty cows he pays us so much a week.

25583. CHAIRMAN.—Are you connected with the County Infirmary and Fever Hospital?—Yes.

25584. You have a magnificent hospital at the Fever Hospital adapted for the treatment of diseases—the County Infirmary is also a fairly good hospital?—But it is an old style.

25585. Not a hospital suitable for surgical treatment?—Would you say that? In some surgical cases where there is fever you want a big ward, but if a man is only lying in bed—

25586. At the Fever Hospital you have wards that will compare with those of any modern hospital. Did it ever occur to the people of Tralee that it might be a good thing—the number of patients dealt with in the Fever Hospital is very small; the number of patients dealt with in the County Infirmary is relatively large—did it ever occur to you that it might be a good thing in the interests of the sick to make an exchange of the

two buildings, to put the fever cases in the County Infirmary and the surgical cases in the Fever Hospital?—I don't think so. You want good air for fever especially, and you would be right in the town with the old infirmary and rather crowded. The Fever Hospital stands by itself in an open place, and there is less danger of contagion.

25587. There is no danger of contagion, I think, in either?—Possibly not.

25588. Take a hospital in Dublin like the Hardwicke, which is close to a most thickly-populated place, the North Dublin Union, fever cases, including small-pox, are treated there?—On account of the building being larger and well ventilated everything is in favour of it, and the infirmary is rather small.

25589. That is the reason why for surgical cases it is not so good?—A surgical case does not want so much air.

25590. It wants such wards as you have in the Fever Hospital?—The doctor knows better about that.

25591. Dr. BIGGER.—It would be a very desirable change if it could be made. You have more room and air space in the Fever Hospital than in the County Infirmary.

25592. CHAIRMAN.—You have very few cases of fever?—About thirteen in the year or eighteen.

25593. Dr. BIGGER.—The number going into the County Infirmary being larger is should be a larger building?—They are not in the same danger.

25594. You can keep fever from spreading very well? They are able to walk out in the garden with a broken arm.

25595. You have not much ground at the County Infirmary?—There is a field at the back.

25596. Not large?—It is not as large as the Fever Hospital.

25597. So even for convalescents you have better ground?—Yes.

25598. Surgical dressings, and operations, and having fresh air and all that kind of thing?—Oh, yes; the Fever Hospital is an ideal hospital.

25599. We were sorry to see such a magnificent building made so little use of?—There was fever there some time ago.

25600. You will find fever ceased or diminished a good deal after the Public Health Act?—Four or five years ago there was a very bad epidemic in Castle Island.

25601. There you have a hospital already—do you think it would be a good thing to reopen that as a small general hospital?—It is rather far bringing people from Bessons into Tralee.

25602. You have a nice building there going to ruin—would it be a good thing to reopen that?—The view I would have is that we should have small hospitals scattered round the country where bad cases could be treated at once, and the doctor of the district could do it. Sometimes a fever case could not be carried the whole distance, and it might kill a person to be carried a long journey.

25603. Such small hospitals would bring the relief to the neighbourhood of the people?—More directly.

25604. And it seems a pity to see the Castle Island Hospital falling into decay when it might be of the greatest use to the neighbourhood as a general hospital?—Yes.

25605. Is there any other matter I have not alluded to?—I don't think there is—only the matter mentioned by Mr. McMahon, that is the unfairness of having to pay for the County Infirmary, that is under the Act.

25606. What do you think about that?—In a way I think each place ought to bear their own liability, but when the Act is there—

25607. We are taking evidence with the view to the introduction of another Act—do you think that is a matter which ought to be amended?—I think so; I think each district ought to bear its own expenses.

25608. On what basis would you put the County Infirmary?—That is a difficult question. We have cases from Cahercross, Dungin, and Listowel.

25609. The evidence we have got from a great many surgeons of County Infirmarys is that the proper thing would be to make all the workhouse hospitals district hospitals, and as the District Councils are connected with the County Councils as the district hospitals should be connected with the County Infirmary, and doctors have a right to send up patients for special treatment without extra cost to the County Infirmary; that the County Infirmary surgeon should, where required as part of his duty, go down to the local places to carry

Jan. 17, 1902.

Mr. R. John
Henry
Deane.

Jan. 17, 1905.
Mr. St. John
Berry
Doveran.

ent operations, he presumably being a skilled operator, and in that way you would maintain a high-class hospital in the county, and no ratepayer would then object as he would be getting value distinctly—I would be thoroughly in favour of that.

25609. And further, making the County Infirmary a training school for nurses and head-quarters for the nurses of the county, that they should be County Kerry girls trained in the infirmary, there should be a small staff kept there, and, as required when exceptional illness broke out, they would telegraph for a girl to the County Infirmary, and she would be sent down, so you would not have to pay high fees to nurses in Cork or Dublin as at present—I would be in favour of that.

25611. Mr. MURTAGH.—Are you quite sure you would be?—That girls should be trained in Kerry, but as to keeping a thoroughly trained nurse on after she had been trained—

25612. CHAIRMAN.—You would keep her on, she would become your officer, and the engagement would be terminated like that of any other officer?—If you get a couple of nurses the expenses would run up; you would want four or five.

25613. You would only keep the necessary number—you would not admit a probationer except to fill a vacancy. You have six nurses in the county, you would want two nurses for each perhaps?—And they would have to reside in the infirmary?

25614. One would be always down there, and then you would want a couple of emergency nurses?—That would add to the cost.

25615. They would be probationers under training?—When they were trained what would become of them?

25616. You might arrange that you would have a claim on their services for two or three years, or turn them out straightaway when they get the certificate—the power would be in your own hands.

25617. Mr. MURTAGH.—Although that sounds very nice, are you not afraid it might mean greater cost and also lessen still more the benefits to outlying districts; there are outlying districts far removed from Tralee that do not get as much advantage as electoral divisions close to it; you would be extending that principle by establishing a county hospital, centralising things more than they are, taking from local men the supervision necessary for the care of their own interest, leading to expense and taking away from the very poor the assistance they have at present?—I would not take away the assistance.

25618. That is the danger?—There might be danger in that case. We have sent nurses from the infirmary out to districts when they wanted them on a few occasions, to the poor districts. In the same way we have had to bring in nurses from Cork when we have had an epidemic, but we only did that temporarily.

25619. I am a member of a Board of Guardians that is particularly well situated in regard to infirmary nurses. The nurse is within half a mile of the workhouse. The Guardians have to pay almost as much for that nurse from the County Infirmary as if she came from Belfast, and more than that, there is the danger that the local men will send for these nurses very frequently when perhaps they could be done without if they were not so close to hand; is there not danger of that?—As to the financing of the question it would require a lot of consideration; I had not time to consider that fully.

25620. CHAIRMAN.—People from a distance object to

contribute to the County Infirmary at Tralee; they say, "We don't use it." That would mean either that there should be a special rate adopted, or much paid by the ratepayers within so many miles, or else that it should be all payable by the Tralee ratepayers. Do you think the Tralee ratepayers would be apt to continue an institution if they had to pay the entire cost of it?—They would think it very hard, certainly.

25621. You have a big hospital at the workhouse, a satisfactory County Infirmary where good work is done here; do you think the Tralee people would hesitate before they would continue both institutions if they had any option?—If they had the option they would hesitate, certainly.

25622. Mr. MURTAGH.—The Tralee people are particularly well circumstanced in the matter of rating—their rating is very small in comparison with the other unions?—That is to the credit of the Guardians.

25623. You would not wish to add a burden to the heavily taxed unions outside—would it not be better to make the low-rated Tralee Union pay for its own sick and relieve Dingle and the other highly-rated unions from the cost of the support of the Tralee sick? I think it would be fair that each district should keep its own sick; if we had not an infirmary they would have to go to the union.

25624. And if these outlying unions had no person to send to the County Infirmary let them send them to the union and pay for their own sick?—Yes.

25625. CHAIRMAN.—Out of what rate would you pay the establishment charges of the County Infirmary?—I would spread the charges all over the county.

25626. You would have the establishment charges still a county charge?—Yes, they would have the benefit of it, but where the patient is from a district that district should bear the burden; that would be the easiest way of getting over the difficulty.

25627. Mr. MURTAGH.—The outlying people have naturally a complaint?—They have; it is a considerable complaint.

25628. Dr. BROOK.—It is a most desirable thing to have a County Infirmary where cases can be treated which cannot be treated in a local hospital?—Certainly, because we have appliances they have not in the others, and it would not be desirable to have these appliances in other hospitals, because it would be very expensive.

25629. CHAIRMAN.—And a great many doctors have not kept their hands in touch for operations, and would not operate except in cases of extreme urgency. They told us that?—Oh, yes.

25630. Dr. BROOK.—Any doctor will admit that even the best of general practitioners. They will tell in others to do the operations although they know all the steps of it, but still they have not that much confidence and practice?—There was a case once in from Dingle to the infirmary, it was a very peculiar case and we had not the appliances to treat it. Dr. Hayes went up himself with the patient to the North Infirmary, Cork, and the doctor there operated and the operation was very successful, but that was a case that would not have occurred in twenty years probably.

25631. It is a great advantage to a district to have surgeons in connection with the County Infirmary whose services can be availed of in an emergency, even to the ratepayers who are paying for the support of that place?—Yes.

25632. Whereas if you had no such institution you might have to telegraph to Dublin or Cork for a surgeon to come down at a large expense, and that comes out of the ratepayers' pockets?—It does.

Miss DOUGAN.

Miss DOUGAN, P.L.O., examined.

25633. CHAIRMAN.—You are a District Councillor and Guardian for Tralee?—Ballinaclogh, in the Tralee Union.

25634. Have you looked at all at the question of amalgamation of unions, or has your attention been directed to the reform of the Poor Law?—I have been thinking of both, and I would certainly recommend amalgamation for the whole of Ireland as well as for our county; and for our county I think one of the unions might be made a technical school for the workhouse children, another might be made a hospital for consumptives, and the other one might be made an auxiliary asylum for those lunatics that could not be sent to the lunatic asylum.

25635. Have you thought what union workhouse it would be possible to close for general Poor Law purposes?—I thought of Keshmure, Dingle, and Caheriveen, leaving Liscarrow, Tralee and Killybeg.

25636. Keshmure for consumptives?—Keshmure for consumptives, because they say the air there is particularly good for the chest and lungs, and the site good.

25637. What did you think for a lunatic asylum?—I thought, perhaps, Dingle, but I cannot be so sure, and for a training school, Caheriveen.

25638. Have you seen Caheriveen Workhouse?—I have seen it passing, but I have not been in it; it stands away from the town and has six acres of ground.

Jan 17, 1906.

Miss Doreen.

25620. It is a most unfortunate old gable!—I have never been in it; then, perhaps, it would be better to make an asylum for these harmless lunatics.

25621. As long as it would last!—The Dingle people were saying the water supply was so bad that it would not do for a large school, while the idiots are a small number.

25622. They want a good deal of washing!—I suppose they could sink wells like an artesian well, because of course water will find its level, and the Dingle Workhouse being so high, I think they could sink a well; I don't see why they should not.

25623. They don't seem to have adopted that!—No, they have that to do; I think it is most necessary that the children should be taken out of every workhouse; I would not leave one child in the union from my experience as a Guardian, and I have been so since 1897, so I remember the old time and the new; I think not one child should be left in the union; they are brought up useless members of society, and people don't care to have them for servants.

25624. Even with the best intentions, do you think it possible in a union workhouse to bring them up in a thoroughly practical way?—No.

25625. Why do you think that?—I don't know why it is, but the whole atmosphere of the workhouse, the whole system I consider bad.

25626. Can you say yourself after your experience that that makes a workhouse an undesirable and difficult, if not impossible, place to rear children satisfactorily?—I think they are only just taught their letters, but they are not really trained to be useful members of society.

25627. Is there in a workhouse any possible means for teaching?—There is a master and mistress.

25628. Take the girls, for instance—what could they be taught in the workhouse?—Only a little washing.

25629. Could they be taught that, even without seeing too much of the undesirable class of adult females?—They could not; it would be very difficult—impossible almost.

25630. They would have to take a day a week if a day could be spared!—Yes, but I am for putting every child out of the union; I should think in a great many places boarding out would be the best, but I am against boarding them out with other children, for I think the class of children that are in workhouses are not children that would improve the farmers' and labourers' children.

25631. I don't mean now for existing children—suppose one puts out of one's mind the children who are at present in the workhouse—they undoubtedly would be undesirable companions for farmers' children in a great many cases for they know too much of evil, bad language, and matters of that sort, but take into consideration workhouse children of the age of two or three years old, do you think that a good system would be to board out young children of that age who are innocent?—Yes, but not at a later age; much better to board them out then, and I would recommend that they should be boarded out with people who had no children or with people whose children had grown up and had gone to service or to America, and those sort of old couples would be very glad to have such children; they would get fond of them and make them their own.

25632. That would be an ideal place to put them if it could be got?—Yes, and any widows or any persons who had no children of their own.

25633. Would you not try to put them, if possible, with people who had land?—Yes, and let them be trained to agricultural pursuits, and farm pursuits for girls.

25634. Dairying, if there is any left in the country?—Yes, but I am afraid there is very little dairying left in the country with the creameries; they have done harm in that way that the general body of girls do not understand anything of it now. But in converting a workhouse into a training school, you should have part for the girls and part for the boys.

25635. You have visited Glenties?—I have not, but if it could be done, if there was land enough, the boys could be taught practical farming and the girls domestic work, cooking, farm laundry, and needlework.

25636. As far as your experience goes, have you ever had an opportunity of observing any girl from an institution employed as a servant?—Yes; personal experience of it.

25637. Will you tell us what you thought of it?—We got a girl, but she was really kept on until she was eighteen at the Industrial School in Tralee; she was kept on, I think, not exactly in the school, but as a

sort of a little mistress by the name; we got her as a servant when just eighteen, and we never had a better; she was good, honest, and affectionate to my brother's children and a good needlewoman; she was kept on to a good age. Sixteen is rather young to send girls out; I would recommend that they should be kept to seventeen.

25638. Did she remain with you any time?—Five years, and then she got married and she is a great friend of ours. We had two others, but they were not quite so satisfactory; they were very honest and nice, and thoroughly to be trusted.

25639. Not such as we have heard the workhouse girls are?—Oh, no, perfectly different; such discipline, such obedience, and treating everyone with respect. That was my experience of three servants.

25640. That was most valuable experience!—That was from the Industrial School, trained under the Sisters of Mercy, and judging from that, I think if a good training school could be organized you might turn out very worthy members of society out of our poor workhouse children, who are now worthless and go back again; in fact they tell me at our workhouse that a good many of these won't stay with farmers; they grumble and come back and say, "Oh, he was so cross with me." They have for nothing, whereas a child trained under religious or very good lay teachers really does not mind a little correction; they are thankful for it; they know it is for their good, but these workhouse children don't like that, and they are thoroughly lazy.

25641. That is because there is no opportunity in workhouses for keeping them employed at real work?—Yes, and the great mixture of children, too.

25642. It is often because there are too few children to organise any work?—Some of the children are really too bad; they go in at an age when they have been trained to thievery by their parents and spoil the other children; but I would recommend if you could see your way to it a training school, and boarding out others with people whose children are grown up, and who would be very glad to have a young person to help them, or with widows, or families without children.

25643. Have you gone into it practically in your union?—There are sixteen children boarded out, but not in my district; more in Knocknagoshell and Castle Island.

25644. It is thickly populated from your house over to Ardara?—It is, but they don't board the children out there; they don't seem to want them.

25645. It might be well to try and get houses for them there?—It would be a good thing to get the very young ones; I don't think our people would like young ones that have been spoiled.

25646. You would not care to introduce a child into a family that would bring evil associations and language?—Not at all; I am for boarding out under certain conditions, and against it in other ways; I am not for indiscriminate boarding out; some people think it is the only means, but I am for a good training school.

25647. People who put it forward as the only means are really thinking of the future when they could board out children at a very early age after exhausting the present number of hobblerboys, boarding out for the future any that can be boarded out; what would you suggest?—A training school.

25648. Do you see any necessity for multiplying the number of schools—you have that school you speak so highly of at Tralee?—That has been limited by the Act that came in not permitting magistrates to commit them.

25649. Supposing power were given, if it did not already exist, as I believe it does, to place workhouse children in such a school as that who could not be boarded out?—I don't know, really; perhaps it would work; I have a great objection to putting the nasty children with the good children.

25650. There are a great many workhouse children who have been in the workhouse only, but the children who are worst?—They should be sent to the Reformatory, and the others should be sent to an Industrial School.

25651. Boarded out at so much a head—that would be the most economical thing for the ratepayers of the country, not to start a fresh institution?—If you turn one of the existing workhouses into a training school, each district which sent children would pay for them at the school.

25652. It would mean an increase in the rates?—They are paying for them at present in the union to

Jan. 17, 1905.

Mrs. Downes.

make them idlers. We are trying to save as much as we can instead of starting a fresh establishment for children, if you utilised the existing Industrial Schools that are suitable for them, and the Reformatory Schools that are a grade lower.

25672. Are they sufficiently large, the accommodation in them. The Industrial Schools are already full notwithstanding the recent stringent regulations—I don't think so; I have rather a fancy for training schools, and would like to have one of the existing unions made into one; they cost so much at present—would they cost so much more to send them to an Industrial School?

25673. The expense of turning a workhouse into a training school is very large. I forget the number of thousands it cost in Ulster, it was very large?

Mr. O'Connell.—It was large, but it was not complained of by the ratepayers.

Witness.—You consider it a success, do you?

Mr. O'Connell.—A great success.

Mr. O'Flaherty.—There is not land enough attached to the workhouses for training children.

Witness.—I don't see why we should not get additional land, and would not the Government help us?

25674. CHAIRMAN.—You have their help if you send them to Industrial Schools?—Can they not help other schools? I think they are not treating us very fairly; they tax us so highly in other directions.

25675. Ultimately that comes out of our own pockets. What branch would you turn to next?—I consider the state of the aged poor in the workhouse is one of the saddest things; I would never recommend any respectable person to go to the workhouse, because there is not proper classification. An old servant who has been very happy in a family, she has had a happy and comfortable life, honoured and respected; perhaps the master and mistress die, and this poor creature has had nothing saved to support her.

25676. She has been perhaps supporting her own relatives?—Yes, and she may become blind; I know one instance; her daughter went to America, forgot her, never sent her anything, her stepdaughter, who was very good, died; she had to go to the workhouse; I think it was the saddest thing; I went to see her there, I know her in a happy home; she had a life of kindness, and there she was, a wretched, unhappy creature, herded with those other people. I think these respectable aged poor should either be put into almshouses or boarded out—in some cases could they not?

25677. That is one of the topics on which we are anxious to get evidence?—I think it would be a very good thing. I know another old servant, she is unfit to take any situation, but if she were boarded out well, a farmer's family she could mind the children and do a little household work, and if the farmer's wife was out she could take care of things, and if we paid a small amount they would be very glad to keep her, I think; the respectable poor ought not to be left in a workhouse.

25678. Have you considered outdoor relief as a method of relieving that class?—I have, and I think it would be a very good plan to relieve that class by outdoor relief and not in the workhouse, and if a more judicious system of outdoor relief was organised, but at present it is abused, and very much abused. At present people who get outdoor relief go to the public-house and drink it, and if it was properly supervised I think it would be the best way of helping those aged poor, especially the old married people, because then they are not separated, and are able to live in lodgings and perhaps keep up their little home, and it would be a much happier thing for them.

25679. Do you think we are able at present, with our infirmity and kindly humanity, to sufficiently safeguard our present system of outdoor relief?—do you think it would not spread and get many more people on it?—At present I think the Guardians are perhaps a little afraid of the workhouse and of the very poor people themselves. A poor person that might abuse the Relieving Officers and speak untruthfully of them, they may give relief to, although if they acted conscientiously they might say they were not fit persons for outdoor relief, but through fear they would say, "Give the outdoor relief to them." I think there ought to be an impartial independent Inspector that would go down to every part of the country and suddenly pounce on those who receive outdoor relief and see if they are deserving cases, consulting the parish priest, the doctor, and the Guardians of the district, and ask if they considered the person a fit person. With regard to the Catholics consult the parish priest, and with regard to the Protestants consult the parson, and the

doctor, and then you would find out the deserving subjects, and the undeserving would be left without it. But at present a great deal of the ratepayers' money is wasted in giving outdoor relief to very undeserving persons, drunkards, and thieves.

25680. Do you find that relief is often given at your Board of Guardians without very much consulting the Relieving Officer, but brought forward by individual Guardians and recommended by individual Guardians?—I think so.

25681. Mr. MURKIN.—What is the course usually pursued when an application for outdoor relief comes up?—They put in a notice of motion to consider it at a Board, and it is passed.

25682. CHAIRMAN.—Is a relief case dealt with by notice of motion?—Yes; you put on a motion that you will bring forward the case for outdoor relief.

25683. And meanwhile?—The Relieving Officer can give in the meantime; in an urgent case he always gives.

25684. Mr. MURKIN.—Is he also instructed to make inquiries and report?—Certainly; the Guardians give every instruction, and they always say the Relieving Officer ought to investigate the cases, but I don't think they investigate the cases sufficiently, but through fear and a desire not to be alarmed.

25685. A desire to please?—Yes; you cannot blame these very much, their lives would be made unpleasant by those people; they attack them and annoy their children.

25686. CHAIRMAN.—You think there ought to be a strict inspection?—An independent inspection.

25687. To test the bona fides of the recipients of relief?—Yes; otherwise I don't see how it can be really safeguarded.

25688. Mr. MURKIN.—Does not the outdoor case on the same rate as?—Yes, but that is all figures; that is not inspecting the cases in their own homes. I mean an inspector to go to the houses and consult the parish priest or rector or doctor; I think another principle that is not very good is giving the outdoor relief sometimes in a particular shop.

25689. Is that done?—That is done; some of the people say to me they are told to go to such a place to meet the Relieving Officer; I think it would be better if the outdoor relief was given in an office. It is very hard sometimes for the poor people to come to our workhouse, it is a mile outside the town; if there were some office for the Relieving Officer.

25690. Do you know you are only recommending what is the law, and if it were known that any Relieving Officer did not carry out the law he would find it a very serious matter?—I know several cases told me by the people about my own district; they said, "We had to go to such a shop for outdoor relief."

25691. They might not be telling you what is accurate, but if you trace that and speak to the Relieving Officer I think you will very easily put a stop to it. It is a bad principle.

25692. It is a bad practice, the principle is all right.—Bad practice I mean.

25693. What you recommend is a careful exercise of discretion in giving relief to proper cases?—Yes.

25694. Have you got any practical world-wide method for contributing towards that end?—I am afraid I am not a financier.

25695. You are aware of the difference between union-at-large and electoral chargeability?—Of course I am. I thought when it was on the electoral division—

25696. It brings it home to a man more clearly?—Yes, and I think it was decidedly better; I know it was better in our district.

25697. Would you rather revert for outdoor relief purposes to the old law?—Yes, I would; but of course where there are heavily congested districts it has been a relief to them to have had a union-at-large charge; I know in my own district it has been exactly the other way.

25698. For towns union-at-large has been a great help—would you be disposed to give them any help by way of a grant in aid. Perhaps it is hardly fair to ask these questions?—I am not a financier, as I said.

25699. Mr. MURKIN.—Still you think the divisional charge is better?—Decidedly better; in our district it was much less when it was a district charge.

25700. Have you any particular view as regards the giving the outdoor relief in money or kind?—Decidedly in kind.

25701. CHAIRMAN.—Not in order to a particular shop?—Sometimes the money is not so well spent, or it is spent carelessly.

25702. When you give it in kind, what exactly do you mean—do you mean to give the actual bread and actual tea and meat if necessary, or whatever might be ordered?—I think so; it would be better.

25703. Or do you mean to give an order to the shops for these articles—if you come to distribute the actual food it becomes an intricate method?—I suppose the order would be the best.

25704. That is what you object to?—I did object to it in that way; it is the money that is given in the shops; perhaps it is better to leave it as it is.

25705. Mr. Murnaghan is considering a scheme suggested in Cork that all the outdoor relief should be given in kind—actual goods—a car should be employed to drive round and deliver the bread and meat to the houses?—Would not that be rather expensive?

25706. It might be rather a saving in the end—so many people would rush to receive money, and so few to receive bread?—Yes, but the deserving poor will.

25707. Would you be in favour of distributing the actual articles to be consumed or not?—By a car like that, I think it would be a very good plan where it would be possible.

25708. In some mountain districts it would be difficult?—Yes, it would be very difficult then, and perhaps money would be better.

25709. Mr. MURPHY.—If depots were established here and there, the Relieving Officer has to go over his district weekly, and if he had certain stores and depots where he had these commodities they could be bought by the Guardians at a far lower price than by the individual person, so that the idea is that they would get better value under the kind system than under the cash system?—I think so.

25710. And children who under the present system occasionally suffer would especially benefit by the arrangement?—I think it would be good.

25711. CHAIRMAN.—Now any other class in the workhouse?—With regard to the idiots I think they should be taken out of the workhouse.

25712. All weak-minded people should be taken out?—Yes; they are another class that are very badly managed in the workhouse; there is no proper person over them. If one of these workhouses could be turned into an auxiliary asylum for harmless lunatics—of course the dangerous lunatic or curable cases would be sent to the lunatic asylum—but where you have these silly people that are harmless it would be a very good thing to have them, all in one institution, and getting better food and care probably they might be taught to do things for themselves, knit their own stockings and make their own clothes, and the women could do something for themselves, and that very occupation would improve their minds; so if one of the present workhouses, say one of the three I mention, I think Kenmare ought to be kept for consumptives and Calverton or Dingle might be made into a school or auxiliary lunatic asylum for harmless idiots.

25713. I don't know whether you have considered the class in the workhouse so difficult to deal with—that is the class of girl-mothers?—Not so much; I suppose send them to a reformatory or these asylums where the nuns keep them.

25714. The Good Shepherd Convents?—Certainly; I would send them there because the Good Shepherd nuns have done more in that way than any others; I would advise that.

25715. Some witnesses think it might be possible to exclude that class altogether from workhouses?—A very good thing.

25716. The result would be that a girl coming in in that condition for public relief and care would never go to the workhouse, but first go to the maternity hospital and then afterwards to such an institution or penitentiary?—I agree with that; I think that would be much the best method; they don't get comfort in the workhouse, and the only chance would be in the Good Shepherd or other penitentiaries like that.

25717. You would treat the sick of course locally?—Yes, I think all the existing hospitals should be retained and made into district hospitals under a district committee.

25718. Why not have it under the District Council?—No; I would have some independent people on the committee too, people that were not Guardians or District Councillors, a few outsiders on the committee; but I would have the District Council and Guardians well represented; I would form a committee of

different people, suitable people, and also have the Guardians represented, but I would not leave it altogether in their hands.

25719. Take now Dingle—we have been speaking of the aged and infirm, the girl mothers, the children and lunatics; if we take those out of the workhouse, apart altogether from the tramps, you will have nobody but the sick; what objection do you see to allowing the present body to deal with the sick—do you think a body such as you suggest would be more useful or better acquainted, or why do you recommend a change in the governing body?—Less jobbery perhaps if there were an independent committee.

25720. There could not be a great deal of jobbery where you have only a doctor and chaplain and nurse?—Oh, yes.

25721. Do you see any objection to leaving it in the hands of the District Council as at present?—Well, no, I don't see any objection.

25722. And leaving there also the administration of outdoor relief?—Yes; but supervised, as I say, I think there is no objection to that at all, because, as you say, all those other classes would be taken from them. I think tramps ought to be really made work hard. I suppose you have been studying up these labour homes in Germany and Belgium; they have been most satisfactory; would it not be possible to start some such place in Ireland?

25723. A great many people would like a labour home or colony to be established for each province in Ireland?—I think it would be very good.

25724. Where they would be detained under magistrates' warrants for a considerable period?—Yes. As it was mentioned by some of the other witnesses to-day, to give the police more supervision over that class of people.

25725. The police would do for starting the committees?—At present about a thousand tramps in the year pass through Tralee.

25726. If you take up such a system as that, if it is made illegal for a man to search about the country without any visible means of earning money, it would come to this, that on a certain day or throughout every tramp in the county would be arrested, and you would have to have houses for them, and all these men, women and children would be taken up and put into provincial houses and there detained, so you would have no tramps at all in the country after one week or a month?—If they thought they would be arrested a great many of these people would work, and then there is a great want of agricultural labourers. In my district the farmers have to come in and look for labourers in Tralee.

25727. These men that we see tramping about the country don't seem to have much capacity for work, wastrel and useless sort of creatures, but if they were fed up for a bit in a labour colony they would become useful and would perhaps be taught habits of industry—you would be in favour of such an institution?—Yes.

25728. It is rather a big interference with the liberty of the trailing public?—With regard to a consumptive hospital, that is a most essential thing for Kerry, because consumption is spreading, and it is really through ignorance. We have put out notices in a great many of the districts, but they don't understand it. In one case that came under my notice a poor man got consumption and he had two boys and a girl. The little girl was only three years old, a great pot of her father's; he always had her on his knee; he used to get but tea and milk and, after drinking some, hand the cup to the child. Lastly, I found it out. I told his wife about this, and the child was sleeping in his room. "You should take her out of his room," "Oh," she said, "I don't like to hurt his feelings." I said, "You will have all your children dead and die yourself." They did make up a bed in the kitchen for him; I hope it won't spread.

25729. That is recently?—Comparatively recently; he only died a year ago and he was three years in consumption; they don't seem to understand a bit about it. If there were an institution for consumption and the cure of it, and taking it in in the initial stage it would be a splendid thing, but I think it would be difficult for the county to support that; I think it should be helped from the Imperial rates or even make it a provincial institution; but one county could not support it.

25730. Dr. BROWN.—Would not a provincial one be making the area too large?—It might.

Jan. 27, 1905.

Miss Donavan.

26733. Would not a county or two counties be better?—Is would; the financing of all these things is difficult.

26732. CHAIRMAN.—That would be decided according to the number of cases and examination of statistics?—Yes, but unless something is done I am afraid it must spread; I have known families wiped out, one not taking it first and then another; they don't disinfect their houses.

26733. Dr. BRIDGE.—The houses are very difficult to disinfect?—They don't understand the danger.

26734. You have not thought of any provision of district hospitals except in connection with the present workhouses—not in places where they are not at present?—I think it would be a very good thing to have a few extra cottage hospitals on a small scale; decidedly I would approve of that.

26735. You have not located any in your own mind?—I think they mentioned some districts to-day, Broom and Waterville, and to re-open the Castledown one.

26736. CHAIRMAN.—I believe in Kerry you have had some experience lately of Jubilee nurses?—I have not had any personal experience, but in Killarney they have done great good, and in Killarney given the greatest satisfaction.

26737. This would be rather an argument for establishing these cottage hospitals, the nurses of whom might act as far as their time permitted as district nurses under the direction of the dispensary doctor?—Yes.

26738. You have nothing special to put forward about the Lady Guardians?—Of course I approve of lady Guardians; I think it is a good thing to have them all over the country; they look into little things that gentlemen don't have time to look into.

26739. We got a suggestion lately that instead of having ladies elected as District Councilors that there should be power given to the local Guardians to co-opt after being elected themselves; that they should be empowered, or directed if necessary, to co-opt a certain number of ladies on each Board of Guardians, so that

ladies would not have the trouble of representing, but go on as a matter of course—would you prefer going up as an elected fellow member or as a co-opted candidate?—With regard to myself I really don't mind; you ought to consult the ladies in Dublin about that.

26740. I think most of them would prefer to get in without a contest?—That does not matter to me.

26741. You don't know the feelings of your colleagues, the lady Guardians?—I am sure in Tralee; we have a Ladies' Local Government Association.

26742. You don't know what their view is?

Mrs. O'Connell.—Would a co-opted lady Guardian have the same power?

CHAIRMAN.—If she was co-opted she would have exactly the same power.

WILLIAMS.—Would she be a Rural District Councilor also?

26743. CHAIRMAN.—If the law said so I—should not like to give that up; at present all the Rural District Councilors are both Guardians and Councilors.

26744. What interests you most in the rural work?—Several things; so many turn up. In some of these Boards of Guardians they might not wish to co-opt a lady—would they be obliged to do so? Mrs. HALLAM says that all through Ireland a great many would not be co-opted if it was optional, and she would like it to be obligatory. I am a member of the County Infirmary and I see you are very anxious to get the Fever Hospital for the infirmary; I do think it would be very bad to get fever cases in that part of the town where the infirmary is. Say an epidemic broke out of smallpox or of diphtheria; it might cause a great loss of life.

26745. There are rows of houses built up to both institutions?—I think it would cause almost a riot in the town.

26746. Mr. MURPHY.—It is a good building doing comparatively nothing?—That row of villas you speak of is quite a modern thing; they only built these lately, and it is their own fault for building them.

26747. Dr. BROWN.—It shows they were not afraid of fever when they put them there?—I would not like to go and live there.

Mr. William O'Donnell.

Mr. WILLIAM O'DONNELL, Chairman, Tralee Union, examined.

26748. CHAIRMAN.—You have been present during a good deal of the discussion and evidence to-day?—I am here all day.

26749. I don't know whether it is necessary to take you aside through the different questions, but if there is anything you wish to say on any of the subjects we have been discussing. What do you think about amalgamation for the County Kerry?—I would not be in favour of it.

26750. Would you leave all the unions as they are? I think so, from the remoteness of the districts.

26751. Supposing you left the workhouses as they are, would you remove, for instance, lunatics from the workhouses?—Yes.

26752. How ought they to be dealt with best—would you extend the existing system or have an auxiliary asylum on a cheaper scale?—I would be for an auxiliary on a cheaper scale for the county.

26753. Where would you suggest such an auxiliary building might be got?—Really, I cannot say.

26754. Somewhere within the county?—Yes, centrally.

26755. Children in the workhouse—what do you think of allowing children to be brought up and reared in the workhouse?—I would not be in favour of rearing them in the workhouse. We have seen a great many out to nurse, and they are giving great satisfaction, more especially for the last couple of years; a lady inspector made a surprise visit through the county and has done remarkable good, so that the children are doing remarkably well. Herebefore it was in the town of Tralee the children were sent to nurse; they were sent into the lanes and alleys; there was an order from the Local Government Board that we should send them into the country districts, and an old woman who had charge of some of the children took a place at Blennerville by the seaside.

26756. Took a seaside villa residence—how many children would she have?—This woman had five children.

26757. Was not that rather large?—She kept the children splendidly clean; she was getting it a week for each child and every day she was taking the children to school; it was a great heartbreak to her when the law said she should only have two. We had to take

three into the house, and then send them to other nurses out to Broom. They are doing well; the only thing Miss Kenney said was that we were sending some of these to grand-parents, and it was a thing she did not approve of. I went through the schoolrooms of some of these children sometimes ago and the female teacher showed me some of the work done by these children—knitting—a great deal of stockings knitted by these children, and it was remarkably well done.

26758. Do the little children appear strong and healthy?—Yes.

26759. Well fed and well clothed?—Yes, that is the children at the union school.

26760. I mean the children boarded out?—Yes, they are doing very well; we had one or two cases where the old women getting the children in charge saved the clothes, and when Miss Kenney saw the children she asked where were the clothes, and the women said she had sold them to pay the rent, so the children were taken away from her. Small farmers don't take these children as a rule; it is poor widows who generally take them.

26761. Who cannot give them milk?—Yes.

26762. That is a pity—would it not be more in the interests of the children, and ultimately of the ratepayers, that a little more should be given for those children to tempt the farmers who could give them good country work and food, a man that would have haw and pigs?—Yes; if they got an encouragement that way I am sure these parties might take them. Of course the rule is laid down at present that we cannot give more than 3s.

26763. That is not a rule?—It is sanctioned by the Local Government Board.

26764. Oh, no such rule is made by the Local Government Board?—It may not have been made by the Board itself; it must have been made before my time.

26765. Dr. BROWN.—They are giving 6s in Tralee?—I think we never exceed 3s. I went through the union and saw these children taught by the schoolmaster, and the knitting is remarkably good. We have a tailor now for the last four years and we had one little boy

who got in to be attending at the bakery and became an efficient hand, and is now earning 3s. in Tralee. There was an order made some time ago that these little boys from twelve years of age should go to apprenticeships in the houses for shoemaking and tailoring, but a farmer would come in and take those boys, so that that was lost, and we are making no tradesmen since.

25766. The children you would board out as far as you could—what would you do with those who could not be boarded out?—I would like to send them to some industrial school.

25767. Would you be in favour of using the existing schools and reformatories as far as possible, or would it be necessary to have additional separate schools such as Glenties?—I would like to start an industrial school for the whole county.

25768. You have one at Tralee at present?—Yes, and it is giving general satisfaction; the only fault is that a boy up to fourteen years of age has to leave. I may not be accurate as to the time, but the boy has not his trade.

25769. Our object in coming round is to try and reduce taxation—do you see any object in starting additional institutions if you have already institutions for the purpose?—I think there is no necessity as far as Tralee is concerned, but take Dingle and other districts.

25770. What difference would it make to Dingle if they were sent to an industrial school already existing, or to one created under a new Act?—In Tralee there is accommodation for 210 boys, and there is at present not more than ninety-five.

25771. There is a big gap there; then you would be in favour of getting children out of the workhouse if you could?—I would.

25772. And the Junction?—Yes.

25773. I don't know whether you considered the question of girls going in to have children?—That is a most painful transaction.

25774. Do you think it would be a good thing to put them under religious influences with a view to their redemption, and, if possible, to take situations again?—Yes, the law, I think, is against us. I saw a most respectable girl; she met a little misfortune and could get no person to take her child and then she came before the Board; I am subject to correction, but I believe the law is such that she should take the child with her; it was most painful to us; we could not keep the child; we wrote to the Local Government Board about it, but we failed.

25775. In such a case as that do you think it would be a wise thing to have a prefabricatory where that

girl could be received and paid for out of the rates at a cost of what she would pretty nearly cost under the existing system, and could keep the child until it was two or three years old and could be boarded out, getting the support from the girl or the child's father?—Exactly. We have a few cases now at present, one of them came in and after some time she claimed her discharge, and we had to leave her out; twelve months after to my surprise she came in with another child, and we have one that has had three already.

25776. That shows the necessity of not letting them into the workhouse at all?—Oh, yes.

25777. Moving them dealt with outside. Then if you had these women and their children, and the general school children, and the lannets out of the workhouse and the tramps, what would you do with the tramps?—I would put them into some labour colony.

25778. If you had all these classes out of the workhouse the only class you would have left in would be the aged and infirm and sick?—Yes.

25779. Do you think the aged and infirm and sick ought to be left in each workhouse in the country as they are at present?—Well, really, of course if I could do away with these amalgamation could then take place.

25780. You have approved of taking the various classes out of the workhouse; if you had only the two classes left—everyone admits that in most cases it would be impossible to shut a hospital for the sick in any place now—but the question is whether the aged and infirm who could travel or be sent by rail, whether it would be possible that for all Kerry they could be sent to a central institution like Tralee, which should be made an almshouse for the entire county?—I think that could be done.

25781. You would save the cost of all the different establishments, because all the aged and infirm would want would be a master and mistress and sometimes a wardmistress over them, so you would save a large amount in salaries and retinue; would you be disposed to agree to a proposal of that sort if it were found a large saving would result and no hardship?—I would.

25782. Mr. MURPHY—Miss Denovan said it would be a charitable thing to board out some of the respectable old people in the houses where they could find a home amongst their neighbours at a cost of 3s. or 4s. a week?—I would call that outdoor relief, but we are rather scrupulous when an old person is there; the most they get is 1s. or 1s. 6d. a week.

25783. Would you approve of something like that which would lessen the number of aged and infirm inmates considerably?—I would very much.

MR. WILLIAM MCGUIRE, P.L.O., Ardara, examined.

Well, gentlemen, I have listened very patiently to the evidence given here by our worthy chairman, and I certainly concur with him in everything he said, but one thing he did not mention, and that is divisional relief. I am watching in the Board of Guardians very attentively, and I find where the abuse in outdoor relief is in Tralee and Castleland. I have to say to you that in Castleland and Tralee there is more abuse than in all the rest of the divisions of the union; it mostly goes in drink; we have a better check in the country districts than in the towns.

25784. CHAIRMAN—Former publichouse?—In Ardara, when they were supplied with goods, I knew many of these people to come to me for money in place of goods. I believe if this was made a divisional charge you would not have half the abuse in Castleland; it is almost impossible for the Relieving Officer to come at them there are so many nooks and corners in the towns of Tralee and Castleland, and even there is a lot of influence brought on him by people in towns to give this relief to Jack, Bill, and Harry. I agree with every word Mr. O'Donnell has said; it is a gross injustice for us in the villages and country districts to have to pay for the expenses of Tralee and Castleland, for I believe there is very little abuse in the villages and country districts compared with Tralee and Castleland, and I would impress on you to make it a divisional charge.

25785. Would you give no relief to the towns?—I would and to the deserving classes.

25786. I did not mean to the individual recipients

of relief, but to the ratepayers of the towns—would you make them bear the full charge?—I would end the responsibility of it.

25787. You would be going even further than then was the case before the Act of 1898—then they had a whole?—It is very hard for the Relieving Officer to resist inducements, for every shopkeeper who has a workman or a workwoman would say, "Give this person so much."

25788. Are you speaking now in a general way, or have you come to your mind where persons in the employment of ratepayers are put forward by those ratepayers for outdoor relief?—They are, and they influence the Guardians.

25789. Without asking you to mention names, do you know of cases where the persons getting outdoor relief were already in receipt of wages from ratepayers?—I do, where they are widows of workmen who are working in townpeople's shops; they speak for them to get relief and they give them some wages. Even going into publichouses in town I see the recipients of relief drinking porter at the counter.

25790. Would they be employed as that shop?—No, but they drink the money they get in that shop and several others. I would impress on you again to have the children boarded out by all means.

25791. Would you be in favour of giving relief in food?—No; I have to say to you when I was supplying these recipients with food where it would be 2s. they would come and ask for 1s. in cash.

Jan. 17, 1892.
Mr. William
McGuire.

25792. Supposing the Belling Officer from his depot or cart, as in Dublin, simply hands down so much bread and meat?—That would do in a town, not in the country.

25793. Would it in Tralee and Castleland?—It would.

25794. These are the only places where you say there is abuse?—Yes, I would go far that strongly. Then to go to the children; it is a shame and a scandal to human nature to see children kept in a foul workhouse where there is no air and foul sewage.

25795. It is often only the smell of soil except—It is bad sewerage, too; go from the country air into that workhouse and you will find the difference; it is closets and sewerage; it is not a place at all for children; you cannot have a healthy child there no matter how you feed them; it is air they want.

25796. You think there is sewerage gas and other foul air?—Yes.

25797. Apart from the sewerage gas and foul air, do you see any other objection to children being in the workhouse?—When they go out to the farmers they are regular manurecrops, not reaped at all, but after a bit they get seasoned and are able to earn their bread.

25798. You have seen children going out of the workhouse and becoming industrious and satisfactory?—Industrious and good; they work with farmers.

Mr. MICHAEL COCHRAN, F.R.C., examined.

25803. CHAIRMAN.—You have heard the evidence of the Chairman, Mr. O'Donnell, and of Mr. McGuire; is there anything you would wish to observe that they have not observed?—I mean to deal with the main question, the amalgamation of unions; I consider we are not in a fit position for any amalgamation. The only place we could amalgamate with is Dingle, and it would be a penal law on the poor and an injustice to the ratepayers, to amalgamate with that union.

25804. That is from the point of view of the Dingle people?—Yes; the poor of Dingle would have to come here, and their friends could not see them again or take them home when they died, so they would have to be buried here at the expense of the union. With regard to the ratepayers, when this Poor Law valuation was made sixty or seventy years ago there was little or no valuation put on the mountain part of Dingle, whereas the land in Tralee was set down as ploughland, most of it; ploughland was supposed to grow wheat, and what was 2s. 6d. a rood, and the hire of a man was only 7d. or 8d.; that fixed the valuation and the same valuation exists now, although wheat is 3d. and the hire of a man 2s., and the sowing of it is abandoned altogether. Land in Dingle for grazing is nearly as valuable as this land here, and the Poor Law Commissioners based their rents on the valuation.

25805. They would not agree with you in that?—Perhaps not, but all their work shows it; I think union rating was a great injustice to the ratepayers.

25806. You would rather go back to the old law?—Yes, because I see what the Guardians are doing now; everyone is trying to get as much money into his own division as he can. In the electoral division of Tralee they are all merchants, and more money will go through their hands; since union rating became law they have risen to £200 a year or perhaps more; they don't care as long as the rural divisions will have to pay it.

25807. You would rather go back to the old law?—If it were electoral division rating every Guardian would see that no one got it but someone who wanted it badly.

25808. Of course you remember that under the old

25799. At what age does the farmer wish to send them?—From twelve to fourteen; they are under the first twelve months, but afterwards they become practical.

25800. Do you know any farmer who has received them yourself?—I do round Ardara.

25801. Do you happen to know whether they objected to them as too young or far had habits?—No, the only thing they complain of is that they are touchy and not economical and unable to stand the cold; they get used to it, and I have known them to get from 6l. a quarter to 85s. a year.

25802. As a Guardian you have often seen these children come back again dissatisfied with the situation they got?—I think 95 per cent. of them don't come back unless they are regular blackguards.

25803. Do many of them come back?—Very few; the only fellows that come back are from the towns.

25804. Tralee and Castleland?—Yes; I very seldom see any from the country. Now whatever you do, get some little place for the tramps by themselves. They are the class of people who live by begging. If they are beguiled and cannot get to a town for lodgings the first thing they will do is to go into a haphazard and sleep there; they light their pipes there, and a great deal of the blemishes in the country are done by these tramps.

Mr. O'Donnell.—We are after spending £300 on our sanitary works in the union.

low outdoor relief did go up enormously, while electoral divisions were in existence, in Lisnord particularly, and I also think Tralee, it did go up to a very high figure—I am not aware of it. I got a schedule of accounts before the union rating and it showed there was a great increase under union rating; that was in some divisions.

25811. Did you happen to look at any considerable number of unions and see what effect it had. Did you look at Kesh, for instance, and see whether outdoor relief was much up since 1890?—I did not see the Kesh return at all.

25812. Do you find outdoor relief is much up in Tralee since 1890?—It is in some divisions.

25813. Do you remember the total amount in 1890 or 1897?—I kept no account.

A Guardian.—It is only £100 a year.

Mr. O'Donnell.—I am happy to say the outdoor relief has gone down.

Witness.—Gone down as a whole he means; in some divisions it is low and in others higher.

25814. CHAIRMAN.—You have told us now you prefer electoral rating, as a country Guardian?—Yes.

25815. Is there any other subject you would like to refer to especially, the children for instance?—I think boarding out children would be very good; it would give them good habits, and they would not be returning to the workhouse.

25816. Do you know of cases coming back to the workhouse?—I did know of some cases coming back that could not be kept out of it.

25817. As regards lunatics, would you keep them in the workhouse?—I think they should be sent somewhere where they would be better cared.

25818. Some special establishment for them?—Yes.

25819. You told us I think that you would not think of taking the aged and infirm from Dingle away from their friends?—I would not.

25820. So practically you would let the present system remain as it is except that you would have district rating for outdoor relief, lunatics taken away from the workhouse, and children boarded out as far as possible?—That was all.

Mr. THOMAS LAWSON, Clerk, Tralee Union, examined.

For the year ending March, 1899, the outdoor relief was £2,432 6s. 7d. and three years afterwards; for the year 1892—

25821. CHAIRMAN.—Have you last year?—I have not.

25822. I would rather have had last year?—Three years after the passing of the Act it was £2,813.

25823. Give me last year if you have it?—I haven't

it, but I can say it has not gone up to what it was in 1890.

Mr. MURPHY.—According to the report for last year it was £2,033.

Mr. COCHRAN.—What is the increase in Tralee?

Mr. Lawson.—I have not the particulars in respect of any electoral division, but I can furnish them at any date you require them.

Mr. Thomas
Lawson

Mr. RICHARD O'MAHONY examined.

Jan. 27, 1906

Mr. Richard O'Mahony.

About the outdoor relief—it is not the poor people who are relieved—supposing some of the country people are ejected and sent into the towns—

25624. CHAIRMAN.—You would be in favour of electoral division rating?—Certainly, we are all Kerry people; why not get the same treatment?

25625. Is that the only matter you wish to dwell upon?—Yes; Mr. Fitzgerald said that there should be three paid Guardians.

25626. Would you like to be one of them?—If there was a good salary attached.

Lieut.-Colonel BOWEN examined.

25627. CHAIRMAN.—You are the Treasurer of the County Infirmary?—Yes; I made out some little statement that you might wish to have; there are two large wards and six small wards in the house, and they contain thirty beds.

25628. How many nurses?—We have a night nurse and three day nurses.

25629. In addition to your superintendent?—And a superintendent.

25630. Is she trained?—Yes; she is one of the Ben Secours, and there are two sisters.

25631. What is your total expenditure?—The total expenditure for five years, excluding the amount spent on structural alterations, was £5,856.

25632. That is £1,160 a year?—Yes.

25633. Is that the amount of your county grant?—The county grant was £5,025.

25634. Then you got very little from subscriptions?—Very little outside.

25635. I suppose the falling off in subscriptions dates from the Act of 1866?—Somewhat, but they were not very many at any time.

25636. You have not many annual or life governors?—I mean the life Governors; we had as many as fourteen annual at one time, but that was a very large number.

25637. Would your view be in favour of retaining the present premises, or have you an open mind on the subject?—I think the premises are large enough for the present requirements, because our average number for the five years is under twenty.

25638. Can you tell me what is your highest number—are all your beds frequently occupied?—Well, no, I don't think so; they are very seldom fully occupied.

25639. Have you had to refuse to admit patients for financial reasons?—Never.

25640. So that your funds have been sufficient, and your premises sufficient?—We have never gone up to the maximum contribution from the county, and of course we always draw on the county for what we want; the maximum is £1,400 a year, and we have never got more than £1,160.

25641. What I say is accurate that your premises and your contribution are adequate?—They are so far.

25642. Tell me about the number of patients and the radius of distances from which they come?—I have got returns here for the half-year ending 1903, the half-year 1904, and the whole of 1904. I could not find the other half-year. During that time there were 421 patients admitted; of those 211 came from Tralee Union, that is 77½ per cent.; 22 came from Listowel Union, 5½ per cent.; 30 came from Dingle Union, 9 per cent.; 16 from Killarney Union, 4 per cent.; 10 from Cahirciveen, 2½ per cent.; and only 6 from Keshmarr, 1½ per cent. The charge for those on Tralee Union was 30½ per cent.

25643. What do you mean exactly by the charge?—The cost.

25644. For the county-at-large?—Yes, but the proportion of it charged on the Tralee Union.

25645. That is on the valuation?—Yes; 39½ per cent. of the whole amount was on Tralee; Listowel, 25 per cent.; Dingle, 7½ per cent.; Killarney, 12½ per cent.; Cahirciveen, 8½ per cent.; Keshmarr, 7 per cent.; Dingle is the only case where the contribution is nearly the same; it contributes a little less than it gets.

25646. Dr. BROWN.—These percentages are on the total cost?—Oh, yes.

25647. Mr. MURKIN.—So that Tralee gets double the advantage?—Quite so. Of course you have to consider that the class of cases that comes from the out-unions would be the most difficult and expensive cases to attend to.

25648. Dr. BROWN.—And, after all, this is not really the cost; have you gone into the question of how long each of the patients was in?—No, but the number of patients during the last five years was 912.

25649. The percentage of cases is, according to the number of patients, I presume according to the rateable value of the union, not according to the cost of the entire for the time being?—I did not go into that.

25650. Or how long they stayed, or the cost of the operation?—No; that would be a very intricate calculation; the cost per patient is about 55 per head, and the cost per bed occupied is now £61; the average daily number was 16½.

25651. Mr. MURKIN.—You say there were on an average twenty patients a year, and it cost £1,100 to finance the institution; that is 555 per patient per year?—It is 261 per bed occupied, but I am taking the number of patients admitted altogether, and they cost 55 per head.

25652. But per annum per patient?—No, per person received.

25653. Taking the average number of inmates in the year at twenty, and the cost at £1,100—it is 555 per inmate.

Dr. BROWN.—How many beds have you?—Thirty, and the average number per day is 16½.

25654. Mr. MURKIN.—It is under twenty; but you will admit the outlying districts get a very much less return than Tralee?—Undoubtedly.

25655. And there is some real grievance on the part of the outlying districts?—I don't deny that.

Mr. M'Mahon.—There is a hospital kept up at Killarney at the cost of the county also; I see there are cases returned from Killarney.

Witness.—That is one of the old district hospitals where you give £1 from the county for every £1 subscribed.

Mr. M'Mahon.—It is £2 from the county.

Mr. O'Donnell.—There is another hospital in Valentia.

CHAIRMAN.—But that is only getting a small county grant of £30 a year; it is the best we have seen; we have seen nothing better in the way of cottage hospitals anywhere; it is quite a model.

Dr. BROWN.—It is a pity they don't get a larger grant from the county.

Mr. FLINN.—Other districts would not complain about contributing to the County Infirmary here were it not that they have to contribute locally to the upkeep of their own hospital. If it was made a district charge I think it is only fair the outlying districts should pay for the patients coming in.

Mr. O'Donnell.—People come from Cahirciveen, Dingle, and Listowel into Tralee and meet with an accident here; they may not be six months in Tralee when they have to go to the county infirmary, and they return themselves as from Tralee.

Dr. BROWN.—Even a person coming to consult a doctor, and staying with friends might be so returned.

Mr. O'Donnell.—And there are parties that come from other countries, such as fishermen, and men that suffer from railway accidents, are brought into the County Infirmary; we had a couple of men from Fenit. Witness.—When a patient enters you ask him where he was living at the time and he says Tralee. With regard to what you said about making this a central hospital and having a staff of nurses it would require an enlargement of the building.

25656. CHAIRMAN.—Yes, or else a change to the other building; there would not be any difficulty in that if you changed it to the fever hospital?—There would be plenty of accommodation there. Of course it would not be so convenient for the management, because the consent of the Ben Secours, who manage the infirmary, strikes the premises—they are next door. I would not be so convenient to them I mean to say. I think the public also in Tralee would object to bringing the fever hospital into a crowded part of the town. It has to be done in cities we know, but still there would be a prejudice against it here.

25657. As regards future expenditure on that infirmary—supposing you stay where you are, have you

Jan. 17, 1905
 —
 Lieut.-Col.
 Rowe.

any funds for further expenditure?—No funds except what we get from the county; they can give us up to £1,400, and out of that must come any structural improvements.

25858. The doctor is satisfied with his operating room there?—I think so; it is a very nice room; in fact it was under his directions it was fitted up a couple of years ago.

25859. You are in an unusually good position for a County Infirmary as regards funds, for you have not tapped your full grant?—We never get the full grant; of course the expenses of late years have increased.

Mr. McManus.—You get a large grant for improvements?

Witness.—We did not go up to the £1,400 last year.

25860. CHAIRMAN.—Is there anything as regards Poor Law reform you would like to mention—you have had a very long experience?—I was a Guardian for a good number of years; I think union rating is an inducement to extravagance.

25861. You would prefer to go back to divisional rating?—I think the outdoor relief is extravagant at present.

25862. Do you think putting it back to divisional rating might tend to bring it more closely before the Guardians—the present Board of Guardians seem to have reduced the expenditure?—I think the present Board of Guardians are doing their work very well in Tralee.

25863. And the presumption is that they would be able to do still more in that way if it was made divisional rating?—Yes, practically; Listowel and Tralee Unions gave no outdoor relief until up to 1861, and the rates of those two unions compared with Kilmurphy—which always gave outdoor relief—was much lower.

25864. Listowel has gone on steadily increasing from 1861?—They have, but they are giving a good deal of outdoor relief now; I think it is the outdoor relief that is responsible.

CHAIRMAN.—I remember when I was inspector of the union I had to look into it very closely.

25865. Mr. McMANUS.—It gives more outdoor relief than any union in the county?—I have not compared it in that way, but I know that at one time there was none given there at all, nor in Tralee.

The Sitting terminated

FIFTY-THIRD PUBLIC SITTING—THURSDAY, JANUARY 19TH, 1905.

Jan. 19, 1905.

At the Court-house, Kilmaree.

Present:—Mr. MICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURTAGHAN, and Dr. COET RIDGER.

Mr. DAVID M. MORGAN, Chairman, Kerry Co. Council, examined.

26866. CHAIRMAN.—You are the Chairman of the County Council of Kerry?—Yes, sir.

26867. The County Council, as far as we learned at Tralee, did not pass any resolution?—They passed no specific resolution, but the matter was discussed, and while they thought it was a matter more for the different local Councils, and for that reason passed no specific resolution, still the whole feeling of the County Council, as far as I can see, the unanimous feeling, was against the amalgamation of unions.

26868. What is your own opinion on the subject?—My own opinion is the exact same as that of the County Council, and I have some means of knowing a good deal about different unions in South Kerry.

26869. You are familiar with all Kerry, practically. I suppose?—With all South Kerry; I consider the distances so very great between the different workhouses that it would be practically impossible to work an amalgamation scheme.

26870. Were you considering the question from the point of view of closing the workhouses in toto, in the case of the dissolution of a union?—Yes.

26871. Did you consider the question at all in the point of view of retaining wards for the sick and bringing to a central institution only the other inmates, those who would be able to travel?—That would, to a very great extent, entirely obviate the difficulties of the case; of course those who are sick would be less able to travel, and in the next place those who are sick are those who want a lodging in the hospital more urgently and quickly than those who are not sick.

26872. In any suggestions that we have received in going through Ireland there seemed to be a general consensus of opinion, such as you have indicated, that it would be inhumane almost to close the local hospitals and give people the option either of not going for hospital treatment at all or obliging them to go prohibitive distances?—It would be impossible in this country.

26873. Supposing the hospitals were kept up at Kilmaree and Cahirciveen for the treatment of the sick, would that, in your opinion, diminish your objection?—It would diminish the objection. But is there not outside that the question of general administration, the difficulty of Guardians attending from twenty-five miles away, from places separated by a chain of mountains, because there is a chain of mountains between us and every other place here.

26874. Supposing the administration of the Poor Law was left with the local District Councils of Cahirciveen and Kilmaree, and that they would have the administration of their local hospital and the administration of outdoor relief, and that they would, as regards inmates taken to a central institution, pay per capita, or as it might be arranged, that would take away the difficulty of obliging Guardians to come long distances; they never would have any place to attend except their own place as heretofore?—That is so.

26875. That idea did not perhaps occur to the Council?—No, most decidedly it did not; but after all would not that mean you would have the same Guardians, and you would have to have very nearly the same staff.

26876. We will come to that. You see the scheme which has been put before us in a great many places is that the local Council should continue to be the Poor Law authority dealing with the sick who are relieved in their district hospital, and dealing with any cases of outdoor relief and Poor Law administration generally, and paying the cost of persons who were relieved in outside institutions. The question I was going to put to you is do you think there are any classes at present in workhouses that might with advantage be taken out of the workhouses. We

might take lunatics; do you think it is desirable, from all you know of the workhouse administration, to keep lunatics in workhouses?—Our asylum I can speak for as I am Vice-Chairman of the Board, and we are dreadfully crowded.

26877. Although you have enlarged lately?—Although we have enlarged, but we did not enlarge as much as the doctor wanted us to do.

26878. Can you tell us the capacity of the asylum?—About 500.

26879. Would there be that number in the asylum?—Oh, yes; we are full nearly all the time.

26880. Perhaps you have heard of the experiment in the County Cork of taking an available building and starting there an auxiliary lunatic asylum where the incurable and relatively harmless lunatics were placed?—Yes, I know of that.

26881. Do you think it might be desirable to take away from the different workhouses the inmates that are in the workhouses and place them, if the building were available, to place them there and treat them pretty much the same as in Tralee?—Unless the medical men say there would be something great to be gained by it from a medical point of view, I don't see what the gain would be from a financial point of view, because we have not come to the point yet that we are so crowded out as to need an additional building; we are able to get on with what we have just barely, and with the help of the workhouses who keep these inmates who are not violent.

26882. You think at present you would leave them there?—I think so, and I think it would be cheaper than starting an auxiliary asylum.

26883. You know you would get in an auxiliary a contribution in aid which you do not get in the workhouses?—We would, of course.

26884. Have you thought whether an economy would not result by having an auxiliary asylum rather than a workhouse?—I am sure it would not result; you would first have the cost of the building; the cost of the additional staff and a more medical staff never does alone; you must have other officers, and when you tot it all up it would, in my opinion, more than counterbalance the rate in aid.

26885. Is it your opinion that the Tralee auxiliary is worked at a financial loss to the ratepayers of the County Cork?—I would not say that, for this reason, that they were put to do it in the County Cork, that is to say that the existing asylum was not able to meet their needs; they were put to do something, and if we were put to do something that might or might not be the cheaper course, but I say, in a county where the asylum meets the present needs, putting up an auxiliary asylum merely to take a few inmates from the workhouses would entail an additional cost.

26886. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—There are eighty of them in the workhouse of Kerry; do you know that at 2s. a week per head that would bring a contribution of over £400 a year?—Yes; that would be £500 a year.

26887. Don't you think they could get better treatment in an institution specially adapted for their case than they can possibly get in a workhouse; don't you think they would be better cared and better treated?—As far as I can see, from our experience of the asylum, that class of patient is nearly hopeless.

26888. CHAIRMAN.—We are assuming that they are all incurable, that the curable would be in the main asylum, but on the ground of humanity and fair treatment would not sending these people to where they would have a decent amount of exercise instead of a little cramped yard, and occupation, and certainly more cleanly keeping and all that; would not that be desirable apart from economy, to have them in a separate institution, and would it not be a saving as well?—That depends on two points. First, on what

Mr. David M. Morgan.

Jan. 19, 1903.

Mr. David M.
Molony.

medical men would think would be better for them, and I am not a competent judge of that; and it depends, in the second place, on the treatment they at present get in the workhouses, and, of course, the local people can state that better than I can.

25589. You are not prepared to give evidence as to the treatment of lunatics in workhouses?—No, sir.

25590. Medical opinion rather favours the keeping of lunatics in asylums?—I dare say, but going back to the financial point as to which alone I can give any opinion; what you have mentioned about the numbers shows we would have a rate in aid of £600; that would just about pay the medical officer-in-charge and the county would have to pay all the other expenses.

25591. It would pay nearly the whole staff according to the Younghusband experience?—But they would be applying for increases of salaries.

Mr. MURTAGHAN.—You must remember that there are attendants for this particular class in workhouses at present.

CHAIRMAN.—In the six unions you have at least twelve paid officers, and most likely more, looking after these lunatics.

25592. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—And you would not require as large a staff if they were centralised?—Do you mean to say that that staff you mentioned are looking after them exclusively and not after the others?

25593. CHAIRMAN.—Exclusively?—As I said, I know little about the internal arrangements of workhouses.

25594. You would have a male and female attendant in each workhouse at least?—Looking after the imbeciles alone and not after the other sick poor?

25595. Exactly; you cannot give them other duties because they must always have the lunatics under their observation; their time is fully occupied; they must always be in the yard?—Still there they have the building; there they have the ordinary administrative staff, and all these things would have to be newly provided for in the auxiliary asylum, and I am nearly certain, of course one cannot be too positive, but I am very nearly certain that most of the public men in the county would agree with me about that, that the auxiliary asylum would be a greater expense to the county, and in a county where we have very heavy rates.

25596. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—You say there they have the building and the staff; if there is any reform in the Poor Law they won't have the building and they won't have the staff?—I am talking of the present condition of things.

25597. CHAIRMAN.—We are thinking of a probable reform for the benefit of the ratepayers and the poor; under any change of system you would not have the present condition of affairs. It takes twelve attendants at present to look after eighty inmates; if three people were put into an institution apart for themselves perhaps half that staff could do the looking after better than at present?—No; would you not have to have a cook to cook for them, a scullery maid, housemaids, landlady, porter, and so on; you quadruple the present staff.

25598. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—You would be able to relieve your present overcrowded institution?—I said already if we needed that we would favour an auxiliary asylum.

25599. Don't you need it at present; you are full?—We are full; but not overcrowded.

25600. Is not the tendency to increase?—No; we have decreased within the last year.

25601. You are exceptionally fortunate, because in every asylum I am acquainted with the tendency is to increase?—That has been so with us up to last year.

25602. Would it not be some advantage to make an arrangement that you would not have to increase your present building?—I would sooner wait until the necessity arose before launching the ratepayers of this county into additional expense. At the asylum the doctor wanted us to go in for much more extensive buildings than we did; we fought the thing out and cut things down as low as we could, and in the result we found that the additional buildings which we went in for were sufficient for the present needs.

25603. You have reached a point when the medical authorities say you should have more room; now do you not think it would be a good thing if any reform was to take place that you would provide some place for these harmless inmates in your central institution so that you would not be called upon in future by the

medical authorities to extend the present premises, if that could be done without any increased cost. You are going on the assumption that the change suggested would mean an additional burden on the ratepayers; I take a different view of the matter, and I would only be inclined to recommend it if I was certain there was to be at least no increase?—Everybody looks at it from their own point of view, but the point of view from which we representatives of the ratepayers look at it is that we would prefer not to incur expense to meet what I call hypothetical contingencies, that we would prefer only to incur expense to meet present actualities.

25604. Dr. BRUCE.—Your idea is, I presume, that if you did require additional accommodation for fifty or sixty extra it would be cheaper to have them in the large building?—The probability of any increase here, of any substantial increase, is so small, having regard to the fact that there has at last come a decrease in the past year, the increase being small a small addition to our present building at the asylum would be cheaper to us than a big auxiliary asylum.

25605. Simply because you have your cook and porters and all that sort of thing, and medical expenditure; you would not need any increase there, and the additional attendants you would require for fifty or eighty extra would be very small?—Very little. I can send you down, from the Asylum Board, the actual numbers in the asylum.

25606. Was there any objection by the asylum to taking in the lunatics from the workhouses of the county?—No objection, but of course they would not like to do anything that would lead to overcrowding.

25607. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Would they be able to take in the eighty inmates scattered through the workhouses now?—No; not without a new building or an additional asylum.

25608. Is it your view that the eighty inmates should remain in the workhouses?—Yes.

25609. Dr. BRUCE.—About a year or two years ago the Local Government Board sent a circular to the different Boards of Guardians asking them to send in the cases that would be most suitable for asylum treatment; do you know was there any objection raised by the asylum authorities to receiving them?—I don't know that there was; it did not come before our Board, to my recollection.

25610. CHAIRMAN.—Leaving the class of lunatics for the present, we may take up the children; do you think, if your experience enables you to offer an opinion, that the workhouse is a good place in which to bring up children?—My opinion on a matter of that kind would not be equal to the opinion of one of the Guardians, but speaking merely as an outsider, I think it is not, and that the boarding-out system is preferable; of course I glean a lot of information talking to people who look after these children; from the neighbours and so on.

25611. You are aware that under the existing law only orphans and deserted children could be boarded out?—Yes.

25612. Would you be in favour of extending the powers of the Guardians by law to enable them to board out all children who have to be supported out of the public rates?—I would, most emphatically.

25613. Do you think it would be desirable, in the interests of the children themselves, and ultimately of the country, that these children should be removed from a workhouse training?—I do, undoubtedly; they are brought up in different surroundings; pure, healthier, and cleaner.

25614. There is another class, the tramp or vagrant, casuals and people who come in and out for week ends, and others of that class; some of them are absolutely idle always and some only work in an intermittent way; have you thought what might be done with that class?—That is almost the great problem that workhouses have to face; my own idea is that the time of their lodging ought to be limited as much as possible; keep them on the move.

25615. That is the present system; they at present come in late at night and they leave early in the morning; that suits them exactly; they just want a night's shelter?—I thought they stayed longer than that usually.

25616. No; they like to get off as early as they can. In England the Guardians have been authorised to detain them for one, two, or three days, according to the frequency with which they claimed hospitality at the union, and some witnesses have recommended

that the Irish law should be assimilated to that of England; others put forward a suggestion that what are called by some labour colonies should be established, say one for each province in Ireland, where this class of about 4,000 people or more should be sent when they were not maintaining themselves; that they should be committed on magistrates' warrant for long periods with a view of endeavouring to give them habits of industry, and at all events keep them from preying on the ratepayers—I think that would be a capital idea, provided, of course, that the industry they would be engaged in would not interfere with any local industry.

26917. That, I think, you may take for granted will be always provided for. Even if it were an interference it would be very small; but you think one ought to be taken that there should be no competition with local trades?—Oh, I think so, because Ireland is a bit behind-hand in the industrial race.

26918. Then there is another class, women and unmarried girls who come into workhouses to have illegitimate children; you are aware that they are not a very large number, but still a considerable number of such inmates, taking all Ireland?—There are some.

26919. Have you any idea of your own as to that subject?—No, sir, I have not.

26920. We have received the suggestion from many places that such girls should not be eligible for admission into workhouses, and it has been proved to us in evidence that these girls, when they come in in that way, very often become the mothers of other children, and that instead of going back to society on as respectable a basis as possible for them they remain on the downward grade in the workhouse, rearing families there at the expense of the ratepayers?—I have heard of that happening in Kerry.

26921. It has been suggested to us that the workhouses should be closed to those girls, as it is not considered by those witnesses a good place for them; that those girls should be placed, before their confinement, and then after it again in some penitentiary or place under religious management, where they should be paid for at the rate of so much a head, with the object of reimbursing them as soon as possible, leaving them only a burden on the rates for a very short time, putting them back to ordinary life again and giving them a chance of reclaiming, and also save the increase of this illegitimate population?—I think that would be clearly the only way out of the difficulty, and a very admirable way out of it.

26922. You would approve of that?—Most decidedly.

26923. Then there is another class in the workhouse, that is, the aged and infirm class; it is almost the largest class in workhouses; about the same number as the sick; at present in workhouses they are necessarily all kept together; they cannot be subdivided, according to, we will say, respectability or any other test; the only subdivision at present is not, males put in one set of wards at one side of the house and females in another. It has been suggested by a great many that this class should be subdivided, that there are a great many respectable old people who have to herd with troublesome and undesirable associates, and that this question is rather wrapped up in the question of amalgamation. As workhouses are at present the classification of such inmates is almost impossible except in a few workhouses, whereas if the suggestions that we have received that the aged and infirm should be taken and kept, say, in one institution in a central place in the county, say for Kerry to either Killarney or Tralee, was carried out it would be possible if you had all the aged and infirm of the county brought in there, and if you had other classes moved out of the workhouse it would be possible then to classify those in a way that would be more humane and better altogether. What do you think of that?—Of course if there were amalgamation I suppose that would be possible, that is to say you would apportion out certain workhouses.

26924. Well it would rather work out perhaps in this way. You have in workhouses, first, the sick, you have the aged and infirm, the mothers of illegitimate children and their children, the general mass of the children, the lunatics and the vagrants. If the vagrants go to a workhouse or labour colony that would take that class out; if the lunatics were to go to the pauper house, the head lunatic asylum, where it was big enough, and failing that to a dissolved workhouse; that would get rid of that class; the children

would be boarded out, and girl mothers would go to the penitentiary, the sick would always remain in the local hospital, and you would only have the aged and infirm to deal with. If you had, in Killarney Workhouse, your local hospital still, and the rest of the house converted into a sort of county almshouse in which the aged and infirm would be housed and graded or classed according to the best way possible; you would be able to do that there?—Yes, sir, but I would almost think that would be the most difficult problem of all, for this reason—there is the conflict between two feelings, everybody has the greatest possible pity and compassion for the deserving poor who are too old and infirm to support themselves, and everybody would wish them well and wish them to pass their declining years in peace and comfort; then on the other hand the ratepayers have a terrible difficulty of making their workhouses hotels; the phrase has often been used, as Col. Kirkwood knows, by local Guardians in different places; you would have a conflict between the two tendencies; in your desire to do a benefit for the people, who would undoubtedly deserve it, you would make the thing as comfortable as you might have too many people.

26925. I omitted to say that in such a county almshouse you would not have them all treated on the same dead level; you would have them classified according to respectability, and the troublesome folk would get as hard a time as it would be possible, consistent with humanity?—You would find it very hard to carry it out in practice.

26926. I think not, because they would be in different parts of the building; you would have separate day-rooms, and dormitories, and exercise places for the different classes?—Who would decide between two old men of sixty-eight years of age?

26927. The managing body?—That one should receive really hotel treatment and the other should receive rather plank-bed treatment.

26928. If you thought the local body would be unwilling to discriminate fairly between the different classes some check could be placed upon it?—Well, if some check could be devised.

26929. It is quite possible, if it were to tend to result in a dead level, putting all on hotel treatment, that would be so obviously out of keeping with the idea that it would necessitate a reconsideration of the practice and a clipping of the wings of discretion, if discretion were not well used?—That is a problem they could get over more easily in England than in Ireland; in Ireland you get the poor in the workhouse from a poorer class than the poor class in England.

26930. Do you really think so?—Oh, yes, and one in which the conditions of life are not at all so high and therefore there would not be so much hardship to these people.

26931. Do you think the inmates of the large workhouses in England are not of a class who have been accustomed to greater hardships than are conceivable in this country; take the poor of London, Manchester, and Liverpool; they are accustomed to a state of want and actual hunger that labourers of the rural districts here could never conceive or deem possible?—That is so; I know when there is want in London it is very bad.

26932. It is never free from want?—But what I mean is if you take the labouring class in this country; the conditions of life amongst the labouring class in this country and amongst the labouring class in England are totally different; the standard of food, clothing, and habitation is all quite different, and on a lower standard in this country, and then if you go in for giving them in workhouses, I won't say Brussels carpets, but something very much above their present condition, you may tempt in a number of people who would otherwise stay out.

26933. Do you think any one comes into a workhouse or public institution in Ireland that could possibly keep out of it no matter what the treatment is?—They don't at present.

26934. And although the treatment has improved very much in the last ten or twenty years in public institutions yet the increase is nearly altogether in the case of people coming into the hospital where of course now they are sure of the best possible treatment and skill and attention?—Yes, and in the case of people coming into the workhouse who cannot keep out of it; that is a state of affairs that the country would prefer to continue once there was no undue hardship on the infirm and aged poor.

Jan. 19, 1905
Mr. David M.
Mortimer

Jan. 10, 1906.
Mr. David M.
Moistery.

26035. Don't you think the healthy will always keep out of a workhouse if they possibly can?—I would not like to be too sure of that at all.

26036. Have you individual cases in your own mind of people, I don't say who accept outdoor relief, but of people who accept indoor relief when they might have stayed out?—I am saying, under the present condition of things, no, but under the ideal conditions, which are being thought of, it might be open; and I do know of instances, in the lunatic asylum, where lunatics asked not to be discharged; they were very comfortable.

26037. That is when they were weak in their hands?—They were not so weak; they were very comfortable, and preferred staying where they were.

26038. You do things on a high hotel arrangement in lunatic asylums?—Well, I suppose they are more comfortable than in a workhouse, and it is right they should be of course. I know of two such cases in recent times.

26039. I could supplement your information on that point with cases I know of lunatic inmates unwilling to leave a place that they get used to. Some of the people from Italian dungeons, as soon as the doors were opened turned back again, but still you would not consider that a sign that their conditions were satisfactory?—On the other hand we are agreed that nobody will at present go to or stay in a workhouse that can keep out of it, but people will stay in a lunatic asylum that can keep out of it, and I say the reason is that the standard of living and comfort is higher in the asylum, and if you go in for making the standard of living and comfort in the workhouse higher you will have the same condition of affairs.

26040. Don't you think the deprivation of liberty and a strict adherence to discipline will make the people outside keep out of the workhouse?—Take the old people; what is they case about a little control or discipline; it would not mean hard work for them.

26041. They don't like it; they are the people most loud in objecting?—I am afraid if you give them punched eggs for breakfast and meat at dinner you would augment the numbers very considerably.

26042. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—I hope you don't consider that we are desirous of making the standard of living in workhouses of such a kind as to attract the ordinary public?—I don't know what the ideas of the Commission are at all; if I may be pardoned for so saying, I thought I was being asked the ideas that might be in the minds of the County Council or in the minds of outsiders.

All that has been suggested is that perhaps it would be a better way to have one particular class in one institution where there could be a better system of classification, and perhaps a little kinder treatment, without adding very much to the expense.

26043. CHAIRMAN.—The object of this Inquiry is, in the first place, to try and save money for the ratepayers; that is the reason we are here. We are here to try and recommend some changes in the administration of the Poor Law that will lead to economy without impeding efficiency; economy is in the foreground of our warrant?—That is what they would be very glad of in this county if you could effect it.

26044. But we cannot effect economy if everybody says "My workhouse is to remain; it is impossible to effect economy if everything is to go on as before?—Every herring hangs by its own tail; there are counties in which workhouses are very much nearer each other than in Kerry; Kerry is a very large county and the workhouses are separated by long distances.

26045. Arms of the sea stretch up between long peninsulas?—Yes, and chains of mountains; I regard it as quite an exceptional county.

26046. It is; there is no county like it except West Cork. If you were asked by your County Council to devise a plan by which money might be saved under the Poor Law could you make any suggestion with that object?—Do you mean in the direction of amalgamation?

26047. Any direction you like?—I think as regards what you say about the tramps—sending them to a labour colony—that would effect a saving almost immediately.

26048. I am afraid not, because the cost for a tramp is fractional; he only gets his bed and breakfast?

Mr. MURKAGHAN.—2d. or 3d. would be the most.

Mr. Clegg, Clerk.—Twopence.

26049. CHAIRMAN.—You could not hope for a saving as regards the tramps except in the beneficial way of taking them off the county-at-large?—Some workhouses complain tremendously of tramps; take the Millstreet Workhouse; it is a sort of half-way house for tramps.

26050. So it is; but the number of tramps they had in Millstreet for the year was 770; take Mountmellick with 2,215; Athy, 1,123; Shillelough, 1,563; Callan, 2,555; Thomastown, 2,567; it is nothing to compare with these?—Still whatever saving there would be, large in some cases and small in others, I think there would be a saving in that respect by sending them to a labour colony; it is the dearest effect. Of course these would be the cost of the labour colony all through; these gentlemen would strongly object to go there, and it would have that effect. Then as regards sending these girls to a penitentiary, that also would be a saving because they would cease to be a permanent charge and it would be beneficial in every way.

26051. Are there any other suggestions which occur to you by which economy might be effected?—I will tell you another. A parent is liable for his child in the hospital provided the child is under fifteen years of age; I don't see why there should be an arbitrary limit as low as that; I would say provided his child was under twenty-one years of age, because every parent will, in this county, maintain his child until the child is in fact beyond twenty-one.

26052. Then comes to the general question I will put to you a little later on; at present the Guardians have power to order relief by way of loan, and then they recover the full average cost; that is more than a great many can pay; and on the other hand take a fever hospital; there a respectable man may go in from any class of life to be treated and they can only charge him the full average cost?—That is all.

26053. Would you approve of an amendment in the law that would enable the governing bodies of local hospitals, whether Poor Law, county infirmary, or fever hospitals, to charge, according to their discretion, such sum as they think the patient or his friends can afford to pay; in the case of a very poor man, 6d. a week, and in the case of a wealthy man up to the absolute cost, perhaps £10 or £20, and to recover it by summary process?—I would be most strongly in favour of that; the only thing as I would like to see some sort of grading or classification fixed on beforehand, because, I am sorry to have to say it, but I am afraid local bodies are inclined to be lenient. I will give you an example. In our asylum you know we can recover from the relatives of patients a certain amount for their maintenance, and those of us who are strongly in favour of doing that have found the greatest difficulty now and then in getting the majority of the Board to agree to get the amount that we think ought to be got from respectable farmers.

26054. You would rather have the law made mandatory instead of permissive?—I would if it were possible to fix on a classification or grading beforehand; it might be done according to the valuation for instance.

26055. That would do as regards farmers, then when you come to the labourers and artisans and small shopkeepers?—Once you come to labourers it is very hard to say what they can pay.

26056. They have such a scheme in operation in the county infirmary of Fermagh, and there they get as little as 6d. per week, and the result is that the salary of the surgeon to the infirmary is about paid by the contributions so levied, and the people there have come to like the system because they feel they can go in to a certain extent as a matter of right, feeling they are paying their way.

26057. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Without going so far as having it mandatory, how would 6d. strike you? Supposing it was necessary that the decision should be by two-thirds of those present how would that most matters?—Would not that make it worse; that before we could fix a sum for maintenance on a farmer we should have a two-thirds majority to do it?

26058. No; but the other way that it would be necessary in cases where people were being let off who could pay it would require a majority of two-thirds to let them off?—I have never found an instance where they would say they ought not to pay at all, but when you come to the amount, how would you fix it? Take the asylum; £11 is as much as we would want; if we set more than that the relief goes to the Treasury.

28958. We are the Treasury ourselves; it is our money which goes into the Treasury!—It does, but £1 or £2 will make very little difference.

28959. Mr. MURKIN.—It is taken out of the local taxation account which is now very low!—But when it comes to a question between £11 and £5 how would you fix it?

28960. CHAIRMAN.—Take it in this way; you would be afraid of some such result, but if the discretionary power was given to local bodies, let it be seen how far they exercise their discretion and then make it more stringent afterwards, if necessary, by law; you would rather have the scale at first?

Mr. MURKIN.—Amenable by a two-thirds majority.

28961. CHAIRMAN.—I did not mean that; if in the Act of Parliament the actual discretion was given to the body, and if they abused that discretion then it might be time enough, after a couple of years' experience, to change it!—That would be, perhaps, the fairest way. Local government is very new to the people of Ireland, and it would be better perhaps to give them their chance first. But I repeat, as far as I can see, the people are honestly trying to do their best everywhere, and then if that failed, what your colleagues suggested, namely, making it mandatory subject to a change by two-thirds majority would, I think, meet the difficulty.

28962. Is there any other way by which economy could be effected in your opinion in the Co. Kerry?—I do not think so; I suppose it is a disappointing answer to give.

28963. I dare say you have in your mind only indoor relief; have you considered whether any economy would be practical under the head of outdoor relief?—In what direction?

28964. Well we have received evidence at Tralee and a great many other places from a large number of witnesses in favour of divisional rating as against town rating. I may say before you answer the question that it is, to some extent a question between the towns and the country; the towns have got a great boon under the Act of 1896; they have got the outdoor relief placed on the union-at-large, and the number of applicants for outdoor relief largely comes from the towns; the towns consider that under the old condition of things they were unfairly treated and they get this boon. Now the country Guardians say "We are paying more for outdoor relief than we need and there is no reason why the towns should not support all the outdoor relief in the towns!"—That is the very point I had in my mind, and I thought at first when divisional rating was changed to town rating there would be a tremendous drop in the outdoor relief.

28965. It has dropped in some unions!—I thought all the country Guardians would say, "Nearly all the outdoor relief goes to Killybegs town and we will cut that down."

Mr. CURRY.—It has come down by a couple of hundred pounds.

28966. How much do you pay for outdoor relief?

Mr. CURRY.—About £1,500.

Mr. MURKIN.—It was down to £1,512 last year.

Witness.—For that reason I think town rating is an advantage.

28967. CHAIRMAN.—But if in the country districts pay far more than they used, because they pay according to the valuation on the £1,500, whereas before they only paid for the outdoor paupers they had in their division. Have you the last year before 1894?

Mr. CURRY.—£1,754 to be paid. Our figure to March, 1903, is £1,715.

28968. Are you including the boarded out children in that?

Mr. CURRY.—Yes.

Mr. MURKIN.—The boarded out children cost £126.

28969. CHAIRMAN.—What would it have been for the year ending March, 1903, including the boarded out children?

Clerk.—We had very few at that time; it was £1,754 outdoor relief and provisional relief.

28970. A suggestion was made that having regard to the hardship it would inflict on towns, and perhaps unfairly inflict on towns according to the view of witnesses, it would not be fair to go back to the old law, and some witnesses suggested a compromise, that it should be ascertained, as it could easily be done from the figures the clerk of the union has now given

us, what would be the present or fair amount for outdoor relief on the union-at-large as it stands, then to say, to guard against any increase, to say that it is not to go higher than that, and any case that is given in excess of that amount should go on the electoral division!—That is to say when you say the amount for the whole union you mean the amount for each electoral division of the union, and anything in excess of that should go on the electoral division itself?

28971. Yes; that would guard against an increase, but it would not help much towards a diminution, because the people would all try to get their share!—All through there is a conflict between town and country; you will find these country Guardians telling you all the time they don't see why they should pay for town relief at all.

28972. And the townspeople say they are only relieving the countryside who come in!—That is so. I don't like taking sides between them.

28973. Mr. MURKIN.—Suppose it was found out what Killybegs was paying last year. Consider the amount that that is in the £ to Killybegs; consider what that would be under divisional rating to Killybegs, and make the balance as the standard amount to be contributed as a union-at-large charge, then Killybegs would have its present benefits!—You would take the amount last year of the out-door relief in Killybegs—you would consider that as the standard?

28974. Yes; in essence, I would consider the number of inmates that are in the electoral division of Killybegs at present and the amount they would be paying under the old arrangement!—Supposing it was divisional rating; supposing £1,500, we will say.

28975. And consider what it is paying under the present arrangements, making the difference stereotyped as a regular union-at-large charge for the future as a contribution to the Killybegs poor, then you would arrive at a reasonable arrangement, according to the present conditions, and you would be giving to the towns the advantage now possessed!—You would levy the whole amount on Killybegs and charge the balance to the union.

28976. Let me give an instance of a particular union. Last year the town paid £150 for outdoor relief; under electoral divisional rating it would have to pay £250. My idea would be to subtract the amount it is now paying from the amount it would have to pay, and give the difference (£100) in future as a contribution from the union-at-large to the town!—I see.

28977. CHAIRMAN.—Supposing it was not a fixed contribution, but went up and down according to a rule-of-three calculation, so that there would be an inducement for the whole union to keep as low as possible—that that £250 should never go up, but should go down, if the numbers went down?

Mr. MURKIN.—You see the way I mean. Find out what it is paying at present under the union-at-large charge, find out what it may be paying under an electoral division charge, subtract one from the other, and make the balance the amount the union-at-large should contribute.

CHAIRMAN.—Make that the maximum, and let it diminish in proportion to the diminution in the number of persons on out-door relief.

Mr. MURKIN.—There is not any possibility of a diminution in out-door relief; the tendency is all the other way. Under the system outlined it is certain there will be an increase in out-door relief.

Witness.—The country Guardians would prefer the reverse way—that the £250 should be put on the electoral division, and the balance, if any, on the union-at-large.

28978. Mr. MURKIN.—We have had evidence from a good many rural Guardians, and they all have admitted that under divisional rating the towns did suffer, and they agree that the present benefits should be continued to the towns; but in order to ensure better supervision and provide against extravagance, they say the electoral division charge should be the future one; that would give the present advantage to the towns, and it would give the future the different Guardians the power to look after their own divisions!—As a Killybegs man I am in somewhat of a difficulty in answering this particular question; but, still, I think it is only fair that there should be some sort of equitable distribution, such as you mention.

Jan 16, 1903.
Mr. David M.
Murray.

Jan. 19, 1907.

Mr. David M.
Molony.

CHAIRMAN.—There was under the old law a rate-in-aid. Although it was smaller, the principle was practically in existence.

29378. Mr. MURKIN.—You see the point is to give to the towns some additional benefit, and ensure in future careful supervision over the expenditure.—So that if there was any across the towns would have to pay something for it.

29379. Would have to pay for future increase, if any occurred?—That would be true.

29380. CHAIRMAN.—I am not sure whether you are giving evidence as regards the Killybegs Union or as Chairman of the County Council?—As Chairman of the County Council.

29381. You have in Killybegs a county fever hospital. The area of charge for that is the entire county. We have received evidence in Tralee from Listowel and other places objecting to that arrangement; saying it was not fair that the fever hospital of Killybegs should be supported by the entire county while the fever hospital of Listowel was supported by the district. Have you any view on that?—I can give you the views of the County Council as distinguished from my own views as a Killybegs man. The view of the County Council is that it is unfair that the county generally should contribute to the expense of the county infirmary at Tralee and the county fever hospital at Tralee, or to the county fever hospital at Killybegs. They look upon the county infirmary as being purely a Tralee institution, and not one for the benefit of the county-at-large, and they look upon the fever hospital at Killybegs as being purely for the benefit of the barony of Magnolia, and for that reason people from Listowel and those other districts object most strongly to the contribution. On the other hand, the people of Tralee and Killybegs are satisfied with it, even though the Killybegs people have to pay for the county infirmary at Tralee. The two localities are, naturally, in favour of what benefits them, but the rest of the county is strongly against them.

29382. There is a nice little hospital at Castleland?—They don't get any county contribution, as far as I know, but Valentin does—a small thing.

29383. Have you visited that hospital?—No, I have never seen it, but I am told it is a good one.

29384. Dr. BOSSER.—Do you know what it takes to keep up the fever hospital in Killybegs?—I forget. I am on so many committees.

29385. Does it only serve practically the union?—Practically speaking, only the barony of Magnolia; but now and then there are cases from outside that. There have been cases from Kenmare side and Glenbeigh district, but the big majority of them come from the barony of Magnolia.

29386. We had some evidence in Tralee regarding the advisability of starting a consumption sanatorium for the county?—The medical men are all very much in favour of that; and any laymen, I think, who have intelligently studied the subject are in favour of it, too, because knowledge is beginning to spread now amongst laymen what doctors were perfectly aware of for a long time, that is that consumption is highly infectious. I know one family, living about five miles from me now, where every single one of them, one after the other, five healthy young men and women, were all swept off by consumption. I can attribute it to nothing but their want of knowledge as to the infectious nature of the disease.

29387. If the first case had been treated in a sanatorium, and there learned how to prevent the disease spreading to other members of the family—I believe that family would have been saved; because they were all, to all appearance, physically strong and vigorous people.

29388. That is occurring constantly in any number of families. It was proposed in other places that to equalise the treatment of the sick—that is, to make no injustice where the county infirmary is charged to the county—the acute cases should be put on a rate, whereby all the different hospitals would be supported. If the sick in Listowel and Kenmare were supported out of the county rate?—For all the local workhouse hospitals?

29389. Yes, what will be district hospitals, acute hospitals, if they are all supported out of one rate, and more or less in connection with the county infirmary; that is, that cases of operations that might require extra assistance in Cahirivreen, Killybegs, or Kenmare, the county surgeon in Tralee could be tele-

graphed for. He could go down there with special instruments and perform the operation?—That would be more treating Tralee like you would treat Dublin, where, of course, in their hospitals they have every possible modern appliance and skill and all that. One does not like to enter on such a topic; but, doubtless, the Killybegs and Cahirivreen doctors would not consider the Tralee doctors as a bit more skilful than themselves.

29390. CHAIRMAN.—Hardly that. I think the local doctors all over the county will readily admit that their hands are not in training for operations, whereas the surgeons of the county infirmaries are in training?—I don't know; I know a doctor in Killybegs who has great practice in operations.

29391. But I am speaking generally. Generally, the doctors throughout the county have no opportunities of operating?—In the country districts, outside towns and workhouse hospitals, they have none at all.

29392. And in workhouses there are no rooms or instruments fit for operations?—I thought more the question I was asked was whether or not the surgeons of the county infirmaries at Tralee could, for instance, come down to the infirmary in Killybegs to perform an operation.

29393. If the case could not be removed to Tralee?—I don't see the necessity for that. I think Dr. BOSSER could perform the operation as well as anyone in Tralee.

29394. Dr. BOSSER.—It might be all right with one particular doctor. You are speaking of Killybegs; but, perhaps, in Listowel or Cahirivreen?—Dr. Macaulay, in Cahirivreen, does operate.

29395. Apart from that altogether, would it not be more equitable to have the sick supported out of a county rate so that the remote parts of the county would be getting the same benefit as Tralee people from the county infirmary?—Do you mean that the richer districts should pay for the poorer?

29396. Yes, to some extent that would happen—a county-at-large charge.

CHAIRMAN.—That the county-at-large should pay for all the acutely sick. You have at present the sick in the infirmary a county-at-large charge. The people at Listowel and Dingle and elsewhere object to that. It has been suggested that one way to meet that might be by making the sick everywhere a county charge.—Any answer I give is subject to this—that that is a matter that has not been before us, and we may be having sight of a consideration that should be present to our minds; but, subject to that, I think we would be opposed to that entirely, because we would lose all the benefits of local control.

29397. Do you look upon the sick as a class that could be limited in any way by any area of charge?—It is not the number of sick; it is not a question the same as of the poor coming into the workhouse, but it is the greater expense attending it. There have been questions already; in fact a Local Government Board inquiry as to the expense attending local hospitals already. I think it was a Local Government Board inspector that I first heard saying that a certain hospital was not to be a hotel. What I say is, if you have the local control and the local Guardians looking very anxiously and carefully as to the administration of their local hospital; if you make it a central business there will be extravagance and expense, beyond all doubt. I say this, that the doctors naturally look at it from a professional point of view, and are desirous to do all their best for the patients, and spare no expense; and they are right enough from their point of view, but their point of view does conflict with the views of the ratepayers.

29398. Dr. BOSSER.—Do you not think getting the best treatment for the sick an economical arrangement. Look at the rate you spoke of. The loss to the county as well as to the family of four or five lives?—Once you come to the point at which the best does not conflict with economy. But I heard a Local Government inspector ask a doctor whether or not he had been painting the ward with iodine. I don't say the doctor wasted the iodine; I am quite sure it was not he; but I say there is a necessity for local control in these matters.

29399. CHAIRMAN.—Some curious results that we could not foresee would, no doubt, result if you made it a county charge. You would have a man paid for the sick at Listowel, and as soon as it became a county charge the Listowel people might have to pay a good

deal more than they do now, even for the county infirmary—I mean on the present scale of expenditure!—Yes, and especially taking what I have been all along insisting on—that the county is a very large county, with big distances separating all its chief towns, making anything like supervision by the central body extremely difficult, if not impossible.

27000. Dr. BROWN.—You would make the same-ness a county charge?—I think so.

27001. CHAIRMAN.—Or, if necessary, groups of counties might be combined for the purpose?—I should say groups of counties.

27002. According to the accommodation necessary in

each county. If one county, like Cork, was able to support an institution, it is obvious little counties like Carlow and Kildare could not!—Oh, no.

27003. Therefore, you would have groups of counties supporting a sanatorium and a single one where it was large enough?—I think that is a very pressing need. I saw one master mentioned in *Tralala*; I don't know whether it comes under the scope of your inquiry; that is, about the question of exchanges in Poor Law matters.

27004. Poor Law matters would, but not roads or District Council matters?—It was with regard to that; I think Mr. McMahon speaks very well; I should not mention that so.

Jan. 18, 1905.

Mr. David M. Morarty.

Mr. EDWARD FITZGERALD, D.P., Chairman, Cabercreven Union, examined.

27005. CHAIRMAN.—Your union has not given us any answers to our queries, but they have nominated you to explain their views. Would you tell us, in the first instance, what are the views of the Cabercreven Board of Guardians as to the possible advantage or disadvantage of closing up your workhouse?—We had a very large Board recently, about a fortnight since (forty members), and they were against the amalgamation of the Cabercreven Union. We are so very remote; we are forty-five miles from the nearest workhouse.

27006. What was the chief reason which influenced the Guardians of Cabercreven in deciding against the expediency of amalgamation?—The long distances would affect infirm and feeble people; they might die on the journey, and the expense of carriage would be so heavy.

27007. The number of aged and infirm in your union is very small?—Forty-five or fifty.

27008. Thirty. The sick would be forty, and the others about thirty, and the other classes number about twenty?—I don't think any of these poor people could get to Kildare or the sick or the infirm.

27009. There is nothing to prevent the aged and infirm taking a railway journey?—You would almost have to send a guide with them on their journey; they would go astray, perhaps, changing at Farrington.

27010. Why should you fear that?—From their feebleness. Some of them never saw a train in their lives.

27011. How long did it take you to come from Cabercreven to-day?—I think about three hours.

27012. You had one charge?—One charge. That does not affect able-bodied people, but it would seriously affect the aged and infirm. The sick, of course, would remain always in the hospital there.

27013. The forty acutely sick would remain at the local hospital. Do you see any reason why those who are able to travel should not be sent to the central institution?—I don't see the economy in the first instance.

27014. But if it were made obvious to you. If, as soon as the statistics are collected from all Ireland, it appeared obvious that a great economy would result from such a centralisation of healthy inmates, would you, as a ratepayer and Guardian, object to the breaking up of Cabercreven Union?—Of course not, if I found it would be economy, with a due regard for the feeble.

27015. We are unanimously of opinion that we ought not to make any recommendation disturbing the existing state of affairs except on the ground of considerable economy, and no suggestion has been made to us that the sick should be removed such practically prohibitive distances; it is that the number of hospitals locally might be increased rather than diminished?—We have scarcely an able-bodied person in our union.

27016. We have all had the advantage of going over your workhouse lately, and seeing that the inmates are pretty much the same as the inmates anywhere else?—We have a very good hospital for the care of the sick, with a Sister of Mercy in charge.

27017. We cannot endorse that. You certainly have got a very able staff for looking after the sick, but as far as the convenience given to the doctor and nurses they seem in a very backward condition?—We always meet their requirements.

27018. That building was an old dwellinghouse?—It was a portion of it.

27019. And, of course, naturally, it is in a very

decayed condition?—I think it is not in very good condition, but we have a very good fever hospital there and infirm wards.

27020. Fever hospital?—Yes; a very nice operating room.

27021. You are fortunate in having a very able staff in your hospital. You have converted an old fever hospital into a District Council meeting-place and dispensary; under what circumstances did that change come about? Why was it converted from a hospital to its present purpose?—The original fever hospital was built by public subscription; it had been paying no rent; we were paying rent in Cabercreven for a dispensary, and also for a boardroom, and were anxious to get the Sisters of Mercy in charge of the sick, because the poor were very badly attended to, with very indifferent nurses. We amalgamated the fever hospital with the workhouse, and got the Sisters in charge, and made use of their house as our dispensary and clerks' office, and boardroom, for economy.

27022. You wished to bring your sick as near as possible to the new nursing staff?—Yes.

27023. You have hardly any income at Cabercreven?—No, we have two landless.

27024. They are classed with the others?—They are. They are made do a little work, such as drawing out; they are very quick.

27025. Do the Guardians often visit their workhouse?—Not very often; it is too inconvenient; but we are in telephonic communication with the workhouse, and it is very useful in urgent calls for the doctor or clergyman, or sending out ambulances.

27026. Take the aged and infirm wards, they are not under the daily control of the doctor; he only goes there when called to see a sick patient?—Yes.

27027. And they are not under the Sisters of Mercy?—I believe not; they are under the master and matron.

27028. And the Guardians don't make a practice of inspecting these wards with a view of seeing that the people get looked after properly?—Whenever they do go up they do go through these wards.

27029. I suppose the officials have the advantage of knowing through the telephone when they are coming?—I am not aware of that. There is no intimation given, as far as I know.

27030. You have very few cattle or tramps, you are so remote?—Only about a dozen in twelve months.

27031. Mr. MURPHY.—You say your objection to any change in the workhouse system is that you don't see any advantage to be obtained by it in a monetary way?—Yes; also taking into account the feebleness of the class of people that remain in our workhouse.

27032. First, under the head of saving—are you aware that owing to the very small number in your workhouse you are paying a great deal more per head per inmate than in other workhouses in the county; you are paying something like \$6 10s. per head per inmate more than in *Tralala*?—That may be. Our staff could attend to three times as many.

27033. Under that head alone you could effect a very considerable saving, and you give a very large amount of out-door relief for the sake of the institution?—I believe we are the most congested in Kerry; I think it is the poorest district in Kerry; the valuation is very low, and the land very bad.

27034. CHAIRMAN.—The union is congested under the Congested Districts Board?—It is.

27035. Mr. MURPHY.—If your sick were provided for locally, do you see any great harm that would

Mr. Edward Fitzgerald.

Jan. 18, 1905.

Mr. Edward
Fitzgerald.

arise if the other classes could be taken somewhere else at a lower cost and the children boarded out?—We have no children boarded out.

Mr. T. C. Fitzgerald.—There are fourteen children in the house.

27033. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—That means almost 20 per cent. of the inmates. Don't you think they would be better outside amongst the farmers?—That is the question. If they are of a suitable age we do try to get places for them, and there are applicants from the small farmers for the children when they are twelve or fourteen.

27034. If the law were so altered that you don't board out the children now eligible, don't you think it would be better to have the children outside, where they could learn the handicraft of the fields?—I don't think they arrive at an age in our workhouse where they could be taught anything.

27035. Could they too learn, like other children, to make themselves useful and handy?—It could be tried.

27036. CHAIRMAN.—Those who are in favour of boarding out are of opinion that the best age for boarding out would be between two and three years, so that they could grow up under healthy conditions, and be trained up as labourers, and be useful. You have rather the view of hiring out when they are work. Looking at it from the point of view of boarding out in infancy, would you be in favour of such an arrangement, so that the children should know nothing about the workhouse?—It would be very hard to depend on the people to whom they are sent to take care of these children.

27037. You have an efficient relieving officer?—But they have large duties, and the children could be neglected in their absence.

27038. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Don't you think the neighbours would keep an eye on a child that was boarded out, and see that it was well looked after?—If you give the people sufficient to induce them to look after the children, but for 2s. or 3s. a week they would not do so.

27039. If you raised the money to 4s. a week?—That might be; but I think it would be better to send them to an industrial school.

Mr. DENIS J. SULLIVAN, M.C.C., P.L.O., examined.

27040. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the County Council, also?—Yes.

27041. What is the view of the Kinnaree Board of Guardians as regards the closing of their workhouse for all purposes except the treatment of the sick?—They would be entirely opposed to that; because of the great distance the destitute would have to be carried, because of the extent of the union, if we were amalgamated with Killarney. We go to the south side of the Kinnaree River into Cork twenty miles.

27042. How near do you go to Eyre?—About two miles of Eyre.

27043. Do many inmates come from as far back as Castlecoole?—Yes.

27044. Do you think many people come to be treated in your hospital from Castlecoole and Smeem?—A fair share.

27045. Are there a great many cases in which people cannot be removed such long distances?—The Guardians have an ambulance van, and if there is a serious case the medical officer at Smeem wires to Kinnaree for an ambulance, and it goes down.

27046. Castlecoole is twenty miles from Kinnaree, and you have not heard of any bad results or objections raised by the people of that district; they think it is sufficiently near with your good ambulance?—I have not heard any objection, but Mr. Sheehan knows more about that district than I do.

27047. You don't think that is too far to move them?—I don't think it is.

27048. Would that be about as much as you think it would be right to remove people?—I think it is quite.

27049. You would not stretch to thirty miles?—No; Castlecoole is far enough—twenty-four English miles.

27050. Have you ever heard any question or suggestion made about putting up a small hospital for half-a-dozen or eight beds that might be under the dispensary doctor at Smeem?—I did not hear it, until I saw it in the evidence of Mr. Flavin.

27051. Well, Mr. Flavin was only asked about it; he did not volunteer any statement on the subject. But

27052. Dr. Brown.—Does the Valencia Hospital not relieve your hospital somewhat?—I think it is useful for that locality.

27053. Do the Guardians give anything for the support of that hospital?—I don't think we have the power to do so; we are paying so much already; we cannot be as generous as we would wish. I think it is supported by subscription. It is a very nice hospital.

27054. There is no waste there?—I am sure not. It is very useful for treating men and such.

27055. CHAIRMAN.—Yes, and for residents on the island?—It is very useful.

27056. Did you ever consider the question of the treatment of the sick at Waterville, and for the county on the back road towards Smeem along the lake; they have to go long distances to your workhouse?—Yes, but our workhouse is about central for the county union.

27057. Do you think a little hospital, something like the Valencia Hospital, would be desirable at Waterville, to be looked after by the dispensary medical officer?—It may be able for a large portion of the year, and you would be paying the staff.

27058. The staff would be the doctor, who would be there in any case, and the nurse would be a person who could act as a midwife for the district?—I think it would be very useful, except it may entail the expense of the building of a hospital.

Dr. Brown.—It would be very small.

27059. CHAIRMAN.—You may get important contributions at Waterville from the telegraph people—these employees would be sick, like other people?—They are pretty well found. There is a doctor in charge, and they have good premises. I hardly think they would come into the hospital.

27060. Is there anything else you would wish to mention?—No; I think Mr. Moriarty has almost answered for the whole of us. We think it a great hardship to have to support the county infirmary—no sewer send any patients there.

27061. We have a list which we got in Yvels showing how many come from Castlecoole?—They must be very few.

CHAIRMAN.—It is not a large number.

Mr. Denis J.
Sullivan.

27062. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the County Council, also?—Yes.

27063. What is the view of the Kinnaree Board of Guardians as regards the closing of their workhouse for all purposes except the treatment of the sick?—They would be entirely opposed to that; because of the great distance the destitute would have to be carried, because of the extent of the union, if we were amalgamated with Killarney. We go to the south side of the Kinnaree River into Cork twenty miles.

27064. How near do you go to Eyre?—About two miles of Eyre.

27065. Do many inmates come from as far back as Castlecoole?—Yes.

27066. Do you think many people come to be treated in your hospital from Castlecoole and Smeem?—A fair share.

27067. Are there a great many cases in which people cannot be removed such long distances?—The Guardians have an ambulance van, and if there is a serious case the medical officer at Smeem wires to Kinnaree for an ambulance, and it goes down.

27068. Castlecoole is twenty miles from Kinnaree, and you have not heard of any bad results or objections raised by the people of that district; they think it is sufficiently near with your good ambulance?—I have not heard any objection, but Mr. Sheehan knows more about that district than I do.

27069. You don't think that is too far to move them?—I don't think it is.

27070. Would that be about as much as you think it would be right to remove people?—I think it is quite.

27071. You would not stretch to thirty miles?—No; Castlecoole is far enough—twenty-four English miles.

27072. Have you ever heard any question or suggestion made about putting up a small hospital for half-a-dozen or eight beds that might be under the dispensary doctor at Smeem?—I did not hear it, until I saw it in the evidence of Mr. Flavin.

27073. Well, Mr. Flavin was only asked about it; he did not volunteer any statement on the subject. But

say a hospital for six or eight beds, that would be under the dispensary doctor and district nurse, who would look after the sick in their own homes, if she had no cases in the hospital, what would you think of such a hospital at Smeem, to take in the people that are in the workhouse behind Smeem and over to Castlecoole? How far is the Blackwater Bridge?—Half-way between Kinnaree and Smeem. I don't know much about Smeem.

27074. What would you think about a little hospital of that sort, supposing the expenditure came to what would be a small sum on the union—say, £250 a year?—I think one district hospital in Kinnaree for it is the centre of the union—ought to be sufficient for the whole union.

27075. You think it is no hardship asking the people to go twenty-four miles from Castlecoole and twenty miles from Smeem?—If you put a hospital at Castlecoole you should put up one at the other side, at Tuelist, which is as far away from Kinnaree.

27076. Is the population anything like as numerous?—I could not answer that; but I think it is very near.

27077. At all events you think that if a hospital were necessary at Smeem it would be most likely that the people of Tuelist would be likely to ask for it?—Yes.

27078. That is where the dispensary doctor lives?—There is a dispensary doctor there.

27079. Do you think they would be reasonable in looking for it?—They would think they had as good a right as the people of Smeem.

27080. Your own opinion would be against giving them the hospital on the ground that it would lead to greater expense, and that twenty-four miles is not so undisturbed hardship on the people who live that distance from hospital?—It is not, considering the country. The roads are good, and we have an ambulance van.

27081. Supposing Kinnaree Workhouse were to be closed for all classes except the sick, would the people

of Kenmare be anxious that, instead of remaining empty, it should be devoted to some other useful purpose, such as a sanatorium?—Certainly, they would be most anxious. A sanatorium for consumptives or an industrial school.

22073. If that were done, would your chief objection from the Kenmare side of the country disappear if it were continued for some useful purpose?—It would not. The Kenmare Workhouse was built for 500 paupers; at present we have only 90 or 100; and we would have plenty of room for keeping the paupers in it if the children were sent to an industrial school.

22074. If you put two or three hundred of some other class of inmates into a sanatorium there, which would be the most useful—to continue the Kenmare Workhouse for the healthy outside or to convert it into a sanatorium for the consumptives for the County Kerry?—I think it could be used for both purposes.

22075. It could not, most emphatically. You could not have the ordinary inmates running through the consumptive patients?—That would be an objection.

22076. There would not be room either. If you had to get one or the other, which would you prefer?—I think it would make a very good place for a sanatorium for consumptives, if it was decided that the workhouse should be closed up.

22077. Is there anything special as regards the union of Kenmare? You have heard the evidence of Mr. Mackenzy and of Mr. Fitzgerald; if any of Mr. Mackenzy's answers struck you as different to what you yourself would give, we would be very glad if you would mention them?—No, I quite agree with Mr. Mackenzy; and especially I quite agree with him as to the injustice of poor people, like those in Kenmare, being called upon to contribute to the county infirmary, and the fever hospitals in Tralee and Killarney, when we have an infirmary and fever hospital of our own.

22078. Mr. MURPHY.—Do you agree with Mr. Mackenzy in his general evidence?—Yes, I do.

Mr. TIMOTHY J. SULLIVAN, Chairman, Kenmare Union, examined.

22079. CHAIRMAN.—Now we have had the advantage of hearing your colleague; you are the Chairman of the Kenmare Board of Guardians?—Yes, sir.

22080. And you live at the place mentioned?—At the Twonist side; at the north side of the Kenmare River, towards Castletownbere.

22081. You heard the questions asked and answered about a cottage hospital at Sneem, and Mr. Sullivan said he thought if one was put at Sneem the Twonist people would say they should have one too?—Yes, quite likely.

22082. You are familiar with the condition of the country?—Certainly, and I don't hear of any complaints in that district.

22083. If there is much sickness, you hear about it?—Yes.

22084. Do you hear of many sick going to the Kenmare Hospital, or are they chiefly treated in their own homes?—The ven is sent out when there is a fever case. There is hardly any case from that remote district unless there is an outbreak of fever.

22085. They have at odd sickness of other kinds. I suppose?—Yes; but they can come into the workhouse on an out-call.

22086. If a man had pneumonia, that is a disease of the lungs, he would not be in a condition for an out-call?—Certainly not; he would go in by the ambulance.

22087. Can you tell me whether many serious cases, such as pneumonias, are dealt with in their own homes along that north side of the bay and up in the mountain passes, or are they brought to Kenmare?—Very few are brought to Kenmare; they are mostly dealt with in their own homes; there are very few destitute people.

22088. Sickness does not stop at the line of destitution, a good many comfortable people get sick, too?—These are dealt with in their own homes.

22089. People of small valuations—£5 or £10?—£7 is the average valuation in that district.

22090. They would be dealt with in their own homes?—They would.

22091. How many rooms would they have in a house?—They would have two or three rooms.

22092. A kitchen and a bedroom, most of them?—A little upstairs, too.

22093. A loft. Would the loft be used for sleeping?—The room is used for sleeping, and the young portion of the family sleep upstairs.

22094. What rooms would you have in the ordinary run of houses? First, there would be the kitchen; would there be a bed in it?—No.

22095. Then you would have at one end a room of the kitchen, where you would have the husband and wife?—No; in the well-to-do houses there are no beds downstairs at all; there are two rooms upstairs as well as downstairs.

22096. You have two-storied houses in that district?—Yes, in the majority of them.

22097. Stead or thatched?—Half-and-half.

22098. Have you two-storied thatched houses in that district?—You have lots in most of them, and windows on the gable ends that will allow the light to come into the loft.

22099. Where do the man and wife sleep?—Upstairs, in the loft.

22100. And where do the boys and girls sleep?—Upstairs, too. There is a partition through the rooms above as well as below.

22101. And the girls and boys are in the same loft?—I suppose something like that.

22102. Do you think that these loft accommodations with the gable and short head-rooms are proper places in which to treat sick people?—I don't believe it would be; but they have an objection to come into the workhouse.

22103. But if they had a nice little hospital in their own district, where they could go in, with no workhouse objections, and could have their own doctor, who is used to looking after them, and a nurse that they would get to know, do you think that would be a popular thing?—I object to it on the score of expense. I think we are over-rated at present.

22104. If we could pull down your rates, and give you that little advantage?—By all means, I would be in favour of it. I heard you say it would cost a couple of hundred pounds in Sneem.

CHAIRMAN.—But if we saved a couple of thousand to Kenmare—I don't perceive you that.

22105. Mr. MURPHY.—It might be possible to use in one place, and distribute the saving all round. Kenmare has a great advantage. Its sick can be treated locally, whereas the people of the distant districts don't get the same advantage?—I would be in favour of divisional rating (instead of union rating). I don't think the rates would go up so much if we had the old system of divisional rating. There is a more or less tendency to give out-door relief when it is union rating. For instance, in my own division, I have nothing to account for at the end of the year to my constituents as long as it is union rating; formerly, if I reduced the rates £d. in the £, there was something thought of me.

22106. CHAIRMAN.—And if you found you had to bring home to them the news of an increase of £d., you would rather come home by a back way?—Yes. I would also be in favour of single representation instead of double representation, because it creates a lot of confusion when a lot of us meet together at Board meetings.

22107. You speak factually. As Chairman of the Board, you would rather control thirty than sixty?—I would rather control ten than thirty.

Mr. JOHN J. SHANNON, C.B., examined.

22108. CHAIRMAN.—You are Chairman of the Kenmare Rural District Council?—I am.

22109. You come from Sneem?—Yes.

22110. It was about your district that I asked the questions as to the cottage hospital. There is a large country about Sneem along the mountains, and along

Jan. 19, 1905.
Mr. Denis J.
Sullivan.

Mr. Timothy
J. Sullivan.

Mr. John J.
Shannon.

Jan. 19, 1906.
Mr John J.
Sheehan.

the sea coast to Castletown?—I—So there is. Castletown is nine miles from Smeem and sixteen-and-a-half from Kenmare.

27111. A cottage hospital under your dispensary medical officer, with a district nurse to look after the sick, would cost, roughly speaking, £200 or £250 a year for the whole union. Do you think the sick at Smeem and the district round Castletown are sufficiently benefited by hospital accommodation at present?—I know that the doctor at Smeem has taken the precaution to send people to hospital in time before they got too bad to be sent.

27112. He is often called in too late, though?—Yes. These cases, such as pneumonia, cannot be sent to hospital. I think a cottage hospital would be a very good thing; but in the meantime, of course, the expenditure is very high.

27113. Your view is that you would not suggest this cottage hospital to add to the rates?—I would not; but if a reduction in the rates were clearly demonstrated—

27114. Would you approve of devoting some part of the money, without increasing the former rates, to the erection of a cottage hospital?—Most undoubtedly.

27115. The district about Smeem is one of the poorest in Kerry?—It is.

27116. The ratio between valuation and the population is very low?—Very low.

27117. The people there are not yet the owners of their holdings—they have not purchased?—Not yet; a part of the estate is under sale negotiations.

27118. Naturally, all the ratepayers look very closely on all the questions of local taxation as coming from the ultimate purse of all?—Yes. They are very sensitive as regards the taxation and the expenditure.

27119. They would welcome any reduction?—It would be very welcome, I assure you, sir.

27120. You are one of the Board of Guardians who agreed to a unanimous resolution that Kenmare Workhouse ought not to be closed?—I did.

27121. Did the Guardians then consider that the closing of it would not mean any substantial saving to the ratepayers?—The question they went into chiefly was that they did not see that Kenmare could be amalgamated. In the first instance, Castletown being twenty-five miles and a half from Kenmare, and the nearest union being forty-one miles, they did not see how they possibly could agree to the amalgamation of the Kenmare Union with any other union in Kerry.

27122. They voted against amalgamation—what did they think would result from amalgamation?—They thought there would be undue hardship inflicted on the poor.

27123. What class of the poor?—The class that would be taken from Smeem to another union; the people in the body of the workhouse.

27124. Not the sick?—Not the sick.

27125. What hardship did they think would result to the healthy people, who would be in the body of the house? Supposing the healthy people in the body of the house were removed to Killarney or Tralee, what hardship would result, in the opinion of the Kenmare Board of Guardians?—In the first place, the people would have no representative on the Killarney Board.

27126. Supposing the District Council of Kenmare remained as it is, and it would have charge of the hospital at Kenmare that would be left there, and that it would have charge of the cottage hospital at Smeem and Tralee, if such hospitals were erected; and that they would then have the administration of the out-door relief, and never go to Killarney or Tralee for out-door purposes at all, but manage all the Poor Law business themselves, as heretofore, except that they would send cheques for the able-bodied that would be maintained at the central institution at a lower cost than at Kenmare?—That is a question that did not arise in the inquiry we held.

27127. They rather looked to the breaking up of their body?—Yes.

27128. They did not consider that their body might still be maintained, and it would meet locally to discharge Poor Law and other duties, as heretofore?—That was the view the committee took of the matter.

27129. Without in any way pledging your colleagues, but merely speaking your own personal opinion, and without due consideration, but on the spot of the moment, how does the thing strike you now, looking at it from this new point of view?—I am still of opinion that I cannot see how economy would result from amal-

gamation, considering the distance the paupers would have to go from Smeem to Castletown, or Smeem to Killarney.

27130. A healthy man or woman gets in need of relief at Castletown; heretofore he would go to Kenmare, but instead of going to Kenmare Workhouse he would go to the Kenmare relieving officer, and be put in the train there, and be labelled for Tralee or Killarney, as the case may be. Where would the hardship be over and above the fact that he would have a railway journey after getting properly entertained by the relieving officer at Kenmare—he would have a railway journey to Killarney or Tralee—do you see a hardship in it?—I do. I see a hardship on the representatives, in the first place. If our paupers are to be transferred to Killarney, no Guardian would attend at Killarney from Smeem.

27131. The Guardians would still remain at Kenmare?—They would not appear to be a very great hardship in that case.

27132. The people would go to the central institution; how the central institution would be governed is a matter for future consideration. It might be dealt with by the Guardians or Council at the place where it would be, at Killarney or Kenmare; a per capita, or so much a head, would be charged, and you would send them a cheque; or it might be managed by a committee, like the asylum committee, on which every district would have its share of representation, as might be thought best. There would not be any word of representation?—I would like to be satisfied of that first.

27133. How does it strike you at first sight?—If we have representation, and then if we had officers who would see that the paupers would be properly transferred to Killarney.

27134. It would not be so objectionable as you thought it was when you voted in favour of retaining things as they are?—Not quite so objectionable, because that question did not crop up at the inquiry.

27135. Mr. MURKIN.—With the extension to the Guardians of the power of giving out-door relief in cases where they could not at present, so that they might, when they thought it a hardship to send the people from the locality, give them a sum of 4s. or 6s. a week to board them in their own neighbourhood, instead of sending them to the central house. If the Guardians thought it proper in particular cases not to send some respectable person away from the locality, to give them power, instead of paying for them in the county almshouse, to give them a certain sum per week to support them in their own locality.

27136. CHAIRMAN.—In Castletown?—I don't believe it could be done at all.

27137. Mr. MURKIN.—You think there may be some hardship in sending people away from their own locality—Kenmare, for instance. If the Guardians had their powers enlarged, so that in particular cases they could give out-door relief to some of these people instead of sending them to the central almshouse, would not that remove the sentimental objection?—There are some people you never could keep at home.

27138. But in particular cases, in which it would be well to do so, they should have the power to do so?—It would be very desirable in certain cases.

27139. CHAIRMAN.—Are you in favour of relief by out-door relief instead of indoor relief—which relief do you prefer?—Outdoor relief is cheaper, of course.

27140. Taking it at so much a head, it is cheaper. Do you think a great many more would ask for out-door relief than would ask for indoor relief?—I am not in a position to say that.

27141. There are a great many people who would take a little money weekly who would not think of going into the workhouse?—The class of people who would go into the workhouse, I think, they would take no money outside at all.

27142. There are a great many people outside who would take money, but would not go into the workhouse?—That is quite so.

27143. Would you be rather afraid that if you had a scheme for out-door relief, without safeguards or without sufficient safeguards, that too many people would run for relief in their own homes and neighbourhood, or if you have such a scheme, do you see what safeguards you might introduce to prevent too much expenditure of the rates?—It would all depend on the amount of relief given.

27144. Do you think it would be a sufficient check if such additional relief, in addition to the amount at present given, if the relief in future of such cases were to be levied on the electoral division; do you think electoral division rating would make people look so closely after the amount given that there would be no danger of any abuse?—I believe so. Of course, while that is so, I find in the Kenmare Union at the present time union rating has been just as cheap as divisional rating.

27145. You, personally, would be in favour of continuing the union rating?—I am.

27146. You are resident in the town, I suppose?—I am resident in the village of Skene.

27147. Your colleagues who preceded you spoke strongly in favour of divisional rating. He said since it has been done away with there is no incentive to representatives being particularly interested in looking

after the finances of the division?—I am of a different opinion. I say the union expenditure has not been increased.

27148. Kilgarvan, Sween, and Kenmare are the three populous centres of your union; would Kilgarvan be in favour of union rating?—I could not say.

27149. But Kenmare is, and Sween?—Yes.

Mr. T. J. O'Sullivan.—There are two divisions that were highly rated before, and there has been a saving there.

27150.—Dual representation on these Boards I consider a great abuse. There is a great deal of time wasted over doing business on these Boards.

27151. CHAIRMAN.—You speak as Chairman also?—Yes. As regards the county infirmary, I consider it very unfair that we should be called upon to pay towards the county infirmary; we never send any patients from Sween or the neighbourhood.

Mr. DAVID J. HEART, F.R.C., examined.

Mr. David J. Heart.

27152. CHAIRMAN.—Did Mr. Moriarty express pretty clearly the views of the Killarney Guardians as well as his own?—Well, he did.

27153. You are against amalgamation?—If I thought it was a benefit to the rates I would not be against it, because the rates are very high, and people are not in the way to pay them at present; but I don't see how it would be a benefit.

27154. If this Commission could make a report and produce evidence that would lead you, and men able to form an opinion on such a question, to believe there would be a substantial saving, would you be in favour of amalgamation if it could be carried out without hardship?—Of course I would; we would want a considerable saving.

27155. From your resolutions, you were evidently of opinion that if Kenmare and Calverdown Unions were broken up the sick would have to come here?—Yes.

27156. That, of course, you have learned to-day would not be the case, because the sick would continue to be treated locally; and, if anything, further accommodation would be recommended for the convenience of the sick?—Yes.

27157. That takes away one of the chief objections?—Indeed, it does.

27158. You heard the suggestion that Kenmare might be converted into a sanatorium or an institution for the isolation and cure of consumption?—Yes, I did.

27159. Would you approve of that, if the institution were not used for Poor Law purposes?—Yes, it would be very useful.

27160. What is your opinion about children—would you think it desirable to board them out?—Yes.

27161. You have done a great deal in boarding out in the Killarney Union?—Yes. My experience is that the children are better off, and much more likely to become useful in the world by and by, than if reared in the workhouse. They are not workhouse birds, and not likely to come back to it again; they are able to do something when they come of age.

27162. The Killarney Board were of opinion that lunatics would be better treated in an institution for the insane than in a workhouse?—Yes.

27163. Did you form any opinion as to whether they should be in the full-blown lunatic asylum or in an economically managed auxiliary?—As far as possible, I think they should be in the asylum.

27164. You think that might be more economical than using a fresh institution?—Far more economical.

27165. But if the opposite appeared to be the fact; if you were satisfied from the experience of Loughal,

where the experiment is being tried, and other considerations, that an auxiliary asylum was more economical, would that cause you to modify your opinion?—I am for economy every way I possibly can; if I was satisfied of that I would be fully for it.

27166. Subject to humane treatment, of course?—Oh, yes.

27167. As regards outdoor relief, you say that outdoor relief, or old age pensions, judiciously administered to the respectable aged and infirm, especially married couples, would be preferable and more economical than indoor maintenance?—Yes.

27168. Would you be afraid that too many people might seek for such relief from the Guardians?—I don't think so.

27169. Would you have any such test as the workhouse test before giving them a pension or outdoor relief?—I think it would be well. I would be in favour of it.

27170. Mr. MURPHY.—What advantages would that bring?—If a family are so destitute that they have to become inmates of the workhouse, I would prefer giving them something outside.

27171. They would simply come in to qualify, as deserted wives now come in, to have their husbands arrested?—If it was explained that they were so destitute that they would have to come into the workhouse, or get relief outside, I would prefer giving the relief outside; and as there might be a great many looking for it, I would have a test.

27172. CHAIRMAN.—As regards the existing number, you would prefer dealing with them outside to inside?—I am very much in favour of that.

27173. Is there anything else?—I say that people who have means should pay their actual cost of hospital; it is very hard on the ratepayers.

27174. Do you mean the actual cost?—Yes; because some of these people pay, but only pay as much as a humble pinner, and they cost the union £1 or more a week. There is another class of people, who, when their children come of a certain age, won't pay anything. I consider that is unjust, also.

27175. Your object would be to get as much for the ratepayers as you could without inflicting any hardship?—Yes.

27176. Would you be in favour of giving the Guardians power to fix and recover summarily such sum as they thought that the patients or their friends could pay?—Yes. I am also in favour of single-member representation and divisional charabability.

27177. Mr. MURPHY.—Single responsibility?—Yes; it will make people more cautious.

..4

Mr. DANIEL SWEENEY, F.R.C., examined.

Mr. Daniel Sweeney.

27178. CHAIRMAN.—Do you agree with your colleagues who have just given evidence?—Yes.

27179. Is there any question on which you differ from him?—I do, on divisional rating.

27180. You would prefer the union?—Yes; simply because Killarney is the centre of gravity; and these people, when they become destitute, generally speak of the union to be nearer to get this relief.

27181. I suppose that is more true of Killarney, as a centre, than of any place in Ireland, owing to the number of people coming here, attracted by the

tourists?—Yes, and they come from other unions; and I wish we had power to send them back to their own unions. They come sometimes as beggars, and then take refuge as citizens in the town. They are a very heavy responsibility on the general taxpayer.

27182. It is lightened a good deal by the union rating, but it is a heavy cost, even on the union?—Yes, I know it is.

27183. Was there any other matter?—I am one of those who dissented from my colleagues—I am for amalgamation.

Jan. 16, 1905.
Mr. Oswald
Steele.

27183. Did you think to what extent amalgamation might be carried out in South Kerry or in the whole of Kerry?—There should be two central bodies—one in Tralee and the other in Killarney. Then, for out-door relief, where a man would have a nice little cottage, that he could be comfortably kept in with a little assistance from our consolidated fund; the ratepayer at the present time, the way he is taxed, could not maintain those people, and it should be given like an old-age pension. We are giving a great amount of taxes, and would like to get something back.

27184. Would you leave the sick in their own neighbourhood?—Oh, certainly.

27185. You would not dream of closing Kinsale and Caherciveen hospitals?—No. It would be very painful to these people if they were near death to be removed to the central place, because their friends are very tenacious, and wish to bury them in their own graveyards; and they might have to come fifty miles to take their relatives away.

27186. That objection would not be so strong if you had the sick treated in their own locality?—Certainly, we should not know any more about that grievance in Killarney if they were treated in their own district.

27187. Except as regards the infirm?—Oh, the chronic cases could be removed to the central place to lessen the staff of the hospitals.

27188. But, of course, you would be prepared to give any people whose situations you touched generous and sufficient compensation?—Oh, certainly; we cannot get rid of them otherwise. If I could do away with some of them I would—unworthy servants!

27189. Who don't exert themselves sufficiently; that would be individuals; that is all right. Are there any officers in situations you would get rid of?—For the imbeciles we have night nurses, and we could do away with them.

27190. You would do away with the master and matron if you brought the healthy all into one institution; you would do away with the masters and matrons of the other five?—So you would; there would be a saving in that alone.

27191. And do away with the food in the healthy wards of five houses?—And the clothing.

27192. They would still want the clothes?—But the clothing of the houses would be reduced a good deal by out-door relief.

27193. What I would take most interest in would be how you would safeguard out-door relief in a way that would prevent its spreading too much—have you no fear of that?—I have not.

27194. You are in favour of union rating; how would you safeguard with union rating out-door relief, so as to prevent its becoming an undue burden?—There is nothing to my mind, from my experience, that the Guardians safeguard more than out-door relief, and are more reluctant to give it. Every Guardian represents a different division, and he feels aggrieved if too much is spent. If you make it a divisional rating, you will prevent that; because if one Guardian finds out that this is a friend or any connection, he will be inclined to increase the out-door relief more than he would if it was union rating, and that would be a sledge of one section against the other.

Mr. James
Steele.

Mr. JAMES STEELE, P.L.O., examined.

27195. CHAIRMAN.—What is your opinion—the last witness was in favour of amalgamation, if duly safeguarded?—I would agree fully in that.

27196. You would rather have amalgamation, if there could be a substantial saving without hardship to the poor?—I would; it would do away with a good deal of officials in other unions.

27197. The cost of the fuel and the cost of keeping up these institutions out of the poor rate would disappear?—Yes; I would be far superseding all the officials that would be done away with.

27198. The compensation could not be as big as their salaries, and it would drop according as the lives dropped?—When they would be going off duty, they could not expect to get as much as when on duty.

27199. What is your view about out-door relief?—I would be very much in favour of divisional rating. I am speaking from long experience, and I certainly think divisional rating would be a great saving. From my own experience, I know that when it was divisional the ratepayers were a great check on the Guardians. I am speaking from experience; it has been on me myself. If the ratepayers of the division found the rates were going up, they would not fail to tell me so; and actually inquire as to how it did go up, and I would have to try and give them an explanation. I would also be in favour of only one representative from each division; when there are two it is too complicated.

27200. You think it is too big an assemblage to discuss matters in an ordinary business-like way?—I know perfectly well it is. On some days scarcely a quorum may turn up; whereas if there is an appointment, a terrible Board turns up, and there is confusion.

27201. Mr. MURKIN.—There is a further difficulty—the two men may not see things the same way?—Yes; and it is easier to get a good, intelligent man very often from a district than it is to get two.

27202. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose you would not be limited to two intelligent men in any district in Kerry?—No.

27203. Mr. MURKIN.—If there is only one representative there is the responsibility on him to look after his division?—That is so; and, of course, under the old Poor Law Act, I must say the *ex-officio* men dealt with the out-door question; it was the elected Guardians had the management.

27204. You don't, then, agree with the last witness, who thought the Guardians as a body look more closely after out-door relief when it is a union charge than when it is divisional?—I do not. I agree with Mr. Healy.

27205. You think there is a direct scrutiny of out-door relief when people in a small area have to pay it?—Oh, yes. I remember your speaking about those families who have illegitimate children. It would be a good idea if those people could be sent to their own unions. I know instances in Killarney Union where they came from other unions and other counties. They persisted when leaving their own localities that they are going to friends of theirs.

27206. CHAIRMAN.—I think you would find that it is as broad as it is long. That is undoubtedly a fact in all unions, that a girl naturally and instinctively runs away from her own locality to a place where she won't be known in her shame; and if people from a distance come here, the girls from here go to a distance, and if you had an interchange, it would be as broad as it is long!—Perhaps so; but if confined to their own localities they would be less likely to fall again.

27207. I am afraid the falling takes place quite irrespective of union changeability?—I think if confined to their own locality there would be a check on that.

27208. Mr. MURKIN.—If the workhouse for the future were closed to that class, you would get rid of the difficulty?—I think it would be a great boon to the country.

Mr. Patrick
Coxey.

Mr. PATRICK COXEY, Clerk, Killarney Union, examined.

27209. Mr. D. STEELE.—Is it your experience, from what you have seen of the working of the two Acts—the old Act and the new Act—would Killarney suffer by a divisional charge?—Certainly; I believe the supervision on out-door relief now is a great deal more and more effectual than it was formerly. When a man formerly was giving out-door relief, if it was a divisional charge, all his colleagues did not mind; now, when it is a union charge, they all exercise supervision over

it, and supervise it very carefully, and, in fact, prevent it altogether.

27210. CHAIRMAN.—Have you known many cases in which, when it came to a decision, the Guardians refused the out-door relief recommended by the Guardian of the locality; now that is a concrete question?—I could not place my finger on it now, but I believe there have been such.

27211. Where out-door relief has been refused after

it was recommended by the Guardian of the division?—Yes, and the Guardian of the division may recommend an increase where it has been substantially reduced.

27212. And his recommendation is not always followed?—His recommendation is not always followed. They have passed a resolution that out-door relief is not to be increased without a notice of motion.

27213. That you are aware, is illegal?—I am; but it gives the Guardians an idea of what is going on. The out-door relief long ago used to come to £2,000, and now it is down to £1,500.

27214. Mr. MURKIN.—When you speak of long ago, what date do you mean?—Before 1895, before the Vice-Guardians came to Kildarey Union; of course, the out-door relief was diminished then, and it was low for two or three years afterwards.

27215. In 1898 or 1899, what was it?—In 1899, £2,000.

27216. Because it would be no test to take 1899 of 1901?—Oh, no.

Jan. 18, 1905.
Mr. Patrick
Corry.

27217. Your evidence is certainly very different to that of the average witness. Most witnesses say that since union rating has been established the supervision of out-door relief is not as close or as careful as it formerly was?—I could substantiate it by fact and proof that the supervision of out-door relief is a great deal more; because now the whole Board takes an interest in it, and formerly only one person or two took an interest in it.

27218. CHAIRMAN.—Did you hear that very interesting evidence of the Chairman of the Keshmone Board of Guardians; does not that show that the ratepayers of the district are a very real check on the individual Guardian?—I don't think that affects them very much.

The sitting terminated

Feb. 4, 1905

FIFTY-FOURTH PUBLIC SITTING.—WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 1st, 1905.

At the Boardroom, Croon Workhouse.

Present:—Mr. MICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURRAGHAN, and Dr. COBY BODEN.

Mr. JAMES COSTELLO, P.L.C., examined.

Mr. James Costello.

27218. CHAIRMAN.—What is your opinion on the general question of amalgamation of unions? Do you think, taking the general question throughout all Ireland, or throughout the Co. Limerick, or any other district you are acquainted with—do you think it would be desirable that any union should be dissolved?—I have no information whatever on the amalgamation of unions in general throughout Ireland; I simply confine myself to the financial position of our own as compared with the surrounding unions. I object to the dissolution of this union, because no matter how the poor may be benefited, if they are benefited at all, the ratepayers will suffer by amalgamation with the adjoining unions in consequence of the difference in rating. I certainly believe that if we are to adopt any better measures at all for the condition of the poor here, and carry out better classification, we can expend a vast amount of money in improving the condition of the poor before we come up to the standard rate of the surrounding unions.

27219. Are you the lowest rated union in the county?—Yes. I would ask you to take in evidence the figures in the Blue-book.

27220. We will do that, of course.—That is our main point.

27221. We will ask Mr. Conway to prepare a form for us giving us all these facts up to date.—Then, of course, there would be a great difficulty, if this union was dissolved, in removing the poor people. It is very hard; the doctors find it difficult to recommend their removal in many instances.

27222. What is the most distant part of your union from Croon?—Ballygarry, to the east.

Mr. Kelly.—It goes ten miles further west.

Witness.—Our main argument is this: that no matter how we may set to work improving the condition of the poor—and we can make many improvements and better their condition in many ways—we will not afterwards come up to the standard rate of the surrounding unions.

27223. Your objection, so far, is mainly on the ground of the possibility of extra expense to the ratepayers of the Croon Union?—It is, by dissolving this union.

27224. I am not saying such a scheme is possible, but if it were possible to make a scheme by the Commissioners who are here, taking into consideration not merely this union and the adjoining unions, but the unions of all Ireland, and making a series of schemes under a general scheme for all Ireland, and if under such a scheme the existing rates that you pay here in Croon could be reduced by some change without inflicting any hardship on the sick—I am only supposing that—would you then have any objection in addition?—Surely, any rational man could not in such conditions.

27225. If the present rates could be pulled down, and at the same time no hardship caused to the sick, is there any other reason that you personally could put forward why Croon should be allowed to have its own workhouse as at present?—I don't know of any other under such circumstances, if we get these conditions. I am not a ratepayer at all; it is more in the interests of the poor than of the ratepayers. I would like to have the poor served within the limits of justice and fairness.

27226. You say you are not a ratepayer?—Only a very small one, indeed; and, personally, it does not concern me, but I represent the district.

27227. But looking at it as regards merely the question of breaking up this union and amalgamating it with Rathkeale and, say, Kilsaule, on the present Poor Law system, you are of opinion that it would be a distinct loss to the Croon Board of Guardians?—Undoubtedly.

27228. But if a scheme such as you have not in view could be introduced which would be a saving to the ratepayers, and still no hardship to the sick, that would take away your main objection?—It would.

27229. In considering the question of breaking up the Croon workhouse, had you in your mind an idea that the sick could no longer be treated here in Croon?—I had.

27230. But if the sick would continue to be treated in Croon?—Of course, I have no knowledge of how that scheme might be carried into action.

27231. And if the only people who would be removed would be the healthy, would you still see much objection to the change?—I would have every objection to have any contact with the surrounding unions.

27232. Supposing your own District Council was left untouched and would still continue to exist?—I believe that would be a wiser policy, for I certainly think a man acting in a dual capacity as District Councillor and Poor Law Guardian, going to one union as Guardian—

27233. Oh, I had no such idea; supposing the District Council remained and continued to be the Poor Law authority, as at present, and they would still meet and look after the people whom they had under their charge, say the sick, and also administer the outdoor relief, and pay so much a head for such able-bodied people as might be moved from the Croon Union to any other place?—That is, if it would not incur any extra expenditure.

27234. Subject always to the rates being lowered?—Certainly; we would agree with that thoroughly, and think it a very sound policy to adopt here.

27235. There are a large number of classes of inmates in this workhouse. First you have the sick. If we leave the acute sick here to be taken care of as heretofore, then the next class would be, say, the lunatics—there are some lunatics here. Would you see any objection to taking away the lunatics and putting them either in a lunatic asylum if there was room?—I don't know that there is any need of taking them away; I think they are fairly well cared for here.

27236. Are you aware that is not the general opinion of those experienced in looking after such things; the general opinion is that lunatics cannot receive that care and have that amount of exercise and employment that is desirable for them in a workhouse, in any workhouse?—We have no lunatics here except imbeciles; they are incurable in every sense of the word.

27237. I mean people with a diseased brain; call them idiots, lunatics, or imbeciles, what you like; any people suffering from brain disease you have some here, practically?—No.

27238. Then it does not affect you much here; you already do what is considered the proper thing; get them taken into the lunatic asylum?—Quite so.

27239. Another class you have to consider are the girls who come in to have illegitimate children?—These are hardly any in Croon.

27240. But still there are some from time to time. Would you approve of the suggestion that has been made to us in a great many places by Guardians and persons having an interest in these cases—would you approve of removing these inmates, or, rather, never admitting them in the future to the workhouse, but as soon as a girl who has had a misfortune, as soon as she has to go to hospital or some place of that sort three or four months before her confinement, would you approve of sending her to a Magdalen asylum or some institution under religious management, where she would be paid for out of the rates at somewhere about the same amount as it costs for her at present?—I would, surely.

27242. The witnesses who have come before us have suggested that, and the way they put it is that, sending a girl to such an institution would stop her from having further children; there would be a chance of reclaiming her and putting her in good ways and getting a situation for her afterwards, where she or the father of the child might contribute to the support of the child. That woman would come to be a burden on the ratepayers, and would not be coming back to have further children, and be a further charge on the rate?—I agree with that.

27243. That would be desirable from the point of view of economy, as well as saving the poor creature from an unhappy life. You would approve of that?—Yes.

27244. That would get a large number of women out of the workhouses in Ireland; and many of the children you have are the children of such women. Supposing the child is taken into an asylum—I don't say that such an asylum exactly exists at present—but supposing the existing asylums could be modified so that the girl could be first received into the asylum, and as soon as the time came she would be sent to the maternity hospital to have her baby, and as soon as she had her baby and could be discharged from the hospital, that she should come back to the asylum, that she would see her baby for a year or two, and that efforts would be made to bring her to a sense of her condition and try to get her on the right road again; that the baby should be boarded out as soon as possible at the cost of the mother or the father of the baby, and that you should in future exclude all such cases from the workhouse, would you approve of that?—I would, sir; but about the boarding-out, I think it is very hard to find proper persons to take charge of them generally; they take them for the sake of making some profit on them, and in spite of all the vigilance they are neglected.

27245. That is an inducement we are all liable to: we all like to make a little money. You would not like to take an entire person into your house without having compensation for him, if you know you could get compensation?—Some people are more covetous than others, and you cannot make a choice without a trial.

27246. Many small people in the country find it very hard to get a bit of ready money?—They are very apt to grasp at it.

27247. Small people rely on the earnings of hens and eggs, and they reckon on that as buying tea for them, or whatever it is; if they had so many pounds a year coming in to them—if they were small farmers those few pounds would go a long way towards buying meat?—I don't believe you will get many small farmers in the Co. Limerick to take children; the people that would take them are labourers, and they don't bring up their own children too well.

27248. They have up to this being doing it under most unfortunate conditions, living in hovels; but now going through the country it is very changed to what it was twenty years ago: you see decent houses, and they can keep their children in comfort and decency now as far as houses go?—They can; and the Compulsory Education Act may help them to send their children to school.

27249. Have you ever tried to get small farmers to take their children?—Not to my knowledge.

27250. Would it not largely come to the question of how much you would give them?—It would.

27251. If you were foolish enough to say to a farmer, "We will give you £50 a year for keeping a child," you would have great competition for them?—I scarcely would.

27252. And if you come down to a fair sum you will have a demand for them if you send them out early enough?—I would be slow to deal with parties if we bring them down to a fair rate of maintenance; the parties that would apply for them would not be the best. However, if the matter had to be tried—

27253. Are you aware that in some other unions very large numbers of these children are boarded out with farmers?—I have heard so.

27254. And they get good milk and starchout, and food of that sort?—I have seen a couple of little boys in the Rathfriland Union taken by farmers, and their lives were miserable, and I have had a fair share of it.

27255. How long ago would that have been?—Probably twenty years back.

27256. What age did they go out to the farmers?—They bought them out in service.

27257. That is hiring out, not boarding out?—But the boarded-out will be used in the same way by parties.

27258. Are you aware that there are stringent regulations now about boarding out, that ladies' committees look after them, and the relieving officers have strict instructions, and there are two ladies appointed for all Ireland to inspect these children?—Under such vigilance I would be in favour of boarding out.

27259. The cases you refer to are cases where farmers would take a grown-up child, because they knew they could get work out of them at a cheap rate. But the question I was rather putting to you was the question of boarding out a little child as soon as it was able to use its teeth, at two or three years old; so much a year would be paid for that little child to the farmer's family; there would be children in the house, and the little child would fall in with the rest; it would not cost much to keep it, and it has been found that a great number of the farmers treat these children as if they were their own?—The scheme would work very well when there would be a vigilance committee to attend to them. You may find several people that would treat them as one of their own, and other parties may be deterred from treating their badly by the inspection.

27260. Another class you have in the workhouse are the tramps and vagrants?—We are most anxious to get rid of them.

27261. We have had a great many suggestions made through Ireland that this class, if they have made up their minds to live on the public, either partly out of the rates and partly out of forced donations—that if they are going to live on the public, they should be obliged to work for the public. It has been suggested that they should be liable to arrest if found going about without any visible means of earning their subsistence—they should be liable to be arrested and placed in what is known as a labour colony under a magistrate's warrant for a certain time, and confined there and made to work either for the whole term they were put in for or for such term as the managing body of the institution thought necessary, giving them leave to go out if the managing body thought they would be fit to work again. Would you be in favour of that?—Oh, certainly. I am sure some of them are skilled workmen.

27262. A great many are warriors?—But their children would be nothing at all, and would become the very worst members of society.

27263. You would be in favour of withdrawing them from the road?—Yes.

27264. We have discussed all classes in the workhouse except one, and that is almost the largest and most important class, that is the aged and infirm. The suggestions we have received from many Poor Law witnesses were either in favour of making a central institution for such cases: have one central institution, say, for a district like the Co. Limerick; get a central workhouse that is not going to be used for the ordinary purposes, and put into that institution the aged and infirm of the county. When there the idea that was put forward to us was, that if they were put in there, and if that workhouse was used for nothing else except the sick wards, of course, for the sick, and all the rest of the workhouse for no other class except the aged and infirm, it was alleged to us that the aged and infirm could be classified according to their respectability, or in other ways, according to age and respectability, on one hand, and that it would be more comfortable for that class, and much cheaper for the ratepayers, to have them all in one institution looked after by one set of officers, and all the other officers in the county who look after the aged and infirm could be possessed and disposed with. How would you consider that proposal?—I don't know how it may work, but I certainly think that proper classification is required: it is very hard to have old people of better feelings mixed up with people of coarser habits; proper classification is most essential.

27265. Take, here, your Crown Workhouse according to its present arrangements; if you were to consult your master or doctor or anyone who has a knowledge of the classification and the apartments and wards of the institution, do you know that it would be impossible for you to carry out such a scheme of classification under existing arrangements?—I know very well that it should be done, but I don't know whether it can be done here.

27266. In my opinion it would be impossible in most workhouses to carry out any such scheme of classification under the existing system?—I don't you think it could be carried out here with the number of aged and

Feb. 1, 1905

Mr. James
Castello.

Feb. 1, 1863.

Mr. James
Conolly.

infers we have—that an attempt could be made at classification in this house.

27267. I suppose you would have about seventy; take it at from fifty to seventy—say fifty even for argument—I can refer you to Dr. Hartigan, a gentleman of long experience of this house, and I am quite sure he will give you the fullest information on that particular matter.

27268. If we suppose for a moment, for the sake of argument, that it would not be possible to classify them in this workhouse, is there any objection that you see to putting them into the central institution?—Not that I am aware of, if it cannot possibly be done here.

27269. I don't say it could not be done, of course, but supposing you could not have such classification done here would you see any reason against removing them in a central institution?—I could not very well answer that presently. But if you take away the able-bodied and aged and infirm we have no business with the house at all.

27270. Except for the sick and any other class that might be put into it in a centralising way. Suppose you were one of the workhouses that would be used for centralising some other class in, because it is not merely a question about Croon; all these questions I am putting to you are exactly the same as we have put in other unions in Ireland, it is not specially for Croon. Then as soon as a scheme for the redistribution of inmates would be considered it may or may not be that Croon would be selected as a central institution for some class?—Personally, I am in favour of improving the condition of these afflicted people in every way, but I am utterly opposed to throwing any excessive burden on our ratepayers for the purpose of assisting the surrounding unions, relieving them in any way. I think it is only fair we should help our own.

27271. I start with the idea that any change would entail a saving for the ratepayers?—Of course, I could not go into such a matter as that; it is rather wide for me.

27272. Have you noticed anything in this union about the distribution of out-door relief?—No; on the contrary I think it is distributed too small to some parties, and I certainly think the auditor is very hard in that respect.

27273. You may be perfectly sure that the auditor is not harder than the law. What change would you wish to see in the law, to give the Guardians the power to be a little more generous as you would call it, I suppose, in the administration of relief?—Parties holding one rood of land and having large families—catties in great distress, they are excluded.

27274. You would repeal the quarter-acre clause?—I would.

27275. Would you limit the amount of land to be held, or would you leave the whole matter in the discretion of the Guardians?—I think it would be better to leave it in the discretion of the Guardians; there are some poor farmers owing five or six cows, and they are worse off than the labourers; adversity, sickness, and many things make their condition very bad at times; but, of course, there should be a strict line drawn.

27276. You are aware that at present a widow with one child cannot get out-door relief?—Yes.

27277. Is that a desirable exception—would you wish to have the power of giving her out-door relief?—I would, until the child would become strong.

27278. Until your own discretion thought it time to stop it?—Yes, if the widow herself is not very well able to work she should get it.

27279. A widow with two children is eligible for out-door relief. You give it in a great number of these cases; in some I think you would not give it. Would you wish that a widow with one child should be put on the same level as a widow with two, that is, that you could give it to her, if you wished?—Oh, certainly.

27280. Have you ever thought of the question of the old married couple, living together and becoming destitute, who would have no means if they did not get relief, coming into the workhouse and being separated. Would you approve of making that class eligible for out-door relief when they are worn out?—I would, until they would become infirm.

27281. I am talking of them being infirm—the case I would assume would be a man and wife aged and infirm?—Living with a son or daughter.

27282. No; living with no son or daughter to support them?—I don't see how they could provide for themselves.

27283. They could not provide for themselves, of course, if they become destitute; I am assuming that they become destitute, they apply for out-door relief and they don't get it?—As far as they could make use of it I would be in favour of their getting it, but it won't be much value, they won't get an outsider to attend them without paying.

27284. I am not talking of them being bedridden?—But they cannot get their little necessities in the house without somebody to go for them, for water, milk, and other requirements.

27285. The view I have heard put forward about these old couples is that it is a little bit hard to oblige them to come into the workhouse and be separated. Would you be in favour of giving such people a small sum, say 5s. a week, or whatever it would be, rather than bring them into the workhouse?—Oh, certainly; any one that could maintain themselves abroad, that could be kept abroad, it would be much better.

27286. You are aware that that would be a very small sum?—Very few.

27287. There are very few married couples in the workhouse at present?—Very few; and very few outside without somebody to look after them.

27288. Therefore giving a discretionary power to give out-door relief in that case would not be very much abused; it would not apply to many?—No.

27289. Have you ever noticed, in the course of your life as a Guardian, people coming into the workhouse to be treated when sick who could really afford to pay something for their maintenance in hospital?—Well, I don't know.

27290. That is not an abuse that has come under your observation here?—No, not to my knowledge.

27291. Is there any matter I have not asked you about that you would like to mention?—There is not, sir.

Rev. T. Lax, P.P., Croon, examined.

Rev. T. Lax,
P.P.

27292. CHAIRMAN.—You are the chaplain in the workhouse?—Yes. In reference to the infirm, my idea is that they should remain in small hospitals through the country, for if not you separate them from their natural surroundings where they had spent their lives. To bring them into a central place would be like exile. There are not so many of them here. In this union you have between 100 and 110 sick generally, and only about fifty infirm people. Then you talk about classification in a central place. I think you could still have the classification in a place like this fairly; classification is not such a great matter in a country place; they are generally the one class you find there.

27293. You mean they are respectable poor people, and there is not the necessity for classifying that there is in a large city like Limerick?—Exactly. Then about the tramps; there is no doubt the nuisance is a great one, particularly here. The number of tramps seems to be excessive. The tramps were—50 May, 1864, 135; for December, 1864, 236; and for January last, 88. This is on the highway for tramps; they ought not to live on other people's industry. I have

been twenty-two years connected with the jail, and I find the tramps there are generally vicious, and if they are not inclined to work the jail should be the place for them, or some labour colony, where they would be made to work. The reclamation would be very much, but you would prevent their children becoming tramps.

27294. It would be hardly fair, if you took their children from them, that they should be given a free leg to start fresh families, perhaps?—Yes.

27295. Now with regard to the inmates?—There are about twenty-four or twenty-five well-minded. I really think the system, if it could be managed, of boarding those out under family care, would be the best. They have very little business here, and if, as in other countries, they could be put out, it would be far better; let the Guardians pay so much for each one.

27296. Would you think of having them boarded out with their own relatives or with strangers. Their own relatives very often are very anxious to get them out of their own house for obvious reasons?—I think so; the strangers would be far better; their own relatives

don't ward them, their presence would always be a reproach to them. Very many, both in the Limerick Asylum and other places through the country, could be boarded out, and there would be no necessity for any new surplus asylum.

27397. Would you be afraid, owing to the limited space in the ordinary country houses—would you be afraid that difficulties would arise in the housing of those, where they would not be members of the family?—I do not think so; of course, it would be the business of the doctor or some other to look after that; but my experience is that places could be easily got, just as easily as for the children.

27398. There is a very formidable objection to it, a matter more of medical knowledge which has come before us incidentally; but a great many of these feeble-minded and insane people, although harmless, have, unfortunately, vicious habits?—Not all. Take the Limerick Asylum; you have an average of 500 there; of that 500 you would very readily get between 100 and 150 with scarcely any of these vicious habits, or habits that might not easily be overcome.

27399. We visited an asylum lately, and were told by the Resident Medical Superintendent and his assistants that 91 per cent. of the males had those vicious habits, and the head-warden intervened and said he only knew three in the whole institution that had not?—That has not been my experience. Of course, some are liable to very sudden fits of anger, but you would not call that a vice.

27400. No, such a person would, of course, be eminently one for keeping in an asylum; you refer to those who would not be dangerous outside?—Who are a good deal imbecile, and whose mental energies, after a year or two, wear away, and the anger they show in the beginning, or sometimes, seems worn down after a certain time. I think boarding those out, as in other countries, would be a very good system.

27401. But that would have to be restricted to persons who had not filthy or vicious habits?—Certainly.

27402. We would be rather afraid, if you excluded from the number who could be boarded out those who have filthy and vicious habits, that the number would be very small?—That is a matter that should be gone very carefully into, but as far as my experience goes it is somewhat the other way. I would say, at least in any asylum if not an exceptional one, you could get 50 per cent. who could be boarded out.

27403. Are you aware of the very interesting experiment being tried at present at Yeough of keeping up what they call an auxiliary lunatic asylum. It is got up to relieve the Cork Asylum, which was overcrowded. There was an old industrial school vacant, and it was acquired by the Governors of the asylum. The Asylum Committee manages the parent house and the new Yeough house; but they put into the Yeough Asylum those harmless cases and cases that are incurable, and there they maintain them, roughly speaking they say, at about half the cost that they cost in the asylum?—I should like to know what the whole lunatic asylum in Cork costs; my idea is, if you get an auxiliary system it would be a new burden on the rates, whatever the promise now made, whereas if you have one central asylum, and then adopt a system of boarding out those who are harmless, you will relieve the congestion and things would be far cheaper.

27404. Would you be afraid that they might not receive sufficient attention in houses where they are boarded out?—They should have a special inspector to see to that, and pay visits unexpectedly and report on it, and then the parties could be punished and the patient removed.

27405. You would, obviously, like to try the boarding-out system for lunatics; it is tried in Scotland?—Yes, and Belgium; now it is getting into Germany and England. At a meeting in 1862 at Antwerp, where you had many experts, they strongly recommended the boarding out of lunatics, and our lunatics cannot be different from lunatics in other countries.

27406. No; but the houses of the ordinary farmers and labourers are not on the same lines as the houses in Belgium?—In country places in Belgium you will find very much the same condition of things prevailing with regard to houses. If you take the Co. Limerick, you would get accommodation for at least 100 lunatics. For your auxiliary asylum you may, in the abstract, draw up a very good scheme that would seem to lessen the rates, but when it goes into working order you will find the rates will be called upon.

27407. You would be afraid of starting a new institution with a fresh staff?—Yes, it must in the end grow into that.

27408. Do you think the reduction of institutions and the reduction of staffs would be likely to tend to economy?—If you increase any institution to a very large and unwieldy size then economy ceases, but if you keep a certain number at a certain reasonable size, in that way you will have the most economy.

27409. Mr. MURPHY.—Are you aware the experts say that the maximum number ought not to exceed five or six hundred in an asylum, and they have reached that in almost every asylum in the country?—But then they have not tried the boarding-out system.

27410. Are you aware that the experts seem to think it would be a dangerous experiment in this country to send out this class of people, because already they attribute the increase of lunacy to the fact that inmates temporarily recovered from their affliction go out, participate in public life, get married, and come back into the house, and then their offspring inherit the tendency; and that is one of the sources, they say, of the great increase of lunacy?—That does not meet my case exactly; I speak of the number of parties who would be beyond marrying, who are quite harmless. You speak of parties who come out for a time, get married, and then go back, and then by heredity their family contracts the disease.

27411. Don't you think there would be a danger in sending out people of that class?—It is largely tried in Belgium and in Scotland, and is a success there; it has not been tried at all in this country. It cannot cost much to try it. It would be far better to try the boarding-out system than building an auxiliary asylum. If the boarding out is a failure, they can be withdrawn.

27412. The experiment is so new, would it not be a dangerous thing for us to venture on it until it had a better trial?—No, I don't think so. Although the experiment is fairly new in some countries it is old in others. When you are fortified with two Commissions, one at Antwerp and one in Edinburgh last year, I cannot see why you are not well fortified, and it would not be dangerous for you to recommend it.

27413. Supposing some of the workhouses become empty, can you see any reason why they should not be adapted as homes for harmless lunatics?—If you empty some of the workhouses you will create the evil I speak of. The infirm people will be removed to some central place, and that is a great hardship on the poor people. Take a poor man or woman who grew up about Cork, and age comes or that person gets infirm, it would be a great hardship to send him ten or twenty miles, where he knows no one.

27414. If you take up that position, you can make no changes?—I can make large changes. I could take out the epileptics; I could keep the tramp nuisance. I would certainly have a separate institution for fallen women; I would have here only the infirm and sick.

27415. By that method you would be increasing the rates considerably. You would be retaining the staff keeping up the same expenditure as at present, but lessening the number in the house?—The number in the house would be very few; there are generally 110 sick.

27416. CHAIRMAN.—That includes the lunatics?—Anyway, say there are 200 in this house; you have about 100 of those really sick, and you have about 80 infirm; that is about 150 out of the 200. The lunatics are very few. In reality, you only get rid of two permanent parties—the lunatics, and those women and the children—and you would make a vast improvement in the hospital; you need not have the beds crowded as they are.

27417. But you could not do that without increasing the cost. Our mandate is that we are to recommend some changes that will not add to the cost?—As far as I understand, your mandate is twofold. It is, first, to try to economize; and, secondly, to make better provision for the sick poor and infirm. It is very hard to do those two things; but you will certainly make better hospitals for the sick poor and infirm, and make the aged and infirm comfortable, and there could be a great deal done for the sick. I would be quite in favour of a central hospital for the fallen women, but not for an auxiliary of any kind.

27418. Dr. MURPHY.—Has there been much consumption in this district?—Not very much.

Feb. 1, 1890.

Rev. T. Lee,
R.N.

Feb. 1, 1905.

Rev. T. Lee,
P.P.

27319. Have you considered any way in which cases could be better looked after or the disease lessened?—Certainly. I think in every hospital you should have a special place for consumption, apart from anything else; and that parties in the initial stages of consumption should be recommended to come into such a place, because in the initial stage you will have some of the family nursing the patient, as there is an erroneous impression amongst them that consumption is not contagious. So it happens, if you are in one family the oldest boy or girl get sick, the others will nurse it, and will get consumption. If you had a comfortable place for those to go to in the first stage you would do a great deal of good by your recommendation.

27320. Have you known consumption to spread much from one member to another?—Yes; I have known it go from the eldest to the youngest. You might have one or two survive, but in a family of five or six you generally have three or four affected if that family gets consumption.

27321. Do you think isolating them here would be better than having an institution for the whole county or one or two counties?—I think it would. If you have to remove them a long distance from home, the difficulty is to get them to go; for a long time it is not very acute, and they will stick at home.

27322. Then you have only a few cases here, and it is not so easy to isolate them and carry out your arrangements, to show them the benefit of open-air treatment?—You cannot have everything thoroughly like that, but you could make a vast improvement. You cannot get them removed from home to a distance in the first stages, you will only get them when it is very acute; but they will come into a place near home, and whatever can be done, I think it would be better to try and effect it in the local hospitals.

27323. We have some experience of early cases trying to get into the National Consumption Hospital at Newcastle, County Wicklow. They come from all parts, but there is not accommodation there for them?—You might have parties who are well-to-do, but my experience is it is very difficult to get the poor in the first stages to go into the hospital if it is distant.

27324. I happened to be at Galway last week, and the *Guardian* wanted to know could they get two cases into Newcastle by paying for them. They will have to wait several months, and by that time perhaps the chance of recovery has passed?—You will find in that case the disease had made fair progress before they thought of it.

27325. Even in cases that have made considerable progress, there is still a chance of the disease being arrested?—The two things would not clash. It would be a very good thing to have hospitals, like at Newcastle, scattered through the country—three or four, one for each province; but at the same time it would

be desirable to have arrangements, I think, to isolate cases here.

27326. The sanatorium should be only for early cases—to show them how they could carry out the treatment at home, and save other members of the family; whereas a hospital like this might be kept for later cases?—Consumption is making such ravages I cannot see why you should not have preventive hospitals throughout the country, and also a consumption ward attached to a place like this.

27327. CHAIRMAN.—Is there any other point you would like to mention?—Except this one. I think you are making a leverage of an "if" about rates; you think on the scheme the rates will be made all right, but perhaps after a time experience would show the opposite; and we now in this district are so situated that our rates are 1s. 6d. in the £ lower than those of Limerick or Rathkeale, our two nearest rivals; so that it would be a very dangerous experiment to try and touch this, and say you did it for the country around.

27328. If the rating area was contained as at present, that would be in your own hands?—Suppose you sent all the infirm to a central hospital; the people should pay so much per head for them, and it would not then be within our power.

27329. It would be per capita of the institution?—But then the per capita would be higher than they could do it for at home.

27330. A figure less than at present?—That is the question.

27331. You are bound to have it; where you have four or five hundred persons, you can keep them at a lower rate per head than one hundred?—We are rather suspicious in this part of the country of schemes, and you may find instead of the rate being lower that they would be higher.

27332. Take the case of Youghal. It is supposed there that the cost per head per inmate is something like £15 a year; now the cost per head per inmate in the future almshouse of the county could not be higher than it is in the Youghal Institution, and you are not keeping any inmate in this or any institution in the county at £15 per head?—My answer to that is this: first, Youghal is a newly got-up kind of thing; it is worked from Cork, and I would like to see all the figures; because Cork people generally manage the world in a very economic way, until you come into close contact with them.

27333. The things on paper?—A good deal on paper.

27334. That "if" that you referred to, was, as Mr. Murnaghan has explained, that the view we are going on is—that it is more economic, *et cetera*, perhaps, to keep up a large number than a small one?—It seems so on paper; but when you have a certainty, and lower rates, why should the ratepayers go from a certainty to an uncertain "if"?

Mr. JOHN O'KEEFE, P.P., examined.

Mr. John
O'Keefe.

27335. CHAIRMAN.—You have heard the evidence of Mr. Costello and Father Lee, and you heard from that that our idea, from evidence that was given generally all over Ireland up to the present, would be in favour of continuing to treat the sick locally; would you be in favour of what you might call a county institution for the aged and infirm, or would you be opposed to it?—If it would better the condition of the sick poor at the same rate I would.

27336. Or a lower rate?—Or lower.

27337. Would you be in favour of a central institution if the condition of the sick poor could be improved without increasing the cost?—Yes; but I thought we were summoned here to know whether this union would be ameliorated or otherwise.

27338. Would you give us your views on that?—My view on this head is that there are two questions to be answered. They are—would it reduce taxation—

Rev. T. LEE, P.P., further examined.

Rev. T. Lee,
P.P.

There is one point I wish to add. It is just about boarding out children. My experience is that the more are boarded out the better; and that institutions, whatever they are, do very little for the children.

27339. CHAIRMAN.—They keep them in good health and all that, but you think they are not as serviceable afterwards?—They are not as serviceable. Under the system of family care they grow up from youth, and will be far better able to work in after-life. That is their natural groove, but when brought together in large numbers they become half idiotic. Since the

workhouse children have gone up to the public schools they are far better than before. When they get into these institutions the boys are generally brought up to a trade. Well, as a rule, there are too many tradespeople; because you have mechanics' institutions and other things in large cities, where the children of the mechanics follow the trade of their fathers, and others, trained up differently, are put out, and don't get work, and you will find them in jails and elsewhere. The best thing for the girls would be to be reared up to know something about ordinary dairy and farm work; both boys and girls are wanted for farm work.

Mr. JOHN O'KEEFE's examination continued

Feb. 1, 1905.

Mr. John O'Keefe.

I was just going to say there were two questions to be answered in the queries we received some time ago, namely—whether it would reduce taxation, or improve the condition of the sick poor. In my opinion, it would do neither, and I would answer these two questions in the negative. I am thirty-one years in this institution, if I live until March next, and I have found the average rate of that institution during that time 2s. in the £, and I don't know, nor cannot understand, nor see any other union so low-rated as that. Then and there I don't think it would serve the condition of the newspapers one bit by altering or changing it. I must say I have no interest whatever in halting this institution here but the interest of the newspapers and the poor.

27340. Mr. MURKIN.—Am I to understand from you that the average rate since you have been a Poor Law Guardian has been something like 2s. in the £—2s. in the £ for the keeping up of this institution. We had no district Council then.

27341. CHAIRMAN.—But you had the dispensaries? We had the dispensaries, and no other union in the county could compare with that.

27342. Mr. MURKIN.—Are you not aware that there is an opinion abroad in the country that these workhouses are not desirable institutions, and that something ought to be done to reform them?—Some of them; when they are tired of the heavy rating; when they are not managed properly; but an institution such as this is—it may be better managed entirely—but it is the best of them all in my mind. If there is any good management at all it is here; and you know something of that, Mr. Mickin, for you were our Inspector here for years and years.

27343. Are you quite sure it is due to good management?—We do our best, at all events.

27344. I do not say that it is or it is not, but I would suggest it is not due largely to the fact that you have a high valuation and a low number of inmates in the house?—That would serve the purpose surely, but I don't think that Croon Union is higher rated than any other union in proportion to its inmates.

27345. Any change we suggest is to economize; our desire is to keep the cost as low, if not lower, encouraging at the same time to effect improvement, and increase efficiency?—I know that is your object.

27346. Do you think that the children should be sent into the country and reared there?—A very good idea.

27347. And don't you think it could be done at a price lower than at present?—I don't think it could be done at a price lower, but their condition would be improved.

27348. In the house they cost per head from £15 to £16 a year; you can get them boarded out for 28s. if you make 25s. a head on thirty inmates, is not that something?—Yes, provided they are properly done; but I can tell you from my experience in the country, that you won't get every house where a child is properly cared.

27349. You have no experience of boarding out in your union?—We have not.

27350. You give it no trial. I come from a union where we have given it a trial, and we have numerous cases, and are keeping our children there for something like 20s. per head, and getting them well looked after. We believe it much more economical, and much better for the children and the future of the country, to send these children out, and let them grow up with the population. Would it not be a good thing for Croon to try something like that?—It may. The only thing the children would derive benefit from would be to educate them outside, and if educated outside I think they would be good members of society by any by, not to mind the rearing of them as servants, because they mix with the country people just as if they were reared outside.

27351. On that score, under the head of children, you could save £150 a year—could not that be worth trying?—It would, if the children were properly treated, as they are here. They are very well cared for here.

27352. Guardians should insist on proper treatment; you have only your own fears that they would not be—I have heard something to that effect.

27353. CHAIRMAN.—About hired-out children?—Exactly.

27354. Mr. MURKIN.—The management of the thing would be in your own hands. If you found a child boarded out was not properly looked after, and you would have the means of finding out, because you would have your relieving officer visiting the place once a month and reporting to you. You would have a ladies' committee looking after them and their clothes, and you would have a lady inspector looking after them with a very inquisitive eye, and all those things would protect the children?—She might have something to do with protecting them, but I would not depend on a committee. I don't want to make enemies for myself. I would not like to go into a woman's house, and say—"These children are badly treated."

27355. But why would you not?—It would be my duty, I know.

27356. CHAIRMAN.—You would not get the ladies to be so nervous as that?—You have put me in a corner, where I cannot answer you.

27357. Mr. MURKIN.—Anyhow, if you could get the system improved without adding to the rates, you would be in favour of it?—Quite so; but of that I have my fear; because I don't believe that until there is some other plan adopted besides amalgamation, or what you have proposed, that it will reduce the rates.

27358. You have no other plan to suggest to us?—I have it to your heads. There can be yet something to lower the rates, some other plan adopted besides amalgamation, for to my mind amalgamation won't do at all.

27359. CHAIRMAN.—Suppose we don't call it amalgamation at all. Suppose your District Council is left untouched, and you still have the administration of the Poor Law and still deal with applications for relief outside in institutions, and suppose you keep an institution here for dealing with the sick, and pay so much for the cases that are sent to the central institution, in the same way that lunatics now are charged for over the whole county; supposing it remained a district charge still, would you be the same objection—because it would not be amalgamation, you must remember, it would be a sort of combination of buildings throughout the county for different purposes—you still would have your local body dealing with things, and Croon would be still the rating area?—Under that head you won't lessen the rates; I don't see how you can.

27360. I will tell you one way you will do it: You pension and lose your entire staff for looking after the healthy, as distinguished from the sick; you have no free to keep up in any part of the institution except your boardroom and hospital, and those items, of themselves alone—salaries, ration, fuel, and light—come to a very large sum?—Oh, I know that.

27361. Fear outside expenses would be that you would have to pay your bill for the aged and infirm and lunatics?—Would we have a saving, then, by paying outside for those?

27362. The union would remain—it would be merely a transfer of inmates?—I don't believe you would pay so much out of the rates by keeping those outside as you would lose by keeping this house in order.

27363. I suppose you can see on general grounds what Fisher Lee says may work out right enough—but on general grounds you ought to be able to keep one institution with one staff at a lower cost, with a larger number of inmates, than you would be able to keep up five or six institutions, with five or six sets of officers, light and fuel, and a small number of inmates in each, because the smaller the number of inmates the larger the amount per head it costs?—I know that very well; but, all the same—

27364. If you were to take all the police—I am not recommending it—but if you were to take all the policemen in Ireland and put them in one big barracks, you could keep them at a smaller cost than in little barracks all over the country?—I know that; but if I pay to send these poor people which you have just commended into other unions once-and-a-half as extravagant as this is.

27365. Mr. MURKIN.—Perhaps other unions are not extravagantly managed. It may be that they have a relatively low valuation compared with the number of their inmates?—There is something in what you say, but I don't know if it is a fact. How is Croon so lucky to be a high-valued union?

Feb. 1, 1905.

Mr. John
O'Keefe.

27355. CHAIRMAN.—There is another reason—that you have done things on what you may call a very close scale!—We thought so. We were very moderate in our way of doing business, while other people were very extravagant, and it would be most uncalled for to ask us to join the other unions.

27356. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—It may not be necessary to do that. All you are asked to do is to try and improve the Poor Law system in your own union, and you all agree that there is room for improvement!—Certainly; but I don't see why the Croon people should be asked to join other people.

27357. CHAIRMAN.—You are not joining!—It is all the same; when you are sending the inmates here and there you must pay for them in proportion.

27358. You would not be sending them to the workhouse of another union, you would be sending them to an institution for the inmates of a certain class for the county. Supposing you were sending them to Rathkila, Newcastle, or Croon, if these places were made central institutions they would be county institutions.—That has not existed yet.

27359. It would be what you may call an almshouse for the county!—I understand; there may be some saving in that, but we have not experience of those things.

27360. It is a jump in the dark you feel, and you don't like jumps in the dark!—No.

27361. Do you see much of the tramps?—Too many of them.

27362. Have you ever to act as a magistrate?—No, I have not that honour, if it is an honour; but then I know, that there should be hard and fast rules adopted against some of the tramps, because they are a perfect nuisance. Some of them that I have met on the roads could have been in the fields, sowing hay. If they visited a certain house or institution more than once in three months they should be sent to prison.

27363. What would you think of the suggestion mentioned earlier in the day, that if they go about the country without being able to account for why they do it, that they should be sent to the labour institution, and there obliged to labour for their support?—I think that would be rather hard; but when they come in here you have a grip on them.

27364. A great many witnesses recommend that the workhouse should be closed to this class, and that when they are found tramping about the country they should simply be brought up before a bench of magistrates, and if they cannot satisfy the magistrates, it might be a question for reference. They say—"Father and so on—So could explain I am an honest man." They could put him aside, and communicate with the referee, and find out whether his story is true. If his story is not true, and he is simply a tramp, walking about to prey on the community-at-large, it has been suggested to me that it would be a good thing in the interests of the public, and of the poor people themselves, that their children should be taken from them, if they have any, and the adult people placed in an institution where they would be obliged to work for their support?—It is a noble suggestion; but you must pass an Act for that. I would agree with that; it is a very good idea.

27365. Would you be in favour of giving the Guardians and managers of local hospitals power, in the exercise of a humane and kindly discretion, to charge as much for a person coming into the hospital as it was thought that person or his relatives could afford to pay without hardship?—Yes; but it is a very hard question to decide. Some people, apparently, may be very well able to pay, but when their affairs are looked to they would be very far from it. In two counties the committee of the county infirmary have drawn up re-

gulations, that all the patients should either themselves or their friends pay; and the governor of the infirmary who recommends the case mentions about how much he thinks that person could afford to pay. It may be as low as 6d. a week, or if it were a well-off person, and an extra amount might be necessary, it might be as high as 43 or 44. These bodies come to us, and say—"We think it would be a proper thing for Parliament to give us the power to charge patients or their friends so much a week as we think they can pay without hardship, and power for us to recover that by summary process at petty sessions." Do you think that would be a fair suggestion?—It would be very fair, provided you could arrange the amount.

27366. That would be a case for the Guardians themselves; it would be in their discretion to settle the matter. A labourer in receipt of 15s. a week would send in a child; that child coming into the workhouse hospital to be treated would, at all events, relieve the labourer of 6d. a week!—That was according to how he was circumstanced at home; if he had a big family.

27367. It would cut off 6d. a week at least!—It may; and he may want another 6d. to support his family.

27368. That would be a matter for your discretion. If he was otherwise able to pay, would it not be fair to ask him to pay that 6d., and so on, according to his means?—It would.

27369. Then you would be in favour of such a discretion being given to the governing body?—Yes. Out-door relief, I think, should be given more freely—be allowed to be given by the Guardians more freely in certain cases.

27370. In what cases would you give it more freely?—If a poor man was stricken down by a visitation of sickness.

27371. You have that power!—I don't think so. The relieving officer has power to give out-door relief, but there are many other things which would require a few shillings which the Guardians are deterred from giving.

27372. In the case of the sickness of the wage-earner of the family, don't you give relief?—We are not allowed in any case of a person having land.

27373. Would you remove the restrictions about land?—I would, certainly; because there are poor people toiling, with a few acres of land, who are, if I may use the expression, a damn sight worse off than people having no land.

27374. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—I think if the matter was brought under the notice of the Local Government Board they would permit you to give relief in that case!—It did not come within my knowledge.

27375. CHAIRMAN.—Is there anything else about out-door relief you would like to mention?—Well, no; we ought to be more liberal in giving relief, and in some cases it is too liberal.

27376. Do you like the union as large as the area of charges?—I don't see that there should be any objection to it, because the townspeople suffered long enough. In former times the tyranny of the landlords sent the poor people into these towns, and it would be too bad to compel the townspeople to pay for that wrong that was done, and it is time they should get relief. I would not be for a divisional charge, although I am speaking against myself.

27377. There are no very large towns in this union?—Croon, Ballingarry, and Adare, and they are villages.

27378. It is not a very pressing question in your union?—I would not say so; I would be very well satisfied with you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, if you left us at we are.

27379. You don't want any further improvement?—I do not; nor I don't want any change.

Mr. EDWARD CORRY, F.R.S., examined.

27380. CHAIRMAN.—What are your views on the question of the amalgamation of unions?—I would be for it if any scheme which proposed economy was brought up.

27381. If there could be a substantial saving without hardship to the sick or the ratepayers?—Yes.

27382. The expression of the opinion of your Board of Guardians, I believe, was unanimously that they did not see how any economy could be effected owing to the relatively low rates Croon has when compared with the other unions in the Co. Limerick?—Yes, sir.

27383. You have heard our discussion here to-day, in which it was not so much what was in the Guardians' mind, the question of amalgamating with other unions, but rather leaving the sick here locally and providing for the other inmates either by boarding out or sending to other county, or district, or provincial institutions?—Yes, sir.

27384. And leaving your Council as it is, the authority for dealing with Poor Law in your area, either as regards out-door relief or looking after the sick, or paying for the inmates that might be in the county or

Mr. Edward
Corry.

other institutions, the same way that you do now pay for sick people that you send to what are known as casual hospitals, hospitals in Cork or Dublin?—My belief is that any alteration will cause greater expense in our neighbourhood, any departure from the present system.

27390. Why do you think that additional expense will be incurred if you abolish the cost of the staff for looking after the healthy here, and shut up the five acres in the chief part of your building, and stop the salaries of the officers that have been looking after the healthy, and were all the healthy elsewhere?—It would appear in that way that there would be a saving, but all the new schemes I have known have abolished one old office and established two new ones.

27391. Give me an instance of that?—Well, generally speaking.

27392. Give me one instance?—I should not bind myself down to it, but it is my impression.

27393. If you give me any scheme that you had in your mind by which the reduction of one office was followed by the creation of two, I would understand what you meant?—The Local Government Act. I don't see, though we got a grant-in-aid, that we are benefited a shilling or the country improved; there is no doubt we got self-government and control.

27394. That was a solid improvement?—A solid improvement, but financially I don't see our benefit.

27395. You mean rates are as high now as before 1865, although you got large grants in aid of county cess and poor rates. Do you think the sums levied from the ratepayers are as large now as they were before 1865?—I don't say they are entirely as large, but we don't reap the benefit that was proposed or hoped for.

27396. What did you hope for?—We hoped for many things we did not receive by it. I did not come prepared to go definitely into the matter, but that is my impression.

27397. We would like to follow the working of your mind in the matter and get at the principle which leads you to object to any further continuation of leases?—If you submit a scheme after your Commission to us or to any other union in the county, which we would have time to think over—

27398. We will submit a scheme to the Government which issued the warrant to us to do so; of course it is a scheme that could not be carried into effect otherwise than by an Act of Parliament, so that before the Act of Parliament would be passed or a Bill introduced even, the country would have the amplest time to criticize it and look into it. What we are sent to get is the opinion of the local administrators on possible changes; you think that no change could be made that would not lead to greater expenditure, and I want to get from you what are the ideas that cause you to give that opinion?—Well, general experience; I did not build it on one particular case at all.

27399. If I could ever come at anything that influences your mind. Nothing was done, was there, by the Local Government Act as regards workhouses?—Nothing.

27400. Has there been any change as regards locative anyones or county infirmaries?—There has been a general change all over the country; I could not point to individual cases; I believe the county did not benefit by the grant-in-aid as it should.

27401. That was not a question of criticizing inmates?—It was not.

27402. The grants-in-aid were very large, amounting to half the poor rate and half the county cess in a certain year?—We were deprived of about 25. in the £ under any other union.

27403. That occurred owing to the exceptional rating?—The rating one year; the rate that was actually levied.

27404. Did that result from cutting down your weekly clerk's estimate?—I suppose it did.

27405. I don't see where the increased expenditure resulted from the change you mention; you get less of the particular grant than you expected, that is all; the grant was based on certain definite expenditure, on figures as they existed?—Glin, for instance; the district school—

27406. Do you think that the children who are sent to Glin cost you more per head than if you had them

in your own workhouse?—They do; and altogether they don't reap the full benefit that we expected. They are as well kept, but their position when leaving school is not so much improved as if they spent their time here, and the extra expense is not worth it.

27407. Have you seen many of the children that come from Glin?—No; but I have heard from the gentlemen here who go down and attend the meetings.

27408. Who are the gentlemen from Croon who go to Glin?—Mr. Power and Mr. Roddy are here.

27409. You have learned from them that the results of the education there are disappointing to them?—They are disappointed that the children, when allowed out, are not as useful as they should be.

27410. Mr. MURPHY.—Do you say the children out of Glin institution are less useful than those reared in your workhouse?—I have heard there is no improvement.

27411. Have you any ground more than hearsay for the statement? Did you follow the career of any of the children?—No; but just when they were allowed out they did not show more capacity to get into positions than if kept here.

27412. You were just told that, and don't know any case yourself?—I have been told of cases, but did not follow it up; I was not so much interested in them.

27413. We visited Glin and were greatly pleased with the way the institution was carried on, and the boys and girls were usefully employed; we thought it a well-conducted institution, and far superior to the workhouse.

27414. CHAIRMAN.—Was there anything else that you would like to say to us as regards outdoor relief, either as regards the extent of it or the method of it?—No; but as Mr. O'Keefe mentioned, there are cases of great necessity that are barred by having land; there should be relief given to these.

27415. Would you take away the restrictions about land?—To a certain extent I would put a limit on it.

27416. What limit would you put on it?—Say five acres; and there should be a discretionary power to the Guardians; they would not be over-generous.

27417. Are you aware how the outdoor relief has gone in this union since the Local Government Act passed?—It has increased something, not very much in some districts, but nothing alarming.

27418. Is there any dissatisfaction on the part of the Guardians on the question of outdoor relief?—I think it is fairly granted they take up the matter very carefully.

27419. Mr. MURPHY.—You would make the maximum in Croon five acres?—Yes.

27420. Five acres here in Limerick would be as good as twenty-five acres in some parts of Kerry?—Croon is about the poorest union in the county.

27421. CHAIRMAN.—Taken five acres of Skula Bog?—You will get as bad as that in the district.

27422. Mr. MURPHY.—Would not the valuation test be a little safer?—It might be, perhaps; the valuation of land varies very much.

27423. The people living in the rich lands would have a great advantage over the people living in the poor lands, who would need it most?—It does not follow; the poor lands are higher valued in proportion to their character than the good land; that is so in this union. When Mr. Griffith made the valuation this land was very fine wheat land. I know land in Kilmallock that would not grow wheat at all, yet would fetch the same bidlock you could find, and the valuation is the same.

27424. Still acreage would not be a safe standard?—Well, I would say to about the value of five acres roughly.

27425. CHAIRMAN.—The value of five acres in the Croon Union?—Yes.

27426. Have you anything to say about giving the Guardians power to charge so much to the friends of patients?—I believe that would be proper; something should be paid—od. or 1s., according to the position of the person.

27427. As regards the tramps, what do you think on that subject?—As soon as they arrive they should be put to some work.

27428. You would put them to work under restraint until they were given habits of industry?—Yes.

Feb. 1, 1903.

Mr. Edmund
Gessely.

Feb. 1, 1905.

Mr. Thomas
J. only.

Mr. THOMAS BERRY, F.R.C.S., examined.

224534. CHAIRMAN.—How many of you from Croon go to Glina?—Four.

224535. You go into Linerick street?—No; from where I live, in Ballygarry, I go by Foyes and drive.

224536. How often do you make that journey?—Once a month.

224537. And you attend pretty regularly?—I do.

224538. Do you find the committee of management, composed of Guardians from so many unions—do you find yourselves a harmonious body?—Well, yes; there may be a little rough corner at some Board, but after all they are harmonious in the working of the institution; what don't interfere with the working, if one man's views clash with another's.

224539. And they express them a little bit freely; but the institution is well managed?—Yes.

224540. Are you in favour of keeping up such a committee for the management of the institution?—Yes.

224541. Would you be in favour of turning that school into an ordinary industrial school and simply leaving it under the management of the present local officers, and to pay so much a head for the children you send?—Is it not actually an industrial school?

224542. I mean under the ordinary Industrial Schools Act; it is a Post Law school now?—I cannot say; I have not been thoroughly acquainted with the others; but so far as I think, this is working well.

224543. There are in the country a large number of industrial schools?—There are, but I am not acquainted with them, and I don't know how the other system works.

224544. Would you be in favour of keeping up the present system?—As far as I know, it is working well. There are boys getting good trades there.

224545. That would equally happen in an ordinary industrial school?—Well, whichever would be the cheapest and best for the ratepayers.

224546. The expenses of the committee are paid going there, of course?—Yes.

224547. That would be a saving?—That would be done away with if it was worked as well the other way. There may be some other expense come in in lieu of the committee's expense if it was worked another way.

224548. Do you see any other expense that might come in?—The appointment of some officers to rule the institution instead of the committee; they might be paid higher than the committee.

224549. Are you aware the ordinary industrial schools are practically owned and managed by rates?—We have none in Glina.

224550. Supposing the committee were withdrawn, and the rates left there?—If it could be managed the same as any other industrial school; I don't know would that cheapen the matter.

224551. At all events it is a new idea, that has not occurred to your mind before?—Yes; I could not give you an opinion on it.

224552. If it were an ordinary industrial school, you would simply pay so much a head for the children that

were sent there?—Then what would be done with the children not able to pay.

CHAIRMAN.—They would be charges to the country.

224553. Mr. MURPHY.—You would lose supervision, and these people may ruin the figure.

CHAIRMAN.—Have you heard of any cases of children, the result of your training, that you were not satisfied with after being at Glina?—No. I happened to get two shoemakers, young lads from my own district, and the party who got them was very thankful for them. They are two very good boys.

224554. And what he would call useful apprentices?—Yes, indeed.

224555. What did he pay for them, do you know?—I think he paid the master £5 or £6 a year.

224556. What master?—The master of the institution.

224557. They were not hired out from the institution. What wages did he give these boys when he got them out of the institution?—They started with £5 or £6 a year.

224558. And their food?—That is what I mean.

224559. Dr. BROWN.—Was he very thankful because he got so cheap?—He was thankful for their services.

224560. CHAIRMAN.—It was cheaper than a farm labourer's wages?—That was for a start, and bound to advance in time.

224561. Dr. BROWN.—How much did he advance?—I don't exactly know. One of the boys has died, the other is working on still.

224562. Have you a knowledge of any of the boys—say, two or three years after leaving?—Well, no; it is not so long since they came out. The first boy happened to get ill, and died, and the second is only a year-and-a-half with this man.

224563. What did the boy die from?—He was in bad health when he got him.

224564. Consumption?—Something like that.

224565. Mr. MURPHY.—These are the only two cases you know of?—Not in my District.

224566. Your view does not support that of the previous witnesses—that the Glina children don't turn out as well as the boys who are in the workhouse?—I am no fault to be found with them.

224567. Would you prefer Glina to the workhouse?—I would. They are very nicely trained there; well kept and nicely trained, both girls and boys. I was through the institution several times.

224568. Have you any experience of children who left the workhouse, after they went out into the world?—Not much.

224569. You don't know how they get on in after-life?—Not much.

224570. Dr. BROWN.—Have you any knowledge of the girls after they leave Glina?—I have not.

224571. CHAIRMAN.—You don't know any of them that went as servants to anyone in your locality?—I do not.

Dr. Hartigan.

Dr. HARTIGAN examined.

224572. CHAIRMAN.—Is there anything you would like to say?—They only thing I would care to say is to endorse every statement Father Lee has made with regard to the boarding out of the children, the lodging of these women that fall case, and also to try and convert as much of this place as you can into a place for old people, sick and infirm, and try to lodge the hospital for contagious diseases.

224573. Since you came here first the number of fever patients has fallen away very much?—Yes.

Mrs. Hartigan.

Mrs. HARTIGAN, F.R.C.S., examined.

224574. CHAIRMAN.—We already had your evidence in Linerick—was there anything you forgot to say to us there?—I think not. Some of the Guardians say the county makes a big grant to the county infirmary, and we in this union reap the benefit from it. Very few from this district avail themselves of the county infirmary at all.

224575. Which hospital in Linerick do they go to, if they have to go?—I don't think they go to Linerick at all; they go mostly to the Mater, in Dublin.

224576. Not to Barrington's?

Dr. Hartigan.—No.

Witness.—If the grant were distributed amongst the country hospitals they could be made more efficient.

224577. There is very little fever in the country now?—There was an outbreak at the time of the introduction of the crematoria.

224578. Until such time as the machinery was put into a sanitary condition, but with that exception you have been wonderfully free from fever?—Yes, and contagious diseases.

224579. You attribute that largely to the working of the Public Health Act?—Yes.

224580. Close the county infirmary?—Yes; make it a Linerick institution for contagious diseases, perhaps.

224581. The county does keep a fever hospital in Linerick in addition to the workhouse fever hospital?—St. John's?—I did not know that.

Dr. Hartigan.—There was an idea that Barrington's might be left specially for surgical cases, and St. John's could be for contagious diseases, and the present county infirmary given over to Linerick, and utilized for ordinary diseases.

Witness.—There are a great many people who want medical care and cannot afford to have nurses in their own homes, and if there was a district hospital they would avail themselves very much of it.

Dr. Moseley examined.

Feb. 1, 1890
Dr. Moseley.

One of the subjects that was touched on was giving outdoor relief to old, worthy people living out in the country. There is one great danger now that arises, and that is when they get ill they have nobody to nurse them. It is throwing a great strain upon the resources of their neighbours, and very often they don't rise to the occasion.

27432. CHAIRMAN.—They are not well enough instructed to do it wisely?—They very often neglect them, and very often there is blackmail levied on account of the condition of affairs. People won't go near a dying person who has always lived a very worthy life, but from ill-health or age has got poor, and has been getting outdoor relief; and I am sent for to see whether they can be removed to hospital, and he or she cannot be removed to hospital, and the next thing is to get enormous wages from the relieving officer by someone to nurse them.

27433. They see the opportunity of making a little money, and take advantage of it?—Yes.

27434. Would it meet your view if a system of joint midwife and district nurse were more largely introduced?—That would be a very good thing.

27435. It might not be such a great expenditure, having regard to the number of payments for isolated nursing?—It would not. Lately we have had cases where there were three worthy old people left in a house together; they had a little farm of land, and a cow; and I never knew such a condition as they were in. They all died between Christmas and New Year's Day. A gentleman took up the case, hearing of it from me, and really found the greatest difficulty in getting anyone to go into the house to them.

27436. Did it end in the appointment of a paid nurse?—There was a woman that undertook it, and went in and stayed up with the people with payment out of their means. I believe it was found in the end, out of their own resources, they were not very poor people, and they were not on outdoor relief. There is another case since that occurred a couple of days ago, where a poor woman was dying, just near me, and we had the greatest difficulty in getting anyone to stay up and nurse her.

27437. Is your view, with the sick who cannot be removed, that there should be some definite provision for nursing them?—There is the danger of encouraging people by giving them outdoor relief when very old and infirm, instead of bringing them into some institution where they will be cared for.

27438. Have you in your mind altogether illnesses that, humanly speaking, must terminate fatally, or an ordinary illness that may be recovered from?—It is the case of infirm poor people in receipt of outdoor relief, who die that out a little bit, perhaps, by begging, and in the end these persons have nobody to provide for them, and they die under very sad circumstances; without care, as a rule. We don't know it in time. I am just sent for to find out are they in a state to be removed to hospital, and I very often find that they would die on the road.

27439. Putting aside that case for the moment, have you many cases in your ordinary practice that you would not think of directing to be removed to the union hospital, but which would require some little poulticing or bandaging, or things of that sort, from a nurse, if there was one in existence?—Yes.

27440. Would a nurse, in other words, be fully employed in the ordinary dispensary district?—I think she would.

27441. From what you know of your patients, one with the other, would a nurse be fully occupied in going round to these people seeing your directions were carried out?—She certainly would—in my opinion.

Colonel Fisher examined.

Colonel Fisher.

I have only one word to say about outdoor relief. We have one case where a man has become a helpless lunatic, and has been sent into the lunatic asylum at Limerick; his wife and a very large family are left starving, and cannot get outdoor relief. I wrote myself to the Local Government Board, and I think they said it was against the Act of Parliament.

27442. CHAIRMAN.—You would like greater discretionary power to be given to the local Board of Guardians?—I think so.

27443. Have you thought carefully as to how far you

27432. And there is a certain amount paid?—To a midwife.

27433. And there is a certain amount paid to untrained and unqualified people for sitting up and looking after dying people?—There is.

27434. Do you think there would be very little extra expense if in future appointments the midwife of the district were also obliged to possess some general medical and surgical nursing qualifications?—I think it would be very useful.

27435. You would find it a comfort for the sick, and it would relieve everybody?—It would be a great relief to my responsibility and the relieving officer's responsibility, and a great relief to the sick people, above all.

27436. Dr. Moseley.—You have a midwife in your district?—Yes.

27437. Is she able to do the whole district?—Yes.

27438. What means has she of getting about?—A bicycle.

27439. You cannot avail of her services at all in these cases?—We would have no power to call on her at present; she is only trained in the one thing.

27440. But she would be so much better than the people you do get. Have you many cases of consumption in your district?—We have a good many cases, off and on.

27441. Do you find that it spreads much from case to case?—Very much.

27442. Goes over the whole household?—It does.

27443. What means would you suggest for the lessening of the disease?—Isolation is one thing; and if commencing cases could only be sent to a sanatorium, and be educated as to the means of isolation and the preservation of their own health, but it is impossible to teach them under present circumstances. The cottages are often very small, with a large family in them, and they are all in too small a place, breathing the poisoned air.

27444. CHAIRMAN.—And expectation freely indulged in, perhaps?—Yes.

27445. Dr. Moseley.—You find that there is very little use in telling them preventive measures?—It is the constant habit that has been formed, and this cannot be broken through by being told. I think if they could be sent for some time in the commencement of the disease to a sanatorium they would be drilled, and would understand the difference when they came back.

27446. They would know what to do, and become accustomed to it?—Yes.

27447. You heard what Father Lee said about having wards in the local hospitals as well, perhaps; for advanced cases do you think that is necessary?—I think some form of isolation would be of great use, different from sanatorium treatment, to protect the other members of the family in a small house.

27448. Where they cannot be properly nursed?—Where they cannot be properly nursed.

27449. And the very fact of having a sanatorium for the earlier cases might have an effect on the larger number of more chronic cases going into the local wards?—Yes; I think it would lessen the disease, certainly.

27450. CHAIRMAN.—You know the County Clare, of course, very well. We had evidence at the inquiries we held in Clare and Limerick as to Corofin being a good place for a sanatorium for Clare, Galway, and Limerick?—I know it stands fine and high, but I have not been through the place. It is very well situated.

27451. That would be convenient. Practically, there is well from nearly every workhouse in the three counties. There is a railway that brings the patients to Corofin?—Yes; I think it would be very convenient, and easily got at.

27452. I thought just as the other witnesses said

27453. You would remove the quarter-acre clause, and allow discretionary power for further cases?—Yes; we have all been speaking over it.

27454. Have you noticed anything you would consider an abuse in the administration of outdoor relief in the union?—I cannot say I have. All the Guardians do the best they can, as represented to them.

27455. And the amount is not excessive, in your opinion?—I think not.

The Sitting terminated.

FIFTY-FIFTH PUBLIC SITTING—MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 25TH, 1905.

At the Courthouse, Cork.

Present.—Mr. MCKEE (Chairman), Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. COOKE BIGGER.

CHAIRMAN.—We shall be glad now to hear any evidence from the County Council.

Mr. E. COLLAMAN (Secretary).—I am the Secretary, and I did not get any instructions. The County Council did not appoint delegates to attend here.

CHAIRMAN.—Then, as far as you know, they are going to leave this matter to the local unions themselves.

Mr. COLLAMAN.—Of course, it was understood that any member of the County Council may come forward, and in his individual capacity give evidence.

CHAIRMAN.—But they are not taking corporate action?

Mr. COLLAMAN.—No, they are not.

CHAIRMAN.—Then we will take each of the unions afterwards. This evening we will take up the question of a sanatorium for Cork.

Dr. P. J. CREMIST examined.

Sept. 25, 1905.

Dr. P. J.
Cremist.

27527. CHAIRMAN.—You are the Chairman of the Cork Branch of the National Association for the Prevention of Consumption?—Yes, sir.

27528. You are a long time connected with some of the medical institutions of the city?—I have been physician to every hospital in the city in turn.

27529. Now, if you would give us your own views about this question?—A rate of 1d. in the £ has been levied by all the District Councils in the county—this amounts to about £5,500 a year—for the purpose of erecting a sanatorium or hospital for cases of consumption in the early stages. A site has been chosen, but not yet approved of by the Local Government Board.

27530. The approval of the Local Government Board is required for the purpose of getting a loan for building, I suppose?—Well, it is required, I think, for the sanction of the site. As to the desirability of erecting such institutions, I should wish to perfect my evidence by a few remarks, as it appears to me that the scope of sanatorium treatment seems to be much misunderstood, even by the educated classes, in this country, many of whom seem to think that its advocates look upon it as the sole panacea for the cure of consumption. I wish to state emphatically, as I have often done before, that this is not so; and that it must occupy a minor, although important, position in any scheme for eradication of this disease, and will ask your indulgence whilst I quote a few statistics as to what has been done by other measures, or at least principally so. The mortality in England and Wales in the years 1881 to 1885 was 28.05 per 10,000, in the period 1895 to 1900 it diminished to 15.23 per 10,000. What was the cause of this diminution in the mortality? Koch's discovery of the tubercle bacillus was not made until the close of the nineteenth century, so that it cannot be attributed to that. The only conclusion that can be arrived at by the best authorities on the subject is that it was brought about by—1st, better feeding, owing to rise in wages and fall in price of food; 2nd, better housing, owing to increased prosperity; 3rd, better conditions of factory life after Factory Acts imposed shorter time, more space, better ventilation, and removal of injurious products; 4th, better drainage, lessening dampness of dwellings and work places, ample hospital accommodation, and most efficient public health service. In my opinion, no sanatorium or other treatment will ever supersede those measures which tend to check the spread of infection and other diseases, encourage thrift and temperance, and raise the physical and moral condition of the people. Whilst fully recognising this, we now know that phthisis cannot exist without the tubercle bacillus,

and with that knowledge few will have the hardihood to say that we would be warranted in withholding what may be termed the direct means to aid us in the extermination of this pest and which have proved so successful in other countries. They are as follows:—1st, sanatorium treatment in convalescent institutions, where the patients are treated in the most modern methods of arresting the disease. 2nd, homes for isolating the advanced cases, which are the most infectious. 3rd, notification of the disease and disinfection. 4th, regaining of spitting. 5th, suppression of infected food. I will quote just now for you a few statements as to what has been done in Prussia and New York by what are called these direct means. The figures published in Prussia show that the tuberculosis death-rate in the country dropped from 31 per 1,000 in 1896, the year after Koch's discovery was made, to 21 per 10,000 in 1900. That has been attributed in a large measure to direct measures—that is, compulsory notification, isolation in sanatoria, and, of course, improved sanitation. Under similar conditions, the death-rate in New York diminished by 30 per 10,000 in twenty years. The death-rate in Scotland is only half what it was forty years ago. Although it cannot be claimed for the open-air treatment that it is a sure and certain remedy for every case of this disease, it can be stated, without fear of contradiction, that no other form of treatment in the history of medicine has ever been so successful, and that, provided the patient be taken in the very early stage of the disease, the percentage of arrest or recovery is very high. In short, a sanatorium would be educational, curative, and remove for the time being a focus of infection from the family of the person attacked. Of equal importance is the erection of homes for advanced cases of consumption, for these are the most infectious, and hence the most powerful agents in spreading the disease in small, confined, over-crowded, and ill-ventilated houses. Although the infectivity of phthisis is very low, as compared with other diseases, in a country like Cork, where the mortality is increasing by leaps and bounds, very active measures should be taken if it is hoped to achieve success. Hospital accommodation for the humble middle class is entirely inadequate; they are loth to enter the workhouse; the general hospitals won't have them; hence they remain in their own homes, a constant source of danger to their families. There is no special hospital in the county or city for the treatment of consumption, which causes more deaths than all the infectious diseases put together, while, strange to say, we have special hospitals for nearly every other class of disease. Looking at sanatoria from the financial side, we have no precedent in this country to go by, so must go farther afield, and see

what has been done in other parts. A few years ago a law was passed in Germany making it compulsory for everyone over sixteen years of age, and earning under £200 a year, to insure against sickness. The insurance companies were heavily hit by consumption, and found that nearly one-half of all their sick pay was devoted to consumptives.

Acting on medical advice, and purely on business grounds, they decided to erect numerous sanatoria all over Germany on the most approved and up-to-date principles. The German insurance societies have found by experience that as a matter of business, and apart altogether from philanthropy, it is cheaper to place their patients in sanatoria and cure them, or add a few more working years to their lives, than to continue to pay sick-pay for an indefinite number of years; for we know what a slow and insidious disease it sometimes is. This, to my mind, is the most eloquent testimony as to the great value of sanatoria.

27521. The insurance companies, I gather from you, themselves, out of their own funds, erected the sanatoria?—Yes; they are State insurance companies.

27522. Not joint stock?—Not joint stock. They are connected with the State; and I might mention that the State subsidises them in this way—that the Commissioners of Woods and Forests in Germany make them a present of a site, as far as practicable, whenever they have it, suitable for a sanatorium.

27523. Have you any figures to show the receipts and expenditure of any of these institutions, and how far they are financed out of the receipts from the patients themselves?—No, I have not any particulars on that point, sir; but I think a very large number of them are free.

27524. They would be intended for people with incomes under £200 a year?—For the workers. Everyone over sixteen years of age, and earning under £200 a year, is obliged to insure, and pay so much yearly to the insurance companies; and then, one of these insurance companies have a fund, by which they meet these sanatoria, and treat workers that go there free; and then, in addition to that, they help to support their families outside; give them a kind of outdoor relief whilst the workers are in these sanatoria; but I don't think that is the State Insurance Sanatoria they pay anything; I think they go in free.

27525. The institution is entirely maintained out of Imperial, not local, funds?—Out of the State Insurance funds, which is Imperial revenue. The patients themselves contribute to the funds by their weekly or annual payments, and the Government then, where possible, present them with a site through the Commissioners of Woods and Forests in Germany. But of the paying sanatoria in Germany, I have not any record.

27526. Will you tell us now something about the prevalence of phthisis in the city of Cork?—In the city of Cork the mortality from phthisis in 1881 was 30 per 10,000, and it has increased from that to 45 per 10,000 in 1904. Three years since, when we started the Association for the Prevention of Consumption, it stood at 38, and then fell to 37 last year; it has increased this year to 46. That is, in one year the mortality from phthisis in the city of Cork has increased 9 per 10,000.

27527. That might be from some registration arrangement?—I cannot say that; I don't think so.

27528. Dr. Brooker.—It was 39 one year and 35 the next, I see?—That 45 per 10,000 is a record. It is far and away the highest of any in the United Kingdom, and it is the record for Cork. Cork never reached 45 per 10,000 before. The only possible explanation I could think of is, it might be the very large number of deaths that we have had from phthisis in the Lonsdale Asylum, and that might have added something to the mortality of the city; but later on I will show you what I think is the reason of it. The deaths in the Lonsdale Asylum might have accounted for some, because I heard there were a great many deaths in the Lonsdale Asylum from phthisis last year. That might account for it. You will have the evidence, very probably, of the doctors of the asylum, who will be able to inform you on that matter.

27529. You have no idea how many deaths there were in the asylum?—No, I have not.

27530. CHAIRMAN.—Or whether they were country or city cases?—No, I could not tell you anything

about the asylum, but I am sure Dr. Woods will give you all the information. We had 352 deaths from phthisis in Cork last year.

27531. Dr. Brooker.—The increase of 9 per 10,000 would account for 72½. Yes, that would be about it exactly.

27532. CHAIRMAN.—Then Cork appears to be at the head, unfortunately, of the whole country as regards phthisis?—It is the highest in Great Britain, and the last death-rate is the highest on record. The extent to which phthisis prevails in the city of Cork is shown by Table 1, that is the table I have just read for you, where it has increased from 30 to 45. You will see that the increase in mortality from 1881 to 1904 is 15 per 10,000. This is certainly very startling, especially when you note that within the last year it has gone up by 9 per 10,000. It is worthy of note in the same table the low rate for epidemic disease, only ten, the lowest we have had at any time.

27533. That includes every kind of fever?—Yes, that is from all kinds of epidemic diseases—measles, scarlatina, typhoid, and enteric. The number of deaths in Cork Union alone increased in the same period from 880 to 703. I have not been able to get a separate return of cases of phthisis for Cork county. I estimate the number of consumptives in Cork city at about 1,000; it is more difficult to estimate the number in Cork county, as no separate return is given, but I should think that 2,000 would be rather under than over the mark. This makes 3,000 for the county and city; two-thirds of this number would represent the workers. The next point we have to consider is the whereabouts of the afflicted ones. In Table No. 3 you will perceive that at the present date the workhouse hospitals in the county account for only 53, Cork Workhouse Hospital for 85; this makes a total of 138 patients in the workhouses of the county and city of Cork. General hospitals give the following return:—South Infirmary, none; Mercy Hospital, none; North Infirmary, 4; St. Patrick's Infirmary, 35; Protestant Infirmary, 12. This shows the fact that at this present moment there are only 175 patients in hospital in the county and city of Cork out of a total of 3,000, and that you have 2,825 in their own homes spreading the disease, without any efficient system of notification or disinfection. The reason is not difficult to ascertain. The general hospitals will not have them, they will not enter the workhouse hospitals, and the infirmaries are utterly inadequate for the requirements of this large county and city. As to its spread in the county, it may be worth while quoting a few remarks of the Registrar of the county in the last quarterly return:—“The Registrar of *diphtheria*—There has been a marked increase in consumptive cases during past six months. The Registrar of *Cholera*—Phthisis pulmonary and tuberculous diseases of all kinds are spreading owing to careless disinfection, isolation, and sanitation in general. The Registrar of *Schell*—There were seven deaths registered from pulmonary tuberculosis during the past quarter, out of a total of twenty-three. This disease is becoming a perfect terror in the district. A country doctor, to whom our Secretary wrote for a return of the number of cases in his district, replied as follows:—“I don't think I had more than ten in hospital at any one time, but I always have from six to twelve on hands; this includes dispensary and private patients. A great many emigrate to America from this part of the county, and several return with phthisis.” I know several doctors in the county, and consult them occasionally, and they all agree as to consumption being spread in this way by returned emigrants from America, coming home among their friends, and consumption breaks out in these districts, and it can be traced to that cause.

27534. In the first place, to the home of the returned emigrant?—Yes, and then it spreads to the entire county. I suppose that, too, requires some legislation. These people would not be taken in America if they went over in bad health, and yet they return in bad health here.

27535. We are obliged to take them?—I recognise the importance of what this doctor said of the great spread of disease by those returning emigrants in the county, not so much in the city. He considers the homes that children under ten years of age are compelled to attend school are entirely too long.

Sept. 25, 1905.

Dr. P. J. Crockett.

Sept. 25, 1906.

Dr. P. J.
Crimm.

27535. Is it five hours a day?—In the infant schools only four or five; but I made inquiries and I think I was told that although the hours laid down are only four or five, very often these children are kept in by the teachers beyond the prescribed hours. Nobody could take exception to the hours prescribed by the Commissioners, but I have been informed that these children very often are kept beyond the prescribed hours. That, of course, is a matter for inquiry; I don't state it authoritatively. And another matter connected with schools. In the last Report of the Education Commissioners it is stated that there are practically a thousand schools in Ireland without any sanitary accommodation whatever, and that for the remaining number of schools there is no organised system of cleaning the sanitary annexes.

27537. Do you think, with the open air there is about these places, that might be serious?—I do. I think there ought to be sanitary accommodation in every school.

27538. But I mean the habitual cleaning carried out by the Public Health authority?—Either by the Public Health authority or the person that has control over the school. I think that is a very serious factor in the health of the school; that there is no systematic rule laid down for the cleaning of the sanitary annexes. "These schools are often very badly ventilated, and I believe it not infrequently happens that children, teachers, and assistants are suffering from phthisis. If you want to prevent its spread far more strict supervision should be given to the schools." These are the remarks of this doctor from the country; they are not my remarks; but I give them to you for what they are worth. I think that the schools require a great deal of supervision. Of course, they are well-managed schools and cleanly-kept schools.

27539. Ventilation would be one of the chief things?—Yes. And then not keeping the children beyond the prescribed hours, and proper sanitary accommodation, and looking after the cleaning of the sanitary annexes. Some regular, systematic way of doing so.

27540. Can you give us any information as to the prevalence of phthisis among children as distinguished from adults?—I don't think the Registrar-General's Return gives that, but the highest mortality is between 15 and 25 years of age. I heard it has lately become prevalent amongst children in Cork Workhouse.

27541. Pulmonary?—Yes; and I think that sanatorium treatment by itself in this county and county borough can do very little. The great difficulty that confronts one is where the funds are to come from to complete the scheme. The increased hospital accommodation that would be required is a sanatorium for early cases of about forty beds, three homes for advanced cases in the county, and one in the city.

27542. Only forty beds?—I think forty beds would be enough to start the sanatorium, because it is only the very early cases that would be taken into it; and forty beds would represent that from 120 to 160 patients in the year could be treated there. And the reason I suggest forty beds is because I think it would be well to limit this sanatorium entirely to cases in the early stage; not to take in advanced cases whatever; because in the early stage of the disease is your only hope of arresting the disease. If the disease gets hold of the patient to any extent, cure is very problematical.

27543. It may be arrested if the disease had been with a person for some time?—It might be; but I say it is problematical. If you can get a case in the very early stage, and put that case under proper sanatorium treatment, you can very readily, you cannot say to a certainty that a patient will recover, but you can say a very large percentage of them would recover.

27544. You spoke of 3,000 cases, roughly, as being the probable number of phthisis patients in the county and city; suppose 3,000 of these would be people who really could not pay for getting proper treatment themselves, how many of the 3,000 would be at the present moment, do you think, cases that you might treat in a sanatorium with forty beds?—A large proportion of those 3,000 would be advanced cases, coming under these headings—humble middle class in towns, small farmers in county districts, and the very poor in county and city. I would suggest that the two first classes be treated in the homes for advanced cases, or auxiliary sanatoria, and the latter,

if possible, should be induced to go into the isolation wards in the workhouse hospitals. It would certainly be better if all classes could be treated outside the workhouse, but financial reasons may not permit of this. All incipient cases of phthisis of every class should be sent to the sanatorium for early cases as far as accommodation would permit.

27545. Are you speaking now of acute and hopeful cases?—Yes, and advanced cases.

27546. You would not leave any of those in the workhouses?—I would not leave any cases in the workhouses. Any hopeful cases I would send to the sanatorium, but ones that were not hopeful I would cater for in the homes for advanced consumptives and isolation wards of workhouses.

27547. If you were starting straight off, do you think forty beds would be at all adequate for the number you have to deal with; it might be if it was a going concern for a number of years?—Well, I think it would be fairly adequate at the start; the county could not do any more; they could not be expected to contribute more than £6, in the £8.

27548. And that would not see you further?—That would not see us much further, especially when we have now to think about the purchasing of the site; for when we first started the project we were offered a site free. Now we have to contemplate the purchase of the site, and I think that catering for 160 out of 2,000 workers would be very fair. It would be as much as we could do. Of course, it would be desirable if we could cater for double the number.

27549. Dr. Brogan?—You would not be catering for 160 out of the 2,000, you would be only catering for 40?—That is of the early cases. You would be able to treat 160 in the year.

27550. Yes, but you have more than 2,000 in the year; I think your estimate is very low?—I think it is low myself.

27551. In Cork city alone there were 360 deaths, and the average duration of consumption is five years?—I thought it was three.

27552. If you multiply 360 by five?—By three. It is laid down by most authorities that three years is the average.

27553. But, even so, forty beds seem to me to be totally inadequate?—It is very low.

27554. You would have a great difficulty in discriminating who should get in?—Yes.

27555. CHAIRMAN.—You are limited by your funds?—Principally by the funds. I quite agree if we could do more it would be very desirable to do that.

27556. Dr. Brogan.—If you get £3,500 a year, surely you ought to be able to keep from 80 to 100 for that?—The present idea is that the purchase of the site alone will cost something about £1,500 or £2,000; and then, with the erection of buildings and everything else like that—I saw some remarks from gentlemen at the Oireachtas Hospital Board—it would bring the whole scheme up to £20,000.

27557. Of course, you would borrow £20,000?—Yes, at 5 per cent, paying off capital and interest, that would be £1,500; and then you would calculate 20s. a week for supporting each consumptive, at the lowest.

27558. £20,000 is a large amount to spend on an establishment with forty beds?—Our original plan was this: we were offered a site free for a consumptive hospital; we went into a calculation of how many beds we could support; we found it would cost us £7,500 to erect the hospital, say £8,000, in round numbers; that would be 2000 interest, and then we had the whole £20,000, or very near it, for starting; but the turn affairs have taken here altered the position entirely.

27559. How much do you calculate a consumptive in a sanatorium costs?—From 25s. to 30s. altogether.

27560. CHAIRMAN.—We had better not go into details now; we are merely now looking into the question of how far in the building up of workhouses, the workhouse buildings might be available for this or any other purpose?—To compensate for that small estimate of a home for early cases of consumption, I think we would want as sanatoria for advanced cases what I would call three auxiliary sanatoria, or advanced homes, for consumptives, with 150 beds for the county, 50 each; and, in addition, we would want in the city of Cork a home for advanced consumptives, with 100 beds, and beside that we would require a central dispensary in the city entirely devoted to the treatment of phthisis, where consumptive people could inquire at various stages, and where they could be treated and get directions as to food.

27561. An intelligence department?—Exactly; and I should say a recognition of the public health service, not alone in the county, but in all Ireland, and assimilating it to England. This will doubtless be considered a large order, but even more will be necessary to check the spread of this disease; and, as I previously mentioned, notification and disinfection are absolutely indispensable. With reference to the County Medical Officers of Health, I think it would be a great advantage to this country generally, outside of the sanatorium question, if there was a County Medical Officer of Health for each county, for in a great many instances in the country there is no doubt in the world that the sanitary law is more or less a dead letter, for many reasons, which it is unnecessary to go into; the principal, I think, from want of County Medical Officers of Health to supervise and organise the units that exist at present; and I think that the great success that has been attained in England of late years has been due to their efficient Public Health service, including these County Medical Officers of Health. At the present time the Local Government Inspector has to do that duty, and I am sure that he has much more than he can do outside that altogether.

27562. You did not think of a site for these three institutions of fifty beds each? I think it would be well to have one in the centre, and one in the east, and one in the west; because if you place these in inconvenient positions, I don't think you will get innumerable cases to go into them. They must be somewhere about Miltown on one side and Donmoy on the other—Quee so; or Mallow and Bally, or a place that be thoroughly over-run with phthisis, like Millstreet. It is about the worst part of the County Cork, and one of these auxiliary sanatoria, if it was erected at Millstreet, would do a great deal of good for that part of the county and the surrounding districts.

27563. Do you know that district?—I know it well.

27564. And if the Millstreet Guardians wish to close their workhouse and turn it into a sanatorium, do you think it would be a good site?—I don't know the inside of the workhouse.

27565. It is high on the hillside, with a good gravitation water supply?—I know the outside of it, but I was never in it. I think it would be all right. Of course, if you look to get the best house for advanced consumptives in the county I should say Miltown. The air of the surrounding districts is better than most other places.

27566. It would be fairly accessible for the different parts?—Yes. Notification and disinfection, I think, are absolutely indispensable. It would enable you to trace the source of the infection, which is a very important thing. A rate of 12. in the £ would be sufficient for the erection of a sanatorium and maintenance, as far as the forty beds go; but I quite agree with Dr. Bigger that the estimate is an extremely low one.

27567. The estimate of the number of beds?—Yes. I think it should be a county-at-large charge, or a union charge, in proportion to the number sent there from each of the respective unions, and the length of time spent by those persons in the sanatorium. The governing body, I think, ought to be the County Council, or a committee appointed by them.

27568. That would be hardly a satisfactory financial way to work it. You would want something from each district to pay establishment expenses; and besides, you would suggest, I suppose, that each patient should pay so much per head for the week?—Yes.

27569. But each district should contribute to the general working expenses—salaries and so forth first. For instance, a place like Miltown, that had very few patients, would you propose it should get off altogether or contribute a certain proportion to the salaries and general expenses, with a right to get patients in at so much a head afterwards?—It would be very hard to ask Miltown to do that, where there is so little consumption in the district.

27570. You could not finance the institution if you did not do something like that?—If you erected a consumption hospital in Tughril or Miltown or Millstreet, where the place is over-run with phthisis, then you could fairly ask the district to finance it, but I think erecting the hospital in Miltown, where

there is little or no consumption, you could scarcely ask the Miltown people to do it.

27571. It would be virtually a county charge—each district contributing its share to the expense of the doctor and nurse, and so forth, and then for each patient that went in at so much a head besides?—Do you speak of the curative sanatoria?

27572. Any institution?—My idea is that for the curative sanatorium you could not have a better place than the county-at-large charge; and the reason I suggest the County Council as the governing body is with a view that this sanatorium system would extend in Ireland, and it is very difficult to organise an entire county; that is, to get all the District Councils of the county to be unanimous in levying a rate, as we did have in the County Cork. It was a very difficult thing to do, and I think the same difficulty would be experienced elsewhere. If it was entirely under the care of the County Council, all that would be necessary for anybody to do would be to approach the County Council instead of going to twenty-one or twenty-two District Councils, as we had to do in this case.

27573. Why would the stage of the disease be a reason for having a different system of charging for the patients? If you have the first stage people supported by the county-at-large, why should you not have those in the second, or later, stages also financed in the same way?—I think the county would object to pay.

27574. It is not the county in any sense. Parts of the county would have to make it up, no matter whether it is a county-at-large rate or charged proportionately on the districts?—I think the county thinks they have enough to pay in the id. in the £, and if they had to support these auxiliary sanatoria I think they would desert.

27575. You think they would not like to have the whole thing under one committee, in the same way as they have their lunacy work done?—I think if the Government contributed in the same way as they do for lunatics, a certain amount, by a capitation grant, for the support of these advanced consumptives, then, perhaps, the county might be asked to do something; but I don't think the county volunteering to be responsible for id. in the £, that you could go to them again, and ask them to provide for three auxiliary sanatoria.

27576. Here is the way it presents itself to us. Suppose a workhouse is closed, any workhouse you like, Miltown or Millstreet, and it is decided to have one of those houses for more advanced cases there, these would be admitted from outside the union in which the building is situated, how would you propose the people should pay; suppose the Miltown people with the workhouse there as one of these houses for chronic cases?—Are you speaking of paupers?

27577. Well, I don't like the words?—Are you speaking of the poorer class—poor people or workers?

27578. I am speaking of the poor people?—Of course, it would be just as cheap, if you speak of the poor people that go in and use the workhouse hospitals. It would be just as cheap for the different unions to pay for them in the Miltown Workhouse as in Mallow or Millstreet.

27579. You see, Miltown will first have to set the concern going—appoint doctors and nurses. You propose that that expense should come out of the Miltown pocket, and they should recoup themselves by the patients coming in from outside, at so much a head per week?—I think that scheme would be rather difficult to work.

27580. Dr. Bigger.—Would it not be much better to have it administered from one centre? For instance, if one institution was full and another nearly empty, would it not facilitate matters to send patients in the county to any of those, if it was a county charge?—I say it should be a county-at-large charge.

27581. For all?—Not for all; for the curative sanatorium. I think if it was a county-at-large charge for supporting 150 additional people, that it would be an enormous burden on the rates.

27582. Won't it come off the outpatients, in any case?—There are a great number of people outside—the humble middle class that are not in hospital at present, that would avail of hospital treatment, if it were there. These workers don't go into the hospitals at present, therefore the rates are not burdened.

27583. If they are able to pay you would be able to charge them?—Certainly, but they may not be able to pay.

Sept. 25, 1903.

Dr P. J. Cress.

Sept. 25, 1915.

Dr. F. J.
Crewes

27584. Would not that go to help to support the institution?—It would.

27585. Would it not tend to better management and all that sort of thing, the same as county infirmaries are at present; they are largely supported by people going in and paying?—Yes, I would propose that a certain amount be contributed in that way by paying patients.

27586. How could you have three centres in the county for sending a certain class of consumptives, unless you had it under one management?—It would be rather difficult.

27587. CHAIRMAN.—It is hardly fair, perhaps, to carry you to figures. You have given us very valuable evidence about the disease and the methods of coping with it, but with regard to the financing?—I have an idea on that matter, that the Government, who have expended large sums of money in exterminating the plague and other kindred diseases in India, should, here in Ireland, where we have this country over-run with tuberculosis, not impose such a task on the ratepayers as to carry out the large scheme I propose. There is only one thing for it. If you want to make an impression on tuberculosis in this country it will have to be carried out on a large and effective system, or it is no good; the same as in Prussia, as I told you, at New York, where the mortality diminished by 30 per 10,000 in twenty years. All that could be done in rich countries, but it cannot be done here by the people of this country, because they are too poor; and unless the State steps in, and does something in the way of a grant for these auxiliary institutions that I refer to they can never be carried out. That has been my impression. That is what I stated from the commencement—without State aid of some kind you will make no impression on it. Of course you will go on, and one year things may be getting a little better and another year a little worse; but to treat the thing effectively, the Government will have to come to the rescue and give help.

27588. But you do think that a very strong case has been established for Government aid?—Look at the tables you have here; look at the mortality increasing from 30 per 10,000 in 1811 to 45 in 1904 of a preventable disease. There is an idea in the country among the people that this disease is a hereditary disease, but that now is proved to be a complete mistake. We all know that it is a preventable disease, and with mortality increasing from 30 per 10,000 to 45 in the limited space of twenty-three years, where is it going to stop? There won't be a man, woman, or child left in the country unless the Government step in and do something. I think the County Cork did a great deal in coming forward and volunteering to pay 12 in the £; and it has

this credit, that it is the first county in Ireland or the first county in Great Britain that has made that start, and said: "Although we are a poor county, we will do something." I think it is the part of the Government to come forward, and say: "We recognise what you have done; we are ready to come and give you a helping hand."

27589. What do you think would be a good governing body for these institutions?—I think the County Council for all, and a committee of the County Council.

27590. The same way that you work the infirmary and lunatic Asylum?—Yes.

27591. Would it be a select committee of the County Council or with members added?—With members added. I should say the chairman of each of these unions.

27592. But altogether a body locally elected?—Locally elected. The reason I mention the County Council is because I recognise what a great difficulty it was to organize the County Cork to get the twenty-two District Councils to agree, one after the other. It is a thing that could not be readily done in other counties.

27593. Were you the ambassador in many cases?—Well, I had something to do with it. There is one point just I would wish to refer to, that is, about the form of notification you would adopt to be a success. I think in the city of Cork nothing short of compulsory notification would do. I think in the county you might very well try voluntary notification.

27594. Voluntary on the part of the doctors?—Voluntary on the part of the doctors and patients themselves, because the country people are not yet educated up to the idea that consumption is not a hereditary disease. They think there is a stigma attached to every family that suffers from consumption. That is the popular idea in the country, although long known to be erroneous; and they are not educated up to the mark as yet. It is more dangerous to have consumption than it is to have typhus fever; but it will take a long time, and the path of the reformer is always a thorny one. I think you would meet with considerable opposition in the country in introducing a system of compulsory notification, but I think that if a system of compulsory notification were introduced into Cork, the same as it is in Sheffield, where it has worked very well.

27595. Is it compulsory in Sheffield?—It is compulsory in Sheffield. The Corporation get a small Act. It is compulsory in New York and in Prussia. In Sheffield it is working very well. I had a letter from a Medical Officer of Health there saying there has been no friction or anything of the kind; and from what I see of the people of Cork, I think they are most anxious to carry out disinfection, and all the rest of it, if it could be done legally.

Dr. J. C. SMITH examined

Dr. J. C.
Smith

27596. CHAIRMAN.—You are the medical owner of a sanatorium yourself in the County Wicklow?—I am.

27597. And you have had a good deal of experience in the treatment of the disease?—I have.

27598. You have gone through the County Cork, I believe, recently?—Yes.

27599. With the object of reporting on a site for the consumptive sanatorium?—Yes.

27600. Have you seen many good sites?—No, I have not.

27601. Did you happen to see any of the work-houses?—I saw two in particular that you mentioned just now, but I did not take much notice of any but the Mitchelstown one; I may have seen the others, but they don't remain in my mind.

27602. There is a monastery of architecture which makes it difficult to identify each union. Mitchelstown you saw?—I did.

27603. Did you think it, as far as a general bird's-eye view, a fairly good site?—From the medical point of view it is very exposed to wind and weather. If it is intended for the isolation of advanced cases only it might do; but for a curative sanatorium I would not recommend it, on account of its being so exposed.

27604. It is sheltered from the south-west?—It is

sheltered a little from the south-west, but it is open to the north and east, and somewhat from the west, I think, as well.

27605. And shelter is most important?—Yes, not only for the cure, but for the mitigation of the unpleasant symptoms of the disease, shelter is most important. It struck me that the County Cork was an extremely difficult county, from its very formation, in which to find a really good central site.

27606. You have heard Dr. Crewes's evidence of the very large number of cases of phthisis in the county and city; would you agree that it is prudent to have a good sanatorium for the acute in the early stages, and another institution, or institutions, that might be necessary, for the less hopeful cases?—Certainly. I think medical opinion everywhere would support me that the two classes are best kept apart.

27607. You would have a male and female wing at each site?—Probably that would be the best plan of construction; I should think so.

27608. You heard the estimate of about \$25,000; could you give us any help about the amount of money?—I am afraid that is outside my previous money. I could give a rough idea of what a temporary wood and lath structure would cost, from small buildings I have put up at my own place of a very simple nature.

Sept. 25, 1908.
Dr. J. G.
Seyth.

27609. Do you mean isolated blocks, containing forty beds?—I am speaking merely of the sort of section simply. I think the cost Dr. Croft was speaking of was for the construction of the whole building.

27610. £50,000?—That means staff, buildings, furnishing, beds, electric light, heating, and everything.

27611. £28,000 was for the site; what about these temporary blocks?—They are of the very simplest description. I have brought a drawing of one of them here, one of my own; it is a very simple thing, indeed, a sort of outdoor hut for patients; a kind of bungalow, with a verandah in front (explains plan.)

27612. What would that block cost?—That block cost me about £150 to build. There are four beds and the nurse's bed, and with the furnishing it came to about £250 a bed, that is £280.

27613. How long would this building last if properly painted?—I am sure they ought to last a long time if the foundations are good; mine are only built on timber piles; on good concrete they should last fifty years.

27614. What is your opinion about these shelters, in contradistinction to hospitals?—I like them better, and I think most of patients seem to take a pride in their treatment when they are under such different conditions to what they have been in before. The only difficulty is the question of heating and attendance.

27615. You have a bed in every room?—One bed in each room.

27616. These rooms are separate private rooms?—Yes, with a common verandah in front. I think a corridor at the back would be an advantage.

27617. Dr. Broome.—They are all private paying patients, and, therefore, you put them into private rooms?—Yes.

27618. CHAIRMAN.—Could you put two in each room?—Not very well; they are only 12 feet square.

27619. Would these be used for patients all in the early stages?—Not necessarily.

27620. Advanced patients, always in bed?—No, I prefer to keep them inside the house; it is so much easier to attend upon them; it is easier to give them their meals hot; otherwise I think they would do better with more air and the more even temperature afforded by the bungalow rooms. I go in for very little heating, and I find the less change of temperature for my patients the better they do. This is a disputed point, and I don't think all my professional brethren would agree with me. We have no heating in that block, and I use it winter and summer.

27621. Have you had a hard winter yet?—Not a very hard one. Patients come to me in the middle of winter and go to this, and as long as their vitality is sufficiently good they seem to do well there. They have extra warm clothing. I think in this country, where the weather is so relaxing, and the winter is so much more bracing than the summer, that patients do better in winter than in summer—that is, in the earlier cases.

27622. Dr. Broome.—Could you give me an estimate of an institution where the patients would be from four to half-a-dozen in a room?—No, I have not gone into the figures that way.

27623. It would be cheaper than this?—It would; it would require much less space.

27624. CHAIRMAN.—If you put a partition up, could you not have three patients where you have now only one?—I think it is stated a thousand cubic feet is the smallest space you could give a patient. That would give over a thousand feet; but I object to two patients in a room, because they keep each other awake, and talk. I am speaking of a curative sanatorium, and I firmly believe, if you want to have good results, you will have to have the patients one in a room, no matter what class they are. I have heard that where there are a number of consumptive patients in a common ward, they keep one another awake at night by coughing. When one hears another cough he then wants to cough himself.

27625. Some doctors seem to think that in forty or fifty years consumption will be largely stamped out. From what we have heard to-day there is not much evidence of that in this country.

27626. I mean as soon as strong sanatoria are taken?—Well, it is diminishing to such an extent that if you prolong the present line in the charity in some places in England the disease should disappear

in the course of fifty years, that is if it goes on diminishing exactly in that straight line.

27627. At all events, the experience in Germany shows that by boldly and firmly grappling with it you can reduce the disease?—Yes. I read somewhere lately that there is accommodation for about 20,000 patients in Germany; many more than there are in the whole of this kingdom.

27628. And there consumption is decreasing very much?—I think it is decreasing very much more rapidly than in England.

27629. You think the results of sanatorium treatment are hopeful?—I do; the results are most encouraging in my experience.

27630. Do you find a considerable number of complete cures?—It is very difficult to say what a case is cured. The only way you can say a case is cured is by watching him for a number of years afterwards. I think it is generally accepted that when a man remains at his work, and able to live an ordinary life, without relapse, for five or six years after his treatment, he has practically been cured. Of course, when they leave the sanatorium you can only guess whether they are cured or not. You see, the disease is arrested; it may be temporary or permanent.

27631. A good deal would depend on his after life?—Exactly.

27632. Would he be more susceptible than others to fresh infection?—Not necessarily.

27633. He would not be immune?—Oh, no, certainly not. We have cases on record of re-infection after cure; we have also cases of relapse, without doubt, through getting into a bad state of health again. It depends entirely as how he keeps up his physical resistance to the disease.

27634. Dr. Broome.—What would be the maximum number that should be in a public institution?—I would not limit the number if you have ground enough and a sufficient number of medical officers.

27635. CHAIRMAN.—You would not like to limit them by one bed a room?—I would like a number of small rooms, with one patient only in each room, but I was thinking of what one doctor could manage. I think an outside number for one man to attempt properly is forty. According to my principles I think a patient ought to be seen three times a day, and practically fed under medical supervision. I always do that with my cases; everything should be regulated individually.

27636. Dr. Broome.—You think an institution might be any size provided you had sufficient staff?—I should think so.

27637. What would be the number you would allow per acre?—I cannot answer that question.

27638. In the selection of a site, speaking generally, what would be the most desirable points?—Do you mean aspect, now?

27639. Yes?—The first thing of all that is requisite is shelter; and, second to shelter, comes place and climate. Shelter from prevailing strong, or wet wind; in fact, if you could get shelter from all but the south so much the better; and then I think a certain amount of elevation in this country is almost necessary for breeziness; where you get breeziness near the sea you get wet.

27640. Your idea is it should not be near the sea?—Never at the sea. I could not give the exact limits, but I would not like to go within a mile of the sea. I am five miles from the sea myself.

27641. You would not like to be near a lake?—It would depend on the site and elevation; if large they are nearly always windy, and liable to storms.

27642. You would like natural rather than artificial shelter?—Well, artificial, too. If the surrounding lands are planted there is more shelter than if they were bare. Pine trees are the best; they are thicker, and branch down lower, and I think they offer less encouragement to flies and insects generally, which may be a great source of disturbance in summer.

27643. Now, you considered the question of having any other kind of sanatorium for tuberculous cases—surgical cases?—No, I have not. I should think only that there is such a disparity in the number of cases, and the accommodation that seems to be available, the surgical cases might very well be treated with the early stage cases, as the treatment would be so very similar, as far as hygiene, rest, and exercise are concerned—in short, the building-up treatment.

27644. But you would have them in different wards—yes, you would not expose the surgical cases to any possibility of infection?—I think in a properly

Apr. 25, 1906.

Dr. J. C.
Sayce

managed sanatorium there should be no risk of infection whatever. I would not have wards at all, only single bedded rooms.

27545. You believe in the educational advantages of sanatorium treatment?—I do, very strongly; it does more probably even than the pamphlet distribution.

27546. They learn by experience?—Yes; and then they go home, and impart their knowledge by example; if they are any good at all, and if they mean to get better, their daily life is a splendid object lesson to their neighbours.

27547. Do you see any objection to having one sanatorium for paying patients and also for those that are not able to pay in the one institution?—Do you mean the two classes will be in the same institution?

27548. The same institution?—Well, I don't know; I can hardly answer on the subject.

27549. CHAIRMAN.—You would be guided in your opinion by the experience in county institutions and other institutions?—Yes, but I have not very much experience of that. I have only one class of patients. I know they take both classes at some institutions, and I believe, from the patients' point of view, there is often a certain amount of disinclination; but, of course, they are only paying just their bare upkeep, so they have no right to complain; but they do, all the same. In one place the difference is 30s. and 7s.; the 30s. is just their maintenance expenses.

27550. Dr. BROWN.—You don't know how the 30s. is made up?—I do not.

27551. CHAIRMAN.—In the matter of food they treat them very liberally?—I think so; I think I have heard them say it costs nearly half. They have a large nursing staff.

27552. Dr. BROWN.—To be of any use, how long should treatment in a sanatorium continue?—You mean for early cases? That is a very difficult point. There is no rule except that a patient should stay until he is well. I think it averages about three or four months in the very early cases in the working classes, to enable those people to work again, with a reasonable amount of safety; but I think to look for a cure would take considerably longer—perhaps five or six months.

27553. Do you think it is wise thing to allow them to go back to work so soon as three or four months?—It depends on their work and the home conditions—and whether they can be looked after when they go home. I think that is a very important point, and when it is duly considered, many can resume work at the end of that time.

27554. CHAIRMAN.—There is a risk of these men going back to low diet after very high feeding?—Of course there is a risk with the working classes, which one does and find so much with the other classes.

27555. Dr. BROWN.—And confined companions?—Yes. A great many have to alter their occupations altogether.

27556. Have you any experience of dispensaries for looking after the cases when they come out?—No.

27557. Do you keep in touch with any of your cases after they leave the sanatorium?—Yes; frequently I hear from them.

27558. From your own personal experience, what would you say the proportion of the cure was to the cases of the disease?—My place has been running for such a short time that the figures would be rather misleading, and I think I could hardly give you much help. I think it generally requires five or ten years, and my place has not been running five. I could not give you any details that would lead to a definite conclusion.

27559. There is a great deal of discussion in medical circles regarding it; have you formed any opinion on that?—If you separate the early cases, and take them only, a very general proportion is from 75 to 85 per cent. of decidedly improved cases, and out of those about half, perhaps scarcely half, are arrested, and a proportion of those in the course of five years, half will have disappeared from the scene; so that probably, at the end of five years, we find 25 or 30 out of the 100 patients still living. Of course, that is a considerable number to save, and you lengthen the lives of others considerably. I think that is a very fair computation. I cannot speak from personal experience.

27560. In your institution, where you have no fires, have you any trouble with patients getting cold?—They complain very often, but they get accustomed

to it in time. They are notoriously free from cold in the head and chest.

27561. CHAIRMAN.—You don't think they run any risk to health; you think them improved?—In the majority of cases. Sometimes a case requires more warmth, but in the majority of early cases, if you can keep them at the one temperature, it matters comparatively little what the temperature is as long as you are able to give them exercise. That is my own experience.

27562. Dr. BROWN.—Comparing sanatorium treatment with home treatment, what would you say?—My opinion is that home treatment is very poor, indeed. You cannot get the proper discipline, or get them to do the thing in the proper way; but when they come to a place under a rule, and have to do what they are bid, it is a very different thing.

27563. After being two or three months in a sanatorium, do they then carry it out?—A considerable number of cases will carry it out, more or less well, and I always aim to get my patient to such a state of health that he will be able, with comparatively little trouble, to carry it out himself. It depends on himself entirely; if he does not carry it out he will relapse; it depends entirely on the patient's character and amount of will power.

27564. How many nurses would be required for a sanatorium with forty beds?

CHAIRMAN.—It would altogether depend upon whether you had them in bungalows or large wards?—Yes.

27565. As regards construction, you could provide good accommodation for four patients for less than £200?—I have done so.

27566. And on the same scale you could provide for forty for £2,000, a continuation of these bungalows?—Just so. That does not include an administrative block or lighting, heating or cooking, or servants' rooms; merely the wards.

27567. Dr. BROWN.—There are quite a number of institutions kept up in this way?—I believe so; a good many in England. This year at Newcastle they were very much pressed for space; they are building a new wing, and they had from twenty to thirty patients in tents for some months; I believe they did very well with them.

27568. For how long in the year did they erect the tents?—It would not do for all the year?—Probably not.

27569. CHAIRMAN.—They were emergency tents, and very good ones?—They would do all right in summer time, but in winter the hardship, I think, would be too great, and the wet coming through the tents in heavy rain, and so on.

27570. Dr. BROWN.—You would not approve of them for all the year?—Hardly, I think; it is very difficult to get a course building properly ventilated, unless the front was all open.

27571. Do you give the patients any work?—No, they have regular exercise walking. The only recreation I allow is croquet; I don't allow tennis or golf, and the walking is at a slow pace.

27572. For a class of patients depending on their own support, would you approve of their doing something in the sanatorium?—I think it is a thing that might be experimented on. I tried it in two cases of the working class, that I took in out of charity. One man I gave some gardening, very gentle work, weeding walks; neither of them did well. One developed neurasthenia, and the other man also developed in the end; I found it did not work at all. Temporary buildings can be erected at a low cost, but the trouble is the heating.

27573. Did you look through the workhouse in the county?—I did not.

27574. You could not give us any information about converting them into sanatoria?—I think about any house, as far as the house itself is concerned, might be converted, and a workhouse probably is a building which has been constructed in a way that could easily be converted, unless the very old ones. The chief change in the construction, I suppose, would be in the windows and the ventilating arrangements.

27575. CHAIRMAN.—You would require both sleeping rooms and day rooms for the patients?—I think it a curative sanatorium the less day rooms they have the better, because then they go out all the time; I would keep them out as much as possible; in fact only give them the diningroom, and not let them stay there too long after dinner; and have shelters and outside for them to sit in. I don't believe in recover-

tion halls, but perhaps for the more chronic cases some sanatorium life might be desirable; I really don't know, because they are not the cases I have to think about so much.

27676. Dr. BRIGGS.—Cases that are able to be out of bed at all should not be sitting in the wards!—No, they should be out of doors, I think.

Sept. 25, 1905.

Dr. J. C. Smyth.

Dr. W. A. CUMMINS, Medical Officer, Cork Workhouse, examined.

27677. CHAIRMAN.—You wish to bring before our notice the question of disinfection?—It was with regard to advanced cases of consumption, which are admitted in very large numbers to the Cork District Hospital.

27678. You have eighty odd?—Oh, we have. I should think they number 180.

Dr. CUMMINS.—215 this year, and 221 last year.

Witness.—I am speaking of the number actually at one time in the hospital. With regard to the female cases, we have been able to put them into separate wards.

27679. How many beds in each ward?—From twelve to twenty beds in the female division. In the male division, where we have these very large wards, containing from sixty to eighty beds, other cases have to be put with them. What I wish to say to-day is that I consider it an extremely undesirable thing to have these cases of advanced consumption associated with other cases.

27680. Could you not restrict these wards altogether to pulmonary cases?—We are unable to do it. In the female wards we can, because they are smaller wards. The union hospitals were originally for the sick in the house, not for outsiders. But now the idea of utilising them as district hospitals has been gradually increasing, and the Guardians of the Cork Union have, I think very rightly, called it now the Cork District Hospital. I would go a step further, and say that that hospital ought to be separated off from the workhouse proper, and should be utilised as a district hospital. With regard to these consumptive patients, I find it an absolute impossibility to get them to stop the horrible habit of expectorating all about the place. It is very well known that a single advanced case of consumption will expectorate 20,000,000 tubercular bacilli in the twenty-four hours. I have seen again and again cases of workmen attending these patients develop consumption, men who came in well. I have had notices put up in the wards, with all sorts of penalties, to try and get patients to give up this habit, but they will not do it; so I have come to the conclusion that the proper thing is to isolate all these advanced cases of consumption by themselves. They cannot do any harm to themselves.

27681. I should think that that was quite possible?—It is very difficult when you have other patients coming in.

27682. I would never dream of putting a man in a place where he would be exposed to the risk of infection?—It is very difficult to prevent that.

27683. I would not take the risk of marking an incoming patient for that ward?—But our wards are limited, because they are so big.

27684. I would much rather say I had no room?—But you must take them in. I consider there should be an absolute rule that no patient except a consumptive should be admitted to the consumptive ward.

27685. If I were a doctor I would not admit a man there unless he had consumption?—You must take him into the house.

27686. Dr. BRIGGS.—You have had a good deal of difficulty with this subject for some years past?—I have had a great deal of difficulty about it.

27687. It has been very often before the Guardians?—On many occasions.

27688. And it was arranged that they would put up a block for chronic cases?—I understood they were to build, but, like many of the other schemes, it did not come off. As you know, in connection with the fever hospital, there is the same thing. I wish to mention that point now.

27689. CHAIRMAN.—Do you ever put any people into the fever hospital that have not fever?—So you put a person who comes in with a broken leg in with the typhoid cases?—Certainly not.

27690. Mr. MURKIN.—Is there no way of partitioning off a portion of the ward, so as to keep the consumptives absolutely by themselves?—There are a certain number of these consumptives who are able to get up and get out in the passages, and go downstairs, and that is where the mischief comes in. When these patients are in bed they have their

spitting cups, which are carefully disinfected; but I am speaking of these patients when they go out into the passage, and go down to the yard, and the entrance to the hospital—when the fire is out in the summer—the patients are sitting by the fire place on stools expectorating into the fireplace. You cannot stop it. I have tried putting penalties on these people, and putting up notices everywhere I can, but you cannot prevent these people from misdoing in this filthy habit. That I believe is the cause of a great deal of the mortality among consumptives. I never would admit an early case if I had my way into the union hospital. I think that a case which is curable, or which might become stationary under treatment, should be sent to the sanatorium that is proposed, which I think is extremely necessary for such cases.

27691. But while waiting for a sanatorium, is there not some way that you could keep these people apart altogether to themselves, and prevent them mingling among the others?—The workhouse was constructed for a totally different purpose, not for the masses of patients that come in. We are crowded up in these hospitals; we have every bed possible occupied. During the winter time we have sometimes more than one patient sleeping in a bed, when the cough comes. We have not room to isolate these patients. If the suggestion I hope to make about the moving of the children is adopted it will give us more room, and then we may be able to isolate patients.

27692. There are several hundred children in the house, I believe?—Yes; including sick and healthy we have a very large number, but the numbers are not quite as great as they were. I do not think these children should be allowed to remain in the house; I think it is a very great mistake.

27693. CHAIRMAN.—Would you be in favour of boarding them out or putting them in some other institution?—Two suggestions have been made. I think one is that they should be boarded out. There is a difficulty about that as regards the parents, because some of these children have a mother or somebody living in the workhouse, and there is a difficulty about getting foster parents for such children. The other proposal is putting them into an industrial school, where they would be taught trades. Now these children boarded out are taught a certain amount of farming, and a certain amount of labouring work, but they never rise practically beyond that condition.

27694. It is not that now a fairly good position for a little child that has been supported in the workhouse—is it not a fairly good position to make them agricultural labourers?—I think it is very good. I merely mention the two proposals. I think there are reasons for and against both. It is better if you can not to have children brought up in a large school—industrial or other school. When they are brought up in the workhouse, the workhouse is their home; and if these children were fed on bread and water, I believe they would come back to the workhouse. I don't think it is a question of the food, it is the association. The most pernicious ideas that we have through life are those we acquire when children, and these children acquire workhouse ideas before they are ten years of age which last them the rest of their lives; and on any slight reverse in life, back they come to the workhouse. I don't think it has anything to do with the feeding. If these children are to be retained in the workhouse, I think their dietary should be put into the sick dietary; that the medical officers should have control over them. Many of these children are the children of consumptives and others, that require extra feeding. They are put on the same diet day after day, and I do not think they do so well; they require special care. The medical officers now have no control over them unless they are sent into the hospital sick, and then they have them under their care; but once they get into the school again they are on the healthy dietary. I prefer to get them out of the house. I have seen generations of paupers during the twenty years that

Dr. W. A. Cummins.

Sept. 23, 1905,
Dr. W. A.
Cassidy.

I have been there. I have seen two that had been children in the school marry, and their children come again into the house; the children of parents who were in the house marry, and have children that are brought into the house; that is three generations. Another point that I would be very anxious to have remedied is the care of the sick infants. Now the sick infants are nursed by their mothers. I am not speaking of the ones actually wet-nursed by them, but the ones bottle-fed and the deserted children. These children, I believe, should be treated in the children's hospital, under the charge of the nurse of that hospital.

27065. Or a person specially trained for that work?—In fact, they should be taken from their mothers. Some years ago all the sick children were looked after by their mothers. I suggested to the late Colonel Spaight that he should move them up to the hospital, and these children he looked after by nuns and nurses; that was adopted, with the very best results, and we have a splendid children's hospital.

27066. Do you think it a good thing to separate mothers and children?—I am speaking of sick infants and deserted children; I have nothing to say to the healthy; of course they are cared by their mothers.

27067. You could not have the mothers in the hospital, of course, with the children?—You could not. It was done for some years, but at my suggestion Colonel Spaight got that altered, and we have now one of the best children's hospitals in Ireland.

27068. Mr. MURKIN.—Then, if children are taken out of the house it would give room for the isolation of consumptives?—It would give room for a great many things we want. I wish to refer also to the fever hospital. Under the Poor Law system patients who suffer from infectious diseases, unless they are admitted on the relieving officer's note, or as urgent cases by the master, cannot be taken into the fever hospital. I hold that it is to the interests of the ratepayers that infectious cases should be taken into the fever hospital without this routine.

27069. CHAIRMAN.—You approve of getting as much from each patient who comes into the district hospital as they could contribute?—That I am quite in agreement with.

27700. Would you approve of Boards of Guardians having powers to make inquiries as to the means of the sick persons, or their responsible relatives, and fixing a charge, say from 6d. a week to £2 a week, according to the means of the patient, and giving these powers to recover that?—Yes, according to the amount of care the patients get. If a person goes in and is anxious to get extra services, a private ward and extra nursing, I would make him pay for that up to the full cost; but I think in the interests of public health, any fever patient with infectious disease ought to be admitted without the note from the relieving officer in the ordinary Poor Law way that a patient is admitted into the workhouse. Unfortunately—you know very well, Dr. Biggs, you were in the district hospital—in consequence of the size of the wards, we have to put patients suffering from various infectious diseases into the same ward, with the result that they may take other infectious diseases and die through it. This I have brought before the Board, and plans were adopted for an additional building, which would enable us to separate the different infectious diseases in the fever hospital. That was not carried out. I think you saw the plans. I think that the fever hospital and general hospital wards ought to be separated from the body of the house. Another point I would like to mention with regard to classification before I go on further, and that is, that I do not think it a right thing that what you might call the honest poor people should be put into wards with jail birds—that is to say, that women or men who are honest labourers and workers should be put in with women or men who are in and out of jail, and are bad characters, in plain terms. I think there

ought to be some classification, by which this thing could be remedied, and that there should be special wards for these cases.

27701. If you get the children out you think you would be able to carry out most of these changes?—I should be able to carry out a good deal of these changes.

27702. It would hardly help you as regards the fever hospital?—It won't help us as regards the fever hospital.

27703. There is another fever hospital in the city?—There is another fever hospital, situated in a very crowded part of the town.

27704. You could not by any arrangement have a classification of diseases—you taking some and it taking others?—That would be impossible. Many of our cases come in undiagnosed. I think there is a certain allowance of fever beds, according to population; and this district hospital is the hospital for at least 100,000. Now, with regard to district hospitals generally, I think that they should be equipped, of course in the best way possible, to treat all kind of cases. We treat surgical cases of all kinds, and, of course, modern equipment is very necessary. I don't see how that could be applied to district hospitals situated in different parts of the country. You cannot keep up an equipment for all sorts of cases in a hospital where you have twenty or thirty sick patients. What are you to do when a patient comes in for an operation? I look upon it that you should have Cork District Hospital as a central hospital, where such patients should be sent. Very great expense would be saved in the equipment of country hospitals if the Guardians were empowered to send up certain patients for operation or otherwise at a fixed charge.

27705. They send them only to the infirmaries at present?—Yes, you have 100 beds in each infirmary. A large county like Cork has a large population, and there is no reason why the district hospital should not be made the centre.

27706. It would mean a great deal of building?—I don't think so; you would not have more than ten or twenty or thirty of these patients at a time sent up from the different unions to the district hospital, that would be thoroughly equipped, and up-to-date. Another thing I suggest would be that a training school for nurses should be established in connection with the central hospital, which would provide nurses for these other hospitals.

27707. You do train nurses at present?—We train nurses, and examine them, and lecture to them, and we also have nurses from the North Infirmary trained in fever nursing. Dr. Browne tried to make it a training school for nurses, both surgical and medical, and was unable to succeed.

27708. Was that in connection with the North and South Infirmaries?—No, in the district hospital.

27709. Are you aware of the arrangement they have in Worcester, where the infirmary and the workhouse work hand in hand?—Yes, there is no reason why we should not do so. I think the district hospital here is under-staffed; we have only two visiting medical officers and two resident medical officers; it would be very much cheapened, and you could have two additional assistant medical officers at a small salary, with a right to ascend to the higher post, and two regular house surgeons. At present the house surgeons have charge of large hospital divisions. I think that the resident surgeon should be only house surgeon, and I also think in such a hospital that a great deal could be done in the way of cheapening the expenditure if resident students were admitted. A great deal of dressing and otherwise could be done by them which are now done by wardmasters, at no expense to the Guardians.

Dr. Smyth.—I think I made an error in speaking of the workhouse I saw. I meant Mitchelstown all the time, not Millstreet.

Mr. JOHN O'CONNOR, B.A., Kanturk, examined.

I wish to give evidence as to the proposed sanatorium, looking at the financial aspect from the amount of money at our disposal. I believe anything less than 100 beds would be of no distinct advantage to the county; there would be no compensating advantage for the money. We would not reach the evil in the first place, and the basis on which you should

make your contributions would be totally inadequate. In this way, the whole scheme would have to be re-set; that is my impression. An estimate has been furnished to us by Dr. Smyth and Mr. Beane, the engineer to the sanatorium, and he has made an estimate for a 44-bed scheme and a 100-bed scheme, and he has taken the Missy site, the one selected on

Mr. John
O'Connor.

Apr. 24, 1863.
Mr. John
O'Connor.

the voting of the Sanatorium Board. He has estimated that at \$18,500 for 100 beds for the erection of buildings alone. I put down the estimate of the cost of acquiring the land, the furnishing of the sanatorium, and the equipment as a going concern on the 100 beds scheme, and I put it at \$265,000, at least, payable in thirty years, at 5 per cent.; that would make an annual payment of \$1,375; I put down 100 beds at \$200 each bed, establishment charges, and under every head, that would be \$40,000. In a sanatorium, the best of everything will have to be got; and on the evidence given by Dr. Smyth, he states we must at least have two doctors on the 100-bed scheme; and I thoroughly agree with him that to feeding patients they require medical supervision two or three times at least; that would be my impression. That would make a total expenditure of \$7,375 annually for this county sanatorium; our income is only \$2,500; that would leave a deficit of \$4,875. The general prevailing idea amongst the contributory Guardians was this: That they should get accommodation in the sanatorium according to the amount that they annually subscribed; in other words, in the 100-bed scheme, according to the amount contributed annually, a contribution of \$53 10s. would entitle the rural district to a bed. Of course, in a 50-bed scheme, it would require exactly double that, I should say. The general prevailing idea amongst the contributory areas is this—that they should get accommodation according to their contribution. In anything less than a 100-bed scheme the urban district would have no bed at all. I think Queensdown would be entitled on its large valuation; but I believe Queensdown would be the only urban district entitled to a bed under anything less than a 100-bed scheme.

27710. CHAIRMAN.—Have you got that scheme in print. I don't understand it—No; this is only merely an estimate of my own.

27711. I mean about each district getting, according to the contribution, a bed or two beds?—That is the general idea prevailing in the county; that is the opinion of my Council.

27712. That is not the way in the lunatic asylum, or any of those institutions to which you contribute; you are not limited to a certain number?—In the lunatic asylum the amount of our contribution is not fixed. Our valuation is very large, and on our contribution we think we would be entitled to a very large portion of the space. In the lunatic asylum the institution is first run, and then the rate levied; it is vice versa in this case.

27713. Would you wish it to be the same?—I think the scheme is impracticable otherwise.

27714. You would rather have the institution, and distribute the cost—I believe any other scheme is impracticable. Any scheme that would have any sort of compensating advantage for the money spent would not work on any other principle. I am opposed thoroughly to the scheme, as formulated by the Hospital Board. If you have a 100-bed scheme, which you cannot, unless you increase the contribution by 5d. in the £—

27715. Dr. BROOKER.—Do you mean you would apportion so many beds to each of the contributory areas?—Yes.

27716. That is, two stated beds to this district and one to another, and so on; and if those beds did not happen to be occupied at that time, would they not be available for any other district?—Well, no; that was the impression prevalent in the contributory areas.

27717. CHAIRMAN.—Are you sure there is such a scheme on paper?—I don't believe there is such a scheme on paper, but I know it is the intention of the Hospital Board to carry that into practical effect. They believe that, as in the case of a great many institutions, people from other districts would be filling the beds, from districts the people of which would not be contributing anything like the same proportion. We will say a district with only \$25,000 or £20,000 valuation; if they had an overplus of consumptive patients in their district the people of Kinnick, Midleton, and Mallow would, naturally, object that they should go and take part of their space.

27718. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Could you not get over that by making the expense a county-at-large charge, per capita, on each district?—That would get over the difficulty, but the Provisional Order does not entitle you to do that; you cannot exceed 1d. in the £ under any condition.

27719. CHAIRMAN.—Your idea is to spend less, and lay it over the whole county?—Yes, unquestionably. I think the estimate for the building is large.

27720. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—There is something in the point of a union taking more than its share of the proportion of a sanatorium and closing it to other unions, just as well entitled to it as this particular union?—They say it is on the basis of our contribution. Undoubtedly, the gentlemen who waited on the several rural districts gave the contributory areas to understand that they would be entitled to a number of beds equivalent to their contribution; and the people whom I represent are under the distinct impression when they contribute £200 per annum, that for every £55 they contribute to the 100-bed scheme they will be entitled to a bed. The Provisional Order is in force now.

27721. CHAIRMAN.—It hardly comes into my province to inquire into that. Our province is to inquire what could be done in aid of a sanatorium by setting aside a district workhouse as an auxiliary hospital or sanatorium?—My impression is that the whole scheme will have to be reset and reconsidered. On its present basis it is impracticable, and will be no distinct advantage to this county. As to an auxiliary sanatorium that you speak of, I am not altogether in favour of that. I believe that every union in this county should be compelled, under the Public Health Act, to establish distinct and separate departments for these consumptives and others, and a separate dispensary under the Local Government Board issued for them.

27722. It is very difficult to get complete and satisfactory isolation in the workhouse wards, and a great many of the doctors, therefore, recommend that these patients should be taken to a different and distinct building, and absolutely isolated—I believe they can be isolated perfectly well in the unions if a little expenditure is gone to. I believe the expenditure in isolated institutions is not much thought of. There is a good deal of bigger-manner about spending any money on a union, and establishing different departments for any particular class of disease.

27723. You have got a very large workhouse at Kanturk?—Yes; and I am sure we could have one of the wards there very well isolated for consumption.

27724. I think you will find it difficult to have any ward perfectly isolated when you come to consider the sanitary buildings and all these things that would have to be provided, and food brought to them?—You have this advantage—you would have the doctor attached to the union and nurses there, who would attend to the consumptives.

27725. How many consumptives are there in your district hospital?—There are only four at present. If you have a ward neatly done up, with good beds and every accommodation there for consumptives, you would find the people would come in there, when they won't come in now.

27726. You know the way most of your wards are approached, from another ward with a common staircase—I know that; but, at the same time, \$1,000, repayable in thirty years, would be only £56 of an annual payment, and that would make a splendid ward.

27727. Dr. BROOKER.—Would that not be a large expenditure for four patients?—I am only taking it as an example. If there were good conditions present in the union, you would find a good many people very glad to come in for treatment.

27728. CHAIRMAN.—Would you think they would not prefer to go to a separate institution?—I don't think they would. People suffering from consumption are more inclined to remain near home.

27729. Yet you will find in every part of Ireland the greatest rush to get into the sanatorium at New-castle. There are a great many applications ahead of the people who apply?—There are a great many applications from wealthy people.

27730. No, from poor people?—I believe the poor people would rather cling to their homes. I say, unfortunately, that their case can be met by wards isolated in each union. I would have a consumptive ward, a miniature sanatorium ward, in every workhouse.

27731. Dr. BROOKER.—There are some other things to think of—the approach to this ward, air space, and sanitary ground. Consumptives are not like fever patients; they are there for weeks, perhaps for months; they have got all their families; the same

Sept. 25, 1866.
Mr. John
O'Connor.

vestals that they too may be used by others. If you want isolation, it does not simply mean putting them into a ward?—I believe there could be ground attached to every union sufficient to give them exercise.

27732. CHAIRMAN.—That is exactly on the revenue line to that on which we are proceeding. We are proceeding on the line of endeavouring to reduce the number of institutions, not to increase them!—My opinion is that there should be attached to every union a convalescent ward. The general idea is this, that there should be a number of beds allowed every district and contributing area in the sanatorium. They say that wherever a sanatorium is situated there may

be infectious at work which would prevent a certain class of people from a certain district getting beds; and when they would be vacant, other people would be popped into them. The only way to discriminate is this: my District Council have contributed the second or third largest amount in the county, and believe they should get space according to their contribution.

27733. That is, according to the rateable value?—Yes.

27734. Then, when the rateable value changes?—Let it go on a sliding scale—up or down, as the case may be.

Mr. RICHARD E. LONGFIELD, D.L., examined.

Mr. Richard E.
Longfield, D.L.

I was rather under a misapprehension as to the scope of your inquiry to-day, because the notice I got from the office at Mallow was that you would sit for the purpose of hearing any evidence that might be given in reference to the proposed establishment of a convalescent sanatorium for the County Cork, and I thought it would be with reference to what the Joint Hospital Board had done.

27735. CHAIRMAN.—No, it is rather supplementary to that. They don't propose to deal with any except acute and curable cases. If anything was done on our Report in the nature of diminishing the number of workhouses for Poor Law purposes, there might be workhouses available for auxiliary hospitals!—With reference to what Mr. O'Connor has just said, I think that at Mallow, for instance, we rather rushed into the scheme. I don't think we had any very clearly defined idea as to how many patients we should be able to send to the proposed sanatorium. I think we had rather a hazy notion we might be relieved of all our consumptive patients, but I think that was fallacious. It is a very good idea to start with; it might be possible either by utilising workhouses or cheap sanatoria; I should be sorry to see patients obliged to stay in rural workhouses. There is rather a feeling now with the ratepayers that the District Council will not get value for what they are going to pay. They are going to pay £400 a year at Mallow; I think there is rather a feeling that they

will not get very good value for that. They may be, perhaps, obliged to go to further expense about consumption wards in the workhouse. I don't think at first we considered the expense sufficiently.

27736. You heard what Dr. Smyth said about these isolated blocks?—Oh, they would be very good things.

27737. Is there anything you wish to say about putting all the consumptives in Mallow in a diseased workhouse, if one was available?—I think it would be a very good thing; the amount of consumption in the country is simply appalling. I have lost a great many from the families of my own neighbours; there are some now who are suffering from consumption; children living with their consumptive mothers that would be much better away. I am quite sure education is a great thing.

27738. You would be in favour if the estimates were satisfactory of having a diseased workhouse set apart as an auxiliary to the sanatorium?—I suppose it would be a very good thing.

27739. I mean apart from the expense?—I suppose it would be a good thing. One great danger is that people are not inclined to go into these hospitals until the disease is so far advanced that very little can be done for them.

27740. That is mending every day; people are beginning to know more about consumption?—Yes; that is one of the great difficulties.

Mr. DENIS O'CALLAGHAN, P.L.C., examined.

Mr. Denis
O'Callaghan.

27741. CHAIRMAN.—You are from Kanturk?—Yes. I would like to draw your attention to the fact that these figures of increased consumption may be explained by the fact that all the emigrants that have been leaving our country every year are the strong and robust members of the family, leaving the weak. That has not had such an effect up to the present, but the chances are it will show more effect in future. With regard to the suggestion that the Government ought to subsidise the funds and assist the country, I think they are responsible in a great measure for this emigration, and they ought to give a little assistance, if not a great deal. I would be in favour of these auxiliary sanatoria, but they should be subsidised by the Government.

27742. You think there ought to be a mitigation grant for these?—Quite so. And with regard to the amalgamation of unions, the Guardians of the central Board will have to come very long distances, and we will only have a certain number of men working the whole Board through the year. At the present moment it has been felt, on account of the distances

the Guardians are living from the unions you have not as regular a Board as you might have. Therefore, if you increase the distances, you make the Board worse. I also think with Mr. O'Connor, that there ought to be no question about the number of patients that every district ought to be entitled to.

27743. You would rather go on the principle that the expense should be first ascertained, the same way as you do with the workhouses and their expenses?—Yes. The reason I say that we in Kanturk ought to be entitled to our full number is, we will always have plenty of patients to spare; we don't expect to be short. Of course, if our beds were more, we should not object to have them filled. There will be a bit of wire-pulling to keep patients out; too much of that thing has gone on already; every contributing area ought to have no question at all about their own right and share. I think there is too much money to be expended on the site and the buildings.

27744. You would like to have it done cheaply?—A cheaper site and cheaper buildings and more money to work it afterwards.

Mr. THOMAS LINDEN, J.P., M.C.C., examined.

Mr. Thomas
Linden.

I was asked to attend the Inquiry on behalf of the Cork Board of Guardians; I am not a member at present, but I was a member when their invitation was received. One of the points the Cork Board of Guardians desired me to bring before you was with reference to the sanatorium for incurable consumptives.

27745. What is your view on that question?—I am giving the views of the Board that sent me here, and I agree with them, that it would be desirable in the event of workhouses being amalgamated in the county that a diseased workhouse should be used as an auxiliary, especially for these incurable cases of

consumption, and I have also to put before you the fact that in the Cork Union a very fine fever hospital, containing 100 beds, is, in the opinion of the Board, available for the isolation of advanced cases of consumption in the fever hospital; for this reason, that the number of cases of fever, I might say throughout the year, has so greatly diminished, that the few cases of fever in the Cork Union district could very easily be treated in the Cork City Fever Hospital by the Guardians paying the expenses of the patients, and in that way the entire union fever hospital would be available for the isolation of advanced cases of consumption. The arguments that were used against

adopting such a course was that in the case of an outbreak there would be no provision for fever patients; but it has been pointed out that, if necessary, consumptive patients could be removed on very short notice back to the house, and it would make no matter

worse than they are at present. As regards the contemplated hospital that is about to be erected by the Joint Hospital Board, the idea is that that hospital should take in only curable cases, hopeful cases.

Sept. 26, 1905
Mr. Thomas
Lambert, M.C.

Mr. John O'Connor further examined.

27744. CHAIRMAN.—Is there anything you would like to say from the general point of view?—I believe that there is at least one section of the Poor Law Act that ought to be at once repealed—that is, excluding people who have more than a quarter of an acre of land from outdoor relief. I believe the Act should be amended, and it should be extended to one acre.

27745. That would be in order to let in the holders of leasehold cottages?—Yes.

27746. Mr. MURKIN.—The Local Government Board have power now to allow that to be done?—We have been encouraged in our union for having done so; and we have been warned distinctly that if we do it again it won't be permitted to us.

27747. I think you will find there was an Act of Parliament, in 1890 or 1891, enabling the Local Government Board to remove the cottages?—We have not got that information in our Board at present.

27748. CHAIRMAN.—And, what is more important, the Auditor has not got it?—Well, he seems to have forgotten all about it; but it is a great hardship.

27749. Is there any other class that you would extend outdoor relief to?—That is the only point.

27750. You would not propose to extend it to a widow with one child, as has been proposed?—Of course, there is a restriction in that way. I think if it was extended to a widow with one child it would not materially increase outdoor relief.

27751. Is outdoor relief heavy in your union?—It is.

27752. What is the rate?—I don't know exactly; but we have been decreasing our outdoor relief for the past twelve months. It was £680, and we have reduced it down to £550 for the corresponding half-year of 1905. Of course, when the Local Government Act was passed fresh men got into the Boards of Guardians, and, more or less, outdoor relief got a little bit increased; but when they got settled down and ascertained down to know more about the conditions of the people in their district, the outdoor relief decreased, with the result that it is in our union about what it was six years ago. As to nursing out the children, I think it is one of the best things in existence; but I think there are too many restrictions put on the people that are supposed to take care of them.

27753. What are the conditions you would put on?—You would like them to keep a cow?—Yes. But the Local Government Board prevents us boarding out in villages and towns; I believe that restriction ought to be withdrawn.

27754. You are not likely to get as good milk and feeding there?—There is good milk in every town now, for there are creameries near them all.

27755. That might be a reason why they would get separated milk?—Not at all; there is good milk to be had in towns and villages. With the Food and Drugs Act and the Inspector so close at hand, people in our district are very careful. I think the exclusion of towns and villages ought to be withdrawn. I never saw cleaner or better children brought up than in some of our towns. Very neat, and a credit to the people who brought them up.

27756. You can understand the meaning of the restriction, that they would get better food and be more likely to become good agricultural labourers if they are brought up in the country?—A good many of the boarded out children have got employment in the towns, and have made very good men; I have known some myself personally. They have been smart young fellows, attending in stores and places,

and have turned out very good men. They can compare very favourably with the children put out in rural districts.

Mr. John
O'Connor.

27757. How far would you extend the boarding out?—What would you think of the idea of boarding out all children?—There are children we cannot board out.

27758. Supposing the law enabled you to board out all?—I believe it is a very good system, excellent.

27759. You would be in favour of it if the Guardians' discretion were increased—to enable them to board out all?—I would; I believe it is a splendid thing. There are a good many people who have small, nice clean houses; of course, the apartments are not what you would call exactly what is required by the conditions of the Local Government Board.

27760. The Local Government Board have not prescribed any conditions?—The Inspectors are very sharp, however; of course, they will select down, too, after a bit; they are fresh. It is only very poor, middle-class people who take these children, and if you adopt the system generally the restrictions will have to be very much altered.

27761. You would not be afraid of enlarging the power?—Not at all; it would be a very good thing; but when you increase the number of children you restrict the area for putting them out, because the area becomes less.

27762. I suppose when the Guardians see a child not properly cared for they insist on amendment, or remove the child?—Always; we bring in the child; that is the general system. I really believe that attached to each union hospital, there should be a trained cook. There is nothing like food, well cooked, for the sick.

27763. Whenever there are men the cooking and serving of the food is done in a very different way to when they are not?—The men have only just come into my hospital, and I have not had a chance of seeing the comparison; but apart from men or lay, I believe there should be a trained cook attached to each union, and the money of the retrospective would be very well spent in getting out the food in a nice way. It is at present a very great disadvantage, and it is one of the things that requires reformation at once.

27764. That is really in your own hands as Guardians?—I believe if there were recommendations made to the unions, I believe myself in a great many of the unions, if a proposition was made that there should be a trained cook, you would meet with a great deal of opposition. I believe it should be a universal system amongst all the unions. Of course, the strong opinion is very severe about Kanturk; it is a very knotty question to deal with.

27765. Have you any change of practice to recommend?—Well, really, except to get land attached to every union, and make them work at remunerative employment.

27766. The suggestion has been made that you should have one workhouse for each province, and any men who were habitual tramps should be obliged to work in these workhouses for a stated period, and not allowed to go rambling over the country?—I am not allowed to say anything about the consumptive, as I said awhile ago about the consumptive, that attached to each union, if you had a little bit of land, and made these people work, you would soon get rid of them.

27767. It is very easily supervising the work?—We have a labour master, who might as well be supervising the tramps. I believe that would be a very good way of getting rid of the tramp nuisance.

The Sittings were adjourned.

FIFTY-SIXTH PUBLIC SITTING—TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 26TH, 1905.

At the Courthouse, Cork.

Present:—Mr. MICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. COREY BIGGER.

Sept. 26, 1905.

Mr. William
McDonald.

Mr. WILLIAM McDONALD, M.C.B., P.L.C., examined.

25770. CHAIRMAN.—You are one of the District Councilors of Kinsale?—Yes.

25771.—About a couple of hundred inmates is just highest total?—About that; they vary.

25772. We find that on the largest day last year they only got to 121?—Yes, it depends on the fishing season a good deal; if the fishing is successful the inmates are not so numerous.

25773. Have many of your fishermen to go into the workhouse?—Yes, in a bad season they come in frequently in large numbers in a bad season.

25774. They don't lay by anything to maintain themselves?—They don't lay by anything.

25775. Would they be married men with their families who would come in?—Yes, but very often it is unmarried men. In the winter season these people when the fishing has closed have to get outdoor relief.

25776. What is the opinion of your Board of Guardians on the question of amalgamation of unions?—I only speak for Kinsale, but as far as Kinsale is concerned, amalgamation would not serve us in any way either the ratepayers or our sick poor—owing to the distance we would be from any place that we could be amalgamated with.

25777. For instance, Cork?—Cork is over twenty miles considerably, and the nearest place in the Kinsale Union to Cork is Carrigrohane, over eight miles.

25778. Is Ballinhassig in your union?—The village itself is in Cork.

25779. Have you ever considered the question from another point of view, that would be keeping a local hospital?—I think our union is turned very much into a hospital; people are appreciating the hospital treatment more than they used on account of the improvement we have made in the hospital. We spent £1,700 or £1,800 in improving our hospital, both male and female, and if there were some more reforms in connection with that matter we would have people going there, if patients were allowed to wear their own clothes in hospital.

25780. Their own clothes or a different kind of clothes?—Clothes that would not have a peepser brand.

25781. You have quite power to provide such clothing?—It is not used.

25782. You could have a suit of dark serge or something that did not look like the workhouse uniform?—That would be very desirable.

25783. The point of view I was coming to was not exactly that. Your staff, of course, costs a great deal—the staff of every workhouse?—Oh, yes.

25784. If you looked at it from the point of view of keeping the acutely sick people and dealing with them in your hospital still, but seeing how far the other classes could in the interests of economy without hardship be treated in a different way. Now, for instance, have you got many children in your workhouse?—Very few; we have boarded them out recently.

25785. What is your opinion of boarding out?—I am altogether in favour of boarding out children.

25786. Would you be in favour of extending the powers of the Guardians so that they might board out all children?—Certainly.

25787. And have no child in the workhouse at all?—No child in the workhouse at all; of course, in some instances, the children might be too young.

25788. But as soon as the doctor would say they would be fit to be fed outside and take the ordinary treatment?—I would be altogether in favour of having children boarded out and even pay more liberally for them, so as to induce people to take them out and bring them up so as to be more use to society generally. It is my belief that a large majority of the children reared in the workhouse divert to the work-

house; they are absolutely no use—they don't even make an effort to be self-supporting.

25789. If that class were taken out of the workhouse, the next class you would come to think of naturally would be the mothers of these children. Now at present when a girl has fallen and is about to have a child, she goes a few months before to the workhouse, and she stays in a ward with women who have had illegitimate children before, and naturally her character is not improved by the association with these women. We received evidence in a great many places in favour of the project that no girl under such circumstances should be admitted into a workhouse, but that she should instead be sent according to her religion to some penitentiary—we will say the Good Shipsheds, or whatever community had established, as they have in Cork, a place where such girls could be taken—and that then they would go to the nearest maternity hospital to be confined of the baby, and as soon as the baby was fit to be boarded out it would be boarded out, and the managers of this penitentiary would use all their efforts to try and fit this woman for service against I think that would be very desirable. I notice myself in Kinsale frequently young girls who have fallen come in there and are ill-befitted women that could provide for themselves. I have brought it under the notice of the officials that it was wrong to have them in.

25790. Have you noticed that they have had more than one child?—I have.

25791. Do you think the suggestion we received was a good one?—Yes.

25792. That would take away from the workhouse the mothers of illegitimate children and the children?—That would be very desirable; those mothers are not to be relied on, and the clergy and others oppose their being sent out for the reason that they would fall again.

25793. Then another class would be the lunatics, imbeciles and idiots—do you think these people are properly dealt with in a workhouse, or would they be better off in a lunatic asylum or an auxiliary asylum, as at Fonghall?—I think they are much better treated in Fonghall than they are in the workhouse because they are splendidly looked after; they were not specially looked after in the workhouse; they were very often mixed about with people who were not affected in the same way as themselves; they were not neglected, but had not the same treatment as in Fonghall.

25794. Would you be in favour of excluding in future all insane or mental cases from the workhouse?—Not all, as long as there was accommodation.

25795. You would take all the insane and hopeless idiots?—It is a mistake to send young idiots to an asylum.

25796. They would go to an institution where they could be taught something?—Yes or properly attended to, because they require special treatment.

25797. Such as they cannot get in a workhouse?—They cannot get in an asylum, but you have some spare persons in the workhouse to look after an idiot child. There is one in Fonghall that is well looked after, and there was another sent out to the asylum the other day from the Cork Workhouse, and it was a great mistake to send that child to the asylum, for there was no means of dealing with it; I would not send it to an asylum amongst insane people, where sent it to an asylum would have several people to look after.

25798. That would take away three classes out of the workhouse—the children, mothers of illegitimate children, and the lunatics; then the large class you would have remaining would be the healthy aged and infirm.

Would you see any objection to having central institutions, according to the number of them, in the county, or part of a county, a county institution for the aged and infirm in the county?—Well, from the people's own point of view I think they would not avail of it; they would not go long distances away from their friends, or the probability of when they died being taken from the workhouse—that is the great objection of old people when they are going out. I know one particular old man who was going about the country begging, and he would go in readily if he thought he had anyone belonging to him who would take him out when he died; he mentioned the matter frequently to me, and that is the feeling among the old people. If you removed them from their friends and the district they lived in they would have a strong objection to go there.

27979. That would be chiefly on the point of being buried away from their friends?—Yes, and also not having an opportunity of seeing their friends occasionally; a good many of them have their friends in the district. People are made believe now that workhouses are so comfortable that they would go in there when they would not before.

27980. That objection you have raised naturally occurred to a good many people, and is induced as to make inquiries as to the number of visits the aged and infirm get in the workhouse; we find that nearly all the visits that are paid to inmates in workhouses are to the sick, but not to the aged and infirm, or hardly any?—I find they always inquire about them; they are not particular about them until they find they are in the hospital or are likely to die; they are always particular to get notification of their death, and if they are able to bury them themselves they do it at their own expense.

27981. What is your experience of the number of people whose bodies are taken out for burial?—As far as my side of the district is concerned they are nearly all taken out.

27982. How far do you live from Kinsale?—Ten miles.

27983. And from that district they do take out the poor people?—Yes; I have seen funerals leaving the workhouse, and even in Kinsale, when I am attending meetings, I often see the bodies being taken away by their friends.

27984. That, of course, is a very strong objection, but take the question of people dying in a lunatic asylum, county infirmary, or any other place of that sort—the same objection applies there?—But they invariably take them away from the asylum from distant ends of the county.

27985. Then if they are able to do that, would the objection be as strong to having a central aged and infirm refuge or house?—As a rule the class that go into the asylum who are able to pay are better off, and are able to go longer distances for the burials than in the workhouse.

27986. If a very large saving could be effected by having central institutions for the aged and infirm in central positions as far as possible, do you think the objections about visits from their friends, as they are so few, and the question of removing their remains for burial, do you think that would be a fatal objection to having these institutions?—I think as far as my district is concerned it would be.

27987. You think that even if it would save a very large sum of money, save the expense of a very large number of officials on the healthy side of the house, do you think if you could save that, and reduce the expenditure considerably, that the objection would be really strong enough to hinder one from trying the change?—I don't know about trying the change, but it would affect the people all the same.

27988. Do you think it would be a sufficiently strong objection to make you, as far as your own information goes, decide against trying the experiment?—I am afraid it is a fatal objection from the people's point of view, and it would be useless; I would not be in favour of it.

27989. Such an objection as that, of course, would put an end to any possibility of savings?—Well, I desist.

27990. As far as our Commission goes, if such an objection as that is raised, it would practically prevent the largest saving that could be made—you would have to keep up every workhouse as it is in order that the people would be within visiting distance of their friends, even if they did not go to visit them, and

that they could, when they reached their last illness, be taken out for burial?—There might be a saving, but there would be a large expense in conveying these people to a central place.

27991. They hardly all arrive at the central place without much expenditure on them?—I don't think they would go there if not taken.

27992. We are speaking of the healthy. If a relieving officer, say at Mallow, in your union, instead of giving an admission to the Kinsale Union—they reach Kinsale at present without any cost?—Some of the people are carried to Kinsale by their friends.

27993. Supposing they get a ticket at Kinsale to bring them to the central institution wherever it may be, say Bandon or Cork or Mallow, a railway ticket, I mean?—I think they would in all probability go if they got a conveyance, and if they got over the substantial objection, which is a strong objection with our people.

27994. You think the objection from their feelings and opinions is so strong that it would be counterproductive in your mind against the scheme?—I think so; if the unions at present were fully equipped as hospitals—in our case our doctor has a dual appointment, he is a dispensary doctor and union doctor, and if he had only the union he could attend to the union, and if the idea prevailed amongst the people that they would be properly attended they would avail more of the hospital.

27995. Of course you know a doctor is bound to give all necessary attention to the workhouse?—I know he does, but if the number of inmates increased it would be very hard for him to attend to his private patients outside. He has the dispensary and the union, and got those appointments when the hospital was not so much availed of as it is at present. The county hospitals here are overcrowded. I am on the county sanitary committee, and I get frequent applications for entrance to the north and south infirmaries. I think if the district hospitals were properly equipped and if the people got to believe they would be equally well treated, they would go to the district hospital first and not overcrowd the county hospitals.

27996. Don't you think it is an objection to the district hospital its being mixed up and associated with all the miscellaneous classes that have to go to the workhouse?—I don't know that that objection prevails very much.

27997. You don't think they object to go in where there are people with illegitimate children attending them and looking after them?—I don't think so; we have nuns there now and nurses. I think they are getting over their objection to it. I sent a man there the other day, and was surprised that he made no objection.

27998. Their feeling about the hospital has changed?—Yes.

27999. You would be against those suggestions that I have mentioned to you which we received in other places, but do you see any other way in which you could point out any possible saving in Poor Law administration?—I would improve the hospitals.

28000. That would not be anything in the nature of a saving—that would be rather increasing at a little extra cost; but do you see any way in which a saving of the rates could be effected?—If the people would avail more of the union it would lessen outdoor relief, because it is being abused in many instances.

28001. How would you say it is abused?—There are people getting outdoor relief that would not look for it some time ago; they are living with their families and getting an instalment per week from the union. If they went to the union they would be just as well cared, and it would not be a sort of pension to the family.

28002. Mr. MURPHY.—The amount of outdoor relief given in Kinsale is not relatively very large. About £300 a year?—It is a good deal larger than it used to be.

28003. If properly given, is it not a very economical way of relieving destitution—that is to say, if nobody gets it except those who are absolutely destitute and would otherwise have to come into the house, don't you think it is the cheapest way that those people could be relieved?—It is; but outdoor relief is very often continued when it is not wanted.

28004. The Guardians can revise the lists whenever they like?—They can, but I am afraid that is not

Sept. 20, 1905.

Mr. William M'Donald.

Sept. 26, 1896.

Mr. WILLIAM
McDONALD.

done. The local Guardian very often does not do that; it is very often done by a Guardian who is not a local Guardian.

27825. Then the objection to outdoor relief is more in the management of it than the principle of giving it?—Yes. I had myself to bring under the notice of the Board some time ago outdoor relief in the neighbourhood of Ballinacraig, where a man was getting outdoor relief, and his two sons, or three, and a daughter were getting wages and could support their aged parent. It was not brought before the Board by any of the local men, whether they know of it or not. I did it with impunity, because I was not in the district; the local Guardian might have brought it on himself.

27826. That was apparently the fault of the relieving officer and of the Guardian of the locality?—I don't know whose fault it was, but I heard of it and thought it was a good thing to relieve the rates.

27827. If there was some provision made that the relieving officer would be responsible for the giving of outdoor relief in undeserving cases, would not that be a useful check?—Yes, but it is very hard for the relieving officer to ascertain whether a man is living there or not; they know when he is coming and get out of the way, and he finds it hard to get information.

27828. For the extent of the area the amount is not very large comparatively?—No, it is not, but I think it is double what it used to be under the old system.

27829. If it could be given only to deserving cases, would it not be the cheapest way of assisting the destitute?—I quite agree with you.

27830. In regard to the infirm class, the Chairman put to you a question that goes to the root of a reform of the Poor Law system, that is, he has asked you if you think it would be possible to arrange that the aged and infirm class could be placed in an institution by themselves. You are aware that at present there are six or seven different classes in workhouses; the sick are fairly well looked after because they are kept apart, but the other five or six classes are mixed up so that they are not, and cannot, owing to the want of accommodation, be as well provided for as they might be. These five or six classes require different treatment. Some require care like children, others, work, like the able-bodied idlers and tramps. In a motley community, such as the present workhouse, it is almost impossible to conduct things as they ought to be conducted, and one way of getting over that would be to segregate the classes in separate institutions. A hospital, as a rule, is indispensable in every union. But if the aged and infirm could be put by themselves in convenient places through the county, say three county homes for the aged in the County Cork, and if the children could be boarded out and provided for elsewhere, those that could not be boarded out being sent to some refuge or industrial school, then the able-bodied people could be put into a place where they could be compelled to work. In that way reform could be brought about that would be beneficial to the ratepayers and beneficial to the different classes. What I would like to know from you is, do you think it would be any great hardship to the aged and infirm to be removed to central homes where they could be taken care of by themselves and treated in accordance with what humanity would suggest?—With regard to the aged and infirm, I think you won't be able to induce them to leave their own locality. I said that in reply to the Chairman, that is my honest opinion. But I think tramps and casuals should be kept separately, and should be made work or made do something.

27831. What is the hardship in asking a person who has to look for support from the public to go ten or twelve miles further than at present to get it. The change would lengthen the distance only to those near to present unions, so the hardship is not much?—They think it is, and would object to it. They move like leaving their own locality and their friends, and there is a great objection to being left there in a pauper's grave.

27832. I quite recognise that in what you say there is considerable force, but I have some experience of a workhouse that was amalgamated fifteen or twenty years ago, and I haven't heard any complaints or any unwillingness on the part of the old to come from the dissolved workhouse neighbourhood to the new one?—I have no doubt in some

cases amalgamation would be a benefit to the ratepayers and the sick poor. In Kinsale, where one-fourth of our population belongs to the urban district and suffering from depression in the local industry there, there are a great many people who during that period are amongst the poor, and in consequence their families want relief. In that way, I think, we are peculiarly circumstanced in Kinsale. The population is between 16,000 and 17,000, and the urban population is over 4,000.

27833. By a system such as has been outlined, considerable saving might be effected, and a benefit done to the deserving classes?—But I don't think you would get that very class of people.

27834. In a small house I may point out to you that the cost of officering is much greater than in a large house. The cost of an officer in the City of Cork, where the number of inmates is almost 8,000, amounts to £2 10s. per head per year. In some small workhouses in the county it amounts to over 2s. You see, there is great room there for saving?—But our rates are considerably less in Kinsale than in Cork.

27835. That is due to other causes. The number treated in the infirmary in Cork is very large, and of course the cost relatively much higher?—There are a lot of extravagances in Cork that don't occur in Kinsale.

27836. CHAIRMAN.—You would be afraid of being rated as part of the Cork Union?—I would object to it strongly, and every man in my locality.

27837. The scheme that has been suggested to us and which we are mentioning does not contemplate any such arrangement. You would still remain your own case, you ask would stay with you, and you would administer your outdoor relief as at present, but the other class, the aged and infirm, would go to the central institution, you would pay so much a head for these or whatever the arrangement would be, and you would, owing to the change, be rated as part of the Cork or Brandon or any other union?—But what about the staff—how would you get rid of the staff?

27838. You would have the same relieving officers, and they would give a ticket to the central home or for a penitentiary, as the case might be, or bring the child before you to be boarded out; you still would be the managing body?—But would we get rid of any of the officials?

27839. You would get rid of all the workhouse officials on the healthy side; the only officials you would have left would be the doctor and the nurses and the chaplains of the hospital?—That would be only saving the master and matron.

27840. And any other officials there are?—There are no other officials except some assistants in the hospital.

27841. You generally have someone looking after the lunatics?—We have no lunatics.

27842. If you have any very feeble aged and infirm you would want a wardmaid to look after them?—There is a wardmaid paid small wages.

27843. They would come to £30 a year apiece?—We generally have to feed them; they are inmates; they get their diet.

27844. Mr. MURPHY.—You would also get rid of firing and light, and the upkeep of the main institution, which is a very heavy item?—Of course, I did not go into all these details, but I am afraid that, as far as we are concerned, we have managed our place economically for a long time. We inherited an economical management from those who went before us.

27845. CHAIRMAN.—If you found that your rates, which you are satisfied are low under the present system, could be still further materially reduced by such a scheme as has been suggested here, would you then be rather disposed to look more favourably on it?—I, as a ratepayer, would welcome any change that would reduce the rates, but if I found it was going to work any inconvenience affecting the poor, I would be sorry to advocate it.

27846. If it were shown you, and you were satisfied that it would be an economy, and if no hardship would result, or not much hardship would result, would you then approve of it?—Yes.

27847. We have had four or five cases in which unions have been broken up and the people had to go

Sept. 25, 1905.

Mr. William
McDonald.

long distances, but we have not heard of any migration from these places that the Poor Law was practically imperative, or that the aged and infirm would not go near the workhouse?—Our union is on the seaboard.

27643. One of the unions dissolved was altogether along the sea—Newport?—It is a long distance from Carl, and a long distance from Bandon.

Mr. MURTAGHAN.—We don't suggest any particular places; we are simply pointing out the lines of a change that some think might be beneficial.

27644. CHAIRMAN.—And in these suggestions there is nothing of amalgamation. It is not proposed that the men should be amalgamated, but that the different classes, aged and infirm, children, mothers of illegitimate children, and lunatics, these several classes should be taken out of the present common pathway workhouse and put into separate institutions, which could be maintained according to all reasonable calculations at a lower cost per head than when you have all the same class of people collected into one institution. Fewer officers could manage these than the number that heretofore managed them in isolated workhouses?—But I don't see that we are going to get rid of any of the officers except the master and matron.

27645. That is a great deal; you seem to have very few officers. In most workhouses there is a male and female attendant for inmates?—We have not any lunatics; we were not able even to give our full allowance to Youghal; we had only two.

27646. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—But the main object is to better the condition of the deserving by removing from their neighbourhood the other classes that are objectionable, in the hope that the change will lessen the number of paupers in the future, because some people say if the children were separated from the workhouse in time the feeling that is at present amongst certain classes of children that have been reared there would die out, and in that way the number would become less?—I am altogether in favour of the boarding out of children. I have advocated it and supported it and made every effort I could to induce the authorities and those representing the districts to adopt it. I have some of these children living near myself, and they are going on remarkably well—going to school.

27647. The number you have at present boarded out is about eight?—We have a very small number of children altogether. It is only recently we boarded out any, and it was under considerable difficulties we boarded them out, but the results are most satisfactory.

Mr. J. P. MEHEW, F.R.C., Kinsale, examined.

I heard your questions to Mr. McDonald about getting rid of the master and matron, but where would the able-bodied go then? You said the aged and infirm were to go to an institution away from the union in which they are at present; then there are able-bodied people coming, especially from the town of Kinsale.

27648. CHAIRMAN.—What class are they?—They are fishermen and men out of employment; these men have no other way of earning their living, and they come in for a week, waiting for a season until they can go fishing again.

27649. These fishermen do come into the workhouse periodically?—Yes.

27650. Is that owing to want of thrift?—It may be. If these fishermen come into the union there should be a person in authority over them; their families also may come into the union.

27651. I think I will have to get from your clerk or master some further particulars about these cases, showing the actual numbers?—The numbers may be few.

27652. And how often they come in?—And then there is another class also that come in there, that is the tramp class, for a night, and go away in the morning.

Mr. R. BRYCE JONES, J.P., D.L., examined.

27653. CHAIRMAN.—You are a ratepayer of the County Union?—Yes.

27654. What evidence do you wish to give?—Simply that I was deputed as one of the Board of Guardians to come; I have no special point to make.

27655. CHAIRMAN.—Are you a member of the Committee of the Sanatorium?—No.

27656. Have you formed any opinion on the subject?—I have not paid any attention to it, but I know it would be very desirable there should be provision made for such cases. I advocated it myself, and supported it in every way at Kinsale when we made a contribution. I have known cases of consumption, where parents and children became affected, and they were on the rate. There was one family in particular where the father and mother died early of consumption; the children were left there, they were in my division, and I had to look after them and see that they went to school, but owing to the parents having died young, the children were healthy enough and have escaped the contagion.

27657. Dr. BRIGGS. You say you have no lunatics at all in Kinsale?—Only two; there were only two or three cases taken from Kinsale to Youghal.

27658. You mentioned something about an imbecile child?—I don't know where it came from; it was at Youghal I saw it.

27659. You would approve of having an institution for imbecile children?—We send some to Dublin. I knew there was an application at the last Board to have some child sent off to some institution.

27660. Have many of your lunatics been taken to the Auxiliary Asylum at Youghal from the workhouse?—Two or three—that is all we had. We were entitled to have more sent on account of our valuation.

27661. You did not object to more going from any other union?—No, as long as the house was able to accommodate all it was intended for.

27662. Is the Youghal Asylum for the whole of the county or only half?—The whole of the county.

27663. CHAIRMAN.—Are you on the Committee?—I am.

27664. Is there anything else you would like to say about the Auxiliary to-day?—Dr. Kelly will come tomorrow and will give all the statistics. The Auxiliary Asylum is getting on remarkably well, the place is well cared for, and the institution will keep, and there is great economy practised in regard to it; they are costing less there than anywhere else.

27665. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—What is the average cost?—About £14 or £15. We haven't it long enough established yet to come at the exact cost.

27666. It has been suggested to me that a very good thing for these people would be if they won't work to get them into a labour institution when they would have to work for their upkeep?—These are tramps going from fair to fair, or workhouse to workhouse, and they earn some sort of a livelihood travelling along; work one day and idle the next.

27667. Would you be in favour of putting these people into some regular workhouse where they would have to work hard—go in under a magistrate's warrant. If they were on the road without being able to explain why they were loafing around that they should be put into one of these institutions?—But I am afraid it would have very little effect in restraining them.

27668. If they showed on the road again they would be looked up again?—Of course it would have some effect. If this class was abolished out of a town like Kinsale you would increase the outdoor relief.

27669. I am speaking of the tramps—you are speaking of the casuals—people who now and then get out of funds. That is a class as to which I would like to get some further information from your officials?—People come in owing to the uncertainty of the season.

Mr. J. F.
Murphy.Mr. R. Bryce
Jones, J.P.

April 24, 1893

Mr. R. Bruce Jones.

present?—I was listening to the evidence just now; it seems to me a splendid idea, except from the sentimental point of view. The poor people who come in through no fault of their own would consider it a great hardship.

27876. As far as you are aware, are many of them buried in the workhouse?—Wherever it is possible their relations take them out; they have a very strong feeling on the matter. The idea is an excellent one from most points of view except that.

27877. We find that the visits paid to these people are very, very few; they are not visited by their relatives, and a great many of these people are old unmarried men and women who have nobody to look after them, but even these people would like to be buried in their own locality?—They like to feel they are in their own district.

27878. If these people received a definite right—if they chose to claim it—of burial back in their own district, from the central institution, supposing it was found that even after allowing for that it would be a great economy?—It would mitigate the hardship considerably.

27879. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—At present that question is largely one of degree, because the poor on the outskirts of the union have to go a great deal longer distance than the people that are near the houses?—That is so, of course, but take our union, Clonsilla; they all more or less think of it as the centre of their district, but on the question of economy, would you not have to keep up very nearly the same staff; how would you get over the casuals?

27880. CHAIRMAN.—The casual is the difficulty, that is a class which you have not in most of the workhouses. You may have it in a fishing centre?—You would have to provide for them, would you not though?

27881. You would have to provide for the casuals, but we are getting statistics which will show the extent of the casuals. It is the only class about which there would be any difficulty. The tramps would be easily dealt with in a labour institution, and lunatics, and women with illegitimate children, but the casual class is the difficulty, and the question is how far such a class could be, if they are bona fide hardworking people temporarily out of work, benefited by a relaxation in the giving of outdoor relief?—Anything that would lessen the tramp evil would be an excellent idea.

27882. The tramp has not much sympathy anywhere?—No; no one has sympathy for him.

27883. You heard the suggestion about taking children and their mothers out of the workhouses—I think that would be a very good thing.

27884. Putting the mothers in a penitentiary under religious influences, according to the religion of the girls—would you be in favour of that?—I should certainly.

27885. That would tend to guard against a second slip?—Yes, and it would also tend to bring up the children better.

27886. Have you had much experience of the boarding out of children?—We have only been doing it comparatively lately in Clonsilla, but it seems to have worked very well; with proper supervision it is very good.

27887. Have you a Ladies' Committee?—No.

27888. That is a good means of supervising it?—Very, I should think.

27889. The Clonsilla Board of Guardians would be against amalgamation in the ordinary sense of the word?—Distinctly.

27890. They would be against their union being broken up and put into Ebbeween partly or partly into Bandon and Duncannon?—They would not like it?—No; they would strongly dislike it.

27891. But does such a suggestion as we have received elsewhere, and has been mentioned to-day, seem to your mind open to the same objection?—Oh, no; I suppose if it was done for one it would be done for all.

27892. And you would still have a local body as the authority under the law—would you be in favour of that?—Subject to the financial results and the point of sentiment, I think it is a very excellent suggestion, but I am not absolutely convinced as to where the economy would come.

27893. The aged and infirm in the chief class—you would have one institution for a very large number, and a much fewer number of officials to take charge of those in a central institution than in all the others put together?—If you take such workhouses you would still have someone to look after the casuals.

27894. The way in which it would work would be that you would have nobody at all there except in the hospital, eliminating all the classes except the sick?—You would still want a master for the casuals.

27895. If once you had to keep up a workhouse for casuals the system would break down?—Quite the hospital the staff is very small; we would still have to keep the clerk of the Guardians.

27896. Yes, but of course he would be a very different officer with different duties to what he has at present—he would be a hospital clerk then and for outdoor relief?—Yes.

27897. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—He is now clerk of the District Council?—Yes, his duties there would remain the same.

27898. Such an officer would always be needed?—Yes.

27899. You say you don't see where any economy would come in under the score of boarding out children—a saving of £5 per head could be made because children can be boarded out for £8 or £10 a year. They cannot be kept in an institution under £15?—But we have very few children, and we board out a certain number as it is.

27900. CHAIRMAN.—And you don't pay your schoolmaster or mistress—they get rationed?—Yes, I think so.

27901. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—You don't board very many in Clonsilla?—About thirteen?—Very few; it is only lately started.

27902. Then there is the cost of fuel for the main portion of the house—that and the cost of keeping it in repair would be saved?—Yes.

27903. That is a considerable amount; in Clonsilla it must cost £300 a year?—Yes, it is a big item.

27904. If that were cut down half, would not that be something?—They would want fuel at the central institution, but, being larger, of course there would be a certain amount of economy.

27905. But you would get more value out of the officers; they would have sufficient work to do. You would get from a man the value of his salary, whereas if you have not work for a man you have to keep him there, and the pay is the same?—That is true.

27906. CHAIRMAN.—Your Guardians are strongly opposed to closing up the hospital?—I think so.

27907. We have never received suggestions anywhere in favour of that. Everywhere it is taken for granted that the facilities for treating the sick would not be diminished, although they might be increased in some cases?—We are increasing them.

27908. Your Guardians point out the desirability of maintaining the fever wards?—Very much. We have outbreaks from time to time, especially in the season.

27909. Have you heard your Guardians discuss at all the boarding out of adults?—No, not when I have been present.

27910. They say here: "Boarding out of infirm inmates and children in the workhouse might be practised more extensively"—I don't remember the point being discussed.

27911. It would be rather open to possible abuse, the boarding out of adults?—Oh, yes.

27912. People with relatives would be anxious to get them boarded out?—Yes.

27913. Is there any question about the chargeability of relief it occurs to you to mention?—I certainly think it should be made a district charge instead of a whole union charge, the outdoor relief—electoral division I mean. The Guardians of the division would be much more careful as to who got relief and who did not. I think that would be the most important thing to do.

27914. And if the electoral division was considered rather small, as it is from a rational point of view, you would think it better to have, say a dispensary district than the union?—Certainly.

27915. You would have as small an area as possible?—Yes; I think perhaps the dispensary district would be the most workable plan; have each dispensary district rated separately for outdoor relief.

27915. As regards the people who get relief in your union, who come in casually, have you any personal knowledge of any of these families?—I don't want names?—I am not very near the sea myself; I am rather inland.

27917. You don't know any families who at slack times of fishing come into the workhouse?—No, I do not. I am four or five miles from the coast.

27918. I suppose they would be very largely about

the towns of Clonsilla and Rosscarbery?—Yes, towards the Galley Head, along that district.

27919. Courtmacsherry is in your union?—Yes.

27920. It is one of the poorest parts of your union?—It is certainly very largely populated. Mr. O'Brien is here, and will be able to tell you all about that.

27921. Is there anything else you would like to mention?—I think not. What I wanted to say more than anything else was putting the charge for outdoor relief on a smaller scale.

Aug. 26, 1902.

Mr. R. Bence
Jones.

Mr. JOHN O'BRIEN, P.L.C., Clonsilla, examined.

CHAIRMAN.—I see by this resolution of the Clonsilla Board of Guardians that Mr. P. W. O'Donovan is to appear as their solicitor; I don't know whether he is here.

Mr. P. W. O'Donovan.—Yes, I am here; but I think my duties are practically nil. From the comprehensive questions you put, it is hardly necessary for me to say anything.

CHAIRMAN.—You have heard the lines we are taking?

Mr. O'Donovan.—I think you are taking the very lines I would have taken myself.

CHAIRMAN.—Would you wish to examine this witness?

Mr. O'Donovan.—I think not, sir. If you follow the course you have adopted already it would be better. If necessary, I can put questions.

27922. CHAIRMAN.—You live in the Courtmacsherry district?—Very close to it.

27923. Are there many fishermen there?—There are people who live by fishing and seafaring business. It is a congested district.

27924. Do many of these men in slack times get very badly off?—They do. In the winter if any of their families get sick they apply for outdoor relief, but they never go into the house.

27925. You don't know of any fishermen yourself who go into the house?—I have great experience, but know of none going in.

27926. Did you happen to be here this morning when Mr. McDonald, of Kinsale, was giving evidence?—He mentioned that he heard of cases of fishermen going into the house?—They might in Kinsale, but not in Clonsilla.

27927. Do you know of many people who go off and on for a week or two in slack times into the workhouse and out again?—No, I do not; none of the inhabitants.

27928. If, without breaking up the Clonsilla Union, we could develop some scheme by which the inmates could be grouped together, and by which your Guardians would pay so much a head for them in the central institution, would you be in favour of such a scheme?—I would not; I would be opposed to it.

27929. Why would you object to it?—In the first place I consider there would be no benefit derived from it, because the present officials should be compensated.

27930. That would be a life pension?—Yes. In the second place, the officials appointed should be paid; and I don't think during the lifetime of the present officials there would be anything gained by it. Besides, additional buildings may be required where the inmates would be sent to.

27931. Suppose you were to take as many of the officials as were of a working age and bring them from the institutions where they at present are, and put them into a central institution, and only pension those who are really past their work, or near it?—I think that could not be done for all unions; it may be done for one.

27932. Suppose six or eight unions joined together, and had a central home for the aged and infirm, you would then have six masters and six mistresses that you could use, if you wanted so many, but you would not want so many?—There should be some left out.

27933. The ones you would leave out would be the elderly people, who would be very glad to get their pensions, and retire, as they would in the ordinary course?—You would not have many of them. The great number are mostly young in Donemurry, Clonsilla, and Skibbereen.

27934. We have visited every workhouse in Ireland, and found very many old people among the officials?—In Donemurry, Clonsilla, and Skibbereen they are young people.

27935. You may take it for granted that there are old and young all the way round. What other objection would you have to this plan?—That the poor people themselves would have a very strong objection; they would not like to go; and then it would increase outdoor relief to a great extent.

27936. What class would it increase the outdoor in—the aged and infirm?—They should get outdoor relief when they are aged, and won't go to the workhouse. Of course, humanity requires that they should get it, and it is often liable to abuse.

27937. Would not all the people who are in the workhouse at Clonsilla at present—aged and infirm, everyone of those people—prefer outdoor relief, if they could get it?—They would not, in general; some of them would. But the question is this—they might not get lodgings outside, or proper accommodation; and I think the house would be better for them—they would be kept cleaner.

27938. I agree with you; but I am talking about what they would wish themselves?—Some may.

27939. A great many at present in the Clonsilla aged and infirm wards, if asked, would be very glad to go out on outdoor relief?—I don't think they would.

27940. Why would not those who would be outside in the future be just as willing to go to the central institution?—They get from their relatives and friends some assistance, and by the little assistance they get from the Guardians, they live outside, at their own liberty, and would not wish to be confined in a workhouse.

27941. That equally applies to the present class as well as to the future?—I think so.

27942. You did a number of people now in the workhouse—is not the reason why they are in the workhouse because they would not get outdoor relief?—I think not. They have not proper accommodation; they have not lodgings outside.

27943. Then, have you nobody in the workhouse except people who wish to come in?—No, of course.

27944. You have not obliged anybody to come in by saying, "We will give you the workhouse instead of outdoor relief"?—It may have been said to people who are not proper recipients of outdoor relief.

27945. Mr. MUNSTERMAN.—You think it would be a very great hardship if these people were asked to go a little further than they have to go at present?—I think it would be a hardship on them; because, the reason why—they wish to see their relatives, and would not wish to go there. I am certain they would have a great objection to go.

27946. As a rule, the aged have no visitors at all, only the sick; they almost are visited frequently; but the old people that are in the house for years have few visitors; that is the general experience. These changes would work this way—it would bring these people into the house, where they could be treated according to their needs and condition. They could be kept more comfortably, and could be separated from undesirable companions, and better accommodation provided without increased cost. Now, on the score of the benefit of that class, would not it be an advantage?—I am entirely of a different opinion.

27947. You don't think it would be better for these people to be by themselves, and treated in accordance with their wants, than have them, as they are, mixed up with other classes, and taking pot luck with the crowd?—If such a change should be made, it is the other classes should get a place of their own, and not the infirm poor. They should be left with their relatives, while if there is a bad class there, there should be a separate place made for them, into which they should be put.

Mr. John
O'Brien

Sept. 26, 1905.

Mr. John
O'Brien.

27948. CHAIRMAN.—Among the aged and infirm there are a great many people of inferior character—I would not say that of the Clonakilty Union. There may be some whose character was bad some years ago, but since the nurse came in they have been entirely reformed.

27949. In every workhouse there are some people that are troublesome and objectionable, and others that are not, and if you had a central institution you could put the troublesome people in one ward and the quiet, peaceable people in another ward—That may be; but it would be rather to increase the cost on the ratepayers than to decrease it.

27950. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Their position, in point of respectability, would be much improved, because they would be away from the workhouse, the name of which they dislike. As regards that, I think it would be very suitable that the hospital should be divided; and in case of any person of respectability coming in there, he should have a different ward from the others.

27951. You could not bring about a change of that kind without adding to the cost. What we are desirous of doing is to improve matters without adding to the cost—I fail to see where the improvement would come in.

27952. These people, kept in bulk, could be kept much cheaper than they are now, in small numbers, just as everything in life can be done much cheaper on a large scale than on a small scale. They could be kept, perhaps, for £2 a head cheaper in an institution, where they would be by themselves; not only that, but they could be treated much better, in accordance with their interests. The cost of provisions is the same in every place.

27953. The cost of provisions in a single house is, proportionately, much more than in a big place, where things are bought wholesale. They could be kept £2 a head cheaper on the score of economy, but on the score of improvement to themselves it would be a great advantage to these poor people to be by themselves, where they would not be liable to association with undesirable acquaintances. Cork is a very large institution, and I don't see the price of provisions cheaper there than in Clonakilty, Kinsale, or Brandon.

27954. I don't separate one place from another, but an article can be bought cheaper on a large scale than in districts—I don't see that.

27955. CHAIRMAN.—It would cost you more to give ten men their dinner at so much per head than to give twenty men their dinner at so much a head?—You may get a hotel to give 150 people their dinner cheaper per head than they would give it to one man.

27956. Mr. O'Donnell.—Do you know the average cost of the keep of an inmate in Clonakilty Union as compared with Cork Union? Clonakilty is only 3s. 4d. and Cork 3s. 10d.—That bears out what I say.

Mr. MURTAGHAN.—There may be an explanation for that. I would like to point out that in the Cork Workhouse half the inmates are in the infirmary.

Mr. O'Donnell.—The same applies to the Clonakilty Union—the same proportion.

CHAIRMAN.—These figures about the average cost of maintenance are not very valuable from this point of view—that they only take in food and clothing; they don't take in all the expenses, as in the lunatic asylum figures. The lunatic asylum cost of an inmate is the correct basis. There you take every penny spent, and divide that by the number of inmates. That cost of clothing and maintenance is open to any amount of juggling, and changes without juggling.

27957. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—We don't make any charge against the Clonakilty Union, that it is not managed economically, because it is. The rate per £ shows it is managed fairly economically, but what we are trying to do is to get at some method of reforming the system in such a way as that the classes would be benefited, and the ratepayers would have a gain; and, of course, our remarks apply generally and not particularly at all—I understand that perfectly.

27958. Are you still of opinion that it would not be a proper thing to put these classes by themselves?—I don't say that; but I say there would be no economy in the rates by doing it.

Mr. MURTAGHAN.—In the cost of firing alone, you

would save £200 or £150 a year, and in the saving that would come about in the master's and matron's salary there would be a considerable reduction.

27959. CHAIRMAN.—Take the lighting and firing. You have six or eight stoves, costing so much a year for lighting and firing; a great deal less than the cost of the six or eight would warm and light the inmates, when they were all in the one house?—There may be a little saving there, but they should have additional fire for additional people.

Mr. MURTAGHAN.—There would not be so much space to be heated in one institution as in six or eight, so that you would be bound to save.

Mr. O'Donnell.—I assume, gentlemen, the present institutions would all be kept going still.

CHAIRMAN.—No; portion of them would be closed.

Mr. O'Donnell.—I assume when they are closed there would be a saving.

Mr. MURTAGHAN.—They might be utilized for other useful purposes.

CHAIRMAN.—The suggestions we have received in different places are that it would be possible to close the able-bodied side of the house, keep the hospital for the sick, and put the other inmates into separate institutions.

Mr. O'Donnell.—If the able-bodied portion of the Clonakilty Union were removed, then they require additional accommodation for the aged and infirm.

27960. CHAIRMAN.—The healthy and the sick are the two classes—There are hardly any able-bodied in the Clonakilty Union.

27961. They are classed healthy if they are not on the doctor's books. What is your opinion about the expediency of outdoor relief?—At times it runs up high.

27962. Would you make it a union charge or have it on a smaller division?—I would make it a electoral division rating. I have long experience of the union, over thirty years; the Guardians would be by far more careful.

27963. Do you think they are not as careful when they have the union-at-large area as they used to be when they had the electoral division?—I really think they are not so careful, although they scrutinize the accounts very often. They have not the thorough knowledge of the whole union, as they have of their own electoral division.

27964. And without that knowledge you think they cannot make as good decisions?—I am certain.

27965. You think people get on sometimes owing to want of knowledge on the part of the Guardians?—I think they do get on.

27966. That would not get on if it were an electoral charge?—Yes.

27967. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Have you tried boarding out in your union?—Yes, we have some boarded out.

27968. Is it of late you have been adopting it?—Yes.

27969. Do you find any difficulty in getting houses for the children?—No, not at present.

27970. Do you find it works satisfactorily?—I think it will, after a bit. When you bring the children out into the country they get more into the habits of the people. When they have relatives, they generally take the children, and bring them up in their own homes.

27971. Would you like to see as many children boarded out as possible?—I would; though, from my experience of Clonakilty Union, I have not known many of the children reared in the homes previously to return; very few. There is one thing I would wish to bring under your notice. We have in the union a great many of the labourers' cottages. At present, if the cottager falls sick, he cannot get any relief, though he is the bread-winner of the family. While the rest of the family would get relief, he cannot. I think the quarter-acre classes should be repealed.

27972. CHAIRMAN.—Would you substitute any limit for the quarter-acre?—I would say one acre at least; and receiving relief in sickness should not be a bar to the exercise of the franchise.

27973. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Have you many hermits in the house?—No, only one hermit; a girl of twelve years.

27974. You would like them all removed from the workhouse?—I would, of course; it would be a proper thing to do, if there was accommodation for them.

27975. Don't you think the epileptic should be in a place where they could be better cared for?—They should be looked after.

27976. What special looking after does that girl get?—There is generally one of the attendants looking after her.

27977. CHAIRMAN.—Is she in the lunatic ward or the healthy ward?—She is in the lunatic ward, I think. Sept. 25, 1905.
Mr. John O'Brien.

27978. Dr. BIGGER.—Do you mean an inmate is looking after her?—Yes, one of the inmates.

Mr. JAMES O'BRIEN, *c.p.*, Chairman, Clonakilty Union, examined.

27979. CHAIRMAN.—You are the Chairman of the Board of Guardians?—Yes.

27980. You have heard the evidence of your two colleagues—Is there anything you wish to say in addition to what they have said?—Not a great deal. I fully endorse the opinions of Mr. Bennet Jones and Mr. O'Brien with regard to the chargeability of outdoor relief.

27981. You would rather have it divisional rating than union-at-large?—Quite so. Union-at-large rating is very much abused by Guardians; when the cost is distributed over the whole area, some Guardians, naturally, are more liberal than if it was a divisional rating.

27982. Mr. MURKIN.—Would not the Guardians representing the towns object to that change?—Certainly.

Mr. O'Donnell.—Mr. O'Brien is a *Glen* Guardian himself.

Witness.—Occasionally householders, I think, should be a charge to the union-at-large. There should be some term of habitation; four or five years' residence, to entitle them to be a charge to the town of Clonakilty. These poorer people, who take a house for a week or three weeks or a month, to get outdoor relief, I don't think they should be charged to the town of Clonakilty.

27983. CHAIRMAN.—Such people as that would be best eligible for any relief at all?—They occasionally get it.

27984. Do you think there would be much hardship in having a central institution for the aged and infirm—not breaking up the union, but simply housing out your aged and infirm inmates?—I don't think that would work at all; I think it would lead to abuse.

27985. Where do you think the abuse would come in?—The money that might be given for their maintenance would be spent in other ways.

27986. I am not speaking of housing them out in the country, but in a central institution. Suppose, for instance, the able-bodied part of the Clonakilty house were to be devoted to receiving the aged and infirm from the surrounding unions, you would have them all there, and would charge so much a head for every person who came from another union, so that five or six workhouses could be closed and only one remain open, as regards the healthy, but the sick would remain open?—I think that would inflict great hardship on the friends and relatives of these poor people, sent a long distance from their homes.

27987. Are you under the impression that these people often receive visits when they are in the aged and infirm ward?—I am.

27988. Have you ever asked for particulars in your workhouse on that point, because we were rather under that impression when we started; but as we went along we made inquiries, and we found that, relatively, a very small number of visits were paid to the aged and infirm, and that only when they came in first; most of the visits are paid to the sick?—I have personal knowledge that there are often visits to the sick.

27989. The aged and infirm?—I cannot say that.

27990. We supposed they would have received visits, but in a great many places they hardly receive any visits. The aged and infirm are so often unaccompanied people, without anyone belonging to them.

27991. Mr. MURKIN.—If these different classes could be kept apart, better treatment could be given to them?—I think it would be very desirable.

27992. CHAIRMAN.—In another workhouse?—No, in the same workhouse.

27993. Mr. MURKIN.—You could not keep the six or seven classes apart in the one workhouse, because there is not room, and you would require additional officers, and that would increase the rates?—We are adding to Clonakilty Workhouse from time to time to give accommodation.

27994. If some method of selection could be adopted, so as to put the classes by themselves, retaining only the hospital for the sick, don't you think it would be an improvement?—I do; but I would not approve of removing the hospital at all.

27995. Dr. BIGGER.—Are you a member of the Sanatorium Committee?—No.

27996. Have you taken any interest in it?—I occasionally read the reports of the committee. With regard to the sanatoria, we have very few in Clonakilty at all.

27997. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. O'Brien, who preceded you, stated that he really knew of no casual poor, only the tramps?—That is all; for the reason that, to my mind, there is ample employment for any man in Clonakilty who is able and willing to work. We sometimes find there are some of these able, but not willing.

27998. What do these men do—they don't go to the workhouse?—No.

27999. I think in comparatively few rural unions do you meet that class?—With regard to the professional tramps, there should be some legislation to deal with them.

28000. Would you approve of putting these men into the workhouse and detaining them there under a magistrate's warrant, and trying to get them into habits of industry?—Quite so.

28001. The country has to support them at present, and it has been suggested to us that the best method would be—if they insist on the country supporting them—the best thing would be to make them work for their living?—I think they should contribute something to the State for their living. In some districts they are a menace and threat to farmers; they make them give them food under threats. I have been asked by some of my constituents to give evidence about the system of administering outdoor relief. I don't wish to mention names, but I think the practice is objectionable where the relieving officer gives money for relief in his own house, if he is a shop-keeper.

28002. That would be against the law?—The practice is very objectionable.

28003. He would render himself liable to dismissal if he did so?—That would be an extreme course to adopt.

28004. Mr. MURKIN.—There is a middle course for him—quit doing it, and quit it at once?—Some people say they think if they don't take the goods sold in the shop they believe the relief will be stopped.

CHAIRMAN.—If people submit to be bullied, of course, they will be; but it is in the power of the Guardians, who know what is going on, to stop it very easily. One word is enough to the man who does it—to tell him he must stop it or go. You have full power.

Mr. O'Donnell.—There is one other witness—Mr. Hurley, Master of the Union.

Mr. DANIEL HURLEY, Master, Clonakilty Workhouse, examined.

CHAIRMAN.—We don't, as a rule, ask the Master to give evidence, so you had better examine him yourself.

Mr. O'Donnell.—It is something on the same lines as the questions you put to the other witnesses. He would be in a better position to reply about the ques-

tion of the going to the district by transferring the inmates to a central institution. Would you put the question, Sir?

28005. CHAIRMAN.—I would be inclined to put the question this way: If you were offered a big work-

Sept. 26, 1905.

Mr. Daniel
Murphy.

house, with double the salary for looking after six times the number of inmates, do you think it would be a good plan?—I would naturally take it.

Mr. O'Donovan.—Would you put the question in the way you did to the others?

CHAIRMAN.—I think not; I would rather anticipate the answer.

28002. Mr. O'Donovan.—Would you give a general idea, for instance, on the vagrancy question—would you make any suggestion?—I am of opinion that if the police enforced the Vagrancy Act that a good many of these tramps would disappear.

28003. CHAIRMAN.—What do you think would happen if the police enforced the law, and brought them up before the Bench; you would find a difficulty, would you not, under the existing law, of proving that they were vagrants within the meaning of the Act, that they had received relief from other workhouses?—It is not necessary to prove that they had received relief from other workhouses; they could convict them for begging under the Vagrancy Act.

28008. It is difficult to get evidence of begging very often?—I have seen them several times begging through the town. After getting the relieving officer's ticket they would beg round until the closing hour at the workhouse, drinking the proceeds.

28009. Would they people they beg from come forward and give evidence?—I am afraid they would not.

Mr. O'Donovan.—If they were summoned as witnesses I think they would. It is a crying shame in the country districts.

28010. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think it would be any hardship to any respectable person if the class of men who are going round were taken up by the police, if they had no satisfactory explanation to give of their position, where they came from, or what they did; do you think it would be any harm to put them into a workhouse, set apart for the purpose, and there obliged to work, not for a day or two, but, say, on a few years' committal, and allow them out if they were working satisfactorily—do you see any objection to that?—None.

28011. Do you think it would hit any respectable people?—It would not; those who were anxious to work; but the tramp class will not work, even if they get it.

28012. Mr. O'Donovan.—Take, for instance, the Clonakilty Union. If the aged and infirm and sick were kept in the union at the present time, and send away the able-bodied and children it would give you more room; you could make improvements, and classify the infirm. Some are very respectable poor, who sometimes feel having to mix up with undesirables; if you had more accommodation you could provide for that class?

CHAIRMAN.—You mean you could do that in the workhouse as it is at present?—If we got rid of the able-bodied class.

28013. I suppose you have no able-bodied men?—Very few.

28014. Have you any at all?—They would not amount to half a dozen at present.

28015. That would not relieve you much?—But they occupy a great portion of room—there are a certain number of wards appropriated to them.

28016. Mr. O'Donovan.—Is there a good portion of the building set apart for them?—Yes; for both men and women, and could be utilised for the infirm class.

28017. Mr. MURKIN.—While your suggestion might give a little more room, it would, in other ways, do little good, and instead of lessening the cost is likely to add to the rates without remedying the things we all wish improved?—At present our Board of Guar-

dians are taking into consideration the question of enlarging the fever hospital. Supposing one of these buildings was vacated by removing the children you could turn that into a fever hospital, and possibly £1,000 might be spent in enlarging the fever hospital.

28018. That would not be necessary if the charges continued were carried out?—The fever hospital at present is too small; it is a small detached building in the workhouse grounds.

28019. CHAIRMAN.—What about the one on the hill? There is no water supply, and the town supply does not go up so high.

28020. Mr. O'Donovan.—It has practically gone in to ruin?—Yes, the inside has.

28021. Mr. MURKIN.—But you, as master, must know that under present conditions it is impossible to carry on the workhouse management as it ought to be done with so many classes together?—Yes.

28022. Have you any change that you would suggest that would not mean additional cost to the rates?—I think it could not be done without additional cost.

28023. But in the way that has been suggested here it can be done, because the calculation is that there will be a considerable saving.

Mr. O'Donovan.—How would the saving come in? Mr. MURKIN.—By the reduction in the cost of the staff. The expenses in connection with the general body of the workhouse which is very large, will cease. Then it is estimated that when a number of people are put together they can be kept per capita at a low rate than where there are only a few.

Mr. O'Donovan.—What officials could be dispensed with?

Mr. MURKIN.—Most of the officials doing duty in the main building of the workhouse.

Witness.—There is only the master, the matron, the porter and two teachers in the extreme portion of the house.

28024. CHAIRMAN.—No wardens?—There are in the hospital wards, not in the healthy wards.

28025. Mr. O'Donovan.—Should there not be some official to take charge of the clothes in lieu of the present matron?—If the matron is dispensed with you must have a scamp or storekeeper over the stores, then you would want a porter always at the gate.

28026. You can dispense with officers under one name, but you will have to re-employ them under another name and in just as costly a manner?—I think some persons will have to be employed in their stead.

28027. Mr. MURKIN.—You would only require persons in connection with the hospital—a clerk of course, would be necessary as clerk of the District Council?—There are stores coming in for use.

28028. All you would want is the staff of an ordinary hospital?—The hospital at present is not sufficient in size for the one district. If you take away the workhouse with the stores in it you must appropriate some other building for the purpose of clothing stores and provision stores.

28029. It would not be hard to take over plenty of space if the house proper was vacated, but you would not need any staff more than the staff of an ordinary hospital?—You would want someone to keep the accounts—your names will not keep the accounts under the present Poor Law system.

Mr. O'Donovan.—See after the repairs of the building and the upkeep.

CHAIRMAN.—These difficulties are not met with in the case of ordinary county hospitals or infirmaries.

Witness.—They don't keep the dirt in such a way as they do in workhouses.

CHAIRMAN.—I don't see the use of keeping it.

Mr. R. CLEGG, J.P., Bandon, examined.

Mr. R. Clegg,

28032. CHAIRMAN.—You are one of the Guardians of the Bandon Union?—I am not now, but I was a Guardian for more than twenty-five years.

28033. You are familiar with the questions discussed here?—Very familiar.

28032. Have you considered the question of amalgamation in the last instance?—I have.

28033. Is your opinion hostile to amalgamation in the strict sense of the term?—I am in favour of amalgamation as a principle, but I think it may be carried

too far; I have gone into the circumstances of the workhouses in the county pretty closely.

28034. You have Clonakilty, Dunsmore, Mallow and Kinsale bounding you?—Quite so, and I don't think out of the seven or eight it would be prudent to suppress more than about five.

28035. That would be amalgamating pure and simple, breaking up unions and dividing them among adjoining unions—what is your view as regards the five unions that might be dispensed with?—That is rather a delicate question, but Bandon is not one of

Sept. 26, 1906.
Mr. R. C. Clegg.

them. I may say that I have gone into the matter pretty closely, and on the basis of area I find that the proportion of workhouses in the County Cork is much in excess of what it is in all Ireland.

28036. Did you take statute acres?—Statute acres; I find for example that in Armagh there are but two Poor Law Unions with an area of 313,000 acres, or an average of 156,500 to each. I find that in Fermanagh there are three Poor Law Unions with an average of 417,000, or an average of 139,000 to each. I find that in Carlow there is only one Poor Law Union.

28037. Of course you know a good deal of these counties are situated in other unions?—Quite so. In Queen's County there are two with 424,000 acres, 212,000 in each. In Kerry, to come nearer home, there are six Poor Law Unions, with an average of 1,139,000, or, in other words, an average of 190,200. In Limerick there are five with a total acreage of 682,000, an average of 136,400. In Galway the acreage is 1,502,000, the average is 130,200, whereas in Cork, where there are seventeen Poor Law Unions, the acreage is 1,820,000, an average of 107,000. So that, as I say, the proportion in Cork is considerably in excess of what it is in Ireland as a whole; the average in Ireland would be 123,700. That would mean for Cork about fifteen workhouses, or, on the other hand, that the number is in excess of the average all over Ireland, and, therefore, I consider the number for Cork might be reduced to about twelve or thirteen.

28038. You did not enter into the question of waste land or profitable land?—No.

28039. That would make a considerable difference, but you think about five would be the utmost that should be closed?—I do; of course I should be totally against the closing of the hospital in connection with any workhouse, or, rather, I should be in favour as far as possible of converting the workhouse hospital into a district hospital.

28040. Then you don't recommend in any instance amalgamation pure and simple, because amalgamation pure and simple, as it has been carried out up to the present means closing up the entire building?—No, sir; I think it would be a most indigestible thing to close any hospital.

28041. In Donaghmore, in the Queen's County, which was closed, nothing was left open there?—I think it would be exceedingly injudicious and very inconvenient to the sick poor, who should be considered first, I think, in the case.

28042. Then you are not in favour of amalgamation as it is strictly understood of all?—Not if it includes the closing of the hospital.

28043. If you did then amalgamate those five unions, would you break up the governing body, or, if not, what would be the governing body of the hospital you would have behind?—Of course if converted into a district hospital it would be the committee appointed for the purpose.

28044. But that committee contemplates the existence of the Board of Guardians, because part of the provision is that the Guardians may at any time, on giving certain notice, reduce the district hospital?—The idea I had in my mind was that in case the workhouse, as a workhouse, were abolished, and the hospital remained, that there should be a meeting of the duties of the workhouse medical officer and of the local dispensary medical officer. In other words, I think if the dispensary in which the workhouse hospital were situated were too large, it should be reduced considerably and have an officer appointed for the dual work of the hospital and the reduced dispensary area.

28045. In other words you would put the local hospital under the dispensary doctor?—Practically, and the outlying portions of the old dispensary district would be, of course, apportioned among the medical men surrounding. I think myself there is rather a fallacy underlying the argument for large amalgamation, because I don't think the ultimate saving would be so much as is supposed by some.

28046. You know what the average rate all over Ireland is?—I do. I have made a little calculation which I would like to submit. I find that the total expenditure in connection with the Bandon Poor Law Union for the year ended 31st March, 1903, was £5,387 14s. 9d.; of that amount there was expenditure on outdoor relief, which, I take, would not be affected by an amalgamation of unions, and the breaking up of workhouses, £1,491 14s. 3d.; medical charities and dispensaries, £206 2s. 3d.; that would remain unaffected; miscellaneous expenses, as certain institu-

tions, registration, repayment of loans, superannuation, all these would continue, £226, the cost of the hospital that I think should be retained, £335.

28047. Only that?—That was the amount for the year I speak of; I am speaking of the salaries; the maintenance of patients in the hospital about £750, so that in other words you have a total of £5,759 17s. 6d. that should remain, even if the unions were amalgamated and the workhouse abolished; that from £5,387 14s. 9d. would leave £1,327 17s. 3d.

28048. As a basis for economy?—As a basis for economy. Now this includes the maintenance of inmates, not in the hospital, say, £975 7s. 10d.; the salaries of all the officers, except in the hospital, with retires, say £262, and miscellaneous expenses, say, £250 9s. 5d., making altogether, £1,327 17s. 3d.

28049. Those are all strictly union charges?—Yes. Now the others not needed if a workhouse were closed would be, as I take it, the master, who in the Bandon Workhouse receives £60 a year, the matron £35 a year, the porter £20 a year; there is one schoolmistress now—there were two—and her salary £25, and possibly the two chaplains.

28050. I think you would want the chaplains to look after the sick?—If they were not needed, £75, in all £225. Taylor and shoemaker £20 and the ratons of the indoor officers, say, £20; that would be £225 in round numbers.

28051. Mr. MEAGHAM.—You put the ratons very low?—The officers concerned, of course, are the master, the matron, and the porter.

28052. CHAIRMAN.—I think you are too low for the ratons?—Still we say £100.

28053. It does not affect the principle?—A portion of what I mentioned is recouped. The whole of the schoolmistress's salary is recouped, and under the Statutes Act the grant is calculated according to the number of officers and their salaries.

28054. It was calculated on a certain year?—It is about half, so that I take it there would not be a saving, a net saving, by the reduction of the establishment of more than about £200 or £250 a year.

28055. Did you take in the firing and light?—No, I did not; that is a material difference of course; but even £400 a year is not much more than a penny in the £ on the valuation of the Bandon Union, so that there is not such a very large question involved, I think, in amalgamation, as to reduction of the expenditure.

CHAIRMAN.—I wish the calculations were as simple as those you have read out, unfortunately they are more complicated than that; it would hardly do for us to take them on that basis.

28056. Mr. MEAGHAM.—Still with all, I think your calculation is a very fair sample of the ordinary workhouse?—I take it that Bandon is about a fair average union.

28057. I quite recognise that you have gone into the thing closely, but there cannot be a very big saving because the poor law system as worked fairly economically—it is in the District Council administration that the expense is high?—Out of the total expenditure there might be a saving of about £200.

28058. CHAIRMAN.—I must say I think your estimate is not correct as regards the £200, but, taking it on a rough basis, the calculations are on the right lines; there are, however, a great many things to be considered that have not been touched on here?—You refer to classification probably.

28059. I am not going into our calculations at present, but I am very glad to receive yours?—Perhaps I may mention at this stage that our union is a fairly average one and economically worked.

28060. I think it is very economically worked; all I want merely to say is that I should not assent to the calculations you have read as being such a calculation as we would produce?—I find the number of inmates in the body of the house is 103, in the hospital 51; that the average cost in the house is 2s. 5d., and in the hospital 6s. 6d., and that the clothing is about 5s. or 6s. In the Bandon Union I find—I may say that I have not assent to the annual report of the Local Government Board for last year—but I find in 1903, the percentage, the amount expended on the relief of the poor in the Bandon Union was 1s. 2d., which I think, is moderate out of the total expenditure of 1s. 6d. I find that for the same year the expenditure on relief of the poor for Munster was an average of 1s. 8d., and the total expenditure 2s. 1d., and that for all Ireland the

Sept. 26, 1905.
Mr. R. CHASE.

expenditure on the relief of the poor for that year was 1s. 3d., and the total expenditure is 6s. 4d., so you will see Brandon is below the average.

CHAIRMAN.—That is incontestable.

28061. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Your valuation is fairly high, and the number of inmates not very large?—The valuation is fairly high.

28062. £75,000, and the number of inmates 150?—154 at present.

28063. Chairman.—The largest number would be 172?—About that.

28064. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—That, of course, affects the poundage considerably?—In reference to the classification I may say that I am strongly, and have been for a long time strongly, in favour of a re-classification of the workhouse, and I think it might be effected in this way. At present there is only one class, practically one class in the body of the house; the result is to my mind a very great injustice to the deserving poor. Those that have lived honourably and respectably are compelled frequently to seek the shelter of the workhouse through no fault of their own in their declining age, and they are obliged to consort in the workhouse with people whose character may be indifferent, if not worse. Therefore, I think it is a crying evil and calls very loudly for amendment. I think it might be accomplished in this way, because personally I am rather opposed to the suggestion that has been made by Mr. Murtaghan, to remove the infirm, including the respectable infirm, to a central institution. I think there is a very strong sentimental objection to that, the people of the locality in their declining years like to live in that place, to die there and to be buried there, and I think anything that would interfere with that very proper feeling is to be avoided. But I think the class might be re-divided into three sections. In the first place I would place the respectable and industrious poor over a certain age, say sixty for men and women who, as I say, have been compelled through force of circumstances to seek the refuge of the workhouse. In that class I would also place widows who have been left without provision, wives who have been deserted by their husbands, through no fault to be ascribed of the wife's own, and those who were incapable of work; in all cases the character should be excellent; it should be strictly inquired into.

28065. CHAIRMAN.—On what basis would you inquire on what lines?—To be inquired into by, of course, a local committee, and there should be in each case a certificate of character from a clergyman.

28066. What would be the symptoms or facts on which you would include a person to be a person of bad character?—I think in a case of that kind the clergyman of the church to which the person belonged could form a very excellent idea.

28067. They might not be what you would call very good parishioners?—Well, I think the police possibly might have some information to give on the subject.

28068. That is what I want to come at—whether you are going on notoriety as regards character?—Very frequently notoriety judges character correctly.

28069. What would you consider bad-charactered people—of course any person of immoral habits, that is obvious; what other reason?—I would take drunkenness as immorality, and I certainly would take it that anyone who in the prime of life drifted into the workhouse whom work could be had outside was a man of questionable character.

28070. Would you say that a person of quarrelsome habits and abusive tongue was a person of bad character?—Not exactly, but I certainly think they ought to be excluded from the first class I speak of.

28071. They would be the greatest nuisance in the house—a person of immoral antecedents and drunken habits would be comparatively harmless in a house compared to a tirage or quarrelsome?—That is very often the case.

28072. Really what you would want would be to get a person of chubbable habits, a pleasant person to live with?—That is the idea. I would appropriate the best part of the house—what is at present used in the Brandon Workhouse as a hospital—for the reception of those people. I should be disposed to divide the wards into cubicles, and allow two, say, to live together at the men's side of the house, two decent men, and at the women's side two decent women.

28073. And old married couples?—Quite so, and I should give those special privileges, give them better food, allow them to wear their own clothes, or

at all events comfortable clothes, not stamped with the workhouse mark. I would give those belonging to the class considerable privileges; in other words make their life more like what it would be in an almshouse; in fact they would be pensioners, as it were, on the public and not paupers, and in that way very greatly improve the condition of the best class of inmates in the house. Then the second class would, of course, consist of those who were neither very good nor very bad, the average inmates of the workhouse. I should allow their condition to remain pretty much as it is at present. The third class should be for those who were vicious loafers, and altogether the undesirable in the workhouse. I would make the discipline in their case very much more severe than it is at present, and I would make their food less attractive.

28074. Are you speaking of the aged and infirm?—No, I am speaking of the inmates as a class.

28075. That is mainly the aged and infirm—they are nearly 40 per cent. of the whole number?—The best of those would form the first class.

28076. You may take it that the sick would be about as large a body?—I don't call them sick; the hospital would be removed altogether. The second class would include practically the bulk of the inmates, and the third class would include those of inferior character, the undesirable, as I say; I would make their condition less pleasant than it is, because I think some drift into the workhouse because they can get better food than outside without working for it. In fact I would make life undesirable for them in the workhouse; I would make them the brewers of wood and drawers of water for the establishment, and what would be saved in the cost of their maintenance would go very considerably to meet the increase in the cost of maintenance of Class No. 1.

28077. Then the people of these several classes would be liable to be shifted from one to another according to conduct?—On promotion or otherwise. If it were found that someone in Class 1 was disposed to be quarrelsome, giving trouble to the superintendent or their fellows, I should send that person down to Class 2. On the other hand I think it ought to be possible for one in Class 2 to be promoted, as it were, to Class 1, and get the superior advantages. But now I think it would be better for me to take a concrete case, and I find it in the Brandon Workhouse. I may tell you that the house was built to accommodate 908. The fever hospital, which is a separate building, a very excellent building, was built to accommodate 105, and there is an old hospital in the town, now used as a dispensary, which would hold about sixty. My idea is if there were, say, five of the workhouses of the county suppressed as workhouses, to convert one of these into an auxiliary lunatic asylum, or for the reception of imbeciles and epileptics. Some time ago Schull was suggested.

28078. It is a long way off?—Schull would be suitable for that purpose; it is at the extreme end of the West Riding. Another I should appropriate to the reception of women of a separate class with their children under a certain age; it would be a reformatory or penitentiary under religious influences. One or two of the others I should convert into a district school or schools, and to that I should transfer all the children at present in the workhouse schools, remove them altogether from the workhouse and from workhouse influences, and the fifth, if there were five suppressed, I should convert into a reformatory, or rather an asylum for tramps; that is to say, when a man was shown to be a confirmed tramp on clear evidence it would be in the power of the magistracy to commit that man to the asylum I speak of; there should be a considerable amount of land attached to that on which a man could work, and, if possible, he should be encouraged to work out his own salvation and return after a time to the world a reformed character. By removing the children and by removing women of a certain class from the Brandon Workhouse, there would be a considerable amount of space, that is now appropriated to those two classes at command. I should also remove the hospital, which is at present under the same roof as the workhouse, and convert the present fever hospital into a district hospital.

28079. That idea did occur to us when we were going round?—It would accommodate about 100. The present number is about sixty-four. So that, even if some of the adjoining unions were suppressed, and that portions of these unions were amalgamated with the Brandon Union we should still have ample space for a possible increase.

There are very few cases of fever in Brandon; it is singularly free from fever of all kinds, and as we have an old fever hospital, at a comparatively small outlay that might be converted to its original purpose of a fever hospital.

28060. Or at a small expense you could put up a cottage hospital in the grounds of the Brandon Union?—Yes.

28061. The fever hospital is an old building?—Seventy or eighty years old.

28062. Was it an old hospital?—No, got up by public contribution; it is not very far from the Roman Catholic National School.

28063. Are there any houses in the immediate neighbourhood?—Not very near.

28064. Is there a populous neighbourhood immediately round it—would you have an outlay at once if it was proposed to open an infectious hospital there?—I don't know that you would; it is not in as populous a centre as the Cook Fever Hospital.

28065. That is to be expected—it is a different matter when opening a place new?—If the hospital were removed from under the roof of the workhouse, if the separate class of women and children were removed to different institutions, we should have the whole workhouse practically for the purpose I speak of. The present hospital wards I should convert into cubicles for class No. 1. Class No. 2 would practically remain where they are now, and the two schoolrooms I think would be easily fitted up for the reception and discipline of the third class.

28066. Mr. MURKINMAN.—Would you not find it rather expensive to go into all that detail in a small workhouse?—I don't think it would.

28067. CHAIRMAN.—You contemplate others coming in from adjoining unions—I won't ask you to say what unions?—I do.

28068. Mr. MURKINMAN.—Why do you favour putting the children into one of the district workhouses instead of sending them out amongst the farmers of the country?—As a matter of fact we have adopted the boarding-out system very largely in Brandon; we were the first who introduced the practice.

28069. Do you find it satisfactory?—Very satisfactory.

28070. Would you not extend that a little more?—Of course there are only certain classes we can send out.

28071. But if the law was altered so as to allow you to send out any child that is a permanent burden on the rates?—I think for some reasons the central institutions might be better; I think it might be possible to send the children to learn useful trades.

28072. CHAIRMAN.—To keep tradespeople there to instruct them?—Quite so.

28073. Do you think it a wise thing to instruct the waifs and strays in trades that small employers could not hope to teach their children—do you not think it a putting them a little unduly up; would it not be better to make agricultural labourers of them in a country where labourers are specially needed?—Some have special aptitudes for trades.

28074. Then they would break into it when they get out. Do you think it is wise to spend money on teaching them trades?—There is the possibility of over-manufacturing the article. I understood the experiment had been very successful in other places, the system of a district school for a county. I think the present vice-president of the Local Government Board, Sir Henry Robinson, devised a scheme of the kind when he was Inspector.

28075. Yes; we have seen two of his schools, Glen and Trillick.—That was the reason I suggested it because I thought it successful in other places.

28076. Mr. MURKINMAN.—The evidence has not been altogether favourable to institutional life for children. The great bulk of evidence has been in favour of outdoor life.

28077. CHAIRMAN.—It is a great improvement on the workhouse?—Oh, yes; I am most strongly in favour of the boarding-out system, because I find very few of those who have been brought up in the country have drifted back to the workhouse.

28078. Mr. MURKINMAN.—Whereas with children reared in the workhouse?—It is almost inevitable that they come back.

28079. CHAIRMAN.—I would not go as far as that, but we do find too many cases coming back?—Too many cases.

28080. You speak of the justifiable feeling of old people wishing to live and die in places where they

were reared—that would be your chief objection to any large centralising scheme?—That was my principal objection.

28101. Any scheme of amalgamation brings them further from home than they used to be?—Not very much, because in no case would the two unions amalgamate and form one.

28102. That has been done?—My idea is that if a union surrounded by three or four others were suppressed, certain divisions of it should go to each of the adjoining unions.

28103. But that, at all events, would increase the distance people would have to go, and would also take them out of the area with which they had been familiar?—It would to a limited extent.

28104. Even as it is, take a large union like Brandon. Some part of your union borders along Courtenessbury for Salway folk or cottiers living along the sea coast—do you think it would matter much to them whether they were taken to the Brandon Workhouse or, say, to Cook Workhouse; would they not be equally out of their district and surroundings and neighbourhood?—Of course they would to a certain limited extent, but the difference in the case of the unions I speak of surrounding Brandon is hardly more than four or five miles.

28105. I mean taking it apart from amalgamation—even as your own union under the existing system have not the people to be taken out of their own surroundings and neighbourhood and brought to a central institution, the workhouse, and are they not virtually cut off from their friends; how far would it be from the most extreme populous part of your union?—Of course that is the case.

28106. They are practically out of range for visits except in extreme cases of sickness?—I understand their friends do come to see them.

28107. From these remote places?—Of course from the towns—you can understand townspeople coming to see the sick. Have you ever ascertained the number of visits paid to those who are not sick?—No.

28108. We have made inquiries and find the number of visits to the aged and infirm, as distinguished from the sick, is very few; they are a very much neglected class as far as their own relatives go; a great many of them have practically no relatives; they are the last surviving members of their expiring generation?—That might be got over by a classification scheme; perhaps some people don't like going to the workhouse to see their proper friends, whereas if class No. 1 bore the name of pensioners—

28109. You think it would be rather a feather in their cap to go to see them?—They might go to see them. I may say that as to tramps it would be very desirable to make admission to the ward one by ticket issued by the police; either that or that the application in the first place be made at the police station, and after inquiry let the Constabulary authorities give an order to the relieving officer to admit.

28110. Put him under police supervision in the first instance?—Quite so, and I think if the police at the station formed the idea that the applicant was probably a confirmed tramp it should be within their power then to telegraph to the police station of the town where the tramp had passed the last night to ascertain whether the statements made by the man were correct or not.

28111. And to advise these ahead of him, perhaps, the way he was going?—Well, at all events they could tell where the tramp came from, and if his statement was incorrect, then it would be the duty of the policeman to bring that convicted tramp before the bench, or, rather, before a magistrate, not waiting for petty sessions day, and have him sent to jail, and then if a man were a confirmed tramp it would be in the power of the bench to commit him to a house of reformation.

28112. Do you not think it would be easier to make a final suggestion—you have made a primary one—if it could be proved straight off he was an incorrigible tramp and vagrant he should forthwith be sent off for his own good?—The mere fact that he had once passed from workhouse to workhouse would be hardly sufficient.

28113. It is not the fact of his applying for relief, but the fact that he is unable to show how he made his living?—Many people wander about the country who are compelled to do so.

28114. Quite so, and they could have a testimonial with them that could show if they were decent people

Sept 20, 1895.
Mr. E. Cress.

Sept. 26, 1905.
Mr. R. Clear.

in search of work, and the people who are tramp-
round as habitual vagrants are very soon identified.
By establishing a system of inter-communication be-
tween the police.

28115. Would you be in favour of bringing these
men before the bench and committing them to a place

for a long term?—I should ultimately, but until a
place is provided that cannot be done. It ought to be
in the power of the police to prevent a conviction
in a case of the kind. A good deal of my evidence is
personal; I should not care to commit my former col-
leagues to everything I have said.

Mr. Daniel
Murphy.

28116. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the Bandon
Board of Guardians?—Yes, a District Commissioner.

28117. We have had the advantage of hearing a very
long statement from Mr. Clear?—Yes, he has gone so
extensively into the statistics that I won't trouble you
much.

28118. Was there anything else you would like to
say—for instance the area of charge for outdoor re-
lief?—I think that is very satisfactory.

28119. You like the union at large as it is?—Yes,
very satisfactory.

28120. As regards amalgamation?—I am for amal-
gamation, and so is the whole board.

28121. Would you be in favour of the Bandon
Union being broken up or others outside broken up?—
Bandon is more central than any, because there are
facilities for rail communication from the distant
unions.

28122. What union would you like to bring into
Bandon?—I would not like to mention them, but
there are four.

28123. There is no doubt of the four unions you
want to swallow Cork?—Bandon was built to accom-
modate 1,000, and the average for the year up to
August last has been only 108; that makes only one-
sixth of the union full, the remaining five-sixths being
empty, and it is just as hard to keep up an empty estab-
lishment as a full one. Then the fever hospital is in
a very healthy situation on a hill; I have heard the
expressions of Mr. Clear about the houses; those are
no houses; it is rather isolated.

28124. But the fever hospital where the dispensary
is?—That is in the centre of the town; it would not do
for an infectious hospital. Of course the up-loop of
the establishment is very expensive when so much of it
is idle.

28125. Mr. MURKIN.—The Guardians of other
unions might object to throw in their lot with yours?
Certainly; they have a right to.

28126. CHAIRMAN.—You would not be afraid of
raising your rates by getting expensive people in like
the Clonakilty people?—The Clonakilty people are
fairly careful.

28127. Mr. MURKIN.—Amalgamation puts and
simple on a large scale would raise a good deal of opo-
sition—it would mean a partnership of the unions
amalgamated?—Nobody can say but we have too many
unions.

28128. It would mix up the expenditure, and the
money and the management of several unions together,
and that is a very thorny topic which, I fear, would
not meet with a very general assent?—It would not be
hard to mark out the proper divisions and have it
fairly divided.

28129. Then it would raise the other trouble—guard-
ians would complain having to come fifty or sixty
miles to look after the interest of their area, and then
they would say the union of Bandon was getting every
thing—their own way in the contracts and the money
being spent in the locality, and they were getting

Mr. DANIEL MURPHY, P.R.G., Bandon, examined.

nothing?—There is no doubt there are difficulties in the
matter, but the law should be made so as to meet them.

28130. CHAIRMAN.—At all events what is in your
mind is that unions have been amalgamated before
now, and if any union should be amalgamated in your
neighbourhood, you would have plenty of room for the
inmates in the Bandon Workhouse?—We have.

28131. And a welcome?—I won't say that.

28132. You would be glad to have amalgamation—
it would give you a larger area of charge and relati-
on?—Certainly, but that would raise the rates.

28133. You would be afraid you might not see on
it?—I am sure we would not in the Bandon Union,
but the other unions may.

28134. Then you are against it?—I am not against
it.

28135. Then why are you in favour of it?—Because
of the expense of keeping up an empty house.

28136. You would have to pay more for keeping up
a full house?—On account of the fire alone.

28137. Mr. MURKIN.—Another difficulty is it
would lessen supervision. If you have a very wide
area it is hard to look after the different parts, whereas
if you have a small field it is easily ploughed?—The
present representatives would hold their places.

28138. The whole spirit of the times is for de-
centralization and giving the people an opportunity of
local control?—Not as regards Parliamentary affairs;
it is centralization.

28139. Mr. O'DONNAN.—Would it not be an advan-
tage to bring portions of the Bandon Union down by
the seaboard to Clonakilty?—I have no objection.

28140. And away from the factious spirit that exists
in Bandon?—I don't see that there is any faction now,
I am not pointing at Clonakilty.

28141. Mr. MURKIN.—Would you approve of
a system that would bring the different classes to-
gether and establish a better method of classification
than at present?—It would be well to have a better
classification.

28142. You would like to see the children boarded
out?—No, I would prefer to see them in an industrial
school; taken out of the workhouse and put into some
industrial school where they could learn trades, or an
agricultural institution with some land attached, which
would be better.

28143. Do you not think they would do well enough
if put among the farmers of the country learning the
ways of life and natural existence instead of in
harmful institutions?—It would be better for their
health.

28144. And would it not be better for their morals
and better for Ireland in the future?—It would be
much better, but the agriculture they would learn would
not be much. Some of the unions could be utilized for
farming stations.

28145. CHAIRMAN.—Practical farming work Mr.
MURKIN means?—I agree with that, for their
morals would be improved, removed from the corrup-
ting surroundings of the union.

Mr. J. E.
Farrell.

28146. CHAIRMAN.—What is the opinion of the
Youghal Board?—The opinion of the committee meet-
ing was that they would be against amalgamation.

28147. They would not wish to break up the work-
house or union at Youghal?—They would not, or if it
was broken up they would wish to have it turned into
a large hospital or sanatorium for that portion of the
county.

28148. You have one large institution there at
present?—Yes, the auxiliary asylum.

28149. That is not nearly sufficient for all the
inmates of the county?—Oh, I think not; it is full at
present.

28150. And it is not nearly sufficient—would the
Youghal people object to giving their workhouse, except
a part for a sick hospital, to take in the rest of the
inmates?—That I am not prepared to say.

Mr. J. E. FARRELL, P.R.G., Youghal, examined.

28151. What would be your own personal view?—They
were willing to give it for some good purpose?—I dare-
say they would; as far as I am concerned I would be.

28152. Have the males in one block and the females
in another, and have all the inmates put under the
auxiliary care?—Personally I would be for that;
children and infants should be maintained outside the
house, boarded out, that is the principle we go on—
we have very few in the house.

28153. Would you wish to have your discretion en-
larged so that you could board out every child of a
suitable age?—Yes, that is the opinion of the Guardians;
they seem to think that the children who are
boarded out have not the tendency for coming back
to the house.

28154. It has been stated to us that they are more
useful and handy when trained in house work from
their infancy?—Yes.

28155. And that the aged and infirm, especially old married people, should be allowed to live together in the workhouse or boarded out. Have you considered the question of boarding out elderly people?—They have; the only thing against it was that they had not leaving accommodation.

28156. Did it ever occur to you that a great many children would be trying to get their fathers and mothers boarded out with them, and you might fear an undue increase in the rates owing to the attempts to board out relatives?—Of course there is a tendency in that way at present for the outdoor relief class.

28157. The cost of boarding out would be more than that of outdoor relief?—Of course it would.

28158. And, therefore, you would expect a tendency on the part of the outdoor relief people to be boarded out?—It might have that tendency; there should be an amount of care taken about it.

28159. It may be cheaper to continue the present system?—Possibly. As for the general rating the Guardians are of opinion that they would wish to have a general union charge as at present. Their idea was, because the tendency is, generally speaking, for country people who attain the age of fifty or fifty-five to come to the town with their families. These old people become chargeable to the Youghal Union who only spend a few years in the town.

28160. You think the present system works very fairly?—Decidedly.

28161. There was a suggestion made to me some time ago that some regard should be had for that natural feeling on the part of the towns, say that the present state of things should be ascertained and a standard sum might be fixed for outdoor relief for each electoral division or district, and that anything in excess of that, be it in the town or be it in the country, should go on the electoral division; that is, let the present state of things be taken as the standard, and if you have any increase over and above that in the future, if there is any undue tendency towards outdoor relief; for instance, if it is found that the proper amount paid per week in Youghal would be £5 any fresh cases above

the £5 would have to be paid for by the town of Youghal or the electoral division itself, whereas anything under £5 would be on the union at large?—That would work very well for the rural districts, but not for the town.

28162. You know how many people ought to be on outdoor relief now—you have got the list pretty well settled?—Undoubtedly.

28163. If anything in addition to that were put on the locality?—It should be charged as an extra on that division—I did not go into that.

28164. Do you apprehend any increase in outdoor relief?—The tendency is that way.

28165. Do you think it would be wise to adopt a safeguard to curb that tendency?—We use every safeguard possible, and there is not to my knowledge one single unscrupulous case of outdoor relief. We have excellent men as relieving officers who exercise very great care, and the guardians themselves from the district come in as a rule to be able to give us an idea of whether they are deserving or not.

28166. And the guardians as a rule are guided by the relieving officers. They don't put on cases without reference to the relieving officers?—They do now; they satisfy themselves as to the necessity. We find it is far easier to give these people outdoor relief than relief in the house at a considerable cost. With regard to the tramp question the Guardians are of opinion that that should be taken totally out of the hands of the relieving officer and put with the police. A deserving man really looking for work should have a passport, and that should take him from one town to another until work was found.

28167. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—To guard against respectable men being harassed?—Quite so, and to have these men sent to registered lodgings.

28168. You don't think there would be any hardship in taking stern measures with professional tramps?—Not at all; it is not alone the men themselves but their families are growing up in the same groove and with no education.

Mr. THOMAS FARRELL, P.R.O., Youghal, examined.

In the HAIR I have got to endorse what the previous witness has stated, and to say that I happen to be one of the minority of five who do not at all agree with this recommendation. Still I come up here to represent the Guardians, and whatever I state not in concurrence with this will be my individual opinion.

28169. CHAIRMAN.—That is the opinion of the Board of Guardians?—Yes, by eight to five.

28170. Was the chief point of difference the outdoor relief charge?—The chief point would be the amalgamation, I think. If the thing would be an improvement from the national standpoint we should not oppose amalgamation.

28171. If your buildings were turned to good use and filled in some desirable way, you, personally, would approve of it, but the majority of your colleagues preferred the present state of things to something they did not know what?—There you are; they don't like to grasp at the shadow; they want to keep the substance. My own view would be that we should go in for cottage hospitals and do away with workhouses, and that the aged and infirm should be allowed to live in these little cottage hospitals, overseen by, say, a religious community.

28172. The numbers of them would be very large for a small institution—there are 14,000 of them to be thought of in Ireland?—Aged and infirm married couples I referred to.

28173. They are very few?—They are very few, and I think that some plan could be formulated to enable them to end their lives at home.

28174. Would you propose giving destitute married couples outdoor relief?—Making them eligible in that way I would lodge them.

28175. Supposing you did not wish to go to the expense of that, but do it in a more cheap way, and make them eligible for outdoor relief?—I imagine it would be more economical to do as I say.

28176. To keep up a house?—No, but to lodge them with a person who had a house.

28177. Then the only people you would board out would be old married couples?—And children, none of whom I would allow enter the workhouse gates.

28178. As regards boarding out elderly people there would be an objection to that?—I think so—elderly single people. If you exclude the sick and infirm and the married people I think the remainder would be very small.

28179. Oh, it is large. Would you see any objection to putting the aged and infirm into a central institution under good management?—If it were economical.

28180. It is very desirably economical?—Yes, otherwise I would have them distributed in healthy situations and overseen by suitable people.

28181. You don't mean boarded out?—Oh, no; I would not go in for a very large institution because I think it demoralising.

28182. Take a large institution like your auxiliary asylum at Youghal?—Of course they require to be kept in large numbers in order to reduce expense.

28183. Would not the same principle apply as regards the aged and infirm—they are as large a class?—I have not considered that.

28184. That is the reason this Commission has been started, to try and save money, and one of the best chances of saving money would be in the aged and infirm?—As regards general rating, I imagine the present scheme of union at large is as good as any.

28185. You heard my question to your colleague as to whether he would think well of any safeguard so that future cases beyond a certain amount a week should become an electoral charge?—I think that would lead to divisional charges eventually.

28186. Supposing an electoral division was assessed at £1 or £5 a week, anything above that would fall on the division?—I imagine that would lead eventually to divisional rating—the other guardians would be availing of every opportunity to make the chargeability of the extra patients fall on this or that locality.

28187. They could only do that on the ground that this standard was exceeded?—I quite see that.

28188. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—The division that would not utilise up the whole money would want to have it credited to them?—They would; I think it would complicate the financial matters.

28189. Either they would qualify for the whole sum or insist upon reimbursement?—Yes.

28190. CHAIRMAN.—They are doing that at present—you take the amount for which they qualify at present as the normal amount, and everything above the normal would be made expenditure?—Certainly. Then on the tramp question, I am at one with the previous witnesses, that it should be put down by every means, especially for the sake of the rising generation, who go round the country demoralised and become useless to the community.

Sept 25, 1905.
Mr J. E. Farrell.

Sept. 26, 1895.

Mr. William
Madgett.

Mr. Bonayne, Clerk to No. 1 Rural District Council, is here, and if anything in the nature of official information would be desired he can give it.

CHAIRMAN.—We are going to ask the clerk of all the unions for statistics almost immediately. If there is anything Mr. Bonayne would like to say.

Mr. Bonayne.—No, there is not.

Mr. Madgett.—I represent the Urban Council, and they, with the Board of Guardians and the Rural District Council, have agreed upon the following answers:—

ANSWERS GIVEN BY THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE YOUNGAL BOARD OF GUARDIANS, YOUNGAL No. 1 RURAL DISTRICT COUNCIL, AND YOUNGAL URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL:—

No. I. The joint meeting are of opinion that Youngal Union should not be amalgamated, but express no opinion on the general question of amalgamation.

No. II. That should the Commission recommend that this union be amalgamated, a course which the Committee strongly deprecate, the workhouse ought to be retained as a hospital.

No. III. (a.) That Guardians be empowered to arrange for maintenance of certain classes in workhouses of other unions, especially for lunatics, idiots, or imbeciles; (b.) The Committee are against combining unions for poor law purposes; (c.) All children and infants should be maintained outside

of the workhouse. That arrangements ought to be made to allow of aged respectable married couples living together.

No. IV. General rating is recommended to be continued in preference to divisional rating. This was carried by a majority of eight to five, two not voting.

No. V. The Committee are satisfied with the present union, infirmary and hospital.

No. VI. Capitation grant for idiots and imbeciles maintained in workhouses should be continued.

No. VII. The Committee are unanimously in favour of private wards in infirmaries for paying patients.

No. VIII. Tramps should be compelled to apply in the first instance at the Constabulary Barracks, and it should be on the requisition of a constable that the relieving officer give an admission ticket to the workhouse. Known vagrants should be kept in houses of detention where they should be compelled to work. Children of tramps should be taken from them, especially the very young, and the Guardians should stand in loco parentis. A system of identification should be put in force, and it should rest with the tramp to show and prove he or she was not a known vagrant.

Sanctioned,
M. CUNNINGHAM, *Chairman*.

Countersigned,
Y. BONAYNE, *Clerk of Union*.

Mr. JAMES CURTIN, P.L.C., Middleton, examined.

Mr. James
Curtin.

22191. CHAIRMAN.—What are the views of your Board of Guardians?—Their views are for amalgamation, except for the sick poor; the hospital should stand and the fever hospital.

22192. But the able-bodied poor should be treated elsewhere?—Yes. The tramps are between forty-five and fifty a week, and they are increasing.

22193. You are on the main road?—On the main road to Fermanagh, Youghal, and Waterford, and then when they come out they go begging from house to house, with their children badly starved and trained.

22194. What would you do with the tramps?—They should be taken and put into some reformatory.

22195. To try and get them industrial habits?—Yes. I am in a position to know; I have retired from work and do nothing but go round the town. Give a clean sweep to the house and drive the officers out of it; they are related to the Guardians, and that is why we are so few here to-day; there are only two of us here, and we have got no relations inside the gates. The officials rule the house. The porter, the master, and the wardmaster are relations.

22196. The Guardians have not a look in at all?—No; those that have not friends have not. Do something; make a clean sweep to do away with the tramps and idlers.

22197. Do you mean the tramps and officers?—Yes,

to a certain extent; give them a clean sweep if it can be done; I will be happy and others.

22198. Who are the others?—All round the town.

22199. The contractors?—Yes, and the people would be glad. Why should not every parish take care of its own poor; they come from all parts of the country.

22200. That was the old law?—Yes; I remember fifty years ago when the people were dying of the hunger in this country, and when I came into the union three years ago I found fault with so much waste of bread and food that was going on. Big chunks of fire-brick meat—and the poor people hungry—went into the swill barrel with the offal; little lean meat, beautiful milk and cream meal porridge. Our guardians, a cousin to the party, says, "We are getting 18s. a week for this." That passed on, and it came down to 14s. a week, and now it has come down to 8s. a week for the last six months. But the contractors say, "If that Curtin gets into this house, there is as luck in it." I remember the people dying of the hunger in 1848 and 1849, and I say it is a mortal sin to see good food going off to feed pigs. I am in the black books with the credence and drunkards all round the country, but I don't care; I tell you what I think. I am for amalgamation; I have got a lady here, too; she is a new guardian, but she is well ported. We would be very happy that you would do something, sir!

Miss MINA ROSEMAN, P.L.C., Middleton, examined.

Miss Mina
Roseman.

22201. Dr. BROWNE.—First kindly tell the Commission what you think about amalgamation?—Amalgamation would be very good except for the sick poor. I think I would keep the hospital.

22202. Would you approve of sending the other classes to a central institution?—Yes, I think it would be a very good idea; I think there ought to be a classification of the poor, and the deserving poor ought not to be put with the tramps and the idle.

22203. You mean with objectionable people?—Yes.

22204. What alterations would you suggest?—I think children ought not to be allowed into the workhouse; there ought to be some central institution where they could be brought up to good habits. I think they generally develop into the tramp class when they get out.

22205. Would you propose to board them all out even in preference to an institution?—Certainly I would, if it could be done.

22206. Are there many boarded out in your union?—Yes, there are a good many.

22207. You have a Ladies' Committee, I presume?—No, I don't think there is.

22208. You are a guardian?—Yes, I represent Cloyne, a very large district.

22209. In most of the unions where there are children boarded out there is now a Ladies' Committee, which is found very useful in looking after children, in visiting them, and seeing the houses they are boarded out in?—When I got elected I tried to bring that on, and went to the houses myself to try to get good foster-parents for the children, and succeeded in getting some out.

22210. Are the houses all suitable?—All that I have got out are in suitable homes.

22211. Perhaps you might think of getting a Ladies' Committee appointed—are there a number of ladies in the district willing to act?—I think so; I don't think there is any committee in the Middleton Union, but there ought to be.

22212. For the aged and infirm—you would wish to see a better system of classification?—Certainly.

22213. Of course that would be possible in a central institution—it is hardly possible in unions as they exist at present?—I don't think they could have it as the unions are at present. Another thing, too, that

could be done. If the unions are left as they are, all the stores ought to be under the control of the masters, if she is a man, and the master ought to be there merely to enforce her orders. Anything the men have to do they do thoroughly well, and there is no complaint whatever.

28214. Would they be quite willing to undertake that duty?—Well, I think they would. I think it would be just as easy as anything else. Then I think all charges ought to be union charges.

28215. You mean for outdoor relief?—For outdoor relief and everything else, and most other things in connection with the poor, because I know in my own town there are very few of the natives really getting outdoor relief; they are all people from the outlying districts that come in and live there.

28216. That have been, perhaps, living a short time in the town?—Yes; a very short time, too.

28217. You would not consider it advisable to establish such a system as was mentioned here this morning—that is to have the present rate a sort of fund, and any increase on that for outdoor relief to be apportioned on the divisions?—No, I think it ought to be all union rating.

28218. What about the lunatics?—I think it is a great hardship to have lunatics in workhouses, especially in the Middlesex Union—there is an epileptic patient there—and then we have to pay for the auxiliary asylum, and it is a risk to the other lunatics to have them in the workhouse.

28219. Is he a lunatic?—He is in the idiot ward.

28220. He is not a sane epileptic?—No, but he works about at intervals; he is perfectly well for a certain time, but he may get dangerous.

28221. As a rule they are amiable at first—it is only in the later stages they become mean?—This is a young man; I don't think he is in all right at any time.

28222. I suppose they won't take that class into the Youghal asylum?—They won't take them into the asylum, and unfortunately, he is always nearly over the fit when the magistrates see him, and they won't commit him to the district asylum.

28223. Would you propose to have a society for epileptics—to give them occupation and plenty of farm work to do—epileptics do better when they are given occupation?—All classes of insane, I think, do better.

28224. Quite right, but particularly epileptics. They seem to improve very much if occupied outside at farm work. In the early stages quite a number of them have been cured in that way. Do you think it would be desirable to have an epileptic colony for a province, say, or one for all Ireland?—One for Ireland, I think; I don't think you have so very many epileptics.

28225. There are not so many insane epileptics—there are a great many epileptics but some have passed the border line where it is possible to cure them, and the sick, you say, you would keep in the institution as they are at present?—I think so; they are very well cared.

28226. If the workhouse was closed the hospital would be practically a district hospital?—I think that would be a very good idea.

28227. In cases where the workhouse is not closed do you think it would be a good idea to separate the hospital from the workhouse?—I don't know whether that would be a good idea; I cannot say.

28228. It has been stated that the hospital to some extent helps to recruit the workhouse—that is, cases discharged from the hospital go into the workhouse; they are under the same management and in the same grounds; it is so easy to go from one to another that very often when they go into the workhouse they stay there, whereas if it was entirely separated—of course that applies more to large towns?—I think if there was a better system of outdoor relief a great many people would not go into the workhouse.

28229. Would you approve of that?—Yes.

28230. In what way would you suggest it could be improved?—The relieving officer could have power to bring certain people some outdoor relief to keep them out—I think it would keep down the rates, because they would be satisfied with much less out than inside the house.

28231. What safeguards would you propose?—A committee like the present Board of Guardians to inquire into these cases.

28232. There are so many people in Ireland of very small means that if they saw their neighbour getting outdoor relief they might want outdoor relief too, and in that way it might spread considerably?—If you had

a committee that would inquire into it, appointed in the district I don't think abuses could occur. A committee elected by the ratepayers.

28233. And have it a union charge?—Have everything a union charge.

28234. A committee might not be able to visit one part of the county, and would have to take statements as they received them?—Well, like a Board of Guardians elected for a union I think they would know all about the poor.

28235. If a case comes up before the Board of Guardians for outdoor relief the guardians of the District mostly speak about it, and is asked about it—would it be the same in this case?—Yes, that would be my idea.

28236. If you proposed an extension of outdoor relief don't you think it would be better that there should be some means of putting it on a small area where it would be more likely to be looked after?—Yes, but in a town or village the poor from every district would crowd into it, and it would be a hardship on the ratepayers if we had to pay for people living thirty miles away, who had been only a short time in the town. Another thing, I think it is very hard that people living in labourers' cottages should not be eligible for outdoor relief.

28237. You propose there should be an extension of the amount of ground they hold—are they not excluded on account of holding the 1 acre?—I think it is a very bad system, for the cottages are built for the poorest class, and I know cases of great hardship, where they cannot get outdoor relief, where a father of a family is ill and cannot get outdoor relief, simply because he is in a labourer's cottage.

28238. Because he has more than a quarter acre?—They have one acre now.

28239. What extension would you propose?—That they should get outdoor relief like any other poor people.

28240. Irrespective of the size of the holding?—Yes, if they are bona fide labourers.

28241. Would you make the labourer a test?—I think so, because you build these cottages for labourers.

28242. There are plenty of other poor—there might be a widow?—There might be a widow living in a labourer's cottage; she ought to be perfectly entitled without any test.

28243. Have you many consumptives in the union?—Yes, there are some there.

28244. Have you made provision for them?—They contemplate building a shed for the patients to spend the day in.

28245. To keep them apart from the rest of the patients?—That is for the outdoor treatment.

28246. Are they living there day and night?—No, just during the day time to go out and live there.

28247. One shed?—Two sheds—one for males and one for females.

28248. Have you separate wards in the workhouse for them at present?—Oh, yes.

28249. That is only modified isolation—not complete isolation?—No; I think it would be very good if we could get a little sanatorium of our own.

28250. Do you think that would be economical?—It would be very much better than giving £400 for possibly getting one or two patients into a sanatorium.

28251. Is that all you want to get?—If we get that we will be very lucky. I think the ratepayers are rather put out about it, giving so much without any guarantee.

28252. Is there much feeling about it?—There was in my district.

28253. Has it been definitely stated that they would only receive two or three?—We have just to take our chance.

28254. What were you wishing to get—a definite number?—Yes, value for the money expended.

28255. You will always have applicants, I presume?—Oh, yes.

28256. Of course it would be only for the very early cases?—Yes, cases with some hope of recovery, but I think if a labourer on the open air system went about in different districts, because I find people have a horror of the open air. They don't sleep with the windows open, they are afraid of the open air, especially at night.

28257. Do you think lectures would do much good?—Do people really learn anything by lectures?—I think so.

28258. They would learn more by being in a sanatorium?—From what I have seen phthisis has taken root before the patient consults a doctor, and it is so

Sept. 25, 1903.
—
Miss Miss
Riordan.

Sept. 26, 1902.

Miss Miss
Riordan.

lets for a cure, but a sanatorium would do good by isolating the patient, thereby preventing infection.

28250. A person who has been in a sanatorium is more likely to carry out the treatment after they have been undergoing it for some months than a person who has not seen any benefit from it, but has only been told about it?—Yes, but I think prevention is better than cure. There are so many cases of consumption in the South of Ireland that we ought to take steps to stop it, and the only way we can do that is by educating the people up to the open air system and proper food which they can get, such as milk and eggs, which are within the reach of all. I think it is a great hardship that the ratepayers should give a night's lodging and food to tramps—able-bodied tramps—able to work.

28251. What would you propose you should do with them?—I think there ought to be some central institution where they ought to be made work, or sent to jail, for the ratepayers are very poor some of them, and these people look well fed and healthy.

28252. You think they should be committed to an institution for a certain time?—I do.

28253. And if that did not prove beneficial and they are found wandering about again they should be committed for a long period?—A long term of imprisonment.

28254. What would you do with their children?—Send them to an industrial school.

28255. Not board them out?—Or board them out, one or the other. I am afraid if they were boarded out, directly these tramps got out they would take them away again; people would not like to take them. That is the difficulty you have with boarding out children; foster-parents don't like to take any but orphans.

28256. CHAIRMAN.—That might be got over if they were boarded out at a distance?—Yes.

28257. There is nothing to prevent the Guardians at Middleton boarding children out in the County Waterford or anywhere else?—That would be a good idea.

28258. Dr. BROWN.—An interchange from one district to another?—Yes, very good.

28259. Have you any difficulty in getting foster-parents for the children?—No.

28260. How much do you give them?—2s. 6d. a week each child, and about from 41 to 55s. every half year for clothes.

28261. That comes to about 60 a year?—Yes.

28262. Are there many applicants for children at that rate?—Yes, a lot more than we can give, because the houses are not suitable.

28263. Can you get them into suitable homes?—Yes.

28264. What do you consider suitable homes?—Where the people are of very good character and clean.

28265. CHAIRMAN.—And have good milk?—Good milk and good water supply, near schools.

28266. Would you require the people to have a cow?—Oh, no; the foster-parents that I get children for had no cows, because they were of the humblest class.

28267. Dr. BROWN.—Small farmers would not take them?—No, they take them as servants, but I don't know whether they would bring them up with their own children.

28268. It is at the younger ages you want them to be taken out?—Exactly.

28269. Anything from a year old?—Yes.

28270. CHAIRMAN.—You seem to be rather strongly in favour of outdoor relief as opposed to indoor relief?—Yes, I go about among the poor people, and I find they object very much to go into the house; it would please them, and then do away with a lot of officials

in the workhouse if we could keep those poor people in their own homes.

28271. Of course you know the legal requirements of outdoor relief, that people have to be destitute?—Yes.

28272. That has come very much to mean being poor—outdoor relief is given now to a great many people who are not destitute, but merely in poor circumstances?—As far as I know I think the relieving officers are very cautious, and only grant it to destitute men. Both relieving officers do their duty well.

28273. How much a week would they get on an average?—A woman or man who is alone is only entitled to 1s. 6d. by law.

28274. That is not so?—Is it not? They seem to think so.

28275. It is in the discretion of the Guardians?—Sometimes the Guardians raise it to 2s., never any more, for a single person.

28276. How far would that 2s. or 1s. 6d. go towards keeping a person?—They generally do some little thing.

28277. Have they a room or shelter?—They have a room.

28278. Does this pay for their room?—This pays for the room, and then they work around.

28279. Is it working or begging?—A great many beg and a great many of the poor are able to do some little thing, and get, perhaps, 3s. a week. They live on very little and they get things from the neighbours.

28280. So it really keeps the roof over them?—That is all.

28281. That is really the idea of most of the outdoor relief—it is not a complete support, just a help?—Yes.

28282. Dr. BROWN.—Have you found that many of them receive assistance from children in America?—I am afraid they don't; I think they go off to America and forget all about them.

28283. Mr. MURPHY.—Compensatively speaking, there is very little outdoor relief in your union?—Very little.

28284. Only about 2500 a year?—It is very little for such a large district.

28285. But there is a danger in making the granting of outdoor relief too easy—you might have too many applicants?—Yes, but I don't think it is done very easily; it is very hard to get outdoor relief.

28286. It is in your union, but it might, if the rules were relaxed too much, become a great danger. That happened in England and they had to reverse matters.

CHAIRMAN.—Almost restrict it to the workhouse.

28287. Mr. MURPHY.—Have you many children in the workhouse?—Something over fifty per cent.

28288. Are any of these eligible for boarding out?—Yes, I have tried to get some out; about twenty are boarded out; there may be more; I am not exactly sure.

28289. Could you not try and find homes for the others?—I am afraid they don't care to let them out except they are orphans or deserted children; I don't think they leave the others out.

28290. Dr. BROWN.—Have you all the deserted and orphans out?—Nearly all, except children that are not very strong, and people would not care to take them, or, of course, children who are perhaps twelve years of age; they don't care to take them too old.

28291. CHAIRMAN.—The last witness seemed to object you to support him in some of his strong statements?—I am afraid I was not able to catch all he said. Besides, I prefer to speak from my own experience.

Mr. JOHN FITZGERALD, F.R.C.S., Macroom, examined.

28300. CHAIRMAN.—You are one of the Guardians of the Macroom Union?—Yes.

28301. Have you considered the question whether you are in favour of amalgamation or not?—We have, generally speaking; they are all in favour of amalgamation.

28302. What unions would you suggest in your neighbourhood should be amalgamated with each other?—We think Macroom ought to be central between Dunmurry and Millstreet.

28303. Kanturk?—Kanturk is rather remote; it didn't matter whether we go or stay.

28304. How would you work out amalgamation?—would you close up your workhouse, or close up MILL-

street?—We discussed that among ourselves also, and we thought we should leave the aged and infirm in the hospital in each union.

28305. And only close the house so far as the healthy are concerned?—Yes, sir.

28306. And get rid of all the administrative expenses?—Of course; that is the great struggle.

28307. You have a good many officers there?—A great many officers.

28308. Active men?—Active men; well paid, rather overpaid. For the same reason as Mr. Curran mentioned a while ago, salaries are well fixed the first day and increased soon after by their own friends. Like Mr. Curran, I happen to have very few friends. There were four other gentlemen asked to come here

Mr. John
Fitzgerald.

and these gentlemen are more or less mixed up with certain classes and friends and relations of the officers. My great anxiety for amalgamation would be to try and get rid of all the expenses.

28310. To get rid of all the avoidable expenses without hardship, and keep the sick there, because it would be a hardship for them to go far—Yes.

28311. Dr. BROWN.—You mentioned about keeping the aged and infirm in the hospital—that would not be a desirable arrangement—I would wish to dispose of them in some way.

28312. CHAIRMAN.—If they went to a central place, say into Cork, they would be all people who could travel by railway—would you have any objection to that?—Not at all.

28313. If you keep more than the sick in the hospital it runs up the expense, and it is not a satisfactory way to class sick people among people who are healthy?—No, indeed.

28314. So that you would be satisfied yourself with having the sick taken care of at Macroom, and let all the other classes of inmates be dealt with elsewhere?—Yes, sir.

28315. Would you board out the children?—Yes.

28316. And the aged and infirm—you say you have no objection to their going to Cork?—Yes.

28317. And girls who are mothers of children—would you approve of the suggestions we have received that they should be sent according to their religion to some religious institution, a Good Shepherd Convent for Catholics, and some other institution, if they are Protestants—would you approve of that?—I would.

28318. Then the tramps—if a workhouse were set apart for the whole of Munster, for the whole South of Ireland, would you approve of giving magistrates the power of committing men who were straggling about the country without any occupation?—I would indeed.

28319. And teach them habits of industry there if possible?—I would, indeed; they are a great nuisance, no doubt about it; not only expense when they are in the workhouse, but a danger and expense also when tramping about the country. They lead a vicious life and commit incendiarism and threaten housebreakers if they don't give them money. They beg, borrow or steal from one Union to another, and then are afterwards entertained at the workhouse at the expense of the ratepayers. They are an awful nuisance, staying in highways and raising dirt.

28320. Of course, sometimes decent men, bricklayers' assistants, shoemakers, and journeyman tradesmen have to move from town to town to get employment?—Yes.

28321. Do you think there would be any hardship on those men if provided with a testimonial or recommendation of character?—It would be very necessary.

28322. There would be no chance of their being interfered with?—Not if they were genuine.

28323. There would not be much difficulty in recognizing a decent man from a tramp?—Sometimes you will be able to ascertain whether they are genuine or not.

28324. Among the ratepayers generally the feeling is very much in favour of reducing substantially the expenditure on poor law?—Oh, yes.

28325. And you think they would not object to any closing of workhouses if it could be done without hardship to the sick or poor?—Yes, they are all in favour of it.

28326. But you seem to think, and I can understand it, of course, that there is a very large number of interested people whose interests are bound up directly or indirectly with the continuance of the present system?—That is so.

28327. Mr. MURKIN.—Your charge for officering is 69 per inmate, per annum. That is high.—Very high, say the reason I told you a while ago—that those officers have too many friends and relations, perhaps on the board, and, unfortunately, I may go further and say that sometimes the officers have managed to rig the elections triennially. Actually very often when there is a contest it is caused by officers who want to put off certain members of the board and put on their own friends. We had that experience last June.

28328. You think the closing of certain workhouses would lessen that?—Oh, yes.

28329. Would you see any difficulty in moving the infirm class to a central home—some of the witnesses have complained that it would be a hardship—do you see the hardship?—We have the railway from Macroom into Cork, and it may help to some extent.

28330. Don't you think these old people would be much better off in a home by themselves, having some light occupation to engage them during the day, instead of being housed as they are in a room or yard without any occupation or recreation just waiting to pass their time until they are called away. You think it would be much better if they were on a large farm where they could exercise?—I think they would be much better off.

28331. Have you any opinion as regards rating for outdoor relief—do you think there is unfairness to country districts by the present system of union rating?—I personally would prefer divisional rating, because it would give us all more or less an interest in keeping down the rates in this way; we would not be trying to get outdoor relief for persons who were not really, perhaps, entitled to it, but because we have not to pay in our own divisions for it we must other divisions all over the union.

28332. The amount spent in your union is very large for the size of the union—£1,800 a year?—Yes, indeed, very large; I think it is the worst case in the whole country.

28333. You think there would be more supervision and care if the area was reduced to what it formerly was—divisional?—Yes; it also applies to us as a District Council, because it is there the great trouble and expense comes in, where certain works are required, perhaps a public pump, or even a private pump, which they could carry out if they would try and make their own division pay for it. They are getting up waterworks in places where it is not at all necessary. That in our union has grown very big. At the very commencement, four or five years ago, when the very first pump was applied for, a few of us tried very hard to prevent it, because it was a bad precedent, and we failed; it was carried by a majority. And on that day certain persons said out of a threat that they would apply for a pump in their own neighbourhood, and in due time they applied and got them, and they are going on since, waterworks and pumps.

28334. CHAIRMAN.—The area of charge is the area immediately benefited?—Yes. The very first pump asked for was one at the top of the hill at the school house, and that is a complete failure; it cost £40 or £50; it is dry almost ever since, and has been repaired at a big expense, and is a failure still. If we could remedy that we would like divisional rating also.

28335. Mr. MURKIN.—Do you board out many children?—Yes, sir. The chairman of last year's Board of Guardians and Rural District Council—they are not the chairman at present—and the chairman of the present year were asked to come here, and not one of them has turned up.

28336. Is there any evidence except yours from Macroom?—No, sir. There has been as much wire-pulling for the person with whom an orphan child should be boarded out as if it was an election for a clerk. Three or four women apply, and their friends at the board fight very hard for them to get the child, and very often the wrong person perhaps gets the child.

28337. Have you a Ladies' Committee to visit the houses where these children are boarded out to see that they are kept comfortably and clean?—Yes, we adopted that some time ago, but I don't think it is carried out.

28338. Do the ladies not report frequently?—No.

28339. CHAIRMAN.—And they don't recommend who should be selected for the care of the child?—They do not.

28340. Dr. BROWN.—You should get these applications to come through the Ladies' Committee?—If that could be done it would be all right.

28341. Mr. MURKIN.—You could get a resolution passed to the effect, that in future all applications for a boarded-out child should be accompanied by a recommendation of the Ladies' Committee. My friends at the board have a holy horror of ladies; they would not stand them at all. At the last election I was trying to get three ladies co-opted and I got beaten into a cocked hat; I was left in a very small minority.

28342. CHAIRMAN.—Did you get a second?—I did, but I think I got no more. I thought it would be really a very good idea to put three ladies on the board to just look after the poor, and go occasionally through the house, and they would be inclined to keep us in check.

28343. Would you prefer that the ladies should all go to the lunatic asylum or Youghal?—Indeed, sir, when it was first mooted about the Youghal Asylum we thought that all our lunatics would be taken away, but they were not able to take them all.

Sept 26, 1906.

Mr. John
Flanagan.

Sept. 26, 1895.

Mr. John
Fitzgerald.

28334. Did they leave you any troublesome cases?

We had a few, but they are gone since.

28335. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Is there much land around your workhouse?—There is not; I should say five or six acres. If we had more ground and could give more work to the able-bodied inmates it would be a good idea, and if we got some of these tramps to till the ground and do some work, in place of going out as they like themselves. There is an amount of abuse of outdoor relief; there is too much outdoor relief given in cash instead of in kind.

28336. CHAIRMAN.—You saw a resolution proposed here in Cork that all outdoor relief should be in kind—would you be in favour of that?—I would, indeed, for the simple reason that the kind may reach them, and the cash scarcely ever does.

28337. Of course you mean in towns?—It would be very difficult in remote country places—I don't think so at all.

28338. I have experience myself where the relieving officer gives an order to the local shopkeeper to supply the goods to a certain amount to a certain poor person; that works all right. He does not name the trader, but gives an order and the person entitled to the outdoor relief can get it on presenting the order at any shop he pleases?—Exactly.

28339. Do you think there is any abuse there?—Well, I am afraid there is abuse there also.

28340. You think the applicants would get tobacco and porter instead of tea and meal?—Yes, but it is not on the part of the relieving officer.

28341. Mr. MURKAGHAN.—Could you not get out of that by sending the order to people who have no houses?—Yes.

28342. CHAIRMAN.—But they all have houses in remote country places?—As a rule they have.

28343. In Dublin outdoor relief is distributed in kind, including coal in winter?—Yes.

28344. There is no check that could be put on outdoor relief as long as the dispensing is in the hands of a public body?—I suppose not.

28345. Is your opinion that relief now is more given to people who are not quite deserving of it than used to be the case?—That is my opinion, because it is union rating. I have known Guardians ask for relief for persons who did not deserve it, because the division had not to pay for it.

28346. Have you any Guardians in your union who are not ratepayers?—We have some and they are not the worst; the ratepayers are more inclined to spend.

Dr. D. J. MURPHY, Workhouse Medical Officer, Youghal, examined.

Dr. D. J.
Murphy.

28337. CHAIRMAN.—The Rural District Council passed a resolution in favour of amalgamation?—No, sir; they passed a general resolution for amalgamation—their opinion was that their own union ought not to be dissolved.

28338. Have you any position under the poor law?—I am medical officer to the workhouse.

28339. You are not medical officer to the auxiliary?—No.

28340. All the suggestions that have been made to us always provide for the retention of the hospital—we have never received any suggestions, or in very few places, that a hospital should be closed?—That is practically a necessity.

28341. People don't suggest that facilities for treating the sick should be diminished—on the contrary we have received a great many suggestions that further facilities should be given for starting new hospitals. As regards the body of the house, do you know what the general opinion is. If the hospital were allowed to remain do you think there would be very much objection in Youghal to closing the rest of the workhouse if it were applied to some useful purpose?—I don't think so.

28342. If the auxiliary, for instance, were inadequate to maintain the harmless inmates—if the workhouse were given up for that purpose would there be much objection?—I think on the contrary they would be rather in favour of that, or as a sanction, for our altitude is fairly high.

28343. There is no shelter?—Very poor shelter generally. I find the great want in the workhouse is the want of paying wards. From time to time I have a great many people in my own district, especially as regards the fever hospital, who would come into the hospital if we had a paying ward distinct from the general body of the house.

28344. You find that chiefly as regards the infectious cases?—Yes.

28345. There is some question of building a fever hospital now?—Yes, it is very badly needed.

28346. Is there much consumption in the workhouse?—I have eight patients at present.

28347. Do you happen to know whether that is a fair indication of its extent?—I know it is very, very general, unfortunately.

28348. So that having so few in the workhouse is no indication of the general condition?—No, they are a class of patients that won't come into the workhouse hospital, and I don't force them to come in most cases, because I don't think it is a very good thing for them.

28349. At what stage are the eight patients?—Two in the acute stage, and the rest practically beyond that, and then I have two that a sanatorium would be useful for.

28350. Dr. BROWN.—Can you isolate them?—Yes, I have consumptive wards for isolation.

28351. Are they out much?—Yes, I try to keep them out all the time.

28352. Have you good shelter for them outside?—Our shelter is very poor; we are on the top of a hill.

28353. But any shade shelter for the consumptive themselves?—No, not specially. The only suggestion I was asked to make by the people of the district was as regards paying wards, and that chiefly for infectious cases.

28354. CHAIRMAN.—If you have a proper classification of diseases, and then paying wards on each side, male and female, it means a great many wards—has any plan been got up for the fever hospital?—A plan has been sent in.

28355. Would it be adequate for classification of diseases and classification of sexes, and two additional wards for paying patients?—Yes, it would meet all those.

28356. Dr. BROWN.—How many wards would be in it?—We have two general wards—one for male and female, and then an isolation bed on either side and two beds, one at the male and one at the female, for paying patients.

28357. That is not classification?—Oh, no; we have no classification between typhus and typhoid.

28358. CHAIRMAN.—It would not be up to date, doctor?—I don't think so; I don't care for the plan myself.

28359. Dr. BROWN.—Have you said so?—I have stated so. We had a consultation on the matter with Dr. Smyth and Mr. O'Brien Smyth; they know my views exactly. We find our diseases classify themselves as typhoid and scarlatina; we rarely have typhus; we have diphtheria sometimes. I don't think we get many cases of measles; they get it over at home.

28360. CHAIRMAN.—Any whooping cough cases?—They are rarely sent.

The sitting was adjourned.

FIFTY-SEVENTH PUBLIC SITTING—WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27TH, 1905.

At the Court-house, Cork.

Present:—Mr. MILLS (Chairman), Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. COREY BIGGER.

Professor COREY, M.D., Cork, examined.

23321. Dr. BIGGER.—I understood you are going to give us some evidence regarding the question of providing a sanatorium for consumptives?—Well, I may mention that I am a member of the Joint Board for the erection of a sanatorium for the Co. Cork. Twenty-eight public bodies joined together for the purpose of having this sanatorium, and the Board consists of fifty-six members.

23322. CHAIRMAN.—How many of these are medical men?—There are only two members of the Board medical men; myself and Dr. Murphy, of Youghal. You should be a member of one of the contributing bodies, and at that time I was a member of the Cork Corporation.

23323. Dr. BIGGER.—Is Dr. Cronin a member?—No. At the first meeting we came to the conclusion that it would be very important to have a suitable site selected, as one of the members expressed it. We considered that everything depended on the selection of a proper site. What was decided on at that meeting was, a medical committee was appointed, consisting of Dr. Donovan, the Medical Officer of Health in Cork, Dr. Cronin, and myself, and we got power to investigate the whole subject, and were authorized to assist the Board in every way in the selection of a site. Advertisements were put into the newspapers inviting tenders for sites, and we also recalled that we had compulsory powers for acquiring sites, if necessary.

23324. CHAIRMAN.—This was subsequent to the issue of the Provisional Order?—Yes, when we were formed into a Board, at our very first meeting. Then all the replies were put before the Medical Committee and we considered them, having regard to the climate as far as we knew about it, the height, and other requisites. We also had power to call in an engineer and get him to inspect the sites that were named, with a view to learning what the quality of the soil was, whether it was retentive or otherwise; also to learn whether there was a sufficient supply of water, whether there were facilities for drainage, and, of course, from the Ordnance maps we learned the heights of the various sites. Furthermore, at that first meeting of the Board they authorized the Medical Committee to call in a specialist if we thought it desirable, and they left to ourselves the selection of the specialist, so that there was great anxiety shown to have the thing done in the most efficient manner. Dr. Smyth, as a matter of fact, was called in, and he visited several places in the Co. Cork.

23325. About how many?—There were twenty-five sites offered, and out of the twenty-five I could not tell you exactly the number he visited.

23326. Five or six?—Oh, he did more; he probably visited about a dozen sites. As a matter of fact, I myself visited two of the sites afterwards selected as being among the three best, and I also spent two days with him on a sort of roving expedition, to see could we get anything better. We went out one day to Millstreet, and the following day seven miles beyond Fermoy, and searched the country in every direction for a suitable site. Then Dr. Smyth and the Medical Committee had two or three meetings, and we discussed the whole matter, and the upshot of the whole thing was, Dr. Smyth selected three sites; one was Coolcure, the other Mount Maury, and the other Rahen.

23327. What part of the country are they in?—Mount Maury is within a mile of Macroom, Coolcure is near Danneway, and Rahen is to the north of Mallow. One of the objections to Rahen was the engineering difficulty.

23328. Water?—No; but the side of the hill was almost vertical, and it would be necessary either to excavate or run up pillars for the purpose of support-

ing the building. It was considered the expense, apart from any other consideration, would be too great, and it had nothing to recommend it above Mount Maury. In Coolcure we found there was a heavy rainfall; as a matter of fact, it was twice as heavy as the rainfall in Cork, and the rainfall in Cork is once and a half as heavy as in Dublin. Then, again, there was a feeling among the members of the Board that, as Lady Randon, who is the landlady, had an objection to part with the site she ought not to be pressed if we could get as good elsewhere, for I may mention that Lord and Lady Randon have always taken a great interest in philanthropic works in connection with the city and county. The upshot of the investigation was that we selected by a large majority Mount Maury as the site. At that same meeting the engineer stated it would cost £12,500 to erect buildings, irrespective of what it would cost to procure the site, and that had rather a dampening effect on some of the members present, and one of them went into figures, and he said the whole thing could hardly be done at all, considering the income we would have. I pointed out at the time that the estimate seemed to me to be entirely too high. It meant a lot of bricks and mortar when other structures would do quite as well—chalets. I mentioned, also, that chalets are what are generally approved of by medical men for sanatoria at present.

23329. Had you Dr. Smyth in consultation at that period?—He was not present at that meeting. I also pointed out that a distinguished engineer had mentioned to me that chalets which would suit for two patients could be run up for £25, or about £40 a patient. Since then, seeing the feeling of some members there that they were disposed to throw cold water on the whole project, I thought we would go into the matter more fully, and I made inquiries as to what the cost of acquiring a site would be and the cost of maintenance. But before going into that, perhaps I may point out the advantage of sanatoria just in a few words.

23330. Dr. BIGGER.—We have had a good deal of evidence as to the feasibility; I think it is admitted by everybody. Could you give us anything more particularly as to how cheaply they could be erected?—Very well. I was anxious to procure the most recent information, and I found that at the last meeting of the British Medical Association, held last month in Leicester, there was a special discussion on sanatoria for Poor Law consumptives. Dr. Weatherly, of Bath, introduced the discussion, and you will remember that he took part in establishing a sanatorium in connection with these counties in England, so that he has practical knowledge on the subject. Before mentioning what he states with regard to maintenance I had better first take up the cost of erecting a sanatorium.

23331. Just give us a few points, more particularly anything that has come within your own knowledge, because anything written on the subject we have probably read?—Here is what it comes to. One of these writers says he has proved it himself by actual experience that "a site, administrative buildings, chalets and furniture in chalets" could all be provided at a cost of £100 per bed, and he states that could be done within fifty miles of London.

23332. The estimate here was nearer £1,000?—That is referred to by him. "Those responsible in the matter had been discouraged and misled by those who had caused the erection of costly, substantial if not palatial, edifices, involving an expenditure from £200 to £1,500 a bed, whereas the best treatment in every respect can be provided on the chalet system at a total

Professor
Corey.

Sept. 27, 1906.

Professor
Coley.

cost per bed of £100, including the administrative buildings, chalet, and furniture, and even the freehold of the site, as he had proved by experience."

28393. CHAIRMAN.—You could have 100 beds for £15,000, and the repayment of the instalments for £500 or £550—I have worked that out on sixty beds.

28394. You would rather have 100—I would, if our income would go to it.

28395. If your repayment of the instalment would only come to £500 a year then you would have £4,800 for your maintenance?—Yes; the maintenance would be the biggest item. Sixty beds would be £5,000 for site, administrative buildings, &c. £5,000, repayable in thirty years at 2½ per cent., would represent the first year £200 principal and £165 interest; that would mean £365 expenditure during the first year. Of course, the interest would be diminishing each year, and eventually the whole thing would be extinguished.

28396. Dr. BROOKS.—How do you propose to get the money at 2½ per cent?—I understood the Board of Works would lend it.

28397. I don't think so; they cannot borrow at that themselves?—I was speaking to the solicitor to the Board yesterday, and he was under the impression it could be got at 2½ per cent.

28398. CHAIRMAN.—At any rate the instalment would not be anything like what frightened us yesterday?—No; then the maintenance?—A sanatorium for sixty patients can be quite easily run at a charge of 25s. a week per bed. When we started the sanatorium in three counties we were often met with the query, "Are you certain you can maintain the sanatorium at 25s. a week per bed?" We said we were. We have now been long enough in existence to know what our expenses are, and we are able to say definitely that a sanatorium for sixty patients can well be run and leave a margin, at 28s. per bed per patient. That is giving them a splendid sanatorium, electric light over the grounds, thoroughly good and well cooked food, and constant medical supervision." If you had sixty beds, 25s. a week would be £75 a week, and sixty beds at £75 a week would represent £3,900 a year. The expenditure per annum, as interest on capital, for site, buildings, &c., £205 the first year, would be getting less.

28399. Mr. MURPHY.—But your calculation is at 2½ per cent; you can't borrow at that?—You can work that out afterwards.

Dr. BROOKS.—Five and a half per cent. would be payable during the thirty years. In other words, you would be reducing your principal.

28400. CHAIRMAN.—Maintenance is very important indeed?—It is. I don't think that would make much difference. I will show we would have money over and above which would easily cover that sort of thing. Maintenance per annum, £3,000; that would mean a total annual expenditure of £4,265; then the total income at 1d. in the £, which we have authority to levy would be £5,347, and the balance would more than cover the excessive interest. One thing I want to point out is, I saw that a member of the Commission remarked that for forty patients it was a very large sum. In this case it would be a question of sixty beds, and the general routine is that a patient is kept in for sixteen weeks—call that four months. That would mean that you would have three patients in a bed every year; that would mean 180 patients in a year.

28401. If you start with sixty, and find there is a rush for further beds, it is easy to put up more chalets?—Very easy.

28402. It is more prudent to begin with sixty beds?—It would. That is one of the advantages of Mount Mary, that it is studded with chalets of trees, so you have plenty of shelter.

28403. Have you calculated anything for making roads and paths?—You see, that gentleman who has had practical experience, states his practical experience, and that would include the whole thing, I presume. He says "site and buildings." That would include paths and things of the kind. All medical men meet a certain number of patients suffering from consumption, who are not in a position to pay for an ordinary sanatorium, and yet are not poor enough to go into what you may call a charity sanatorium, and I was thinking that if, out of the sixty beds, twenty were appropriated for patients that could pay 10s. a week, that would increase the income.

28404. Dr. BROOKS.—I take it you would charge patients whatever they were able to pay?—Yes; that would reduce the expenditure. That is what I was particularly anxious to bring before you, because certain members of the Board were rather frightened by the statements put before them, and came to the conclusion that the game was hardly worth the candle; but I think it would be very well done, and much more moderate. There has not been a meeting of the Commission since I was able to work these figures out.

28405. But you will bring them before the Commission?—Oh, to be sure. One of my objects is coming before you was to ventilate the thing, that they might read the figures and digest them before the next meeting.

Mr. RAYNE FREWER, D.L., QUEENSTOWN, examined.

Mr. Savage
Poole.

28406. CHAIRMAN.—You are Chairman of the Committee of the Queenstown Hospital?—I am Chairman of the Committee, and have been Chairman for several years.

28407. We visited the hospital last week, and will be glad to hear any statement from you. Your origin, I believe, is in Secoury?—Yes; but about twenty years ago Dean Kellier and I worked out new rules, the basis of which was that Protestants and Catholics should be exactly on an equality in everything in the hospital, and we made a general committee of forty, twenty Protestants and twenty Catholics, and an executive committee of sixteen divided in the same way.

28408. Was it at that period you entered into an agreement with the Cork Board of Guardians?—The agreement with the Cork Board of Guardians is much older than I am.

28409. Has that ever been revised in your time?—Yes, it has; it used to be 1s. 6d. a head for all patients; they now pay 2s. 6d. a head per day for fever patients. Even that does not pay us. We have no funds; we live from hand to mouth.

28410. Voluntary contributions?—Entirely. It is a very popular little institution in Queenstown: the people of the place get up entertainments, and have a street collection, and so on, and we make, on an average, from £350 to £400 voluntarily, and the payments from the workhouse come to about the same.

28411. Do you think your Committee would be in favour of making that a public institution, depending on the rates?—I cannot see the use of it myself. I

think the ratepayers would lose £350 a year, and the people who now take an interest in it would take an interest no longer.

28412. But your nursing system is rather defective?—It is, because we cannot afford any more; we have only one qualified.

28413. That is the reason it occurred to me that you might think it for the good of the institution and the patients?—I complained about it myself, and made a fuss, but we cannot afford very much. The trained nurse lives close by the hospital, and the woman that is in charge at night has had thirteen years' experience.

28414. As a midwife?—Yes; and nursing and other things. She had thirteen years' experience in the hospital, but no qualified training. When we have many patients in the hospital we get in extra nurses. Our average number of patients is about twelve, and sometimes less than that, and it runs up to as much as thirty-six. We can make up thirty-eight beds on a pinch, and then, of course, we get in an extra staff for the time being.

28415. Do the Guardians pay you as much as a patient would cost in their own place? I believe they do. It costs us £50 a bed all round for the year, including the whole maintenance, the maintenance of the house, and of everything about the hospital, and we divide that by the number of patients. Of course, in the workhouse hospital they only charge the cost of feeding. What they pay us from the workhouse does not cover our cost.

28416. Have you ever approached them for a

Sept. 27, 1906.

Mr. Savage
Presb.

further grant?—We approached them about the fever patients and got more. Their answer is that they could do it cheaper in the workhouse hospital.

28417. That would not be so if they arrived at the average cost in the proper way by taking all the salaries?—I don't think it would. If this was made a public institution it would simply mean putting £850 a year on the rates at least.

28418. But if you get the cost increased that they pay you that would also come out of the rates?—Yes.

28419. And you cannot improve your nursing staff unless you get an increase from them?—No; we have two members of the Board of Guardians on our Committee.

28420. Every person who goes into your hospital is either paid for by the Board of Guardians or himself?—Quite so.

28421. Dr. Broom.—The only thing is that a patient pays less very often than the Guardians pay?—Our regular charge for that is a guinea a week. We cannot always get it.

28422. I thought you admitted some at less than that?—No; for paying patients our charge is one guinea a week.

28423. CHAIRMAN.—And any that cannot pay?—We take on a note from the relieving officer.

28424. I suppose if a man could not pay as much as the Guardians pay you are inclined to put him on the Guardians' list?—We cannot do that; they are set in by the relieving officer or the dispensary doctor.

28425. Dr. Broom.—Could you not try an intermediate charge? If a patient could pay 5s. a week?—That would help; but how would he be admitted; he would not be sent in by the doctor then. They generally go in as private patients of the doctor. At Queensdown, we get in men with all sorts of queer diseases, heart-ache, from ships, and we get poor fellows who have met with accidents by falling from aloft. They are paying patients, paid for by the companies that they belong to. We charge a guinea a week, and it is hard to get it sometimes.

28426. CHAIRMAN.—Are you aware of a provision in the Local Government Act by which workhouse hospitals can be turned into district hospitals. If your hospital could in the same way be made a district hospital, afflicting the local committee as the managing body, with further representation on the part of the Guardians, there would be still a possibility that the Committee would look closely after the hospital as they do at present, and perhaps raise funds for a little extras and comforts, would you at first sight think that an objectionable arrangement, the management practically remaining very much as it is?—That would be the danger; if you destroy the interest the people take in it locally you will check off that source of supply.

28427. I see that, but if the local people are still on the committee of management they would still be able to raise money for a great many things that are

not exactly proper charges against the rates?—What representation would the Guardians get?

28428. They would get a very much larger representation than they have at present—you might turn that over in your mind?—Yes.

28429. At present the hospital does need a great many things that the funders don't seem to be equal to. The question is are you going to let the hospital continue as it is or put it in a proper condition?—Of course one would like to arrange one's own committee on that. I will say plainly they are rather jealous of the interference of the Board of Guardians, because we think we have built that up by degrees.

28430. But you realize that it has not reached the highest standard?—We realize that more money would enable us to improve the hospital.

28431. Mr. MURKIN.—If a grant in the way of an annual contribution from the Guardians could be got as an aid to the maintenance of the house that trouble might be got over?—It might.

28432. I agree with you that it would not be a desirable thing to remove the local interest and take away the opportunity for individual benevolence that attends these charitable hospitals, but if there was something in the way of an annual contribution?—Quite so; it is a very popular institution at present, and the poor are our principal subscribers. Every church in Queensdown of every denomination has a service for it, and the street collection is very good. The Guardians supply half our income.

28433. CHAIRMAN.—A good deal more?—I don't think so; of course we make extra whips now and again. Our income in 1905 was £619, and of that the Guardians paid £312; our income in 1904 was £556, and of that the Guardians paid £384. In 1903 they paid in five quarters almost in one year; there was some little friction about representation on the Board, and they kept back one quarter from the previous year.

28434. Mr. MURKIN.—Things are working smoothly now?—Oh, yes, they used to pay us by the quarter; now they pay monthly.

28435. CHAIRMAN.—The question is whether the local interest could not be kept up as in county institutions, where the local people take the greatest interest and provide extras?—That would be a very good thing if we could get the Board of Guardians more representation and preserve our own organization.

28436. You would like, of course, that your local present committee should be predominant in the future committee?—Yes.

28437. You have got an ambulance?—Yes.

28438. And the Guardians have that?—Yes, and they build a stable on our ground; the ambulance, I think, belongs to the Guardians.

28439. There are no operations done in the hospital?—Oh, I think there are.

28440. I mean there are no proper facilities?—No, no proper facilities; no proper operating room; of course any heavy cases are sent to Cork.

Most Rev. Dr. KELLY, Bishop of Ross, examined.

28441. CHAIRMAN.—We have had your Lordship's memorandum giving under five heads the nature of the evidence you are going to give?—You have been down to see the auxiliary asylum, I think. The view that my committee took was that that institution should be of a new type altogether. We understood that the 76th sec. of the Local Government Act intended to establish quite a distinct type of institution, and our view was that the institution should be concerned much more with the physical wants and physical comforts of the patients than with any mental disorder or disease. The existing lunatic asylums were intended for curable patients and for dangerous patients and consequently it was necessary to have a very strong staff of medical officers and a large number of attendants to help to care those who were curable and to prevent those who were dangerous from doing harm to themselves or others. But as we understood the 76th section of the Act auxiliary asylums were to be established for persons who were born idiots, and consequently incapable of cure, for persons who had brain disease and for those who, though they had been once acute and dangerous lunatics had worn themselves out, as it were, and become chronic—and, therefore, what we

wanted was an institution in which they would be well fed and well clothed and looked after carefully and all their physical wants properly attended to. In other words, we intended to establish not a lunatic asylum but a home for idiots and imbeciles. The official authorities took rather a different view. The inspectors of Lunatics published a letter on the 22nd November, 1905, and in that letter they quote a letter of the Resident Medical Superintendent of the Sligo Asylum, written to the Leitrim County Council. The Leitrim County Council were moving at that time in 1905, as were several other County Councils; for instance the Kildare County Council made a very considerable advance in this matter under their very active chairman, and other County Councils, and their idea was to establish auxiliary asylums, particularly where the asylum district included two or three counties, the counties in which the lunatic asylum did not exist were anxious to establish an auxiliary asylum in one of the other counties, and thus, as it were, to equalize the expenditure. For instance, the chairman of the Kildare County Council made a very great effort, as the asylum is at Carlow, to convert the prison at Naas into an auxiliary asylum, and then have the auxiliary

Most Rev.
Dr. Kelly.

Sept. 27, 1906.
 —
 Mount View,
 Dr. Kelly.

asylum in Kildare. In the same way the asylum district being Sligo and Leitrim, and the asylum being at Sligo, the Leitrim County Council wanted an auxiliary asylum in Leitrim and so on. The resident medical superintendent of Sligo wrote to the Leitrim County Council pointing out to them that, owing to the requirements of the inspectors, it would be more expensive to fit up a workhouse than to build an addition to their own asylum, and the inspectors quote at length that passage, and then continue to say: "After ten years' experience, the inspectors fully concur in all that is herein stated, and they believe that when the cost of converting a workhouse into accommodation for insane cases, of the district staff, which is enjoined by the Act, and the fact that a capitation grant of only 2s. a week can be obtained, are taken into consideration, it will almost always be found more economical, where possible, to build annexes of an inexpensive type in connection with the existing asylums, as such buildings could be administered as part of the asylum and thus save the cost of a separate staff of higher officials. Further, the capitation grant would be 4s. in the latter as against 2s. in the former case." That was the idea of the inspectors to increase the existing asylums, and they have pressed that idea on several of the counties. For instance, in the County Clare they passed that idea, and at one time the Clare Asylum Committee had actually passed a resolution to build an addition. I don't think they have gone on with it. The same occurred at Clonmel, where they are actually building at present. You see the view of the inspectors was diametrically opposed to ours, because they speak of the higher staff of officials, a distinct staff, and consequently you would have two separate staffs of officials, evidently equal in both cases. We did not think it was necessary to have that higher staff of officials to cater for the physical wants of the people we considered. And hence you see we had the materials there for a very pretty struggle and that struggle has gone on, rather sharply part of the time. The whole official bodies of the asylums, not only the medical staff but all the rest of the staff through the country, took up the views of the inspectors, and the *Medical-Psychological Journal* and the other medical journals joined in and very great pressure was brought to bear on the Government to restrain us from all quarters, England, Ireland and Scotland. However, our committee, with short intervals of doubt and cowardice, persevered, and we have established the institutions. In the institution we aim at giving physical comfort, and we provide as good food and good clothing, and as careful and kindly attendance for the patients as is provided in any other asylum. We have not made provision for the mental cure of the patients, because we regard them as incurable, and we have not made extraordinary provision for dangerous lunatics; if a patient becomes dangerous we send him to Cork.

29448. Have you had many of those cases?—There have been a few; there has been no transfer to Cork for the last four months. The objection was made that these chronic lunatics were liable to get an acute attack at any moment, and when they did harm might be done. Our answer to that was there is no family in the County Cork in which a member may not suddenly get an acute attack, and the members of the family have to run the risk, and the members of that family are far less able to protect themselves from a person that has become insane than the official staff in Youghal are able to protect themselves. I argued myself as a *reductio ad absurdum*, if that view were to be taken the whole county should be shut up in a lunatic asylum. We established the auxiliary; it was opened last February twelve months; it is about eighteen months in existence. The patients were drafted gradually as first, so that it was not fully stocked with patients for the first five or six months; it is now pretty fully stocked. The accommodation was intended for 417 patients, and there have been 400 there for several months past. We had 350 there for a considerable time.

29449. Now you have 400 odd?—I think the actual number at present is 399. In Youghal there is accommodation for 250 men and only 150 women, and consequently in transferring patients from the workhouses we had to take that fact into account. We had also to take into account distributive justice as between the different unions, because while these patients were in the union they were a union charge, and when we transferred them to Youghal they became

a county at large charge, or a county borough charge, and consequently if you transferred all the females out of the workhouse at Fermoy you relieve the union of Fermoy of the cost of thirty patients and put that on the county-at-large.

29444. But you would not let that seriously stop you taking in a patient?—Oh, not at all, but I merely point out that the question is there, and in making the transfers we tried to keep that before our minds as much as we could. I myself drew up a list, and, according to that list, we were to transfer from the workhouses 180 males and 102 females, making 282, and then we proposed to transfer from the Cork Asylum the other 120, making 402 altogether; that worked out in leaving nearly 300 females in the workhouses.

29445. How many have you at present, males and females?—250 males and 180 females, because the house is built in that way; those 300 were not all transferred. When the medical superintendent went round to the workhouses he found some were epileptic patients, and all those on that list were not transferred; I think 250 were taken from the workhouses.

29446. And he did not remove any of the bedridden, filthy cases?—At first he did not remove filthy cases, but latterly they have been sending filthy cases to Youghal.

29447. Because we saw some in the Cork Workhouse, and they rather made it a ground of complaint that their inebriate patients would not be taken from them?—That was so. Then Youghal has relieved the Cork Asylum to a considerable extent. Our numbers at the Cork Asylum had gone up during 1903-1904, the average daily number was over 1,500, and the numbers had reached 1,700. At our last meeting the number in the house was 1,637, so that we have relieved the Cork Asylum to the number of 200. Then the mortality had been much greater in the Cork Asylum; there was an outbreak of typhoid.

29448. At present your institution, my lord, is practically full?—It is full.

29449. Then you cannot relieve the workhouses of the patients that are there at present?—No. Our original idea in 1899 was that we would erect two auxiliary asylums; at that time we felt that between the patients in the workhouses and the excessive number in the Cork Asylum that we had to make provision for 800 patients, and that in order to do so we should erect two auxiliary asylums of 400 each, and the idea at the time was that one of them would be at Youghal, and the other would be at Schull. We had actually entered into negotiations with the Schull Board of Guardians, and they had passed a resolution to give up their workhouse, but we met with so much opposition in Youghal that we thought we would work out Youghal first.

29450. You intended to have an auxiliary for the east and one for the west?—Yes.

29451. You did not intend to put males in the one and females in the other?—I was working out a new idea like this our minds were not perfectly clear at first and we were clearing up as things went on, but there was a sort of idea that there would be one asylum for males and another for females, but it was pointed out that it would work better to have males and females in one institution for the labour of the men in the farm, and of the women in the laundry would be useful. However, that is a matter of detail, but our committee has never withdrawn the view that they intend to establish a second auxiliary asylum.

29452. You are still personally in favour of extending the auxiliary system to enable you to take the patients from the workhouses?—Undoubtedly, we are still overcrowded in the central asylum, 800 more than the accommodation was intended for. You know the number of inmates in the workhouses.

29453. Mr. MURPHY.—There are fifty-nine males and 106 females at present?—That corresponds pretty well with the figures I have here.

29454. CHAIRMAN.—Would you be in favour of keeping your auxiliary within a close distance of the parent house, as at Youghal?—The further away the better, because to carry out my idea, you never can work up the auxiliary properly except you establish in these institutions quite a new idea from within, a new ideal, and you must start a new tradition altogether, and if you allow the ideas and traditions of the existing lunatic asylums to get into the auxiliary asylums you never can work them as they ought to be

worked, because once the ideas and traditions of the present lunatic asylums get into the auxiliary asylums you will have the staff there demanding exactly the same salaries, and everything must be done in precisely the same way; you must have all the equipment and outfit in the auxiliary that you have in the central asylum. That equipment and outfit is absolutely worthless, it is a waste of money, and consequently if you are to work the auxiliary, as in my opinion the Act of Parliament intended, it should be worked, you must set up a new tradition, and consequently the farther away the better.

28455. Mr. MURKIN.—Your idea, my lord, is that domestic care is the main factor?—It must be a home; it is not a lunatic asylum at all; it is a home.

28456. CHAIRMAN.—A better home than the workhouse?—Of course, and a better home than the lunatic asylum.

28457. Dr. BUCKER.—In what way, my lord?—In the way that people are really more comfortable and happy; they have more domestic happiness.

28458. How do you utilise their labour?—You must remember that the labour energy of the two classes is quite different. Among the acute insane many are full of vigour and full of life—insanity is, in fact, an excess of vigour both mental and physical, and hence you must utilise that energy, and from the curative point of view it is a most useful thing to employ that energy. But take an imbecile, imbecility is the absence of all vitality, the imbecile lives an animal life or perhaps a vegetable life; you take a person born an idiot, it is the same thing; you have not the same opportunity of utilising labour or the same amount of labour to utilise, but of course you will have a certain amount of labour energy and that labour energy has been utilised chiefly on the land.

28459. How much land have you?—Around the asylum first there were about twenty acres, and since then we have paid £550 for a farm; I cannot tell you the amount of land in that farm.

28460. CHAIRMAN.—But you look forward to having the male and female inmates as far as possible exercised in labour on this land?—Yes; then of course about the yard and premises they have to do a good deal, cutting coal, cleaning up walks, a sort of house labour life; I don't think we can go very far in the way of getting up workshops. The inspectors think we ought to have tailors' shops and carpenters' shops and all sorts of shops. We have not got the class of people for those shops, and amongst the acute insane, people that never learned a trade, can be utilised owing to their mental activity, but the class of people we have to deal with, chronic lunatics and imbeciles, it would be a hopeless task to attempt to teach them trades.

28461. Dr. BUCKER.—Don't the classes of acute and chronic run into each other?—Of course they do.

28462. Is there anything distinct except the mere name?—Of course they teach.

28463. After the acute stage is over, don't they become much the same as the chronic class?—I quite agree with you that the two classes touch each other exactly the same as sane and insane touch each other. It is impossible to draw a strict line of demarcation between the sane population of Cork and the insane in the asylum; they touch at the borderland and overlap each other to some extent. But taking the two as a body, the sane population and the insane population, the general characteristics are very different. Now I regard it in precisely the same way as between the acute and dangerous insane and these imbeciles and idiots and chronic cases. A certain number of those in the parent asylum will touch on the fringe of those in Youghal, and even the two fringes will overlap each other, but if you take the body of those in Youghal and the body of those in Eglington they are perfectly distinct and require a distinct treatment, and from the labour point of view there is an enormous difference between them, and hence we look after principally what concerns their physical comforts and feeding.

28464. Mr. MURKIN.—Before you leave that labour question, don't you think it would be advisable to keep those people occupied in some way?—Decidedly, and we are keeping them occupied, utilising their labour, but you will remember we are not in full working order there yet.

28465. CHAIRMAN.—Three half years?—The first half year hardly commenced at all; we have only had it, properly speaking, two half-years working; then the roads down there about the place, the recreation ground and all that, are not fully laid down yet.

28466. You are not quite a going concern yet?—Not in a full sense.

28467. Dr. BUCKER.—Do you say that it would cost you more to utilise their labour?—In one sense it will; it will cost us more to utilise the labour, but on the other hand the labour will be in itself profitable, and I quite think one will counterbalance the other.

28468. Having an enclosed yard with railing all round you can keep 100 under the supervision of one or two officers, whereas if that 100 men were out on a farm they might need eight or ten officers?—I don't believe that at all; I quite admit that you might require two or three instead of one. The chronic patients are not at all liable to get any sudden attack.

28469. Are they all admitted under a medical certificate—that is, are they classified going to Youghal?—Yes.

28470. The 400 you have in Youghal, are they all taken in Youghal as cases that are not amenable to treatment?—Decidedly.

28471. Have they been under observation by the medical superintendent for some time prior to the permit inscription?—Certainly; it is the resident medical superintendent must admit them all, and no one can go to Youghal except through the resident medical superintendent.

28472. CHAIRMAN.—Even the workhouse cases?—Yes.

28473. Dr. BUCKER.—Did he visit them in the workhouse and transfer them direct to the Youghal Asylum?—In the first instance when we had large numbers in the workhouse, and when we removed them to Youghal, for the sake of convenience and to save expense, and particularly on account of our Cork asylum being overcrowded, we could not have brought them into the Cork Asylum, so the superintendent went round to the workhouse; he examined them there, and he got from the workhouse medical officer and from the master and matron of the workhouse and people in charge of them, the history of each individual case fortified by his own observations, and he sent them down to Youghal on the strength of that opinion, or left them behind in the workhouse. But after the transfer of the first body, since then all pass through the Cork Asylum and nobody goes to Youghal except people that have been under observation in Cork Asylum for some time.

28474. Would it not be a better thing to make it a condition that they should not get in in any other way?—That was the condition, but when we started first that condition was an impossibility; you could not do it.

28475. CHAIRMAN.—They were all admitted to the asylum nominally on transfer?—Yes, but at present they all pass through the asylum. Of the 430 in Youghal at present I should say 350 have passed through the Cork Asylum; at least over 200 of them, and then according as they die out all the fresh cases will pass through the Cork Asylum.

28476. What does the staff consist of at present at Youghal?—In the first place there are ten men there.

28477. One of those men is manager?—One of the men is manager, another is clerk, another is a store-keeper, and the others act as general helpers and assistants, and do the work of attendants, servants, cooks, landresses, and everybody else. And the manager and clerk do actually the work of attendants. The clerk generally makes up her books at night, so you may regard at least eight out of the ten as added to the attendants. Of the secular attendants there is one head attendant, or sort of general manager; he works both outside and inside, works out on the farm and about the yard.

28478. How many male attendants are there and female?—There are three charge male attendants. The ten men are paid in salaries £155 a year. There was a question as to whether they would take rations or get money in lieu of rations, so it was finally agreed to give them £20 a head in lieu of

Sept. 27, 1906
 Meet Rev. Dr.
 Kelly.

rations. The salary of the general manager is £45 a year and rations of course. There are three charge attendants, males at £30 each, that makes £90. There are five male under-attendants at £18 each, that is £90 more. There are two night male attendants at £26, and that makes £52. Therefore on the male side attending to the patients you have ten attendants and this general manager; then, of course, you will remember that the men go about amongst the men as well as amongst the women. On the female side you have one charge attendant at £30, you have six under-attendants at £18 making £78, one housemaid at £15, one night air-wind at £18.

28479. Only one?—Only one; there are only 150 women in the place. One cook at £20, that gives you as special attendants on the women eight attendants, ten women altogether. You will remark that the number of attendants for the 150 women seems to be greater than the number for the men; you will remark that we have eight attendants for 150 women, whereas we have only eleven for 250 men. The reason for that is that some of the female attendants help to do other work about the place, sewing and that. The remainder of our staff consists of an engineer at a salary of £70 a year without rations, a fireman at £22 a year without rations, a gardener at £22 a year without rations, but he has a house to live in, and he gets fire and light; he lives in a porter's lodge. Then our medical officer gets £100 a year without any other emoluments, and the chaplain lives on the premises and attends the meetings of the asylum, and helps to manage the business generally; he gets a salary of £100 a year, and has a house, so the total salaries we pay is £265, and then there is £200 a year in lieu of rations for the men there.

28480. Thirty-six paid officials?—Yes.

28481. What are the duties of the visiting medical officer?—He goes there every morning, spends two hours a day there, and he has to go round and see all the patients, the same as the resident medical superintendent has to do in Cork; he has to see the entire inmates of the place every morning, and, of course, he has to pay particular attention to any of those that are sick.

28482. He would have some sick from time to time?—Of course he is hardly ever without having some people physically sick. Then, if there are 150 people physically ill that will require to be visited more than once in the day, just like any other medical man in charge of a patient he is bound to visit that person; if he sees a patient in the morning and considers him dangerously ill and it is necessary to visit him a second time in the day, he is bound to come just as if it was his own paying patient outside. He lives in the town a short distance off, and he must spend two hours a day there; we are going to get telephonic communication between the institution and his house so that he can be summoned at any hour.

28483. In sick cases have any of the men or female attendants special nursing knowledge?—Some of the men have been in institutions over in England; they have special nursing knowledge, of course; and some have formal certificates of nursing.

28484. None of the secular attendants have?—No, the Inspectors complain that none of them have got the Medical-Psychological certificate, and they seem very distressed over that; I am not in the least distressed, I confess, because we are not going to treat psychological patients at all; if we were I would feel distressed over it.

28485. I think you were about to go on to the cost of working?—I am sure you quite understand what is meant by the cost of maintenance of the asylum.

28486. It means the entire expenses divided by the number of patients?—Yes, omitting from the calculation money spent on buildings or the repayment of loans for building purposes, and also having taken into account any money received from paying patients, so that the net average cost means the cost per head to the public purse; it does not mean the total cost of the patients and of the establishment, because supposing you had ten paying patients you would have repayment.

28487. You don't take those into consideration?—No, not in calculating that item.

28488. Before you go on, how much money was borrowed for the building?—We were in a bad way there; we borrowed a great deal of money, and there

is one of the points in which, if any other auxiliary asylums are established, things will have to be greatly improved. The establishment of this Youghal Asylum was initiated by the County Borough of Cork and the County Council, and they consulted the engineer of the borough and one of the county surveyors. These two gentlemen drew up plans, and these plans had practically been adopted by both bodies when it was discovered that the asylum committee was the proper authority to deal with this question, and when the matter came before the asylum committee it came with the plans already drawn up and accepted, and, therefore, I wish to say that I am in no way responsible for the money spent on the buildings, and if we have to establish a second auxiliary asylum, which I think we shall have to do, I think we will have a very different capital expenditure. The amount of money spent by us is fully £25,000.

28489. If you have formed any opinion as the subject, will it be possible to indicate what portions of the items you would have struck out if you were doing it de novo?—I don't know that I would have struck out any of the items. The auxiliary asylum is three-fourths a new building altogether, and so in reality we have erected a new auxiliary asylum. If we were doing the thing again we would not have touched Youghal, but would have taken up one of the workhouses in the county, and instead of spending £25,000 in erecting a new building, I am quite certain we could repair and repopulate and furnish another workhouse in the county for 400 patients for £4,000 or £5,000.

28490. Structures £25,000, and furniture and fittings about £2,000?—I don't think I would spend more than £1,000 on structural alterations, I mean stone and mortar alterations; then, of course, there would be heating and closets and furniture. If you take in heating and ventilation and closets I think £3,000 would cover it, and you could furnish it for £2,000. The new building cost £17,000, and then we got up electric light which I don't think we should have got up; that cost £1,500, heating and ventilation, £1,500, that is £3,000. Of course that accommodates two engineers, one at £78 and a fitter at £23, and it also runs up our coal bill enormously every year; that is an exceedingly expensive item; I know I have no electric light in my own house.

28491. I take it your personal view would be against taking the Youghal Workhouse if it were available?—On the contrary, my personal view would be to take up a workhouse, and by preference I would take up the Youghal Workhouse.

28492. To complete your buildings there?—Yes. Having started Youghal, my personal view would be to take up the Youghal Workhouse and work them together; that would be a far better way. I am opposed to new buildings, and as we have already established one branch of the asylum at Youghal, by preference I would take up the Youghal Workhouse, although they think in Cork that as I live in the West I should defend the West, but I don't take that view of the public service.

28493. Dr. Reuben.—You said something about a higher staff when you spoke of the asylum; I take it that that letter of the Inspectors means that the higher staff referred only to the administrative officers, the medical officers, not a higher paid staff?—I quite agree with you there; they did not intend a higher paid staff, but they intend, in my view, that we should have a similar staff in a place like Youghal to what you would have in the main asylum, and that is a thing we could not afford.

28494. CHAIRMAN.—They wanted to run it on the same lines as the parent institution, and the committee wanted to run it on different lines?—Quite so; we have established a new type of institution; there is nothing like it as far as I know in existence, and I don't see how anybody could read the Local Government Act and not see that a new type of institution is intended.

28495. There is no separate committee for Youghal?—No, we have only one asylum district, made up of the county and city; we have only one committee.

28496. The same committee manages the parent house and the auxiliary?—Certainly, and if we get a second auxiliary the same committee will manage it. But we have established a house committee for Youghal.

28497. That has an advantage in ensuring acquaintance with the rules and management of asylums of the higher type and the lower?—Yes, the patients are under our charge in Cork, and then they are transferred and still remain under our charge in Youghal, and occasionally, if one becomes dangerous, that patient comes back from our house in Youghal to our house in Cork. We have a separate house committee for Youghal, and a separate house committee for Cork.

28498. Are you, my Lord, on each?—I am on each, but I rarely attend the house committee meetings, because I live so very far away; things are very inconvenient; for instance, I had to come up to Cork last night to be here this morning. I attend the monthly meetings rather regularly. Then there is a house committee that assembles in Cork a week before the monthly meeting to look after the internal house business, and that committee reports to the general monthly meeting. The house committee also meets at Youghal a few days before the monthly meeting, and also reports to the monthly meeting. The business is done for Cork and Youghal at the monthly meetings.

28499. I think it is the view of your committee that the only medical attendance at Youghal should be the visiting medical officer?—That is our opinion, and we fought a hard battle over that. And we fought against their sending a medical officer from Cork to Youghal because he would carry down with him the traditions of the lunatic service, and in spite of all our committee could do he would run the auxiliary asylum on those lines, and we would not have it. It is a class of knowledge that is mischievous and injurious to us.

28500. You have the advantage of the Inspectors' visits?—We have.

28501. Mr. MURKIN.—When the Inspectors recommended a higher staff inferentially they meant a higher paid staff?—They meant a staff exactly the same as in the main asylum. Our medical officers in Cork in salaries alone cost us £1,610 a year. Then the superintendent inhabits a large mansion that was built for him at an expense of several thousand pounds; the rent would be £200 a year and washing and garden, and so on. The assistant medical officers have all furnished apartments, so that at least these emoluments would be £600 or £700 more. The medical staff costs at least £2,200 a year in Cork. There are only 1,617 patients there—there have been over 1,600, so for the purpose of comparison we will call it 1,600, and compare 1,600 with 400; we pay £2,800 for medical attendance on 1,600 at Cork, and we pay £150 for medical attendance on 400 at Youghal; that makes a very serious difference; it comes to something like Mr. a patient in Cork, it comes to only £s. a patient per year in Youghal, and hence you see what a serious thing it would be for us to admit the Inspectors' view that we should have a distinct staff of higher officials.

28502. Your idea mainly was to give the patients domestic comfort at a low figure?—Exactly, and we proposed all along to give them a higher style of domestic and physical comfort than they had in any asylum in Ireland, and we feel them better than any asylum in Ireland.

28503. Is your dietary scale better than the parent house?—Yes, and we are able to give them food in a better and more comfortable condition. In the half-year to 30th March the total cost of maintenance was £3,172; in that there was on building £200.

28504. Roughly speaking, £3,000?—Now, unfortunately, I am not able to give you the exact average number of inmates there during that time.

28505. What was the latest calculation made as to the average cost per inmate?—We have not had it this year.

28506. Because I have heard a figure mentioned in a general way?—My theoretical figure from the start was that we would keep them at £15 a head. Now the staff is a little more expensive than I calculated on; I calculated we would keep a staff there for £300 a year, but the staff is now £900. In the £200 a year I meant only salaries; however, the ration will work out at less than I calculated, so that I will believe we will work it at £15 a head per annum.

28507. Could you have prepared for us a calculation to a recent date giving us details from the books?—I can, of course; all in the world I want is to find

out the average number in residence, for I have all the other information.

28508. What you have now is the figure for the half-year from September to March last?—That figure would work out on 370 patients at £15 a head. These figures include payment for a number of articles that were really furnishing. In the strictest sense of the word we have not the figures except from March last.

28509. Dr. BROWN.—You said this worked out to about £15?—On 370 patients.

28510. Had you 370 all the time?—I cannot say that distinctly. At one monthly meeting it was announced there were 368 patients, and at another 365, so that I cannot pin myself to those figures. But I have one point that will be a little more reliable. Starting with the present half-year five months have run and we have paid the bills for the last five months, and here are our accounts (produced). That first month includes the payment of loans, though that is headed May, it is really the accounts for April paid at our May meeting. The last payment was made in September; of course it is for the August month. That first month includes a half-year of the repayment of loans, which is £769, so that you exclude that figure it is £498. The next month you will see is £410. The next month is £338, and the reason is a large cargo of coal came in in that month. The next month is £264, and the next £381; that gives exactly an average of £441 per month; that would work out at £14 per head per year; twelve months would be £5,292.

28511. CHAIRMAN.—What number of patients do you take?—360, and I am pretty sure of that figure.

28512. Then the more patients you get in the lower the rate will be?—I don't think that calculation is quite fair, because in the first months the average amount of clothing and other things did not come in, and I would not pin myself to the £14. My distinct opinion is that we will work it out at my original figure, £15, but I am quite satisfied to stick my reputation on the fact that we will work for £15 a head.

28513. What does the parent house cost?—The usual asylum cost is £24 a head.

28514. You have not taken credit for the £s. with you or the 4s. with them?—No, I calculated on exactly the same lines; our last year was £24.

28515. Dr. BROWN.—Some of them are down as low as £21?—Yes, but you will remember some of them are up to £30; Mullingar and Belfast are pretty bad, and Richmond is not satisfactory.

28516. I thought Belfast was down to £21 or £22?—It is very recently they have come down. The report for 1903 is the last I had.

28517. You mentioned about maintenance—I am not very clear how you said the asylum made up their maintenance—did you say all their income from paying patients is deducted?—Yes, is deducted first before they strike their average.

28518. That is rather misleading, because one place might have a large number of paying patients?—It is rather misleading; here in their system (explains tables). The Inspectors are always advising the committees that by enlarging their asylums they would have the benefit of a higher staff, and therefore that they would save the expense of the resident medical superintendent, and they would have the advantage of the cheaper staff that would come from larger numbers; that argument is, to say the least of it, unsound, and so my mind misleading, for if that were a sound argument the larger asylums in Ireland should be worked more cheaply than the smaller asylums, and the extraordinary fact is that the larger asylums are the most expensive; Richmond is the biggest of all, and it works out at £37 a head.

28519. CHAIRMAN.—They don't think anything of expanding large sums there?—That is for buildings.

28520. Mr. MURKIN.—They would be cheaper if worked on the same lines?—No, they could not be. The number of officials will run up in the exact proportion of the number of patients, for instance, our resident medical superintendent in Cork is paid every month £70 odd.

CHAIRMAN.—Then coal and light for instance. The same coal and the same light will serve for a very much larger number of patients. You reduce the cost per head under that item.

28521. Mr. MURKIN.—Take your own house—could you not keep your 360 patients at a lower rate per head than you could keep 150

Apr. 27, 1906,
West New Dr.
Killy.

Sept. 27, 1906.
 Most Rev. Dr.
 Kelly.

patients?—Under a re-arrangement, yes; but if you start with an asylum of 400 and if you run that number up to 600 or 800 you cannot keep 800 at one penny per head less than the 400, because the salaries of all your officials must run up in proportion to the number of patients. In the smaller asylums the resident medical superintendent has only £350 or £400; in the larger asylums he has from £1,500 or £1,800 a year.

28522. There is no must in it; it is all the work of the committee?—But we take what exists; if you make me Chair of Ireland I will undertake to settle the matter for you, but take the committees as they exist, and take officials as officials exist, there is the extraordinary fact that the bigger the asylum the more expensive it is. It is not a metaphysical or physical necessity, but in the state of things, unfortunately, it amounts to a material necessity.

28523. CHAIRMAN.—Whereas it ought to be the other way?—That is it; I am entirely with Mr. Murnaghan, and if he and I got express command I think we would make it alright. Now the salaries in Cork come to £280 per month for our staff—that is £3,360 a year; with salaries I add pensions, that is over £5 a year on a patient.

28524. Dr. BROGAN.—In the course of time will you have pensions in Youghal?—Practically, no; the position of medical officer is non-pensionable, and the chaplain is non-pensionable; no doubt if an attendant served there for a long time that attendant will have a pension, but we will never be exposed to any serious pensions.

28525. CHAIRMAN.—Are the attendants on the same footing as regards pensions as the attendants in the parent house?—Yes; if they continue in the service they will be treated in the same way with regard to pensions, but of course their salaries are smaller than in the main asylum.

28526. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—And the fact that some of them live outside the house makes the pension much less?—Yes, the more serious trouble about having a large staff is this that an enormous amount of the provisions is consumed by the staff of the asylums. This is the last report of the Cork Asylum; it is not merely the money you pay them in salaries, but the expense of feeding them is a most serious thing.

28527. CHAIRMAN.—Is there an allowance scale for them?—It is not published if there be. There is the quantity of food stuff that came into the Cork Asylum in 1905, and you will find that the most that came in was 304,000 lbs. of beef, mutton and pork; taking the dietary scale the patients are allowed 2½ lb. of meat per week, and taking fifty-two weeks in the year, that amounts to 136½ lbs. of meat for each patient during the year.

28528. Dr. BROGAN.—That is in the Cork Asylum?—Yes, working on dietary scale, which you have. Taking the 1,550 patients, that would work out at 225,225 lbs. of meat that went to the patients, and it will leave 80,000 lbs. of meat going to the officials—well there would be, I should say, about 100 of them fed up there.

28529. CHAIRMAN.—Do you get the whole carcass?—Yes. Substantially more than one-third of all the meat coming to the institution goes to the officials. Then again you will notice we paid for 32,000 lbs. of butter in the course of that year; that cost us at least £1,400; the dietary scale makes provision only for ½ oz. of butter to patients on Friday, given to those who don't take fish, but, assuming that they all get ½ oz. of butter, that comes to 2,400 lbs.; that will leave 30,000 lbs. of butter to be accounted for.

28530. Dr. BROGAN.—Don't the medical officers often allow butter and eggs additional?—I daresay they do, but you have got a very large margin still. We get 14,000 dozen of eggs into the asylum in twelve months at a cost of £525, and except the extras given to patients there is no room for eggs in the dietary scale. If you look to Youghal you will find that the butter in Youghal costs 25 a month for 400 patients, or 475 a year, whereas in Cork it came to over £100 a month. Therefore, in the existing asylum the maintenance of the staff is an exceedingly serious question—more serious from my point of view than their salaries.

28531. CHAIRMAN.—That is assuming all these provisions outside the scale are consumed by the staff?—Well, they must go somewhere.

28532. That is the point, but where?—If you maintain 400 patients in Youghal getting the same amount of butter as in Cork, for £5 in the month, it becomes a serious question to inquire what becomes of £112 worth of butter in the Cork Asylum for four times the number of patients; you have from 160 to 180 officials to be fed in Cork, whereas in Youghal you have only twenty officials to be fed. All this is the reason why I am so exceedingly emphatic on the necessity of keeping an auxiliary asylum quite distinct from the tradition of the other, or you cannot prevent the waste that goes on.

28533. Has the committee ever looked into this question of butter and other things at the parent asylum?—Well, they have, but you must remember the committee is practically useless; it is the person who manages the institution; you may as well think a man with an extravagant wife can have his family go on well; it is the people who work the place, it is the tradition amongst those. You know you have got a certain tradition in the asylums of Ireland, and the bigger the asylum the more extravagant the tradition, and if you let that tradition into your auxiliary asylums the committee is quite powerless. Now, according to my view, I will commit myself to the £16 per head per year. I quite take the risk of committing myself to that figure. That works out that we get five guineas from the local taxation account, and that will leave £10 15s. 6d. to be paid by the local rates. In the main asylum the cost is £24, and of that we get ten guineas from the local taxation account and that leaves £15 10s. 6d. to be paid by the local rates.

28534. Mr. MURNAGHAN.—My Lord, it must be borne in mind that when you do get the ten guineas you are not getting it from the Treasury—it makes a hole in an Irish fund?—That is the very point I am going to develop for you. By our operations in Youghal we are saving the local taxation account £2,000 a year, and we save the local rates of the county about £1,800 a year. Now there were over 4,000 of these patients in the workhouses at the time the Local Government Act was passed, and if those 4,000 patients were all transferred to the main asylum they would be a charge of £40,000 a year to the local taxation account. This local taxation account is pretty well bankrupt. The income of the account in 1899-00 was £203,000; next year was £208,000; then £209,000; and then £211,000, so that it increased only at the rate of £2,000 a year, and since the passing of the Act that no new public-house licences can be granted, I don't think it can increase any more at all. The expenditure in 1899-00 was £225,000; next year, £270,000; next year, £282,000; and next year, £293,000, so that the expenditure increased at the rate of £14,000 a year. So that while in 1899 there was a balance of £23,000 in the account in 1905 there was a deficit of £63,000, and things have gone on since then; I have not the figures for the last two years, they are not published anywhere, and in order to get these figures I had to apply directly to Dublin Castle. I am quite sure in 1906 the payment out of the account will be £20,000 more than the income. If these 4,000 patients in the workhouses had been saddled on that account where would we be. The question will arise how it is that the account has been able to pay more than its income. There was a balance the first year of £23,000, the next year of £17,000, and the third year of £5,000, and, furthermore, there was a windfall for which the Cork Asylum is to be thanked. We raised at the Cork Asylum a question that we were unfairly treated by the Treasury in the transfer from the old system to the new in regard to asylums; we made a tremendous amount of noise over this, made speeches, published pamphlets, and wrote letters to the newspapers. I went over to London and had a battle with the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Financial Secretary of the Treasury, with the result that we made them pass for us a supplementary estimate and give us £37,300; that went into the Irish local taxation account, and that is the surplus on which the county is working at the present moment, and when they exhaust this you will have to apply that section of the Local Government Act.

28535. Another visit to London?—I don't propose it. Then you will have to fall back on the reduction of the grants of 4s. a head. Therefore, by the pelf we are following we are benefiting not only ourselves in the County Cork, but the people all over

Ireland, and if this auxiliary system policy is extended to the whole country it will be to the benefit of the country at large. I said to you a few minutes ago that we had 1,718 patients in Cork a few years ago; now we have only 1,500 odd; there are 200 below in Youghal now. When these patients were in Cork they were costing the local taxation account £1,600; they are now below in Youghal and are costing the local taxation account only £1,500, so that the transfer of these patients has saved the local taxation account £1,000 a year, and hence if you establish that principle pretty generally throughout the country it will have the effect of keeping the local taxation account solvent, and the Guardians will be able to get fees for their medical officers and their apothecaries, and various other people will be able to get paid, whereas they cannot get paid if the system is adopted of transferring the harmless patients from the workhouses into the main asylum.

23535. We have been asked all over the country to recommend that the managers of auxiliary asylums should be paid £s. a week instead of 2s. 6d.—I think the men who recommend that don't know what they are talking about; I would be strongly against it. Of course the Inspectors have told me, "Oh, the grant has been increased in Scotland, and you will get an increased grant in Ireland." There is no possibility of our getting an increased grant under the present conditions, since the establishment of the Irish Development Grant there is no possibility of our getting additional money out of the Treasury, and we simply have to be as economical as we can at home. Of course I quite understand that the people who make that recommendation simply look to their own immediate interests.

23536. They don't see it coming out of an exhaustible fund?—In Cork we kept writing and speaking and lecturing the country, and still we could not get the asylum committees out of the view that it was not from the Treasury the capital grant was coming. They said the Treasury grant ought to be increased; we kept writing back that it was not the Treasury grant; it was an Irish grant, and still that point could not be got into their heads. These men think it is the Treasury they are milking; in reality they are robbing an exclusively Irish fund.

23537. That £37,000 came from vested money?—Oh, yes, we made out our case against the Treasury.

23538. As managers of the local taxation account?—The Cork Asylum started this agitation, and we got

the other asylums to pass resolutions, and we got various questions asked by members of Parliament; we had taken the principal part in it in Cork, so to give effect to our agitation when the Irish estimates were on in May I crossed over to London and interviewed several people there, and finally I saw there was nothing for it only to go straight to the Chancellor, Sir Michael Hicks Beach. I went to Sir Michael and gave him a half quarter of an hour of it; I could not get him to agree to our view, but I saw the late Mr. Hanbury, the Secretary of the Treasury, and Mr. Hanbury did agree with me, but in any case a couple of weeks afterwards they put on a supplemental vote.

23539. Do you know on what principle (that was put on?)—I do, but it is a long long story; it would more than double my evidence; if you wish I will send you a little pamphlet published about it. You see then that I am exceedingly vigorous on extending the principle of these auxiliary asylums to the country as a whole, but I wish to say this, except you extend them on the principle of being a perfectly distinct type of institution and keep them from under the wing of the existing lunatic asylum system it is far better to increase the main asylum than set up other asylums of exactly the same type; but if they are set up as we have set up the Youghal Asylum I believe they will be exceedingly useful to the country from every point of view.

23540. You appear to acquiesce in the high expenditure of the parent institution?—A great deal of it is necessary; for instance, I have mentioned to you that our medical staff in Cork costs us 35s. a head, but that medical staff, I believe, is necessary; possibly we might get on with one medical officer less, but you cannot in the main asylum get on without a large medical staff; then, again, in the main asylum you must sometimes have two attendants looking after a single patient; you cannot therefore get on without a large staff of attendants, but my view is this, that in the main asylum you should keep only the curable and dangerous cases, and those that are quiet and chronic ought to be transferred to auxiliary asylums.

23541. What about the filthy and bed-ridden cases?—I think those ought to be transferred also to the auxiliary asylums. That may happen to run up the charge a little in the auxiliary asylums, but still you could keep them cheaper and better in the auxiliary than in the main asylum—the filthy cases.

MR. THOMAS LINCHER, J.P., M.C.C., examined.

23542. CHAIRMAN.—You are a witness on behalf of the Cork Board of Guardians?—Yes.

23543. You are also one of the managing body of the Youghal Asylum?—Yes.

23544. Is there anything you would wish to say in the first place about the Youghal Asylum?—I think after his Lordship's evidence there is very little left for me to say except that in the main I agree with his remarks.

23545. Is there any point on which you differ with him?—No, the Board of Guardians, for whom I appear here, are of opinion that until sufficient accommodation is provided by auxiliary asylums the section of the Local Government Act, which prevents the asylum committee from sending patients to our workhouses, should still be left in force. As you are aware by the Local Government Act, when an auxiliary workhouse is established in a county, the power then to send patients to a workhouse ceases; in my opinion that is a mistake to this extent—it should have said until an auxiliary asylum that could accommodate all the lunatics was established. We have at least 400 imbeciles and harmless lunatics to be provided for in the county. I should remark that in my opinion when an auxiliary asylum is established it should be kept as clear as possible from interference by the main asylum, because I think the two institutions are radically different.

23546. You have the same managing body—do you approve of that?—I think the management would be good enough.

23547. What you mean is interference by the officials?—Yes. If it could possibly be called a home

for imbeciles and idiots instead of an auxiliary asylum it would be more appropriate. The rules which apply to the main asylum are not at all suitable for an auxiliary asylum.

23548. Now, then, as regards the Cork Board of Guardians?—As I mentioned on being examined on Monday, I am not at present a member of the Cork Board of Guardians, but I was at the time your invitation to attend the Commission was received, and they appointed me a witness, and I have a letter from the clerk asking me to appear. The Board of Guardians have sent to your Commission answers to the queries addressed to them, and I am here generally to support those answers. As far as the Cork Union is concerned, the Guardians are opposed to amalgamation with any other; it is quite large enough, if not too much at present, and it would not be prudent to increase it, or add any portion of any other union to it.

23549. MR. MEYERSON.—But do you think it is outside the question of segregation of classes and their removal from the workhouses?—Oh, certainly not; in fact the Board of Guardians have approved of the idea of having children brought up in a disused workhouse, and the application of it to an institution for training children would be very useful.

23550. CHAIRMAN.—This was one of the first unions in the country to start the boarding-out of children?—Yes; I believe they have done on 200 boarded out.

23551. Have you had personal experience of that system?—Yes, for about twenty-three years.

23552. What is your own opinion of the success of the system after the long trial it has received in

Sept. 27, 1895.
West. Hall, Cork
Killy.

Mr. Thomas
Linch

Sept. 27, 1924.

Mr. Thomas
Mahan.

Cork—I think it is a very successful system if properly carried out.

28554. By carrying out your reform is sufficient inspection?—Yes.

28555. Is there any other safeguard?—There is also a safeguard as regards the class of children to be sent out. I have noticed one of your questions as to the children of habitual criminals, and in my opinion very great care should be exercised before those children would be boarded out, for this reason, that when they are boarded out they have to attend the same school and become the companions of children outside, and they are very likely to have an injurious effect on the morals of those children.

28556. You are now thinking of children fairly grown well up, five or six years old, who have been associated with the home of bad parents?—Yes, of course, if they are taken out at such an age that the connection with the parents did not have an influence on them, then my objection would not apply.

28557. You would have all the children born in the workhouse boarded out as soon as they reached an age at which the doctor considered they might safely be boarded out?—Yes. Every child in the Cork Workhouse which could legally be boarded out was always boarded out at once.

28558. Would you extend the power of the Guardians and enable them to board out every child that had to be supported out of the rates?—I would, with the reservation I have already made.

28559. Are not those children that would, even under the existing law, go to an industrial or reformatory school?—In my opinion that would be the proper place for them; I have had experience of what I am speaking about; I have one case especially before my mind where a child sent out in that way finished up in a reformatory; thieving was the vice to which he was addicted, it would be a mistake to send out a child of that sort.

28560. Then the Guardians should have a discretion either to board them out or send them to an industrial or reformatory institution?—Certainly.

28561. But as far as you had fairly innocent children you would board them out?—Yes.

28562. Have you thought at all of any step that might be taken with regard to the mothers of illegitimate children?—I think the suggestions that have been already made to the Commission would be very good; send them to a home for a period.

28563. Not admit them into the workhouse?—No.

28564. They should go to an institution or refuge under religious management?—I think that would be a very good idea.

28565. And as soon as the time arrived for the child being born they should go to the nearest public maternity hospital, and then back again to the institution?—Yes.

28566. With a view of having them reclaimed and put up again in a position to earn their livelihood as soon as possible?—I think they would have a better chance of becoming reclaimed than in a workhouse.

28567. There is no machinery or arrangement in the workhouse for reclaiming them?—Not as far as I know.

28568. The very vicious and newly-fallen have practically to live together?—Yes, in the same ward.

28569. If you had a sufficient space for lunatics and all kinds of mental diseases in the auxiliary, would you be in favour of keeping any mental cases in the workhouse, or are you of opinion that all such cases should be dealt with by the committee of the asylum or auxiliary?—I would not be in favour of keeping any mental cases in the workhouse.

28570. So you would take out of the workhouse the children, the mothers of illegitimate children, and all mental cases?—Yes, and I would also, in some deserving cases, take out some of the respectable aged poor who had not been long in the workhouse.

28571. I was just coming to that class—they are the largest class that you would have remaining, excluding the sick, that would be the aged and infirm?—Yes.

28572. We received in a great many places suggestions that the aged and infirm would be better in an institution, a county institution, or a district,

according to the number of unions united, where they could all be segregated according to character and other considerations?—It occurs to me it would be a very good thing if the respectable aged poor who had to go to the workhouse through no fault of their own, if they were sent to some place such as you mention, but there was another idea that occurred to me having reference to a home of that kind in Cork, which is kept by the Little Sisters of the Poor; I don't know whether the Commission have visited the place or not.

28573. Not in Cork, but I am aware of the system on which the Little Sisters of the Poor in Limerick and elsewhere conduct their establishments?—I think it would be a very good thing if the Guardians sent old people to such an institution and paid for them as they do for the blind.

28574. Do the Little Sisters keep out of that all objectionable characters?—Oh, certainly; it must be a recommended case before they would take it.

28575. You would give the Guardians power to board out all suitable cases in such an institution?—Yes, of course; I am not aware whether the managers of that institution would take them in, but I say to give the Guardians power in case they came to an agreement.

28576. Then as regards cases that would not be suitable for that, and there are many remote parts of the country where it would be difficult to get such an institution as the Little Sisters, what would you think of having a district workhouse set apart altogether for the aged and infirm of a county or portion of a county or for a couple of small counties grouped?—I believe there is a good deal in the suggestion, but at the same time if that central institution was too far away from the former home.

28577. It should be accessible by railway, but it would be out of the parish and surroundings with which the people were familiar—it would necessarily be away in most cases?—If these poor people thought they would be more comfortable in a place like that they would not have such an objection to go a distance.

28578. It was put very forcibly before us yesterday by one of the witnesses that one of the great objections that these people have to go into a place like that is that they would be buried in a workhouse away from home; at all events that objection could be met if there were an obligation that these people be buried in their own burial place?—I think that would remove all the objections.

28579. We said that these poor people once they enter the aged and infirm ward are very seldom indeed visited; the majority never visited; comparatively few are visited; it is quite different as regards the sick who are visited, but the aged and infirm are very often the last surviving single members of an expiring generation, with no one to visit them?—Of course you have the returns; if that is so, I think the objection against a central institution would not be so great.

28580. That would get out of the workhouse all the inmates except the sick and the casual poor—that is the class that you are very familiar with in Cork—people who are out of work for a few weeks come into the workhouse and go out again, and out, you have a good many of those?—We have in Cork, and people who travel from one workhouse to another.

28581. There are the tramps, a different class to people who are usually destitute, perhaps very often owing to intemperate habits or dissipation, they have not anything laid by—for instance, men working on the quays, carrying large sums for a short time, don't keep anything over for a time when there is no work?—There is a considerable number of that class.

28582. What do you think would be the best plan to adopt as regards that class, if you had the workhouse practically cleared of all classes except the sick?—The best plan would be if you could provide them with work. The workhouse, if you carry out your idea, would be comparatively empty, and there would be more room for carrying out some industrial work.

28583. You would put them in there. This question really only arises in the cities?—If the outdoor relief could be extended.

28584. Now, don't you think the outdoor relief would be dangerous?—I rather thought you were going to recommend that they should be put into a place

Sept. 27, 1904
Mr. Thomas
Lynch.

and work?—If that could be done, but in the workhouse where there was not sufficient land attached it would be difficult.

23593. You see it is dealing with a city population, and they have no experience of land as a rule?—If you could establish some industry in the workhouse that would keep them at work.

23594. And make it distasteful for them?—As a test of destitution.

23595. You think it would be possible to have to a limited extent such labour works in a city like Cork?—I think it would be possible, but it is very difficult to select what branch of industry to take up.

23596. Do you think that would be the best way of dealing with the comparatively small number of casual destitute in the city?—Either that or give them outdoor relief under very stringent conditions.

23597. You have the power at present of giving them outdoor relief under certain conditions—do you think it would be at all safe to enlarge that?—I am entirely in favour of outdoor relief, provided there are proper safeguards, and one of the safeguards recommended by the Board is the appointment of an inspector of outdoor relief, a man who would go around and pay surprise visits to the different people who are receiving relief—one man might do for the whole of Munster or Cork County.

23598. I expect a man would be quite handsomely employed in the city of Cork—it does not do to make an inspection for the purpose of entering certain representations made, a man is not a good inspector until he becomes familiar with the place and the people, and then he can put his finger on the sore spot?—I thought an inspector for the whole county would be sufficient; they would not know when he would turn up.

23599. But when he turned up he might not be effective?—Well, it would be better than the present system.

23600. You have to get a very close knowledge to test the bona fides of applicants for relief?—If such an officer was known to be in existence several ratepayers, who don't like to come forward, might put him on the right track, and if there were no deserving cases would mention them to him.

23601. Is Dublin the outdoor relief is given in kind?—I have heard that, but have no experience of it.

23602. What would your opinion be as regards able-bodied females and able-bodied men out of work—such a man as in the present condition of affairs would go into the workhouse for a week or two weeks?—Are you excluding the sick from your question?

23603. Oh, quite; this is altogether able-bodied, for the sick will get relief, of course, but the able-bodied man, who is casually destitute, would you give him relief in kind or in money?—I think it would be much better give it to him in kind.

23604. Do you bake your own bread in the house?—Yes.

23605. So you would be able to distribute, as the Dublin Guardians do, send round your own bread cart?—Yes, there is space to bake all the bread required.

23606. You would not have many?—No; I think many would refuse it.

23607. Then they could go without it. That would leave you in Cork Workhouse with nobody in the workhouse except the sick, and this would for a casual workhouse if it were carried out instead of the relief in kind. Would there be then a large amount of building space which could be used as a home for the aged and infirm of all the surrounding unions. The hospital could be very largely increased, of course. You are very short of hospital buildings, but you would have remaining a very large amount of building space if all the children were gone; if all the able-bodied women and mothers of children were gone you would have the whole workhouse cleared out except the sick; then you would not have room for a very large number of the aged and infirm, who could be classified according to their respectability and other circumstances?—Certainly, there would be a good share of room, but at the same time I consider the Cork Workhouse entirely congested.

23608. I am speaking of it when it is empty?—

But it should come down a good deal before I would consider there was sufficient space.

23609. The only class you would leave in it would be the sick—1,500 you may take as the extreme in the worst part of winter?—Then you have to add the casuals and tramps.

23610. We will come to them later on; the aged and infirm say, 500?—Are you providing for the able-bodied women?

23611. They go too. All these able-bodied would have been cases if the system had been in operation for years?—I don't think all the women in the Cork Workhouse are of that class.

23612. Are not most of the women of that class?—I don't think so.

Mr. MURKIN.—234.

23613. CHAIRMAN.—Assuming there to be room?—Assuming there were room, Cork would be an excellent place for it.

23614. If Cork were too full you would have Mallow or Midleton, or some other workhouse?—I agree with you.

23615. You would be in favour of a central institution?—I would.

23616. Now as regards the tramps and casuals. You know the suggestions, I dare say, that have been made to us in a great many other places that after taking all precautions to prevent any bona fide labouring man who is on the road looking for work really being interfered with; that all the professional vagrants or tramps should be prevented in future from tramping round the country; that it should be made an offence to do so, and if a man could not explain why he was doing so he should be sent to a labour house, or a workhouse properly so-called, and there detained under a magistrate's warrant with a view of teaching him habits of industry, and making him give some return for the support he is getting from the people at large in the country?—I do agree with that suggestion.

23617. You don't think it would be an undue interference with liberty if every possible means is taken to protect people who are really looking for work?—If that were done then, I think, the cases of the real tramps should be dealt with in that way.

23618. Supposing a Cork man hears there is a job in Waterford, he can easily get from his parish priest or some person who knows him some documentary evidence to show what he is on the road for?—The danger is that that would be worked as a hardship; perhaps a policeman who might have a grudge against a man might bring that Act into force.

23619. He would be over at Kilmacshane or Fermoy or some place that way, and having what would be equivalent to a passport to pass through he would not be interfered with?—At present I would not commit myself to go as far as that. The Cork Board have recommended that the system at present in force in England be adopted, where they can keep a habitual tramp for a week.

23620. That is not operating in a very satisfactory way at the other side of the Channel?

23621. Mr. MURKIN.—Our people being of a roving disposition it may work more satisfactorily here?—I have a strong objection to a man having to prove his innocence in any court; if there is a charge against him it should be proved.

23622. CHAIRMAN.—It is very difficult to get legal proof of a man being a wanderer?—Then you would be convicting him on suspicion.

23623. Of course that should not be, but in other countries men are not allowed to rove about?—I suppose they make their own laws in those countries. If we had the making of our own laws I would have no objection to that.

Mr. MURKIN.—Is a country that boasts of its freedom the idler and vagabond is brought before a magistrate and gets from one to six months' imprisonment.

23624. CHAIRMAN.—In America and Germany they certainly don't tolerate it?—You are rather afraid that cases might be twisted?—Yes.

23625. Well, that would be abominable, of course?—It is better to put up with the nuisance for a little while longer unless it could be safeguarded.

23626. Is there anything you would like to say about outdoor relief generally?—With regard to the

Sept. 27, 1906.

Mr. Thomas
Lynch.

quarter-acre clause, the Cork Board of Guardians would be anxious that that should be extended.

28518. So as to include one acre?—Yes.
28519. Or perhaps something a little over one acre to make it clear of the house and land?—Yes, and the Board are very strong on the appointment of an inspector of outdoor relief.

28521. Why don't they appoint one for their own union?—I am not aware that they have the power, or have asked the Local Government Board; they have appointed a number of relieving officers.

28522. They never proposed that?—I don't think they did; I rather fancy it would be better to have an inspector who was not locally connected at all. I don't know whether the Local Government Board could get their inspectors to do the work or not, the ordinary inspector, not the medical inspector.

28523. When I was a Local Government Board inspector myself I occasionally did not particular cases that I had my suspicions about, but never more than that, and really one's times would not be equal to more than that?—Unless the Local Government Board would appoint one man specially for a province.

28524. My own idea is that in a city if there is much outdoor relief given, a man would be fully occupied, indeed?—This would be merely checking what the relieving officers had done.

28525. He would be very fully occupied, I think?—If he checked the cases once he need not come back on that list for a considerable period.

28526. I differ with you; I think he would have to keep his knowledge up-to-date, week by week, because that is the way the case comes in; the relieving officer might miss it; it is regarded too much in some places in the light of a pension?—Of course the Board are altogether in the hands of the relieving officer; he knows about the case, and the Guardians as individuals know nothing about it. This is my own idea; I would have the surcharge in the case of inspector relief put on the relieving officer unless he placed on his book a note stating he disapproved of such relief.

28527. Is there not such a provision now in the union accounts order, where money is lost owing to the negligence of any person, that person should be surcharged?—The auditor would have to decide who was responsible, and this promise would help him. The relieving officer would say the Guardians put it on without his consent, and the auditor might not come on for twelve months. On my suggestion no case is put on in the Cork Workhouse unless the relieving officer certified it was a fit case; then the auditor will only surcharge the Guardian who initials.

28528. If a Guardian came in and pointed out that he had not the fact before him on which the surcharge was made?—Yes, but don't you think it would make it clearer for the auditor.

28529. I think your suggestion would?—The relieving officer is the man who is supposed to have visited the place.

28530. I don't think any chairman would initial such an order for relief with that note on it?—No, I think he would not. Then a widow with one child is excluded at present.

28531. You would include her?—Yes. Then orphan children, take the case where the father and mother die; we have found some difficulty sometimes at the Cork Board of Guardians in relieving children of that class; we could not give them outdoor relief, and in order to relieve them at all they should be brought into the workhouse and registered before being boarded out; I think power ought to be given to the Board of Guardians to give relief to these people if they have somebody to care them, such as some relative living with them, perhaps an older sister or aunt or grandmother; I think it would be much cheaper for the Guardians to give them relief than to bring them all into the house and board them out.

28532. Your suggestion would be that in the case of orphan children who had some responsible relative of good character to take charge of them, it should be competent for the Guardians to give outdoor relief to them?—If they wished; it would not break up the family; it would keep the family together, brothers and sisters.

28533. On the whole are you satisfied with the distribution of outdoor relief?—The only way I can judge that is to take the amount of relief at the passing of the Local Government Act in the Cork Union; it was £135 a week; now it is between £150

and £160; that increase has altogether taken place in the urban districts attached to the union; there is none, or very little, increase in the rural districts, but in the urban districts of the city, and some other urban districts which form part of the union, an increase has taken place of £50 or £55 a week.

28534. Do you attribute that largely to the area of charge changed?—I do; I would be in favour of divisional charges as far as outdoor relief is concerned unless this system of inspection is carried out if that is not done I would make the outdoor relief a divisional charge. I think divisional charges would check to a considerable extent any improper outdoor relief.

28535. Taking away from the towns the privilege given them under the Act of 1898?—Well, to make a divisional charge.

28536. It was hard on the towns before 1898, so many people coming from the country into the towns; the Act of 1898 gave a benefit to the people in towns and urban districts by making it a union-wide charge?—Yes; the rates in the towns were much higher than in the rural districts, but if they go on increasing the amount of outdoor relief that they were entitled with before the Act was passed—

28537. That is where a person had got 2s. they now get 2s. 6d.—do you mean that?—I take the bulk.

28538. That might represent more cases—do you think they have increased the payment per head?—I don't allege that.

28539. It was suggested to us that it would not be quite fair to take away from the towns this benefit but that a sort of standard payment on outdoor relief might be taken for each electoral division, say the existing scale, and then say that anything additional would become an electoral charge?—I take it that would be the scale in existence at the passing of the Local Government Act.

28540. Or even since that?—A good deal of injury has been done to the rural districts since.

28541. Well, that some standard should be fixed after due inquiry, and then anything above that standard would become divisional?—Yes.

28542. Do you think that would be fair?—I think that would be fair, and it would be a check against any extravagance. Militiamen and army reserve men who resort to the workhouse from time to time should be compelled to pay for their maintenance.

28543. I suppose some of these are among the tramps?—Yes; in some cases they leave the workhouse, undergo their training and spend their money, and come back to the workhouse; I think there ought to be a claim on their pay.

28544. Have you made a claim over?—I am not aware that we have.

28545. Do you get a good deal of pension?—Yes.

28546. Have you been advised you have no claim against the payments made to militiamen?—That is my present impression. There is another point that affects Cork Union very much; it is that power ought to be given to the Guardians to pay for the removal of an inmate who does not belong to that union.

28547. That is the Law of Settlement?—We are here in Cork where the shipping companies land all their undesirable and returned emigrants, a great many of whom are lunatics.

28548. That would not be the Law of Settlement—that is where people land out of ships at your port; that you should have the power to send those people to their destination and charge the unions where they come from?—Yes.

28549. You restrict that suggestion to the people who are put off Transatlantic ships?—Yes. Of course there are other people who come to Cork from other countries, but if we get rid of the Transatlantic liners it would meet the greater portion of our claim; in that connection I may mention that the County Council some time ago passed a resolution on that subject. Councillor James O'Neill is in accordance with notice moved:—

Resolved: That we, the Cork County Council, beg to draw the attention of the Executive and of the Irish Members of Parliament to the very unsatisfactory state of the law, which enables lunatic patients and paupers belonging to other counties to be committed to Cork and to remain chargeable to the rates, particularly those who become insane

when embarking, or who are found insane when disembarking at Queenstown; also to the injustice of bringing lunatic patients and paupers from England and Scotland without a reciprocal power being granted to Ireland. That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Lord Lieutenant, the Chief Secretary, and the Members of Parliament for the City and County of Cork, and all the public boards in the county.

Councillor Broderick seconded the motion, which was passed unanimously.

28593. Your present suggestion is about those people who disembark?—Yes, I think power ought to be given to pay their expenses; in some cases I think power ought to be given to medical officers to give temporary relief in urgent cases where the relieving officer would live too far away, especially in rural districts; a medical officer might be called in a case where some relief would be necessary, and he would

have to go in a very roundabout way to get the nourishment for the patient, sending to the relieving officer; I think it would not be absurd.

28591. We have found it grossly abused in some parts of the country?—I am astonished at that.

28592. The amount of milk and whiskey that was ordered was terrific?—I was not in favour of whiskey as a medicine. The County Council had not sent anybody to attend your inquiry, but I have here a copy of a resolution passed by them on the subject of amalgamation.

On the proposition of Councillor O'Gorman, seconded by Councillor O'Neill, the following resolution was passed:—

"That we, the Council of Cork County, are of opinion that some of the existing eighteen workhouses in the county are not necessary, and should be abolished."

28593. They don't indicate the workhouses, but express the principle?—Yes, they leave it to you.

SEP. 27, 1905
MR. THOMAS
LINDEN.

Dr. CUMMINS further examined.

28594. CHAIRMAN.—You wish to add something to your evidence already given?—About the terrible cases of consumption; I would be anxious for some general rule as in the case of fever patients. Fever patients are not sent to the general body of the house. As regards consumptives I should say the same; they should be treated exactly as fever or other infectious patients; there should be a rule as regards the classification of consumptives as there is with regard to fever patients.

28595. Is not that in the hands of the medical officer?—You get a rush of patients in in the winter time, an enormous number of consumptives and other patients and you simply have not room. I would make it obligatory that there should be room provided for consumptives. Also as regards the fever hospital, I don't think it would be large enough to contain the cases of consumption. Take the cases of consumption—you cannot put them into the fever hospital, because you would have women as well as men, and you have not room. Another thing that I wanted to make an addition to is the question of idiots and imbeciles in the workhouse; there are two classes, one likely to be benefited by treatment—

28596. Have you any in the workhouse likely to be benefited by treatment?—These cases generally are sent to some asylum for the treatment of idiots, but there are a number of others who are unable to be treated, not curable in plain terms. I am speaking of these cases; for these cases I think there ought to be some provision; they come in as children; I have some of them in the children's hospital; they grow up then in that hospital sitting in a chair or something of the kind.

28597. Would not Youghal receive these cases?—They are mental diseases—would not Youghal receive all mental disease cases as far as their limits allow?—But these cases require a certain amount of special treatment; most of them are children.

28598. They are hopeless cases?—They are hopeless; you cannot cure them in the sense of putting them to work; they are inoperable and harmless.

28599. Are not these a class that could be suitably dealt with at Youghal?—I think they might be sent

to some institution; there are only a few in each workhouse through the country; collect all those and put them into one place, where there would be some proper persons to look after these children; they are all of the same class; hopeless cases.

28600. You prefer to have one institution for all Ireland for hopeless idiots to sending them into an auxiliary?—I would rather have that; I think it would be more humane; these children become the best of other patients, and it is very difficult to avoid that. Whereas, if all of one class were collected from the different unions it would prevent that. Would I be permitted to go into the question of the advisability of removing the fever patients from the fever hospital to the north or south fever hospital.

28601. Dr. REAGAN.—That could be dealt with between the authorities here. It is one of the things you can do—you don't want the law to do that?—I think it would be objectionable, therefore I am against it. A patient comes in from the end of the district suffering from influenza; he comes in eight or ten miles with a high temperature; that patient is put into the ordinary ward; he is found to be suffering from typhoid; we consider that patient is not fit to be sent off again on another journey to the fever hospital.

28602. CHAIRMAN.—Supposing you had them by ones. You have at present two hospitals receiving the both sexes and various kinds of disease; you can have much better classification of disease if you have not to mix the classification of sex, if you have only one sex in each hospital?—What would you do if the union hospital was for female patients and male patients came in—what would you do with them?

28603. Send them to the other hospital?—But many of these cases come into the observation ward.

28604. Do they not come in with a doctor's certificate?—Yes, but the doctor may have examined them in a dark room. A child comes in suffering from a little bronchitis or laryngitis, and it turns out to be measles.

28605. It is a case for local arrangements?—That hospital would not be suitable for consumptives.

The LORD MAYOR OF CORK (ALF. BARNETT), examined.

28606. CHAIRMAN.—Your Lordship wished to give some evidence as regards the poor law system?—I have some questions that were desired for me by the Council. No. 1 refers to the amalgamation of unions in the county. The Council express an opinion thereon. No. 2, as to disposal of workhouses no longer required. Like answer. No. 3, whether with or without a dissolution of any union it would be possible to make better provision for the classification and treatment of the inmates? That the Corporation consider no further provision required beyond that now made for harmless lunatics in the auxiliary asylum at Youghal. No. 4, as to whether any changes in the law and procedure as to administration and in the chargeability of relief would be desirable? No change recommended. No. 5, whether additional accommodation is required for the proper treatment of the sick poor, and, if so, how it should be provided?

None recommended. No. 6, whether any financial or administrative changes are desirable in order to secure a more economical system of relief generally of the sick, the insane, and all other classes of the poor or destitute? None recommended. No. 7, how far in the case of persons not destitute a system of payments or contributions for the treatment of sick or insane in hospitals or other such institutions would be desirable? That such would be desirable as far as the ability of the persons concerned may extend. No. 8, what change may be desirable as to the treatment of tramps or casuals? None recommended. This was confirmed by the Council on the 24th of April, 1904. Those are the answers of the Corporation. But I have heard Dr. Cummins's evidence. Perhaps I did not catch him properly about the patients in the Cork Union. Now there is a very large institution there, a fever hospital; it is generally occupied by

The Lord
Mayor of Cork

Sep. 27, 1904.
The Lord
Mayor of Cork.

advent or sight; on one occasion there were four; I don't know how many there may be in that to-day, and when larger institutions in other cities in Ireland can do without a fever hospital inside their walls, I don't see the necessity of having a very heavy institution like that maintained with a constant staff.

22667. That is in the union?—Yes; I believe, sir, in the South Dublin Union all the cases are sent to hospitals outside.

22668. Of course they have very large hospitals in the city—Cork-street and the Hardwicke?—And we have a very large and idle one in Cork—the Cork Fever Hospital.

22669. Would they make terms with you to receive all your cases?—I am sure they would if approached.

22670. Has the matter been broached?—Yes, but I don't know what stage it is in now. Mr. Lane may know more about it, but I certainly think there ought to be a change made in that way.

22671. To close the union fever hospital and come to an arrangement with the Cork Fever Hospital for the maintenance of patients?—Yes.

22672. And it would leave you a very fine building for the treatment of other cases?—It would, a very fine building for consumptive cases; there are 150 beds in it.

22673. Do you know the extent of the accommodation at the outside fever hospital?—I think they have over 100 beds. And then about the charges for the rural districts—the rating for the different districts; I certainly differ with anyone who proposes an alteration in that way, because the city of Cork suffered before the Act came into force. For the next month until after Christmas all those idle men flock into the city.

22674. You think it only a fair relief to the city of Cork?—I think it was only common justice. We are constantly burdened in winter with men from the country who have no work there; and again, sir, I want to say I am entirely opposed to rearing children inside the walls of the union. I think it is not the place in which you can expect to make good members of society. It was only yesterday I advocated the admission of children to industrial schools; that other people perhaps would allow into the union; some of those will be six years in the industrial school, and when they come out they will be useful members of society. I hope—but I never expect to get that among the inmates of the union—that they turn out a different class of children altogether, and when they come out they have the brand of the union on them.

22675. You have had a good deal of experience of the boarding-out system in your union—how has that worked?—It is working remarkably well.

22676. Would you be in favour of having the power of the Guardians for boarding out enlarged—there are a great many children in workhouses that they cannot board out—would you be in favour of a law being passed to enable Guardians to exercise their discretion of boarding-out in cases that had to be supported out of the rates?—Certainly. We may not reap the benefit of that, but those who come after us will reap the benefit of it. You bring children into a different life outside; what can you

expect a child to be that is kept inside in that union for his lifetime and reared until he is fifteen or sixteen; you cannot expect him to know anything about life outside; when he gets outside the walls he is like a little wild bird. It is only a couple of nights ago—I happen to live just convenient to the Cork Union on the Douglas-road—I saw a woman there; she had two boys, one was about ten and the other about twelve, and they were standing like two little dogs alongside her for a long time; I was over the wall in my place watching them with great anxiety; at last I went out and went over to the gate-keeper and asked what about these two boys and this woman.

"She left this morning," he said, "and she got drunk; she has come back now and wants to get in and she won't be allowed in; she acts sometimes as a deputy." I asked, "Were those boys reared here?" "They were," he said. "Then they were afraid to stir." "Well," said I, "what will be done with the boys to-night?" While this was going on she stood up and walked away with the boys down the road. I asked, "Where is she taking them?" "Oh, she will go down to some public-house; you will find them there later on." That is a cruel case; if those were reared outside would that woman have that control? If they were reared outside their foster-mother would be fond of them, and they would become acquainted with little boys and girls outside.

22677. Were they illegitimate children?—I did not ask him that question. I am opposed altogether to having a school inside the union; you can prepare a child for life if you have him outside; in that way I would be very anxious that some law should be made that would improve that. That is a thing that occupied my attention when I was much younger than I am at present. I know a case now of a girl being brought before us; it is an unfortunate result of boarding out; she was born in the union; she was an illegitimate child; she was put out for fourteen years, and she came back again to the union, which is not always the case.

22678. When was she put out?—I think she was about four years old; she was boarded out in the country. She was brought before us for refusing to work; she was then in the laundry, and there was an illegitimate child of her in the house at the same time. Here were three generations—her mother, herself and her child; it was a very exceptional case.

22679. Was she weak-minded?—The sergeant of the district where she was placed said she was very bad in their locality. She did not appear to be of weak intellect, but that is only one case.

22680. I believe you have a Ladies' Committee?—A very good one, too.

22681. Do you happen to know whether they are aware of that case you have mentioned?—Oh, certainly; there was another case of a foster-parent that had a child out, and when she found she would not get paid any longer she came and dumped the child down at the union. I recollect going before the Ladies' Committee and appealing to them not to allow this child to be left in the house for an hour, and they told me they had power to put her out for twelve months more, and they would attend to it; she was taken out next day again, so much afraid was I that she would get into bad habits.

MR. JEREMIAH LANE, &c., examined.

22682. CHAIRMAN.—You are appearing in conjunction with the Lord Mayor for the Corporation?—I am, sir, but in addition to that I, as well as the Lord Mayor, am a member of the Board of Guardians, who have answered the questions, and we were consulting parties to those replies. The Board of Guardians seemed to take a more general interest in the questions and answers than the Corporation, consequently my views are more embodied in the answers the Board of Guardians have given to a much larger extent than in those of the Corporation.

22683. We have the answers here—if you will add anything yourself that occurs to you?—Thinking over the question of pauperism in its entirety, I believe that the system of keeping fathers and mothers and children in the workhouse is the principal means of breeding and continuing pauperism in Ireland, and until such time as the children are in a separate institution away from the influence of their parents you can never stop pauperism in this country. We have instances in the Cork Workhouse where there

are as many as three generations in the house at the same time; they are reared there; they meet their mothers regularly; there is a day set apart in the week when parents can visit their children; it is known as the fair day in the union, where there are all kinds of things carried on, and as a rule the mothers of these children are deputies in the house, and it is only a natural thing to suppose that these deputies in the execution of their duty are very often inclined to take what is given the sick, if possible, for the purpose of conveying it to their children.

22684. I suppose the nurse keeps a good look out so that?—It is almost impossible for the nurse to watch the deputies. We made an effort to do away with the system of deputies altogether from the hospitals, as we felt it was a great incentive to the deserving poor man or woman who was there to be probably in their dying moments watched over by one of these deputies, who are in many cases known as belonging to the criminal classes.

22685. What was the result of that effort?—To

increase the number of deputies, because we increased the number of attendants, and as a natural consequence we increased the number of deputies.

28665. I thought your proposal was to have paid officers?—Yes, sir; I think we increased the number of nurses by ten or twelve, and some of these nurses had to get deputies appointed as servants, so what we were trying to decrease we only increased, and I held that there are the same number of deputies, if not more in the hospital to-day than there were before. I would suggest, in the event of the hospital being separated from the workhouse, that paid assistants be employed in the hospital instead of pauper-deputies, as at present.

28667. Do you think they have as much opportunity as before for loving contributions on the sick?—I believe it is going on to a large extent; the nurses are very good and watchful and careful, but it is not possible for them to keep these deputies under observation at all times. The nurses withdraw at a certain hour in the evening; they live in community, and leave at eight o'clock in the evening, and don't come on duty until eight o'clock next morning. Then the night nurses are few in number, and the deputies have charge of the hospital completely.

28668. Dr. BARNES.—Are the night nurses rather few?—I would like to see them increased. If the children were removed altogether away from the influence of their parents you would not have the same amount of inducements to people to remain in the union.

28669. CHAIRMAN.—You know these women deputies remain in the house because their children are there?—Yes, and in many cases their husbands are there.

28670. You don't think it would be a sound thing to take the charge of the children away from their (removal) parents and let them go off with a free leg?—I should be very careful of relieving them of that responsibility, but at the same time it would be very desirable in the interests of society to take the children away from parents who are intemperate or of vicious habits.

28671. Would it be your opinion that where a parent was unfit to be treated with his child he was also unfit to be at large himself, and if you support the child owing to the bad character of the parent would you be of opinion that the parent should be deprived of his liberty?—I thoroughly agree with you. Then the children of the workhouse get no industrial training, and if there was such an institution provided as I have in my mind, where they would get an industrial training and get situations from it, they never would return to the union.

28672. You know the great difficulty of getting employment in trades now?—There is certainly.

28673. And there is rather a shortage of agricultural labourers in the country?—Yes, and I think it is the greatest misfortune that there was not some land attached to the present Cork Union.

28674. If the children are boarded out won't they be taught to be agricultural labourers?—Yes; I am entirely in accord with the system of boarding out children.

28675. But if you put them into a place and teach them a trade at a high cost—a cost small repayments could not incur—you may give them a trade that they cannot follow?—Well, they do it in the industrial schools.

28676. If you go and do it as well you will still further increase the number of people who won't get employment?—What industrial training does a boy or girl get in the union now?

28677. If you heard them out they will be taught household management and farming the same as any labourer's child?—They can only be boarded out until fifteen; I would be rather inclined to increase that than decrease it.

28678. At discretion, especially in the case of the girls, perhaps?—Yes, I am fully of opinion that as long as parents are allowed to be with the children in the union you never can get rid of pauperism, so it struck me that a separate institution for children altogether outside the union would be desirable.

28679. Why would you say an institution when you have boarding out at your hands?—If you can do it to the full extent in boarding out.

28680. And for cases not suitable for boarding out have you not got the existing industrial school?—I don't think they are sent there from the union.

28681. Under the existing law they are not, but if the law were changed to enable cases that were not

eligible for boarding out to be sent to an industrial school or a school such as the Lord Mayor mentioned just now where children who had associated with vicious parents might be sent, a reformatory, you have not in view a separate institution, have you?—I think if the boarding out system was considerably enlarged it would remove any difficulty. I agree with the suggestion that where children have associated with vicious parents they should be sent to an industrial school, or reformatory, at the Guardians' discretion.

28682. You would be in favour of enlarging the power?—Certainly. There is another grievance that I, as representing the Corporation, have to mention. We were entirely led to understand that when the auxiliary asylum was built in Youghal all the inmates would be removed from Cork Union, and it was on that clear understanding being given that the Corporation co-operated with the County Council for the purpose of getting this great burden removed from the union. Well, now, sir, what do we find? There were only 122 removed up to the present from the Cork Union; a number of those patients have died since, and we have the greatest difficulty in getting others removed since.

28683. I don't know whether you were here when the Bishop of Ross gave evidence; he explained that they are now full, and he would wish to have an enlargement of the place so that all the inmates that are in every workhouse could be taken in—that would meet your view?—Yes, and it is remarkable; it appears it is against the law to keep inmates in any union, and still they are kept there.

28684. Oh, no; a lunatic cannot go into a workhouse because he is a lunatic, but if he is a lunatic and delirious at the same time he can be removed into the workhouse?—If this burden was taken off the shoulders of the Cork Guardians it would mean the removal of the sixty patients that we have to maintain out of a union charge; when they were transferred to the insane asylum or an auxiliary asylum it would become a county-at-large charge, and they would be getting a portion of that capitation grant which the Guardians never get; it is a general county and borough charge. There is another class of inmates I would like to be removed altogether out of the union, that is the blind; I hold that we are not competent to deal with these cases, and it is far better to keep the blind people in charge of those who are better versed in looking after their best interests than we are in the union, and if all the blind were removed and paid for in some institution not only would the comfort of the poor blind people be improved, but the cost would not be any greater.

28685. We had evidence to that effect from some members of the Association for the Blind in Dublin?—We are very much annoyed by tramps and casuals coming in and we hear great complaints all over the entire country of this class of thing. I believe a great lot of it is owing to the fact that there is not a regular dietary in all the unions.

28686. You may take it for granted that these people have the roving instinct, and no matter how uncomfortable you make a workhouse for them they will rove on unless their course is stopped?—There is another point; it frequently happens in Cork that husband, wife and children enter; they reside in the house for, say, three months; during that time the children are sent to school; they are commencing to learn something, and some special occasion comes, such, for instance, as the races, and the father and mother take it into their head to look for their discharge; they can get it on three hours' notice, and the little children, who are just beginning to settle down at school and being taught cleanliness, are withdrawn from the school, and the whole family make their appearance in the street, and after two or three days they come back again to the workhouse and obtain admission. That is a great flaw in the Poor Law system; if there was a law in existence empowering the Guardians to take possession of these children of vicious parents.

28687. You have a law enabling you to pass a resolution putting yourselves in loco parentis in the case of children of vicious parents?—There is an amount of that going on lately in the Cork Workhouse; I saw a fine healthy young woman and she refused to work because she was displeased with some of her clothing. I asked how long she was in the house, and I was informed that not only was she born in the house but her mother was born in the house, and

Sept. 27, 1905.
Mr. Jermiah
Luce

Sept. 27, 1905.
 Mr. Jervais.
 Lane.

the probabilities are that her children will be born in the house too. They form each other's acquaintance inside, go out to get married, return to the house and bring up a family.

28703. It is an utter breach of the rules and regulations—what you describe as fair day would be a gross irregularity!—That is a certain day in the week when the parents are allowed to see the children, in fact, I might say, it occurred this present week, and the master only yesterday informed me that when he entered the gate where the women are allowed to see their children he found a number of things, bread and other things, in their possession, with the result that he sent the whole of them back, and refused to allow them to see the children for that day.

28704. Are they allowed to see the children in a body?—I am not sure.

28705. If they only saw them singly, there would not be anything except what is proper!—As a member of the board for a period of six years, it is my opinion that the board is too large to do good practical work; we have done on 550 members; I have not found in my experience that such a large board is able to do the business quite as well as a smaller number of people.

28711. I suppose your average attendance is twenty to thirty?—We have a very good attendance, on certain occasions; if there was an election, for instance, we would have the entire board. There are only thirty-two members from the city, and the valuation of the city is £178,000, as against the rural districts of £185,500, with Queenstown's £23,000 thrown in, so the city valuation is as great as the rural districts. Queenstown has four members, and the whole lot forms a board of 100 members; I believe the city has a grievance in not being represented according to valuation and population; I would not suggest increasing the city representation, but I imagine the country would be very well served by reducing the number of Guardians in the country and making it a smaller board.

28712. Are you a city or a country Guardian?—I am a city Guardian. The Lord Mayor mentioned about the fever hospital, but as I understand the Guardians have power to deal with that question, it will be only wasting your time to refer to it; it is a splendid building, has room for 100 beds, and costs 2650 a year, and we have an average of four or five patients a day. I was not aware of the fact until to-day that the Guardians had power.

CHAIRMAN.—They have power to enter into negotiations; it would not be final, of course.

Dr. BROOK.—The other building would have to be inspected and seen that it is suitable.

28713. CHAIRMAN.—You have power to start the matter?—I have heard you put a question about the outdoor relief; we had a very long discussion on that matter at the Board of Guardians, and we feel that it would be a great hardship if you were to recommend that outdoor relief be given in kind as far as the city is concerned; there are a great number of charitable people to be found in the city, as well as charities for that purpose for giving relief, and they generally give it in kind; the greatest hardship the poor people have to contend with is getting the rest of their little houses.

28714. What we spoke of to-day was not the giving of outdoor relief generally in kind, but giving it to able-bodied people in kind; that is, if a man, owing to his own want of providence or perhaps hardship in some way or other, if he was an able-bodied man, it was proposed that if you give it to a man of that class he should get it not in money but in kind; I did not understand the suggestion to apply to existing cases of relief, but to the new class proposed to be added. If you gave money to any able-bodied man who was improvident, and was not a total abstemious, what would be the probability as regards the money you would give him?—The probability is—

28715. He would liquidate some of it!—Yes, no doubt it occurs in some cases. There is a proposition that we should have an inspector, which is a very proper one in my opinion, to see that the relieving officers did their duty, and that only proper people get outdoor relief. Frank has been found with the increase in outdoor relief, and it is easy to account for that. Previous to the Local Government Act there was a class of people in power who never came in contact with the poor and never knew the needs of the city, and after the Act people were returned

such as myself who were always more in touch with the poorer classes, and we know the deserving cases and were interested in them, and it was on that account the relief went up, but I believe it was perfectly justifiable. The great objection I have to the entire system is that it is a costly system; the poor law system is too costly. I have seen recently that a certain authority said that the system in Ireland costs £960,550, and out of this sum there was £178,125 spent on salaries alone; there was £137,564 in the upkeep of workhouses, while there was only a balance of £207,669 devoted to the assistance of the poor in various forms, thus representing that it cost 1s. 4d. to distribute 1s. 4d. in relief.

28716. That is not referring to the poor law alone, it also refers to dispensaries?—All in connection with the poor law system.

28717. That is medical charities' work, that is an expensive service, and it is mainly dispensary doctors' salaries that goes into your 1s. 4d.; that is not the figure we have to work on; we have to work on what is the actual expenditure under the Poor Law Act as distinguished from the Medical Charities, Registration, and other Acts; that would make it appear that the cost of distribution is very much higher than it is!—We were also thinking with regard to the fact that an inmate in the union can claim discharge on three hours' notice that that is too short in some cases, and that there should be a discretionary power given to the master of the union not to give discharge to people who are regular visitors and leave the union for special purposes.

28718. Do you mean specially now is the case of tramps?—Yes and people who want to come out this morning and go to the races and go back in the evening; if they were kept inside they would probably lose a few winners. If the law would empower the master to use his own discretion.

28719. That would be a very strong step to give a man power over another's liberty unless you indicated in what way he was to use that discretion; if you were to say in the case of tramps that the law should be made as in England that would be a limitation, but would you give the master power as regards any inmate to prevent his discharge for a lengthened period?—Well, perhaps—I don't know that the master would abuse it.

28720. If I were master I should not like to have that power!—Our object and desire is to hit at the tramp nuisance, and if he had the power in the case of tramps it might meet the purpose. There is another grievance that the master of a union very often labours under, and it is this, if one of these tramps refuse to perform a certain amount of work, and if he misconducts himself, a tramp or any other inmate, the master has no power.

28721. Why can he not bring him before a magistrate?—He cannot, except that he secures an information against him that he threatened him.

28722. Could he not charge him with refusing to work?—He has to report the matter to the Board, or he must summon in the usual way.

28723. He must charge him!—But when that person knows he is charged the next thing is he applies for his discharge; we are thinking if the master had power to take him before the nearest justice of the peace.

28724. So he has practically that power!—I was not aware of it, and I don't think the master of the Cork Union is aware of it.

28725. I don't like giving legal opinions, but certainly proceedings can be taken by the master in his own name against an inmate for breach of rules and disciplinary conduct, whether he should take him to a magistrate or to the court, I won't say!—There is another disqualification that I would like to draw your attention to; at the present time a person in possession of a quarter-acre of land is prohibited from getting relief.

28726. Yes; we have had that before; you would extend it to an acre or an acre and a quarter?—He might have ten acres and still be destitute.

28727. Would you be in favour of removing the limitation?—Yes, and leaving it in the discretion of the Guardians and relieving officer; I have known people in possession of twenty acres of land practically destitute; I think that restriction ought to be removed altogether. I don't know that I have any more to add, only that I am strongly of opinion that the union is no place for keeping the blind; they ought to be removed to an institution for that par-

pose outside the union, and benefits of every class should not be there. It would cease to this, that you would simply have it as a general hospital or infirmary, and those who at present are there would be better catered for outside; the system is damnable—

ing as it exists at the present day, and I don't know of any changes except the changes that I hope this Commission will recommend of altering the present system entirely for the purpose of doing away with all the bad points to be found in the Poor Law system.

Sept. 27, 1905.
—
Mr. Fennell
Lanc.

Mr. JOHN DODGSON, R.N., examined.

With regard to the cause of pauperism, as far as I can see in our own district, the first cause and the principal cause that I see plain evidence of in our own district is emigration; I know of one old couple in our parish who had five sons; they all emigrated; the last of them went last year. While they remained unmarried in America they sent home quite sufficient to keep the old couple here; now they seem all to have got married, and the old couple have had to apply to me for outdoor relief, and if it is refused there is nothing for them to do but go into the workhouse and become a burden on the rates.

28728. CHAIRMAN.—Is it a usual thing for children to forget their parents?—These children were exceptionally good; I have known them to send £15 and £20 in one year; then, of course, when they married and their children grew up about them they failed to supply what they always supplied. That emigration is felt in our district, for although the Corporation have been kind enough to build about 130 houses for the workmen of the city, and although people have gone there from the city owing to the cramped state of the city, the population is about 650, and although that 650 has been imported into the district, the population of the district in the past twenty years has fallen off by 1,700.

28729. What is your clerical division?—Bishopstew. It is only now we are beginning to feel the drain that has been going on for the last twenty years; that must necessitate an increase of pauperism and an increase in outdoor relief.

28730. You think emigration is the indirect cause of a great deal of poverty?—The great amount of it more than people would imagine.

28731. Have you any observations of a practical nature—that is, merely to explain the poverty, not to suggest how the difficulty could be met?—The want of employment causes the emigration in the first instance; how that is to be met might be outside the scope of your inquiry.

28732. I wish it was not, but I am afraid it is!—We would all wish that. Another cause is the spread of education of an unsuitable kind, which gives the sons of the working classes a distaste for labour, and they imagine though they cannot find a field for their education here they may find it in America; I hope they are not disappointed, but I am afraid they are. The want of knowledge of preventive measures to avoid illness, which causes the spread of disease and discomfort, which is one of the causes of emigration, of course, causes suffering with the effect of overcrowded hospitals. The head of the family for want of having someone to nurse him or a proper home has to go to hospital, and he leaves the family in destitution behind him. There was a woman the other day applied to me and got provisional outdoor relief for one week, although they say it is against the law; she has one son earning the enormous sum of 2s. a week; she has five daughters, one of them serving her time, and she is receiving 2s. a week, which serves to put boots on the family; she works in a boot factory. The other children are going to school. I have known her to pawn all she had in the house; I went there and saw no fire or anything to eat; she was refused outdoor relief, why I fail to see. I was looking for a cure for consumption; I think that is one of the causes of it.

28733. How would you deal with that case yourself?—There should be exceptions made to the rule; it appears that there is no exception to the rule for outdoor relief, because it seems we can only give her the miserable sum of 5s. for one week and leave her in hopes of more.

28734. Is there 2s. besides?—That 2s. goes to find boots for the children.

28735. Then there is the 5s. that the son gets?—That is what deprives her of getting outdoor relief.

28736. There is 11s. earned and how is it spent?—They have to pay 2s. a week house-pent.

28737. You thought relief ought to be given—the relieving officer did not?—He said according to the

law it could not be given, and although he gave 5s. he said he would have to pay it himself. If a father has to go into hospital through illness that illness might be cured at home if there was a little more outdoor relief given.

28738. He could not well be nursed in a home where there was no fire or food?—He could be nursed far less than it costs in the hospital, and it would prevent the overcrowding in the hospital, and for a person in decent circumstances the very shock of removing him to a hospital in these cases out of four kills the patient.

28739. The Board of Guardians did not agree with you on this representation—you brought it before them?—I did.

28740. They did not adopt your recommendation?—I brought it before the outdoor relief Board, and the chairman said it was against the law on account of the boy earning 2s., but that if the boy went away to-morrow from them they would have to get it. My idea is that if these nursing mothers were engaged to the early symptoms of disease, what they were and how they might be checked, it might have a good effect.

28741. You cannot hope to make little doctors of them, and even doctors themselves, if half-a-dozen of them look at a man they won't be able to agree as to what is wrong with him?—The population has declined in the rural districts, and the dispensary doctors draw a salary for doing very little; I would get them to instruct the boys in schools as to the early symptoms of disease, what they were and how they might be checked, it might have a good effect.

28742. That would be in surgical cases?—Yes, to qualify for first aid. There was another thing with regard to the illegitimate children; it seems almost cruel that a woman who has cruel, perhaps cruel under a promise of marriage, should have to remain a prisoner in the house with her child for fourteen years; if she abandoned that child and shewed ill-will to it the child would be taken up, maintained in the house, and put out to nurse.

28743. You would suggest what a great many were witnesses have suggested—that the Guardians should have power to put illegitimate children out to nurse?—Certainly; in America, I believe, the first illegitimate child is taken and reared at the expense of the State; I would certainly let them maintain the second one themselves, but if they get a fresh start they would not be a burden to the rates by remaining in the house or destitute. With regard to Mr. Lane's remarks about enlarging the number of city Guardians—the Guardians in the city are very near the meetings of the Board of Guardians, and have only to run up in a tram for a penny, whereas the rural Guardians have to come a great distance. There might be a case from that very district coming on that day, and if one of the Guardians was ill the other could come and represent him.

28744. If there was a reduction you would like it made all round?—I would not have them reduced at all; the more the better; I would rather extend it. With regard to outdoor relief in kind, I would be altogether against that; they give these orders for outdoor relief to the shopkeeper they are dealing with and the neighbours know they are getting this outdoor relief, whereas if it is given in money they don't know it.

28745. They are bound to know it if the law is observed, because you must publish in some way the amounts these people are getting and the names?—They want to hide it before the people in their own locality, which is quite natural.

28746. It may be natural, but it is not the law?—Everything in the law should be in accordance with natural feeling; they get much better value when they get the money than when they are getting an order for outdoor relief.

28747. There are a great many opinions to the contrary on that point?—I have seen a man get 4s. in

Mr. John
Dodgson.

Sept. 27, 1904. a neighbouring union, and I have seen him get an order to the butcher for 4s. worth of beef; if he sees that beef on the road coming home it is a hungry dog would eat it.

23743. If he lost the money a thirsty man would drink it!—The money might be some use to the man who found it, but the meat would not be much good, even to the dog.

Mr. D. C. Keenan.
Kilishan.

Mr. D. C. KEENAN, Chairman, Maroon Union.

I beg to state that I am in favour of amalgamation of unions. My reason is in order to get rid of staff expenses. I am in favour of retaining the hospitals for the convenience of the sick poor. I am for union rating and the standard system for towns, because if divided I fear we would be too sparing of outdoor relief, which might be unfair to the deserving poor. I would be for re-classification of inmates, at least into three different departments. The tramp class should have a separate place, and be compelled to work. The respectable poor should be separated from the in-

different and get a different dress, etc. I would leave it optional to each union whether they should amalgamate or not. I am for the boarding out of children, as at present, except where the child is over six years, when I think it should be sent to an industrial school. There should be a separate place for immoral women. I am in favour of the suggestion that a passport should be given to a person looking for work in order to distinguish him from the tramp class.

The Sitting terminated.

FIFTY-EIGHTH PUBLIC SITTING—THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER, 28TH, 1905. *Sep. 28, 1905.*

At the Courtroom, Bantry.

Present:—Mr. MICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURNAGHAN, and Dr. CORK BOGGER.

Mr. WILLIAM COTTON, Chairman, Bantry Union, examined.

28749. CHAIRMAN.—You are aware, of course, generally, of the nature of our inquiry here, to inquire whether any unions could be broken up and the workhouses used for different purposes, or whether other reforms could be introduced in the interests of economy and efficiency in the Poor Law administration—you know that generally?—Well, generally; of course I only read things in the papers from time to time.

28750. What view is taken by your Board of Guardians on this question?—We did not discuss anything except about the outdoor; we passed a resolution at one time.

28751. What was your view about that?—That the rating should be divisional in place of union.

28752. Did the Guardians representing the town agree to that?—The few representing the town I think were opposed to it; of course their views are different to ours in the country.

28753. Would you be willing in the country to take things pretty much as they are at present, and to say that on the basis of the existing expenditure you would consent to a union charge, but that any increase should go on the electoral division?—Well, I think the outdoor relief any way should go on the electoral division, and be a divisional charge; I know there is a tendency to increase when it is a union-at-large charge, and Guardians representing their own division would be more careful.

28754. They would be responsible to their constituents immediately?—Responsible and more scrupulous about giving an increase.

28755. Where it is off the whole union they are not so careful?—Not so careful.

28756. Of course you know that the recent legislation in 1886 gave the towns a benefit in consideration of all the poor people that gathered into the towns?—I know that; perhaps it would be only fair, too.

28757. You would be willing to give them some compensation for that still?—I think so.

28758. The suggestion I made just now is one that we received elsewhere that the expenditure should be fixed. The proper expenditure on outdoor relief, as far as it could be ascertained, what might be called the standard expenditure, would be fixed at so much a week, say, for each electoral division, but if the expenditure exceeded that, any additional cost should be made an electoral division charge, if it ever happened?—I believe that would be only fair; I know right well in days gone by the houses of labourers in country districts were thrown down; they had no houses and they came into the towns.

28759. Now as regards the workhouses—are you in favour of keeping all the various classes that are in the workhouse still? The classes you have in the workhouse now are the sick, the aged and infirm, children and their mothers, lunatics and tramps. We have received suggestions in a great many places that it would be desirable, as far as possible, to exclude all classes from the existing buildings except the sick, and we have got the suggestion from a great many witnesses that the aged and infirm should be put into a central institution. Supposing you have, say, five or six unions in this part of the country, with one union in a central position, say Bantry, or whatever union might be selected, and all the aged and infirm of the surrounding unions should be put in there, leaving the sick hospital as it is?—And what about the outdoor relief cases?

28760. The Board of Guardians in each union would still administer their outdoor relief. Say Donnybrook, they would have their sick hospital there still, and would administer the outdoor relief there still, but the aged and infirm would come, say, to here or whatever workhouse was selected—I am of opinion that it would be better for the aged and infirm—they might be better looked after.

28761. And you would have considerable economy, it is thought, by having all that class together—you would have much fewer officers if you brought the six or seven unions in together to one institution?—That is what we want, because we have too many officers for the inmates we have; that would be no harm.

28762. Then, as regards children, some people think it is a mistake to have children and the mothers of illegitimate children in the workhouse at all; they make suggestions to us that the proper course would be that as soon as the girl is about to have that illegitimate child she should be sent to a religious institution—if she is a Catholic to the Good Shepherd, and if a Protestant to some of the Protestant institutions of the sort, and that she should be paid for them by the Guardians at so much a head, that she should nurse her child there for a year, and then afterwards the child should be boarded out, and the managers of this religious institution should endeavour to maintain the girl, and put her back into the world again in a situation or otherwise?—I would fall in with that view too.

28763. At present in workhouses if a girl has one child the tendency is to go out and have another?—Sometimes it happens; we have experience of it here too.

28764. It is hoped that evil may be reduced a good deal—would you approve of that?—I would.

28765. Do you approve of boarding out children?—We have no experience in the Bantry Union.

28766. We get strong evidence in favour of it in Cork the last two or three days, and other places, showing that the children who were boarded out became useful labourers in the country; they got into habits of industry and handiness, and get employment without difficulty, and never know what it is to go to the workhouse, and don't fall back there the way workhouse children are apt to do at present. The Guardians of the Cork Union recommended that the law should enable them to board out all children that have to be supported out of the rates; you can board them out for about 18s a head, and they cost far more than that; double that if you take the full average cost in the workhouse?—I would agree with that; I think in after life they would be more useful.

28767. Then as regards the lunatics and idiots, it was proposed in Cork and elsewhere that all the lunatics should be removed from workhouses and put in an auxiliary asylum that you have in the County Cork and never kept any more in workhouses—would you agree with that?—I would.

28768. The cost in the Youghal Auxiliary is very low for an asylum—it is 215s or 216s according to the evidence we got yesterday. Now carnals and tramps—a suggestion has been made that men who go about the country, not looking for work but mending about the country, putting up at workhouses and living on contributions from farmers and others, it is recommended to us that these men should be liable to be arrested if they could not give a satisfactory account of themselves, and had no documentary evidence such as a man looking for work would have, and that they should be sent to a district workhouse, one, say, for all Munster and another for each of the three provinces, and should be kept there for a number of years, if necessary, to try and bring them into habits of industry, and, at all events, if that could not be done to make them work for their support?—I would fall in with that view; they should be arrested surely, and not allowed to go from union to union.

28769. To your knowledge are they a most objectionable class to the country?—Indeed they are. I see them from time to time on the road; they come to this union, and then go on to Kermore the following night; they are only going round from union to union, and they are dangerous besides in going along the roads.

Mr. William Cotton.

Sept. 28, 1864
Mr. William
Cotton.

28770. Are they troublesome in asking for support?—They are; they steal or do anything they can lay their hands on, and perhaps they may go into a hay-

shed at night and burn it. They are smoking and have matches with them, so they are dangerous. We have a very unjust law that allows them to go about

Mr. Benjamin
O'Connor.

28771. CHAIRMAN.—You are also a member of the Board of Guardians?—Yes, for the past six or seven years.

28772. You have heard some of the evidence?—Yes, I agree with the portions I heard from Mr. Cotton.

28773. Taking an area of half a dozen unions in West Cork, would you see any objection to putting all the aged and infirm healthy people—not the sick, leaving the sick as they are in your own infirmary—would you see any objection to bringing into a central workhouse, such as Bantley, or whatever workhouse might be selected, the aged and infirm from all these unions?—If it were practicable, I think it would be very desirable, but there is such a large number of aged and infirm and sick poor in the district.

28774. We have the numbers—here in Bantley you have 37; Castletown, 31; Dunmanway, 35; Schibberon, 68; Schull only 37—I rather think there are more; I really regard all the inmates of the Bantley Union at present as practically aged, infirm and sick.

28775. The majority, of course; I can give you the figures for the place—Bantley, 34; Castletown, 32; Dunmanway, 33; Schibberon, 68; Schull, 47.—The inmates, generally known as able-bodied, have practically disappeared from workhouses in the country districts, and instead of being a workhouse I would regard the institution at present as a hospital, and, therefore, for the treatment of the sick inmates I would regard it as a district hospital, and exclude from it all other classes—that is to say what is known as the tramp, he should not get admittance at all; I think children should be boarded out under proper supervision, and before being discharged from that system they should pass through an industrial school for some time.

28776. That is a matter I should like to discuss a little further with you—why would you send them to an industrial school?—I think it would equip them better for the battle of life afterwards.

28777. Do you think putting them into an industrial school and only teaching them the rudiments of trade might not unuse them for their natural work, that of farm labourers?—I don't know; I think anything in the shape of technical education—

28778. Technical knowledge is good, of course, but the class you most need in the country at present is the class of agricultural labourers?—Yes.

28779. Labour is scarce and becoming scarcer?—It is, but I am driven to the conclusion that when children of that age become trained they will not become agricultural labourers; they will have a different ambition.

28780. That is what I think—why should the Guardians spend a large sum of money that might unuse the children and make them more ambitious when a very good, healthy and cheap occupation might be obtained for them by boarding them out and rearing them as agricultural labourers?—That is assuming the country is not going to improve.

28781. Don't we want agricultural labourers badly?—The population has decreased in this country, and that, to my mind, explains the absence of able-bodied labourers in the union. Labour is scarce.

28782. Mr. MURPHY.—I suppose you are aware that what other countries want most is the agricultural labourer?—Yes.

28783. And it being one of the chief wants of our country, should we not try to supply it?—I would be slow in saying we should bring up children with the object of retaining them in ignorance.

28784. CHAIRMAN.—Not in ignorance—the question is whether you would make them shoemakers, smiths, tailors or carpenters?—The education they would

receive, examined,

28785. Bantley, examined, derives from an industrial training would make them better labourers.

28786. If it would if they would go back to it?—I think if the Board agreed on the boarding-out system, discharging them without any fixed purpose or better training than they would get from such a system would not be felt to them; it would be better give them some industrial training.

28787. Industrial education at a school like ordinary children is good, but take the ordinary children of very small farmers; they cannot get any of that trained instruction?—Up to the present, but I think the educational system all through the country is in the direction of giving them that.

28788. Do you think it necessary or wise to spend a large sum of money on poor little children that have to be brought up at the public expense in workhouses when you could give them at a cheap rate a good, healthy employment and occupation as agricultural labourers?—I think, having been taken in hands by the public and boarded out, they should not be left to go out into life without giving them something additional in the shape of technical education.

28789. They would go to the very same schools as the small farmers' and labourers' children in the country go to—the question is, should you take the boarded-out and give him an expensive finishing education such as could not be obtained by the self-supporting labourers' and farmers' children in the country?—Yes, it may be going perhaps too far.

28790. Mr. MURPHY.—And there is the other advantage that the children would be raised in a home where they would be accustomed to the ordinary affairs of life, and where the domestic sentiment would be encouraged instead of being stifled, as it usually is in an institution?—The boarding out would be a great improvement on the present arrangements.

28791. CHAIRMAN.—Your idea would have a finishing year or so?—I thought so, yes; merely as a suggestion. However, that class, at all events, I would exclude from the workhouses, and the able-bodied man, as far as Bantley is concerned, has disappeared as an inmate; if a casual case turned up it ought to be provided for by outdoor relief under proper supervision.

28792. As regards the girls who enter the workhouse to have children?—I certainly agree that they should be excluded from it, and trained in domesticities such as you mention. As regards tramps, they should not get admittance at all; they should be very rigidly dealt with. If it could be arranged, not only should they report themselves to the police when they come to a town like this, but, if possible, they should only be accommodated at the police barracks for the night; that would make them very chary about coming there, and if treated that way it would remove a lot of them.

28793. One suggestion we have got goes further than that—it goes to the extent that if a well-known vagrant could not give a satisfactory explanation for himself he should be liable to arrest, be brought before the magistrates and sent to a real workhouse in order that he might be trained for a couple of years, if necessary, to habits of industry, and in order to protect the honest man going from one town to another, the bricklayer's assistant or whatever he might be, in order to protect him, such a man should always bring with him a letter of recommendation from some person of respectability?—Yes, for the protection of the community it is very necessary.

28794. You would agree with that—you would not think that would be going too far in depriving that class of their liberty?—It would be very desirable.

28795. You are aware a great many of these people have children with them, and they are being brought up in the worst possible way?—Yes.

Mr. William
Cotton.

There are beggars going through the country that don't go to any union.

28796. CHAIRMAN.—I would call those next door to tramps, but there are a number of decent old

Mr. WILLIAM COTTON further examined.

people that have the goodwill of their own parishes, we will say, and are never refused a bit as they go along, or, perhaps, stay in houses—you would not touch those people?—No, but strangers.

28706. I would call the stronger tramp!—They never come near the union at all you know.
 28707. Even so. It is not a question of coming to the union—if this change were made there would be no union for them to go to, so that anyone wander-

ing from place to place would be liable to this treatment?—Then I would be satisfied; I know that those people go to the public-houses after their day's work is done and drink there.

Sept. 28, 1905.
 Mr. William
 Cotter.

Mr. TIMOTHY MURPHY, R.L.G., Bantry, examined.

I concur with the evidence of the other witnesses. Outdoor relief has increased since the Local Government Act. Probably Mr. Crowley could give you an idea of what it is.

28708. CHAIRMAN.—We were going to ask him to give us a return afterwards?—Here are the cases on outdoor relief last week (list produced).

28709. £17—what used to be the amount before the union-at-large rating?

Mr. Crowley (Clerk).—It has increased largely.

28710. CHAIRMAN.—Not doubled?

Mr. Crowley.—Not nearly that; the expenditure used to be £15 or £13.

28711. CHAIRMAN.—Twenty-five per cent?

Mr. Crowley.—No, I would not say so; during the last twenty years it has increased very much.

CHAIRMAN.—We will ask you to give us some statistics on this point.

Mr. Timothy
 Murphy.

Mr. DANIEL BOWEN, J.P., Chairman, Skibbereen Union, examined.

28712. CHAIRMAN.—You are the Chairman of the Skibbereen Union?—Yes.

28713. It is one of the largest, with most inmates, in West Cork?—Yes.

The Clerk.—It was £15 last year.

28714. CHAIRMAN.—Suggestions have been made to us in a good many unions that as far as possible each workhouse should be strictly turned into a district hospital for the sick, and that the other classes should be dealt with in some other way?—That is the old people?

28715. No, the sick. We will take the classes, beginning with the children. The evidence that we received very generally is that it is not desirable to have children in the workhouse?—No, I agree with that, too, myself.

28716. Are you in favour of boarding out the children?—Board out as many as you can; but, of course, you cannot board them out until they come to a certain age—a couple of years old.

28717. Would you be in favour of boarding out as soon as they can?—Certainly. At present the Guardians can only board out orphan and deserted children.

28718. Would you be in favour of an Act of Parliament giving the Guardians discretion to board out all children who would have to be supported out of the rates?—Certainly.

28719. At present you have a considerable number of women who enter a workhouse to become mothers of illegitimate children; in a great many of these cases these women have more than one child—they keep on having three or four, and even up to eight or nine children we have found with some of these women; it has been suggested to us that girls, as soon as they are about to have a baby, should not be received in the workhouse at all, but should be sent at the expense of the rates to a penitentiary or refuge under religious management in the city of Cork, or wherever else it would be, and they should stay there until immediately before they would have the child; that they then should go to a maternity hospital for that, and then return to the institution with the baby and stay there for a year and nurse the baby; that the union, if it were a Catholic, and Protestant Union, if it were a Protestant, should endeavour to reclaim these girls and put them forward in situations and get them out of the position their unfortunate step had put them in—would you approve of that?—I would, but these people should have power to prosecute the putative father for the support of the child.

28720. The bastardy law in England is very different from that in Ireland; there the girl herself can proceed against the man—have you ever proceeded here?—We have in the Skibbereen Union.

28721. There is a good deal of difficulty about it?—There is; it is very hard to succeed, but in the last case we succeeded.

28722. At all events the law in England makes it much easier to hit the father—is it your idea that the law should be changed so as to make it easier to penalise the father?—I think so. We had a case in the Skibbereen Union where we recovered against the father for the maintenance of the child; still we must keep the mother and child in the workhouse.

28723. When once these girls come into the workhouse it is generally for life, or very often?—Very often; I quite agree that they should not be taken into the workhouse. They are not a very good social element even in the workhouse.

28724. No, they are not; that is where they are very much out of place. Then their children should be boarded out afterwards; as far as possible get either the father or the mother to contribute to the support?—Children should be put into some institution where they would learn trades.

28725. Why should you prefer their learning trades to being made agricultural labourers?—What they would be most inclined for.

28726. You can very cheaply make them agricultural labourers—that supplies a want that is felt in the country?—In the Skibbereen Union we have apprenticed some of them to trades.

28727. That is doing very well for them, but it is costly?—It is not; we board out children at 65 a year and £1 for clothes.

28728. Why do you make tradesmen of them?—Some of them might have a natural turn for trades and others for farming. You must turn them to what you consider the best account—what they are naturally inclined for.

28729. Would you do more for them than an independent labourer could do for his children—even if his child had a taste for becoming an engineer you could not make him out?—There is a good deal in that; the employers should not be called upon to do more than put them in a way of making a livelihood; you might have a few children whom you might put to a trade—I would not approve of it generally.

28730. Lascivious and idiots—do you think they ought to be kept in the workhouse, or would you send them to Fonghal?—They should be put somewhere; of course they are very troublesome in workhouses.

28731. Dr. Bowen.—How many have you in your workhouse?

The Clerk.—There were nine sent to Fonghal; I think there are seven remaining and two children.

28732. CHAIRMAN.—The suggestion about carnals and tramps—is that the well-known vagrant if he could not show a good reason for marching about from place to place should be liable to detention in a vagrant workhouse, and committed there under a magistrate's warrant, if it was thought a suitable place?—Generally the tramps we get here comes from the midland counties, Dublin and Limerick; there are very few people from our union tramping around and, after all, if these people are badly off why should they not be treated in their own unions.

28733. We hear in other parts of Ireland that they come from the south?—Well, the tramps we get are from Limerick and Waterford.

Clerk.—There are no tramps from Skibbereen.

Witness.—And more than that—they are an element of danger; I remember a case where they brought fever into Skibbereen; they carry infection round the country; it is only talking that they go looking for work; the majority of them would run away from work; they go from one workhouse to another.

28734. Do you think that these people who are undoubtedly living by begging, or getting their support

Sept. 28, 1905.

Mr. Daniel
Berke.

In the workhouses at night and their breakfast in the morning—do you think that those people ought to be obliged to work?—I know they ought, and the only way to make them work is not to let them go to the workhouse at all; let the police take them up and deal with them. They come to Skibbereen and then go to Schall, and from Schall to Kancity, and then to Dumanaway, and generally three or four of them keep company on the road.

28825. If you had this class out of the workhouse the only class remaining, besides the sick, would be the aged and infirm; what would you think of having the aged and infirm dealt with in some central institution for a group of unions, and bring all the aged and infirm there under a master and matron?—I would be in favour of it if it is a saving. But suppose you take twenty or thirty people out of a workhouse we must still keep some staff in the workhouse.

28826. No, no; your staff would disappear; all your healthy inmates would be gone; you would only have the doctor and the nurse and the chaplain in the small workhouses remaining!—You must have a matron there and a master.

28827. Oh, no, because all the healthy inmates will be gone, and the children and their mothers, the lunatics, the criminals and the tramps will be gone, and it is really only in cities and towns that there are what you may call the in and out poor; they are nearly all taken down out of work in cities!—Would it not be very hard on our people to be removed long distances?

28828. That is the objection!—Of course it would be very costly.

28829. No, the expense would be very little, because these people when they are admitted into a workhouse practically stay there, and they could be made more comfortable at a less cost, because you could divide the aged and infirm, according to character and other circumstances, in different parts of the institution. And they would be much more comfortable!—I was going to mention about classification.

28830. You may have observed that all these suggestions are really classification ones—you classify and bring all the parties away from the big workhouses where they are herded together, and if you bring the aged and infirm to one central institution you can classify them according to conduct?—You have people in the workhouses who are there through no fault of their own, and others that are there through their own fault, and yet they get the same food. These people who can work and won't work should be put as the lowest class.

28831. Would you agree to put them into a central institution?—I would for that if I thought there would be a saving.

28832. We would not recommend it if it was not a saving!—Whether they would be put into a central institution or not these should be classification.

28833. We would not recommend any change as far as we can see at present unless it was a saving. To try and cut down the very heavy rates is one of our chief points, and if the aged and infirm were brought into one institution we think it would be a great saving—you could reduce the number of officers; it ought to be cheaper to keep people in large numbers than in small numbers?—That stands to commonsense. If they were sent away to a long distance the men and daughters who could support them if they liked might be more anxious to keep them at home.

28834. You don't see any harm in that?—No, that would be an improvement too. We find, and I suppose the same thing applies to other unions, a lot of able-bodied men will come to the workhouse at night, take their discharge in the morning, and they come up the next night with a ticket from the relieving officer to admit them; we have no power to refuse them.

28835. Are those what are called corner-boys?—We have a few of them, and have written to the Local Government Board several times and cannot stop it. The relieving officer told me they come to him at eight o'clock in the evening, and if he does not give them a ticket he will be responsible; they are men who earn nothing, simply use the workhouse as a lodging-house; they go to cage round the town; there should be some control given to the Guardians that if they came in they won't let them out for a certain period; keep them in for a month, and if they take their discharge keep them out for a week.

28836. Would you put them in the same rank as the tramps?—Of the two I think they are the worse; they will stop there for the night, go out in the morning, and come back at night.

28837. Cheap lodgings!—Yes, and causing anxiety to other inmates.

28838. Of course they are put in the casual and tramp ward!—I don't know.

28839. As regards outdoor relief!—It is a general complaint in every union—outdoor relief has increased in our union about 20 per cent.; it is between £1,500 and £2,500 a year to the Skibbereen Union. You will find some cases of people whose sons and daughters could support them who get outdoor relief. The son gets married, and the farm is given over to him, and then the father comes at the self-hearted Guardians to get relief for him. The effect of that is that some people who are getting relief would be entitled to more relief, but they don't get it, because people are getting relief whose sons and daughters should support them. Outdoor relief is a very hard thing to remedy.

28840. One of the Clerk Board of Guardians yesterday recommended very strongly that the Guardians should be empowered to appoint an inspector of outdoor relief cases, just as a trial appointment, to see whether a man would do more than save his salary by being put on to overhaul the relieving officers and look into the cases of relief; if there was such a power given to your Guardians would you be inclined to exercise it?—I don't think it would be any use to us; in a large union like Cork it might do good, but in Skibbereen the relieving officers know all the people, and the Guardians too.

28841. Mr. McENAGHAN.—But perhaps an outside inspector, unbiassed by local circumstances or friendship, might be of service. For instance, a man sent down from Dublin to look over the case of outdoor relief in the union, say once every three months—don't you think that would be a safeguard, and place the responsibility on the relieving officer?—I don't believe so; the relieving officer makes his report on the look, and it is generally left to the Guardians of the division whether the man would get relief or not. All I look to is to see he is legally entitled, and that I would not be annoyed.

28842. Yet you say there are people getting outdoor relief who should not get it?—Yes.

28843. And others not getting relief that is not enough to keep them?—They should get more—something should be done about the relief. Some people would go so far as to say that old people who have no one to look after them should be brought into the workhouse, and relief should only be given to widows and those who keep houses.

28844. Don't you think to revert back to the old system of divisional rating would remedy material?—I don't think so.

28845. It is said Guardians take little or no interest in granting outdoor relief!—They take the same interest as before, but as I said in the commencement, there are little abuses.

28846. My own experience as a Guardian is that they don't take the same interest as they formerly did, because I remember very well fifteen or twenty years ago how closely the ratemakers of a division watched its expenditure, and if there was any extravagance in outdoor relief on the part of their Poor Law Guardian he was promptly called to account, and somebody else put in his place; that is not done now, because no man can be called to order—his responsibility is general!—As a matter of fact before the passing of the Local Government Act the tendency in our union was to make them all union-at-large charges; they tried to get him of the division and put him on the union; we had two-thirds of our union-at-large charges before the passing of the Act.

Clerk.—Not quite two-thirds.

Witness.—About inmates—I know cases where people have a very great habit of bringing home their relatives. In America if a man's wife goes insane she is put into the union, and he must pay for her, and they have fallen into the habit of bringing their relatives home to Ireland to commit them. There was a case where the Cornard Company brought a man down and let him loose in Skibbereen, so that he was committed here; we threatened them with law proceedings and got that money back.

28847. CHAIRMAN.—We had evidence in Cork that a great many returned Americans were thrown on

the rates of the Cork Union?—It might be very hard to prevent a man coming back to his own country, but the Emigration Law prevents him going into America. He will go to America and abandon his own country, and stay there for twenty or thirty years, and then when he falls in health he is brought back and left on the roads here.

28848. After losing their health or reason on there you would not care to take them back?—In our part of the country at one time consumption was rare; it was all brought from America; the first case of consumption I saw was a man who came back from America.

28849. Mr. MURKIN.—Does not the American Government send them back?—Yes, but why should

not these people stay in the country they went to in their health?

28850. Do you think the Irish in America would care to have a restriction placed against them returning to their own homes?—I quiet forces that. If there was an outbreak of smallpox in any portion of Europe or cholera, there are very stringent measures taken to prevent it coming in, but smallpox is brought over here from America without restriction.

28851. CHAIRMAN.—Your union is contributory to this sanatorium?—Yes.

28852. Are you in favour of it yourself?—I was in favour of it at first, but the way they are getting on lately I don't know what to say about it.

Sept. 28, 1906.

Mr. Daniel Burke.

Miss ELLEN MARY BROWN, P.L.O., examined.

28853. CHAIRMAN.—You are one of the Guardians of the Sclibbereen Union?—Yes.

28854. Have you a Ladies' Committee there for inspecting the boarded-out children?—We have not, but it is easily wanting.

28855. Do you look after the children much yourself?—I have not long been elected—only since June.

28856. Do you think a Ladies' Committee would be valuable for inspecting boarded-out children?—It would be badly wanted; I should like it very much.

28857. It is of great value to have a Ladies' Committee undoubtedly; you haven't it yet, I suppose, to look very closely into the arrangements for children inside the workhouse?—No, not very much indeed.

28858. What has struck you generally, so far, in your knowledge of the Poor Law administration?—The classification; it wants reforming wholly; at least our workhouse ought to be divided into three classes.

28859. How would you manage that?—what classes would those be. First, you have the sick—what you sub-classify the sick at all?—I don't think so; I don't think it would be necessary, especially in a union where the nurse have charge.

28860. As regards the aged and infirm people who are healthy, but feeble?—I would divide the body of the house into three classes.

28861. What would those classes be?—I would put people that are well conducted and deserving all through life, but through no fault of their own are in the workhouse, I would divide them into one class and give them the very best part of the house and the best diet.

28862. The women at one side and the men at the other?—Yes.

28863. In the middle grade you would have?—The not very good and the not very bad.

28864. And in the lower grade you would have the objectionable?—Yes.

Dr. JENNINGS, J.P., examined.

28877. CHAIRMAN.—You are the Medical Officer of the Sclibbereen Workhouse?—Yes.

28878. We would be very glad now to hear anything that your long experience would enable you to state to us?—Oh, I don't know, I think the idea of suggesting reforms is just fashionable for the moment; I don't see how the existing system can be improved so very much; the hospital seems to be very good; typhus fever is disappearing, and that is due to the zeal and efficiency and ability of the Local Government Board Inspector, Dr. Brown, with the co-operation of the Guardians.

28879. You are inclined to think that the poor law system that you have known so long is answering the requirements?—Undoubtedly, and cannot be improved upon very much.

28865. What would you consider would justify you in putting inmates into the third or objectionable class?—People that don't conduct themselves, even when they are in the house.

28866. In the first place, of course, people who have been injured naturally would be there. Would you consider drunkenness a reason for putting them into the third class?—I think I ought to; it leads to all other things.

28867. And quarrelsome people and abusive?—Yes, abusive especially, because no officers can get on with them.

28868. That classification would be a classification of the aged and infirm chiefly. On the female side at present you have the aged and infirm women—then you have got the mothers of illegitimate children?—I would make them do all the hard work.

28869. They do the work at present?—They do.

28870. Would you leave them pretty much as they are in the working class?—Yes, if they were not in an institution for themselves altogether.

28871. That is what I was going to come to—do you think it would be better that that class should be excluded from the workhouse, and if they were Catholics put into a Good Shepherd's Convent, or if Protestants put into a Protestant institution—do you think that would be better than putting them into a workhouse?—I think it would really.

28872. Do you think it would be more likely to prevent an increase in the number of children?—Yes.

28873. To try and reclaim them?—Yes.

28874. Was there any other matter you wished to mention?—Well, no, not particularly.

28875. Nothing about outdoor relief?—The outdoor relief system is abused at present.

28876. Can you suggest any way of remedying that?—I cannot. People who are not entitled to it get it, and people who are truly in need of more than they get cannot get it; outdoor relief now is very high.

Miss Ellen Mary Brown.

Dr. Jennings.

Mr. DANIEL MCCARTHY, Sclibbereen, examined.

I am Clerk of the Union.

28883. CHAIRMAN.—We will ask you to be kind enough to let us have a little later on some statistical information?—In yesterday's Examiner Mr. Murkin is reported to have stated that it costs in a country workhouse £7 per head—

CHAIRMAN.—We cannot have that kind of evidence at all.

Mr. Daniel McCarthy.

Witness.—I want to contradict that, because I have the report of the Local Government Board to contradict it.

Sept. 24, 1905.

Mr. William
Cotton.

There is one observation I forgot—in our hospital a lot of people come in there who are not hospital cases, and they are treated there and treated successfully; that entails a good deal of expense on the rates; well, we cannot charge these people any more than the average charge.

28884. CHAIRMAN.—Would you be in favour of a change in the law—supposing the Board of Guardians had a discretion to charge such an amount per week or day as they might think could reasonably be paid by the person or by him or her friends?—Certainly.

28885. You think that would be a fair discretion to give—not to hand them, but give them the power to charge such sums as they might think desirable?—Yes, and it is unfair to the medical officer.

Mr. WILLIAM COTTON further examined.

28886. In some county infirmaries they have started the plan you recommend, and they have been able to pay the medical officer's salary out of the receipts. In our hospital we can only charge the average cost.

28887. You have to charge either the full average cost or nothing. If a person came in you could not charge him 6d. per week, or if it cost for fever £3 a week you could not charge that, but you now would be in favour of an amendment of the law that would enable you to charge from 6d. to £3 a week according to the amount they could pay?—According to the actual amount that they could pay.

28888. And according to their ability to pay?—Yes.

Dr. Jennings.

There is another view to take of that question. My experience, of course, must give way to yours, but suppose a farmer breaks his leg or breaks his collar-bone, sustains a serious surgical injury and goes into the hospital and pays the average charge; he has been all his life a ratepayer, and I think he is punished quite enough by having to pay the average charge.

Dr. JENNINGS, J.P., further examined.

CHAIRMAN.—Well, according to the chairman's suggestion that would be in the discretion of the Board of Guardians—in the majority of cases it would be quite enough for a man who was unfortunate enough to meet with an accident.

Mr. Florence
Crowley.

28889. CHAIRMAN.—What is the view of the Dunmurry Guardians on the question of the amalgamation of unions or classification of inmates?—The view of the Dunmurry Board is that the law should remain as it is; they are not for amalgamation, or even asking others to amalgamate with them.

28890. They don't want their own union to be broken up or any other union?—No.

28891. As regards the classification of inmates—have they any views on that subject?—There is one particular matter that has struck me very forcibly, and it is this, the classification of the old people that are in the hospitals. I would be for having some central institution where the undesirable class would be sent to, people that have no sentimental feelings as regards their locality. There are others that are in there without any fault of their own but poverty and Providence. These people would, unfortunately, rather die by the fence side than be transferred from their own particular district, and the undesirable class that has but very little sentiment don't care if they are sent to Juan Fernandez or some other place.

28892. You are arguing against obliging the aged respectable poor to be sent further than they are at present?—Quite so; I am totally against it, because I know their sentiments, and I think the officers of our union can minutely describe to you, or can classify, being under their observation from time to time, those very nicely. Some of these stranger people that were not born in the locality and make themselves undesirable, I would be for removing those to some central institution.

28893. You would keep the respectable aged and infirm poor in their own locality?—Quite so.

28894. And the less desirable or troublesome class you would send to the central institution?—Quite so; that is my view.

28895. That in all you have to say as regards the indoor classification?—Quite so.

28896. As regards outdoor relief is there anything you would wish to say?—No, our power of granting outdoor relief should be increased in this direction—for instance a man is debared from receiving outdoor relief if he holds anything over a certain quantity of land. I am aware from my long experience of thirty years at the Board that you have

men holding six or seven or ten acres of land of an inferior class that they are very frequently more fit subjects to receive relief than those that never had land. I would like the law to be changed so that if this question did arise, this outdoor relief could be given to those people if they are sick or in want.

28897. Would you go beyond that?—I would; sickness or inability to work; if Providence visits them with any affliction, loss of cattle or any other little things like that, I would say it would be very necessary that powers should be given.

28898. Would you really recommend that Guardians should have power to give relief to people who might have lost their cattle, and have as much as six or seven acres?—Quite so, and ten acres of inferior land; they are often very poor.

28899. Is there any way in which you would safeguard people's extravagance?—The representatives of the people, I think, are economical enough to look after that; the man that dispenses this is a large ratepayer himself as a general rule, and I don't think they would be anxious to keep up the rates.

28900. Would you have it a union-at-large charge?—No, I am for divisional rating, because there would be more economy practised, but I know the towns will suffer. What I would wish to suggest would be that the rural districts would provide an auxiliary rate or a grant that would relieve the towns.

28901. As they did under the old law?—Quite so; it was a commutation system, and we relieved the towns. Divisional rating is the soundest and most commonsense way of doing it; it comes under my notice every day; a certain man applies for relief, give it to him, it is as little to us as it is to any other division. If it were to fall on one particular division that man probably would never have got relief, and some people are demoralised by getting outdoor relief, and if outdoor relief is not given carefully it demoralises the people who get it. I am twenty-five years a member of the Board. I am a member of the County Council, and I have long experience in these matters.

Mr. Cotton.—I think the Guardians should get discretionary power to give relief to the people who hold more than a quarter of an acre of land.

Mr. JOHN MURPHY, J.L.C., Dunmurry, examined.

28902. CHAIRMAN.—You are a Guardian of the Dunmurry Union?—Yes.

28903. What is your view about amalgamation of unions and classification of inmates?—Since the commencement of this inquiry it is giving me serious consideration, and, totting the whole thing together,

I believe amalgamation would not be to the advantage either of the rates or the relief of the poor.

28904. Would you then rather agree with Dr. Jennings that the system as it is is good enough?—The system as it is is good enough with properly and well-elected Guardians.

Mr. John
Murphy.

28905 Do you think there is any failure in that respect?—I believe not at present; they represent constitutionally the feelings of the local people.

28906 So that the present system meets with your approval?—It does; I believe that any new change would increase the taxation rather than diminish it.

28907 You would not like to have fewer Guardians?—No.

28908 Everything is as it might be?—Yes; I believe if you amalgamate you will have more officials than at present; you will remunerate the present staff and have those a burden on you if you appoint new ones; amalgamation would be against the interest of the poor and of the ratepayers.

28909 As regards outdoor relief?—I do agree with the evidence already given that in exceptional cases of people with large families, and sometimes illness, it ought to be discretionary with the Guardians to consider their cases and grant temporary outdoor relief.

28910 You are aware that at present destitution is the only qualification for outdoor relief?—Yes, I may call that permanent destitution.

28911 You change that into poverty?—Into poverty.

28912 You enable the Guardians to give outdoor relief to poor as distinguished from destitute?—To poor, I believe those holding small holdings are just as badly off, if not worse, than the labourers.

28913 That is enabling the Guardians to act as a charitable body as well as a relieving body—you would be in favour of that?—I would, and, in addition, I would say some maintenance or reward should be given to doctors so as to issue red tickets for relief. At the present time I see many of our people holding these small places, and even larger ones go to death's door before they can afford to bring in a doctor. I believe there is a great need for reforming the laws, so that medical assistance can reach these humble classes; I believe they would die for want of medical aid sometimes.

28914 Dr. BROWN.—What prevents them getting a red ticket?—The amount of land they hold.

28915 CHAIRMAN.—There is no barrier?—I have said so myself. A poor person.

28916 Dr. BROWN.—No distinction whatever?—And the amount of land would not bar them?

28917 CHAIRMAN.—No; if they are poor, that is the qualification?—No matter if they held any amount of land.

28918 Dr. BROWN.—So long as they cannot pay for a doctor they are entitled to a red ticket?—He may have cattle, but they are mortgaged.

28919 CHAIRMAN.—If the doctor thought he was being unfairly dealt with he would have power to apply to the Guardians to have the thing set right?

—As regards the maintenance of children in this institution, I entirely agree with the outdoor system of rearing these little ones as opposed to this institution; I believe they grow up better citizens by mixing in the country with their equal little fellows; if confined to these institutions, reformatories and so on I believe it is a nest for rearing up young fellows either for the army or navy, pocket-picking or jabs; they won't make useful members of society.

28920 You are altogether for continuing the present state of things?—Yes.

28921 Except in the case of tramps?—I don't think we can improve them much; they are not much of a valuable commodity on the people.

28922 They are not a valuable asset?—No, nor they are no great loss either to the ratepayers; I believe if they did not get this lodging for the night there would be more danger outside; they would go to hayricks and sheds and sleep there, and be more cost to the ratepayers in this way than if left in for a night's lodging.

28923 Would you be in favour of putting them into a diomed workhouse, if there was one available, where they would be obliged to work hard, on a magistrate's warrant for a couple of years to get them into industrial habits?—I believe the labour there, even under compulsion, would not pay for the officials over them; I believe they are cheaper as they are.

28924 You would let the present system continue?—I would with police supervision. Then as regards the classification of inmates I know there are some old women especially who are given to harping and are abusive; if these could be detached from the others, and leave the old quiet people who are saying their prayers go their own way by themselves.

28925 And lock up the soldiers?—Yes, if there was some central place for those; if we had two in the County Cork, for East and West Cork.

28926 You would not be able to fill two?—Perhaps not; well, one. My general summary is that amalgamation would not serve the country, neither ratepayers, nor those whom the law is intended to relieve.

Mr. DANIEL D. HARRINGTON, J.P., Chairman.

28927 CHAIRMAN.—You are one of the Guardians?—I am Chairman of the District Council. By resolution of the Board last year, they unanimously decided that amalgamation would be detrimental to the interests of the ratepayers and poor of Castletown.

28928 You are cut off very much?—You are at the end of a long promontory?—Yes, about thirty-six miles.

28929 You are in quite a peculiar position like Dingle?—Yes; I think we are worse than Dingle; our communications are worse.

28930 Except that you have daily steamers?—Daily in summer and alternate days in winter, and then by driving Bantry and Keshmarr are the nearest points; on that account I am of opinion that it would not be expedient or economical to amalgamate Castletown with another union at all.

28931 You have a considerable number of inmates there too?—About seventy this past week; sometimes they go to 100, or sometimes to 110.

28932 Ninety-eight the year before last was your maximum, and a great many of those are sick?—They are sick, and aged and infirm.

28933 Fifty-two in the hospital?—I think about that.

28934 In any case it would not be possible to take away the sick from you?—It would not, or the aged and infirm.

28935 Why do you think it would not be possible to take away the aged and infirm?—First and foremost I believe they would prefer to die by the roadside than to leave the workhouse there, and I believe there are a great many in workhouses that if they found they would be buried among their friends would stay in the workhouse in the neighbourhood.

Castletown Rural District Council, examined.

28936 They attach a great deal of importance to being buried with their friends and relatives?—Yes.

28937 Are there many burials inside your workhouse burial ground?—Very few; 90 per cent. are buried by their friends, I am sure.

28938 So that the feeling is very strong?—Very strong on that point, and also they are visited by their friends, which they could not be if they were further away.

28939 You notice that there are a great many visitors to the workhouse?—I do regularly.

28940 Have you observed that most of those visits are to the sick, not to the aged and infirm?—Well, they are to both.

28941 Are you aware a great many of the aged and infirm are people who are just the surviving, unmarried, or widowed remainder of a generation—old people without any friends practically?—There are a great many of the aged and infirm who have got friends and prefer to live there.

28942 Have you noticed that a great many of the aged and infirm are old, single, or widowed people without any near relatives to take an interest in them?—I have not gone into that; I do believe that they would not go into a union further away.

28943 Do you think it is desirable to retain children—there are very few children in the Castletown Workhouse—only three?—Very few.

28944 Do you think it is desirable to retain children in the workhouse?—I do not. I know they are well looked after where they are, but I always say the workhouse is no place for a child. I prefer to see a child sent off at a certain age to an institution where they would have the means of industrial training. I have not much experience of boarding out in Castletown; there are only three in our union, and

Sept. 28, 1900.
Mr. John Murphy.

Mr. David D. Harrington.

Sept. 28, 1903.
Mr. Daniel O.
Harrington.

they are boarded out with their grandmother. The associations when they are boarded out would be better, I am sure, but a great many people take them to Lourd out, not so much for the amount they receive monthly as for the service they may render them afterwards. Our children are very well looked after in the Castle-town Union, but I would strongly say that when a child comes to a certain age he should be sent to a school for industrial training.

28945. Why industrial training?—When a boy is in a union he remains there until sixteen years of age; he leaves it unprovided for, and the first thing he does is to do things that would not be very conducive to his future welfare.

28946. I think we both agree that it is desirable he should not stay in a workhouse—then the question is whether it would be more in the boy's interest in that rank of life to be boarded out among the labouring classes, where he would become one of the labouring class, or whether it would be more in the child's interest, and in the interest of the community that that child should be sent to a school to be taught a trade?—Well, we have no experience of that, but from what I have read the general opinion tends towards that.

28947. Take the country people that you are familiar with who are failures in life and whose children would have to come into the workhouse—I would agree with boarding out under proper supervision.

28948. Rather than go to the expense of giving them a trade education?—Well, I would like them to get a trade education when they are poor.

28949. Do you think that putting them into positions that the smaller ratepayers themselves could not hope to put their children into would be wise?—I think the Industrial School Act should be put in force for them as well as for others—I would not go to increase the rates for that.

28950. What do you think would be the wisest thing to do—whether would you think it wiser to bring up these children to recruit the labouring class, which is deficient just now, or whether it would be better to put them into the trade class, who find it very difficult to get employment?—I always agree it is better a child should be brought up outside the atmosphere of the workhouse.

28951. Then would you make them labourers or tradespeople—do you think the tradespeople are fully employed at present?—Oh, I do.

28952. Are you short of labourers?—Sometimes.

28953. Then it becomes a question whether it would be more prudent to make labourers of them or tradespeople?—According as opportunity would offer among those people.

28954. Would you put them into an institution where they would be brought up as tradespeople, or board them out where they would be brought up as labourers?—I would go in for giving the child the benefits of an industrial training by State aid; they are perfectly entitled to it.

28955. More than they would get at an ordinary school in the country, even when they are boarded out?—The question of being boarded out and industrial training are different things; one is brought up as a pauper, and the other under State aid to make them good members of society afterwards.

28956. They would both be supported by the rates—the only question is whether you would bring them up as paupers as labourers, or more expensively as tradespeople?—I would give a boy his opportunity according as he had a talent.

28957. If sent to an institution he could not be brought up as a labourer?—If they had a farm he could be brought up as a labourer.

28958. Those schools have not farms—do you mean a new kind of school should be started?—I would say yes, whatever would be determined on afterwards to remove them from their present position.

28959. Mr. McBRID—Your rates are very high—the highest in the county?—They are high this year; we have adopted the Local Government Board dietary, which increased our rate considerably; then also there is this year an estimate for elections, and

then the new accounts order; there was an estimate for books.

28960. Ordinarily they are very high?—In a small union it fluctuates very much; sometimes it is low and sometimes high.

28961. If this re-arrangement of the system could be made it might reduce the rates?—Yes; I would make a suggestion also on that. I fancy if a Relief Rate Act was adopted by State aid or a county-alteration charge, that a rate in any union over the average rates of other unions should get a help.

28962. CHAIRMAN—What would the other unions say to that?—I don't know what they would say to it.

28963. I think I can imagine?—In coming to the relief of a union whose position is such that it is amalgamated it would be detrimental to the interests of both ratepayers and the poor.

28964. Mr. McBRID—If an arrangement was made which would not interfere with the accommodation of the sick nor injure the classes that can properly claim relief, would you assent to such re-arrangement?—If the sick were properly provided for it would entail an amount of expense; you should have a staff there in the same way.

28965. Not necessarily an expensive staff?—You should have a fair staff, I am sure, in the hospital.

28966. The upkeep of the main body of the house costs a considerable sum—the cost of fuel, light, and repairs, and a good many of those things could be spared?—I don't know; the hospital at present is certainly a hospital well cared and kept, but still if you had a hospital there you would have a lot of the aged and infirm there who would all become hospital patients. I may say all the Castle-town Workhouses as a hospital—the chief part of it—I regard the aged and infirm as hospital patients. Then as for representation, the distance is so very far; the residents of each division know the wants of their division, and if you had a union far away from Borehaven in a short time you would have no residents.

28967. CHAIRMAN—If you retained your local Council, and if you dealt with outdoor relief and managed your district hospital, then the only difference would be that the aged and infirm, or healthy inmates that were supported elsewhere would be paid for by you monthly, quarterly, or half yearly as the case might be, in the central institution?—I think the present arrangement would be better than that.

28968. You understand the arrangement that has been suggested to us—that the Council should continue to be the Poor Law authority still, that they should deal with outdoor relief, and deal with their hospital, and that they should pay the bills for the inmates that are supported elsewhere in a central institution, on the ground of economy?—You would send the patients away and have other institutions?—

28969. Send the healthy away and keep the sick?—We have not an able-bodied inmate in the house. I don't think it would conduce at all to the welfare of the poor to have the union amalgamated; we have gone into that subject very carefully.

28970. That would not break up the union—yet still would have your local institutions and your local Council managing matters, and have your district hospital under your control. The only difference would be that in the same way as you pay for the inmates or patients in the county infirmary you would pay for the aged inmates that might be elsewhere?—I think it would be a hardship on the aged and infirm to remove them from the place in which they are at present.

28971. That is an intelligible objection that we have had from a great many?—I think that is a serious consideration. On a consideration at first of the question a majority held that divisional rating would be preferable, but that was reversed at the last meeting. If there is a union rating it should be a general rating.

28972. Are you referring to special charges under the Public Health and other Acts?—Yes.

MISS BROWN further examined.

Miss Ellen.
Mary Brown.

You questioned the last witness closely what ought to be done with a child after a certain age. Don't you think it ought to be decided by the attitude of the child himself?

28973. CHAIRMAN—Yes?—The poor people have talents as well as the rich.

28974. Certainly; the only question is putting them in such a position early in life that their future is

decided on before they have time to voice any taste?—Don't you think if a child is educated that it would be a pity to throw him away on labour?

22673. I think it is a very nice pursuit—I think everybody is anxious to get away from it, and the

person that ought to be able to decide that would be the schoolmaster or schoolmistress of the school when the child was boarded out.

CHAIRMAN.—I would rather leave it to the lady Guardians.

Sept. 28, 1903.
Miss Ellen
Mary Brown

MR. EDWARD BLAKE, *p.s.o.*, Castletown, examined.

22676. CHAIRMAN.—You are one of the Guardians of the Castletown Union?—Yes.

22677. Do you agree with Mr. Harrington?—I agree with him entirely; I don't see the use in amalgamating where we would keep the hospital and out-door relief. It is in these two all the expenses are—it is not twenty or thirty paupers that cause the expense.

22678. If you only kept the sick you could dispense with all the other officers except the officers of the infirmary?—The most of them that we have been are sick.

22679. The master, matron and porter, and any lunatic attendants, if you have them, would all go?—I understand that well enough. Would they not want a master or porter then to look after them?

22680. Oh, no, we never have any such officers in a little hospital?—We may do away with three or four of them.

22681. Would you like to reduce the rates if you could, or rather keep them as they are?—I would like to reduce them.

22682. If we submit a scheme that is likely to reduce the rates considerably, and not inflict any hardship except, of course, the hardship that Mr. Harrington told us about, the removal of the aged—would you be disposed to think that is a scheme that might be considered?—If I thought the expense would be lessened I would like it.

22683. If it did not cause any hardship?—Even if it did. How can it reduce expense if we have to pay for the inmates, old and sick?

22684. They would be kept in a separate institution where the expense ought to be less, where a large number would be supported, and instead of having in the seven or eight rooms all over the place separate staffs of officers you would only have the one staff of the central institution, and nothing like as many officers as all put together in the individual unions?—I don't see that to such a place as Berchamstown would reduce the expense. Suppose we paid for an inmate sent to Clonsilla, or Bandon or Dunsany, would it not cost as much to send him as would support an inmate for three months?

22685. How much had you to pay for your return ticket this morning?—I paid for no ticket.

22686. How much would it be?—I could not tell you, I never came that course; I thought my own horse with me.

Mr. Harrington.—6s. return on dock, and 7s. cabin. It would be 3s. 6d. single.

Witness.—Then sending a horse and car to Dursley or The Mines.

22687. How do the Dursley people come into you at Castletown at present?—They come by water; they would have to change to horses then.

22688. Do they come the whole way by water?—No, only a mile or so across the channel.

Mr. Edward
Blake

DR. LYNE EXAMINED.

I am the Medical Officer of Castletown Workhouse.

22689. CHAIRMAN.—Is there anything you wish to mention as regards the evidence you have heard?—I see a very great difficulty about amalgamating Castletown as it is so isolated. The class of inmates we have are all aged and infirm; there are no able-bodied people, and they never come into the workhouse except when pretty far gone. From Dursley they have to come three miles to the Sound, and then it is eighteen miles to Castletown.

22690. How many inmates have you had from Dursley?—I cannot say, but we have had some; it is from remote places they come.

22691. Have you any from the island at present?—I had one not long ago. I cannot tell about the people in the body of the house, but the difficulty is if they travel eighteen miles by cart after crossing the Sound these old people would be so shaken if you put them in a boat and send them down Bantry Bay; if there was a high sea they might get sick and perhaps die.

22692. You would have to keep them for a night in the district hospital?—If there was room for them.

22693. If they were so feeble that in your opinion it would not be safe to let them go on you could keep them for a week?—There are people in the body of the house that I, as a doctor, would not certify were fit to be sent down Bantry Bay in a boat; people have got seasick and died; I would not take the risk of giving a certificate.

22694. It would be a remote possibility?—I would not think so. I was on one occasion at an inquest in Dublin when an ex-soldier, who was not very

strong, came across the Channel and got seasick, and the verdict was that he died of it.

22695. It is a remote possibility?—No, I think it would be very likely to kill a person who was feeble.

22696. Have you met many cases of deaths from seasickness?—No, I have not had to deal with seagoing people; the Castletown people are not likely to die of it.

22697. Is there any other matter you would like to mention to us?—No, I think that is about the only thing.

22698. DR. BROWN.—Have you many convalescents at Castletown?—One male.

22699. Have you an isolation ward?—Yes.

22700. Have you many acute early cases occurring at Castletown?—No, very few; I have a few dispensary cases who are at home on out-door relief who are in consumption, these, I should think; they are rather chronic though.

22701. Of course the district has joined with the other districts of Cork with reference to the sanatorium?—Our union is subscribing.

22702. You think it will be a benefit?—I should think it would be a very great benefit to have a sanatorium.

22703. Have you many lunatics?—I think we have about four; we tried to get them sent up to Cork, and Dr. Woods said there was no room for them; he suggested to send them to Eglinton, but they are scarcely cases for that.

22704. Did you get any removed from Castletown to Trough?—We made an attempt but failed; I think we are entitled to send four, and they applied about a year ago, but did not succeed in getting them sent.

Dr. Lyne

MR. EDWARD ROYCE, *p.s.o.*, Chairman, Schull Union, examined.

22705. CHAIRMAN.—Are you the Chairman of the Schull Board of Guardians?—Yes, sir.

22706. Have you considered the question of the amalgamation of the unions, or the re-classification of the inmates?—Yes, we have.

22707. What is your view on the question?—We examined a meeting of the Guardians to discuss the matter, and they were almost unanimous that we would have no amalgamation owing to the geographical

position of our union being a headland, that it would be very inconvenient if they were sent to any other place. It is thirty-three miles from the furthest off point of our union to Shillbreena, and twenty-nine to Bantry, and we believe the western portion of our union would be practically disfranchised and cut off from representation if they had to go further.

22708. Supposing that instead of amalgamation it

Mr. Edward
Royce

Sept. 28, 1904.
Mr. Edward
Rogge.

was only a reclassification—supposing the Council at Schull still remained and still managed their hospital and still administered the outdoor relief, and that the union was not broken up, but only the inmates were classified and sent away, the healthy to a central institution, and treat the sick as before at Schull—what would you say to that?—They may not have as large an objection to that; I don't think they would have so much.

29000. They have not considered that point?—Not fully.

29010. Now, without asking you to pin yourself too much to an opinion at first sight, what would your own opinion be where you would have your Council still remaining, and the work still in your charge, and the outdoor relief still in your hands?—Most of our people are poor old bedridden people, not properly called hospital people, and they have a hatred of going beyond where they are. They say if carried to any other union their friends would not go to visit them, and if they died they would be buried outside their own family burial place, and they won't go any further.

29011. Would your opinion then be against sending away the aged and infirm to another institution?—We are of opinion that we would gain nothing by it; we are fairly satisfied with the rates we are paying, and we consider if we amalgamate with any other union we would, perhaps, have to pay more.

29012. It is not a question of amalgamation—the question that was put was not as to amalgamation—your rates would be still struck on the Schull area; the only thing is that instead of supporting your healthy inmates in the house at Schull, you would pay so much a head for them, or pay according to the arrangement in some outside or central institution with the object of being able to discontinue the services of the officers who look after the healthy?—The inmates themselves and their relatives would have a great disgust against that; they would not like to have them removed too far away from them that they might not see them again.

29013. Do you think that that is altogether a reasonable objection—would that be such an objection as would influence you as a representative of the ratepayers in voting against a change if it were proved that it would be a distinct and material saving in the rates?—If I thought it was, and was a benefit all round, I would be in favour of it.

29014. I don't say a benefit all round, but if you considered it would be a benefit to the rates, do you think the objection you have just put on behalf of the aged and infirm going away from their own homes would be a strong enough objection to make you vote against any change?—Whatever little we gained by that change would not compensate for the loss we sustained.

29015. How much reduction in the rates would compensate you—if we could reduce your rates by something in the £1—We have not gone into figures.

29016. I am not asking you as chairman of the board, but personally as a ratepayer—if we could show you you could get off £2. or £3. in the £1—It would be a great inducement to me; it would change my sentiments; we have a very substantial building, and the upkeep costs very little.

29017. You have to keep up the fire and lights in the healthy part as well as pay the officers who look after the healthy part?—The cases that we have at present, are, except the children, nearly all bedridden or infirm cases.

29018. You put most of them into the sick wards?—Yes, that is the doctor's classification.

29019. I have never seen a workhouse where the classification was so extreme—you have forty-seven in the sick wards and three in the aged and infirm.

If we were dealing with the question we would accept that classification without overhauling it—I think it would be entitled to be overhauled; we have thirteen children; we would have more inmates, but we are fairly liberal in giving outdoor relief; we give a great deal of outdoor relief.

29020. You could continue that if you thought fit under the new system?—We have 125 cases getting outdoor relief at present.

29021. How much do you pay a year for that?—From £500 to £550 a year.

29022. I take it that I might summarise your opinion by saying that the Board of Guardians are strictly against any question of amalgamation—that they did not consider this question of reclassification with the continuance of the Council, which I have just outlined, but that your own personal view of that is that you personally would be inclined to reconsider your view if you found that a substantial saving would be effected by sending the healthy to a central institution?—That is so, but we fear that we might not be able to gain as much as is expected.

29023. We have to get more statistics from the clerks of the unions before we can finish our calculations, but you may be sure that we won't recommend any change unless we can see to the best of our judgment a decided economy. Is there any other point you would like to mention?—We are so isolated from other centres that we are not troubled with a great many tramps; we have a very long seaboard, larger than any other union; I don't think Castletown would be in it; we have from Keating Water Bay, Schull Harbour, Long Island Channel and Croaghmore to Duncannon Bay.

29024. No, Castletown beats you?—We have a large fishing population, and a great many of these poor people, when the weather gets bad and they are out of employment, have to seek outdoor relief from the workhouse, and it would be a great inconvenience to them. We have six curing stations and about sixty fishing boats surrounding our union.

29025. How would the closing of the able-bodied wards affect the fishing population?—If some of their families got ill we could not give a bit of outdoor relief, and they have recourse to the workhouse then.

29026. That is when there is illness?—Yes.

29027. Your hospital would still be there, and you could still give your outdoor relief if the head of the family was inside the hospital—you could give relief to the family outside?—It might be some of the family that was stricken ill.

29028. That would not be a case for relief if the man was earning all the time and could support them?—We have some islands too, five of them, and two of them are three miles south of Schull; there is a population of over 500 on the islands; they have to come out in boats and then come from the shore, where they land, to the workhouse when they want anything, and we would have to be sending our relieving officer if we changed to the other workhouse, and it would be a great distance.

29029. They would not have to go there—they would still come to Schull?—Who would be there to superintend them?

29030. Your Council would be still there—they would be officers of your Council and would come in Council meetings; the only difference is that you would pay the distant institutions for maintaining your healthy?—Would we have a Board of Guardians there still?

29031. Certainly, according to the suggestions made to us?—That would change the aspect somewhat.

29032. Would you then be in favour of it?—Well, more than the others.

29033. You would not have so great an objection?—No, if I could have a substantial saving I would be in favour of it more or less.

Mr. J. H. KELLER, J.P., examined.

Mr. J. H. Kelly. 29034. CHAIRMAN.—You are Chairman of the Schull District Council?—Yes.

29035. And one of the Guardians of the union?—Yes.

29036. You have heard the evidence of Mr. Rogge?—Yes.

29037. Now, without taking you over the same ground, you heard the last discussion we had—supposing the local body remains, the sick to be still

in your charge, the administration of outdoor relief to be still in your hands, and the healthy inmates sent to a central institution, what would you think of that?—I would be in favour of such a classification as that if it could be proved there was an economy; we have at present only very few able-bodied. I would be very much in favour of having the undesirable class removed and the children also.

29038. What do you mean exactly by "undesir-

able"—Mothers of illegitimate children. I think they ought to be removed and put into some place.

29039. What would you do with the children?—I would prefer boarding them out, let them live in the open air and learn the healthy occupation of labourers and let them go to country schools. Otherwise I would not be in favour of doing away with the place altogether as a hospital. Our hospital is very economically managed. As far as stimulants go there is none of that there.

29040. Now as regards outdoor relief, is there anything you would wish to say about the present system?—I think it is a bit abused in a good many cases; probably people get outdoor relief who don't deserve it, and other cases in which there is not sufficient outdoor relief given.

29041. Do you see any way of remedying that?—I think we ought to get poorer in the case of a small farmer or labourer who would be sick and had more than a quarter acre of land to give relief.

29042. That might increase the outdoor relief?—I think it would reduce it; we might not have to bring these people into hospital to treat them if we gave a little relief outside. Some members of the Board are in favour of divisional rating. My division would benefit by it, but I would be more in favour of centralising all taxation.

29043. Do you think the tendency would be a little bit on the extravagant side?—I think the local people fairly well look after their districts.

29044. Do you think the exercise a very active supervision over outdoor relief now?—I think they do except in a few cases.

29045. Can you think of any way in which these few abuses could be stopped?—There is a practice on the part of the medical officers of giving certificates to parties wanting nourishment, and the relieving officers acting on these give provisions, a little milk and tea; in some cases I think that has been abused.

Mr. DAVID J. GALLAGHER, Vice-Chairman, Schull Union, examined.

29053. CHAIRMAN.—You are one of the Guardians of the Schull Union?—The Vice-Chairman.

29054. We know from the two preceding witnesses the view of the Schull Guardians?—I dare say you do not. I have not been summoned to consider your letter. My opinion is that amalgamation or redistribution is necessary, because the cost of the establishment exceeds the cost of the maintenance of inmates.

29055. Would you be in favour of the first instance of keeping up a hospital for the acute sick?—Yes.

29056. Then the other people—would you be in favour if there would be a substantial saving—would you be in favour of sending the healthy to a central institution, keeping up the Schull Board of Guardians or District Council, as the case might be, to deal with the hospital and outdoor relief?—Yes, consistently with economy; the acute sick are not many in Schull. Of course I am aware of the length of the district; from Crookhaven to Skibberen is very long and it is too hard to expect a sick patient to be taken there on an ambulance. My idea is to establish a temporary hospital in Schull, but there is the sentimental point.

29057. I think you might start by admitting that it would be necessary to keep a 500-bed hospital in Schull for the acute sick?—Whether little or large, that would depend on the staff employed there; I only considered a temporary hospital there.

29058. Don't you think it would be always necessary to have a hospital there?—A temporary hospital where a person taken in an ambulance from Crookhaven might rest for a night or two nights, and then be taken on to Skibberen.

29059. That would be a kind of a hospital that does not exist anywhere in the world?—I think a temporary hospital should be attached to each dispensary where sick patients could rest.

29060. There are a great many patients you could not remove that way; some of them would be barely able to stand one removal; sending them on might mean death. You have your hospital at Schull, why would you not let the hospital remain there as

I know a good many cases in which parties who get 1s. or 1s. 6d. a week don't convert it to any profitable use; they sometimes drink it.

29046. You think if the area were the electoral division that would be more likely to make the Guardians look more closely?—Those would not be much of an improvement; we go very closely into the list.

29047. When these individual cases of under-earning people come up it is suggested that they should be knocked off?—Very probably, but some local gentleman will say it is a deserving case, and we follow his advice.

29048. Does any gentleman say: "This is an undeserving case" and get it knocked off?—That happens.

29049. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Would that local gentleman advocate it as strongly if his own division had to pay for it?—He may probably.

29050. Do you think his advocacy is not due largely to the fact that other divisions were paying for it?—No, I think not; it is local sympathy with the party concerned. Our outdoor relief bill is considerably lower than when we had divisional rating, one-third lower. I think the sanatorium is a good thing if they established it on a proper basis, but I am against spending too much money on extravagant buildings. I think there are plenty of substantial good workhouses in the district that ought to be utilized.

29051. CHAIRMAN.—At all events if they do make a small sanatorium for acute cases, would you be in favour of assigning a disused or empty workhouse for dealing with such cases?—I would; I am also against the expenditure of money, such as on the Youghal Asylum, when there are plenty of buildings that could be utilized.

29052. You are not opposed to the system in Youghal, but to the expenditure in the first place?—Quite so; I think some substantial workhouse ought to be taken up and then added to it afterwards if required; I think it was a foolish expenditure, and I am afraid they will do the same with the sanatorium.

a going concern for cases of illness that arise in the union?—Perhaps it may be utilized for better purposes after.

29061. How could you get out of the responsibility of looking after the sick of your district?—There on those lines I would be opposed to amalgamation in any sense. If you retain a hospital you only dispend with the services of the master, matron and teacher.

29062. And porter?—Well, their superannuation would have to be considered, and possibly there would be very little saving in that.

29063. Their superannuation would be a charge that would drop off?—It would be very hard on young men and women.

29064. There would be situations for them in a central institution possibly?—You are aware the valuation of Schull is only £15,000 or £16,000, and the number in receipt of outdoor relief has gone down considerably.

29065. This is the time of year when it is lowest?—Well, I have statistics; September 1903-1904 there were 137 cases, and again 100 cases. But the real point is that the cost of the establishment exceeds the cost of the maintenance and clothing of inmates. I have it from the audit.

29066. It is dangerous to go into these questions without more care?—In September 1904 the cost of maintenance was £273 12s. 6d., whereas the cost of the establishment was £237 3s. 3d.

29067. What was the cost of establishment—what items were brought into that?

Mr. P. O'BRIEN.—Salaries of medical officers and trained nurses and the salary of the schoolmaster.

29068. CHAIRMAN.—Salaries of all the medical officers. These figures are not arranged as that you can jump them in the way you propose, because the medical charities are included in that?

Witness.—No, they are not included in the cost of establishment.

Dr. BROOKS.—There are other officers and other expenses here, £120 of which no particulars are given.

Mr. P. O'BRIEN.—It is all included.

Sept. 29, 1905

Mr. J. H. Kelly.

Mr. David J. Gallagher.

Sept. 23, 1905.

Mr. David J. Gallagher.

29066. CHAIRMAN.—There is too much included. Dr. Broom.—The salary of the clerk, I expect, is included.

Witness.—Outdoor relief is going down in our district. There has been £40 of a decrease between March, 1903, and March, 1904, and nearly all the inmates in Schull Workhouse are hospital cases, very few children boarded out, and very few healthy people in the body of the house.

29070. CHAIRMAN.—You think it would be better to keep the union intact if you have to keep up a hospital?—Yes.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN, F.R.S., Schull, examined.

Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

I am the senior representative of the largest division of the Schull Union, elected on the amalgamation ticket, and tried to be hunted on that ground, but was elected by the largest majority anybody ever got in the Schull Union. I am in favour of a general scheme of amalgamation of unions, and particularly the Schull Union, as I believe a good many of them are unnecessary, and are a great drag on the slender resources of the country. Exclusive of local selfish ends, the great stumbling block that I see to amalgamation is fixing the area of charge and not giving each union the full credit for its agricultural grant. I am in favour of amalgamation on the following lines—1st, that each union get full credit for its agricultural grant after amalgamation takes place; 2nd, that the area of charge for maintenance and clothing and outdoor relief, &c., be the present areas. If both these items of expenditure were levied off the amalgamated area it would be sure to lead to an abuse of public money, as Guardians would not be likely to exercise half the vigilance when the areas of charge would be too large; besides in one union poor rates may be much higher than in a neighbouring union; therefore, levying rates for all purposes off the amalgamated areas would inflict a great injustice on unions whose rates may be lower than the union amalgamated with, and ratepayers and Guardians would never consent to amalgamation if they could avoid it; 3rd, all expenditure coming under the heading of the establishment charges to be levied off the amalgamated areas; 4th, and for the purpose of reducing establishment charges to a minimum the Poor Law valuation of the amalgamated areas should be at least £100,000. Now in Schull Union the valuation of the area of charge is only £15,500, whilst the average yearly amount of establishment charges calculated on the abstracts of seven half-years is £608 4s. 2d. per year, and to raise that amount off the Schull Union the Guardians should strike a rate of 9/3d. in the £, while a rate of 1-45d. in the £ would be sufficient on a valuation of £100,000. The average yearly cost of maintenance and clothing of inmates in Schull Workhouse calculated on the abstracts of seven half-years is £200 8s. 7½d. per year, so that the amount of establishment charges is actually higher than maintenance and clothing of inmates. The total average cost of maintenance and clothing and outdoor relief is £864 5s. 1½d., and only this small sum reaches the poor of the Schull Union, if we exclude £19 12s. 2d. average cost of medicine and medical and surgical appliances for workhouse, &c., £40 14s. 5d. average yearly cost of medicine and medical and surgical appliances for dispensaries, whilst the total average yearly cost of working the union is £2,206 12s. 4½d.

29073. CHAIRMAN.—Did you mention those figures at all to the Clerk of the Union?—No; I moved amalgamation there two or three years ago. I have the abstracts to prove the figures.

29074. You did not ask the clerk of the union for his opinion on those figures?—No, sir; we got no action at all. I may tell you that I don't agree with anything the chairman has said; we were never summoned at all over amalgamation.

29075. Do you think that there is a strong feeling among a large portion of the ratepayers in favour of it?—The large majority are in favour of it.

29076. Do you think that though they might be against a change they would be in favour of something in the nature of amalgamation, leaving the hospital for the acute sick still remaining, such as the last Guardian disappeared off?—If you keep the hospital you will have to keep the staff, and I am in favour of wiping out the staff.

29071. I am afraid it would be inhuman to send the sick such an enormous distance as from populous parts of your union it would be necessary?—I must say the doctor is adding very much to reduce the cost per head. The transport nuisance is not felt very much in Schull, but still at certain times of the year a few of them come round and should be put under certain restrictions.

29072. You are a little off the beaten route for them?—Yes; there were 230 admitted there for the half-year to September 1904.

29077. What staff would you have to keep for the hospital?—You will have to keep the nurses and the doctor.

29078. And the chaplain?—Yes, I suppose so, that will be a good deal. I would be in favour of keeping a fever hospital there in any case, for a time, until I saw how it worked; perhaps it may not be necessary at all.

29079. Don't you think it would be necessary to keep a hospital where people who get suddenly and seriously sick could be treated?—What I say is this, from my experience of public life for the last six years, that the poor hate the workhouse.

29080. Do the sick hate the hospital?—They hate the workhouse.

29081.—Supposing we abolish that, and break up the workhouse as such, leaving you the district hospital, where only the acute sick are treated, would you have the same objection to that, and do you think it would be equally unpopular with the country people?—It may not after a number of years, but I always find if people have anyone to take care of them they won't go into the workhouse or infirmary at all. Take the newspapers, all the sections close among them go to Cork, and surely they can go to Skibbereen.

29082. Take a man with pneumonia, who could not be moved to Skibbereen or Cork, would you leave that poor man in his own home or keep up a little hospital in Schull where he could be treated and cured?—A man suffering from pneumonia could hardly be removed to the hospital if he has anybody to take care of him.

29083. Is it a very unusual state of things, for nearly all the workhouse hospitals round the country are now becoming popular with the people?—That is what I understand.

29084. Any place where the workhouse hospital is not popular, I am afraid it is easy to be taken for granted that there is some good reason for its not being popular?—I would not go so far as to say that.

29085. Would you think it right to try a small hospital, and send away the other inmates?—I suppose it would not be fair to break up the hospital after all, although I am directly against it. It would be too harsh to wipe it out at once.

29086. That is the point of view I myself would regard it from.

Dr. Broom.—Would you rather see a little hospital separated altogether, or another institution from the workhouse?—I would.

29087. Close up the workhouse entirely?—Oh, yes.

29088. CHAIRMAN.—You could repair those buildings on the other side of the road and close up the other place altogether?—The very thing. We were going to utilise it as an auxiliary asylum at one time instead of Tynagh.

29089. That would be the whole workhouse. You knew a site on the opposite side of the road where there are ruined buildings?—Yes, that is a fever hospital.

29090. If that could be put into repair and serve as a district hospital, with fever wards in the neighbourhood of it, would you think that might do?—I would; that would be sufficient, I am sure.

29091. Dr. Broom.—That would get rid of the idea of a workhouse?—That is true.

29092. CHAIRMAN.—In Mr. Murnaghan's District there was a workhouse like Schull closed up altogether and they sold the house and buildings, and there is a church erected now on the site out of the workhouse stones. (JP. *rears*.)—I am strongly opposed to divisional relief.

29093. You would rather have union-at-large?—Because it is most unjust to divisions that contain large villages and towns. I never heard any reason ad-

voiced why one ratepayer in a union should not contribute as much to the support of the deserving poor, according to his valuation, as another. This would not be the case if it were divisional rating, because the division containing the large village would be rated twice as high as the neighbouring division, which did not contain any village. It would also mean a lot of extra labour, as every division should have its own agricultural grant. In Schull union rating has worked very well. We have actually reduced our outdoor relief. The average amount of our outdoor relief, calculated on the abstracts of seven half years, is £121 13s. 7½d. per half-year, whilst for one of the half-years of the standard year—the half-year ended March, 1869—the amount of outdoor relief was £280 16s., so we can show a substantial reduction since it became union rating.

20094. Mr. McNEIGHAN.—The half-year previous to the standard year was very high; it was much above the average so it is hardly a fair estimate?—That will

give an idea; I suppose the Guardians tried to be as economical as they could when it was divisional rating. I would not object to a dispensary district charge.

20095. CHAIRMAN.—It is the small divisions you object to?—Yes. The division I represent was persecuted under the old divisional rating; it was always 4s. in the £, and sometimes reached 5s., while the neighbouring divisions were about 1s. 6d. I don't see a reason why one ratepayer should pay more rates than another; it is very unjust. Since it became union rating in Schull we have reduced all round, although our expenditure has increased very much. We had to get trained and qualified nurses and a nurse trained in midwifery who were not there in the standard year, yet we kept our rate almost to the standard rate. Our standard rate is 2s. 3½d., while our average rate for the seven years ending 31st March, 1906, is 2s. 4½d., and whilst the number in the work-house has gone up nearly 50 per cent.

Sect. 13, 1906.

Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

The Sitting terminated.

Sept. 29, 1905.

FIFTY-NINTH PUBLIC SITTING.—FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 29TH, 1905.

At the Courthouse, Mallow.

Present:—Mr. NICKS (Chairman), Mr. MURTAGHAN, and Dr. COEY BIGGER.

Mr. D. L. O'GORMAN, M.C., Fermoy, examined.

Mr. D. L. O'GORMAN.

I first will hand you in a map (produced), which indicates the unions of the entire county. I have also marked on it the asylums, and the auxiliary asylum in Tougal. The North and South Infirmaries are also supported by county funds, and the Cork Fever Hospital also gets a grant out of the county funds. The distances are marked here. You will find that the distance between the various workhouses average from ten to sixteen or nineteen miles in some of the western districts, but in our district you find Fermoy ten miles from Mitchelstown and fifteen miles from Mallow. However, as this explains itself I will hand it in. Here are letters from the county surveyor certifying that the distances are correct. I don't think it will be necessary for me to call the attention of the Commission to the great changes which have taken place in this county since the institution of the Poor Law. The population has diminished by nearly a half, and we have now railway communication in this county, which did not exist before, and there are 3,000 labourers' cottages, none of which were built before 1854, and these have an important bearing on the matter. I am sure you will agree in that. The Poor Law Inquiry in 1835 reported that you had in Ireland 1,131,000 agricultural labourers, whose average earnings did not exceed 2s. or 2s. 6d. a week, and that of those, one-half were destitute during thirty weeks of every year. At the present moment the demand for agricultural labour in this district far exceeds the supply. In 1841 the population of Cork County was 775,388, it is now less than 323,475; labour is now much higher, and food and clothes are cheaper than they were when the Poor Law was established; persons are now sent from every union in the county to Cork to be treated. In the Fermoy Union there is not a Board day on which we do not send people to Cork for treatment. We have an auxiliary asylum established in Tougal for lunatic idiots, and though that is now full, there are 400 patients there, still in every union in the county you will find there are a large number of idiots and imbeciles, and a workhouse is certainly not the place for those persons. The asylum in Cork is overcrowded, as you are aware, and it must be evident to all that another auxiliary asylum is necessary, and it will be a great advantage. Deaf and dumb children are sent to Dublin for treatment. All the unions in this county have signified their willingness to contribute a penny in the £ towards the establishment of the asmatarium, which is badly needed for the treatment of consumption. In the County of Cork there are 3,335 rural district cottages, and 684 are under contract. These figures are taken from your own Report, for 1903. In the Fermoy Union alone we have 490 of these cottages. We had 875; there is now a new scheme for 120 cottages, and practically all these are finished. In 1872 the amount spent on the rations and salaries of officers in all the Cork Workhouses, this is taken from the Report issued by the Local Government Board, was £14,000; in 1892 it was £19,731; that would be an increase of £5,000, although, undoubtedly, distress and destitution has decreased largely in those years. It is my opinion that by proper management we could do in the County Cork with two workhouses—one, I should think, in Mallow, and one in Banader. I would send to these all the undesirable, and they should be detained there for some time. Whenever it would be necessary I would retain hospitals; I would extend in deserving cases the outdoor relief; I would board out all the children, and I would make it within the power of the Guardians to rent in the villages a house—the rent of a small house would be a mere trifle, 6s or 8s—and by giving a room in that house to aged, respectable people, it would be very much more economical than the present system. The rent, probably, would not be more than 4s or 6s; if they got

the rent, a little grant of coals, and a few shillings a week, it would go much further than the present system. In Fermoy there is absolutely no distress, except where it is caused by sickness, old age, or drunkenness. There is absolutely no distress; and in the county I know of no place where there is less need for a workhouse. A hospital, of course, we would always want; and I can show you, sir, that by establishing a hospital, we would effect a very large saving. Now, sir, it is pointed out that Fermoy is a model union, and that we have the lowest rate in the county; but in Fermoy we have a valuation of £105,000; we have an average number of 197 inmates to provide for. Now, sir, in Skibbereen they have a valuation of £48,000, and they have over 300 inmates to provide for. In Clonsilla they have a valuation of £52,000, and they have over 300 inmates to provide for. If we take Cork as a standard of comparison, where you have a large number of inmates, where the thing is controlled, they have over 2,000 inmates, and the cost per inmate under the heading of officials' salaries and rations, would work out at 11s. per head per week of the inmates. If you come to Fermoy, you will find the cost of the officials' salaries and rations works out at 2s. 6d. per week; and that Fermoy, with the exception of Dunmoreway, is the most extravagant in the whole county. Dunmoreway works out at 3s. 7d., and the average cost there for maintenance and clothing of an inmate is 4s. 3d., and the cost of administering that 4s. 3d. is 3s. 7d., which I don't think is good enough. Of course, it will be pointed out to you that the relieving officers' salary is included in that, but it is included also in Cork. The same salaries are included in all these. What costs 11d. in Cork costs 2s. 6d. in Fermoy. Again, I would point out that numbers of persons are admitted to workhouses who should not be admitted at all. We frequently have able-bodied women, who should not be admitted for instance. We have, too, a habit, I think it is wrong, of admitting pensioners who are able to pay for themselves. They do pay for themselves in the workhouse, and it is pointed out that it is no loss; but I don't think a workhouse is a hotel, and the mere fact that a man is able to pay for himself is conclusive proof that he is not a fit subject for admission. I have known an instance of a woman admitted two or three times, whose son, son-in-law, and daughter-in-law were all in receipt of large sums of public money.

2095. CHAIRMAN.—That is entirely for the Guardians to admit or not admit—it is; but I point out the fact that a woman whose immediate relatives were in receipt of large salaries was admitted, and pensioners are constantly admitted; and the mere fact that they pay in no way does away with the undesirability of that. I take it from your figures that we have 197 inmates in Fermoy; their cost would be the cost of maintenance, which is £1,672, and salaries, £1,280; that gives a total of £2,952. I now take it that of that 197, twenty should not be admitted at all; I take it then we have about twenty children, who should be boarded out, at an average cost of 2s a head; that would be £120 a year. We have then still, sixteen or seventeen of these idiots; they should be sent to a new auxiliary asylum, where they would cost about £35 each per annum; that would be £287. Then in Fermoy on last Board day, I noted the number of hospital cases. They were twenty in one and twenty-three or twenty-four in the other, that is, about forty, but I really think that the number of cases we would have in hospital would be about thirty cases; and I would say in a county hospital like Fermoy we could run it at about £25 a head. We would not have very serious operations; it would not be like the Mater Misericordie in Dublin, or the North and South Infirmaries; the really serious cases

are sent to Cork; that would mean about £100 for thirty cases. That would leave fifty people, to whom I would give outdoor relief—some might do with less than 2s. a week, some might want a little more; most of these are respectable old people from the country villages. If they are placed in houses in a village, their rents paid for them, and they get a grant of coal, and a few shillings a week, it would be much better for them—they would be self-respecting people.

29097. What change would you suggest in outdoor relief?—I would make it illegal for the Guardians to give outdoor relief to anyone who had been convicted of drunkenness three times.

29098. How would you make the class that go into the workhouse eligible for relief?—I would suggest old married couples and old broken-down agricultural labourers.

29099. They would be eligible at the present time?—They are; but I want to account for the 137 we have. I would pick out the fifty most respectable.

29100. What change would you suggest in the law so that some of these who at present are ineligible for outdoor relief should become eligible for it?—Many of these persons that I suggest are quite eligible; they have come in because their horses tumbled down or they could not pay the rent of the house, and if they had the loan: their sons and daughters would help them.

29101. Do you regard all these people as eligible for outdoor relief under the existing law?—They are.

29102. And, therefore, you think no change would be necessary?—Not in that; they are eligible. That would leave me sixty undesirable, and I would send them to a central institution, and have the law altered, so that there would be power to confine them there for some time. That would cost in that central institution about £18 each; that would be £720; that gives me a total of £2,111.

29103. What sort of charge would you have for the support of these inmates in that central institution?—I would like a county-at-large charge?—That would be my private idea; personally, I can see no objection to that. At present you have an inmate of the workhouse; he is a union charge in Fenny; he goes out of his mind, and goes up to the asylum, and he becomes a county-at-large charge at once, and nobody objects. On the other hand, I will admit that it would be more popular if you made the charges at the central institution so much a head, and charge the existing Fenny Union for the number of persons they sent there.

29104. What would you do with regard to apportioning salaries in the central institution?—That would be as in the asylum, part of the cost.

29105. The asylum has no difficulty, because it is a county charge?—I would have no objection to making this a county-at-large charge. I have noticed that before your Commission members have given evidence in favour of returning to divisional setting. I think that is altogether wrong; I don't think it would lead to economy. If a thing comes up at the County Council as a county-at-large charge, you may take it that the whole Council is against it but the men from the district, but if it comes to a divisional charge no one cares.

29106. Do you find that is the case in the granting of outdoor relief?—The outdoor relief, I think, has gone down a little; it was £1,500 odd, and is now only £1,500. I really think that as the Guardians get educated to that the wish to return to divisional setting would disappear. To come back to figures—I have a total of £2,111 as against a cost of £2,052, being a saving of £59.

29107. Did you make out the poundage of that?—No, sir. Then, with regard to the feeling of the district, I can give you very important evidence, and satisfy you that the feeling of the bulk of the people is entirely in favour of abolishing the workhouse. I commenced by telling you the country people detest the workhouse. I have said to poor old people, "Why don't you go into the hospital?" And the answer they give is, "I would die by the ditch sooner than go into the workhouse." Before this Commission was thought of I was so struck by the vote that in 1902, on November 24th, I proposed to abolish the Fenny Workhouse, and I explained, as I have to you, the advantage we would have from establishing a hospital; and on a poll the voting was twenty-one to thirteen—thirteen were in favour of the abolition. I

will hand in the report, and you will be able to study the arguments in favour of retaining it; they are even more striking than the arguments against it.

29108. I see there was a plan of campaign recommended to the officials?—Exactly, sir—the vested interests, that is the entire objection. I don't wish to show any bitterness or temper, but I recently read the evidence of a gentleman before this Commission, and to my certain knowledge his son was the clerk, his sister was the matron, and his nephew was the relieving officer. The result of that proposal of mine was that I received this—this is from the Ballynase Land and Labour League:—"The following resolution was passed unanimously. Resolved, that the Ballynase Branch of the Land and Labour League compliment Mr. O'Garra for the noble effort he made to get rid of the workhouse." That is from the labourers. I have taken every means in my power to test the matter, and, except the Poor Law Board itself, the people are entirely in favour of giving up the workhouse. I would point out to you too that if these workhouses are to continue, and we are to have in addition a sanatorium and two auxiliary asylums, the sooner the ratepayers start for America the better. As showing that the low rate does not indicate anything, this is a letter from the county secretary, in which he showed there was no rate in the Schull Union on land for similar purposes in the half-year ended 20th September, 1900, therefore the rate is no indication—it is the expenditure. The general hospital in Fenny, under the Sisters, is excellent; it could not be much better. But you will find here the report of your own doctor as to the maternity ward, and I remember myself a nurse being called before the Board, and admitting that for three days the bed in which a patient had been confined had not been made up, and it was in a state of unspeakable filth, and we will have that nurse in our employment. The poor are aware of all these facts. I hand in a resolution of the County Council, in which they unanimously state that some of the seventeen workhouses in the county are not necessary, and should be abolished.

29109. You did not touch on the question of tramps?—The tramps are very difficult gentlemen to deal with. I would not admit them to any of these institutions; but I would have a tramp who wanted a lodging apply at the police barrack, and let him be provided with shelter there, and in the morning he could get a little coupon from the policeman, which would entitle him to a breakfast, and then he could move on.

29110. You would not look him up, and teach him habits of industry?—No.

29111. Have you thought that these people take young children about with them, and ruin their lives?—When it was proved they were utterly unfit to have charge of a child I would take the child from them, and send it to a distant county.

29112. You would not take the insurance, as they look upon the staff, from them, and give them a free leg to run about the country?—It is a difficulty. Illegitimate births are not very numerous here, but after a second lapse I would confine her in a penitentiary.

29113. Don't you think it would be better to send her after the first lapse, when she would be more easily softened, to a penitentiary; when, after a short time, she could be placed out again?—It is certainly would be better, but the Guardians hesitate to follow up the supposed father, because they generally fail; and I don't blame them; it is hard to prove these cases. If the law itself would follow these things a little further it would be a deterrent.

29114. Under the English law it is more easy to make the father pay?—The law should be altered here so. It is very hard on the women. The woman cannot leave the workhouse without taking the child, and you will find instances where a mother has to remain with her child for three, four, or five years, and I think it is very hard. All these things I went into a long time ago, and when I wrote to the Local Government Board to know how many Poor Law officials we had in the County Clerk, they wrote back to say they could not give me the information, as it was for official purposes. I suppose they were afraid to make it public, there is such an immense number of them. You will see the expense of sending persons to outside hospitals. I find here, Victoria Hospital, £23, £19; Eye, Ear, and Throat Hospital, £10 10s. I don't think the slightest hardship would be entailed

Sept. 20, 1900.
Mr. D. L.
O'Garra

Sept. 20, 1893
Mr. D. L. O'Connell.

on the deserving poor by abolishing the workhouse; on the contrary, they would prefer a cottage home in their own villages. And with regard to the undesirable, no sentimental reason should prevent us from effecting a very large economy.

20115. You say you would spend £20 a year on the house, and give a room in that to a deserving old person, or couple—would you have any one in charge of it?—No one would be in charge; you may have four families living in it.

20116. Would you not be afraid it would get neglected?—The Guardians would exercise a supervision, and the relieving officer would report. Most of the people are clean and tidy. The cottages in Fermanagh are beautifully kept.

20117. You would put that on the relieving officer, and you don't think anything would be necessary beyond his occasional inspection—have no person paid to look after it?—I think it would be quite unnecessary.

20118. You would like to retain a hospital pretty much of the kind you have in Fermanagh?—Yes.

20119. You would not keep it for the more acutely sick?—For aged people, who are scarcely hospital cases, but merely old and broken down.

20120. Yes?—Well, if possible I would keep them out. A great number of agricultural labourers and others are now being trained into letting the public look after their relatives. I know labourers who are pretty well off, and could easily learn to maintain their parents, but as they find it easy to get rid of them, they do so.

20121. Would you be afraid that the cottage home arrangement would increase the number of people looking for relief, hoping to get it in that form?—That would all depend on the administration; if properly administered I don't see how it could.

20122. It would be quite easy if you administered it yourself, but from your experience of things, how they are done, do you think that system might not be freedom?—I know you would be besieged by canvassers, and they would all have letters from parish priests and ministers that they are the most deserving people in the world; but we have some discretion in that matter, and if properly worked it is perfectly safe; and I have not abandoned all hope that things will be properly done. I think the people are waking up, and see through a lot of this humbug.

20123. Dr. Broom.—What kind of a hospital did you refer to when you mentioned that you would keep it for £25 a year?—In going through the Trough Asylum everything is beautifully done; it is practically a hospital, and a great many of the people are bedridden, and if they can do that for £25, put £7 on top of it, and we ought to be able to do it very well.

20124. I must say that it is not a very good way of going into the matter; it is only 8s. 6d. a week, and I don't know any hospital kept for anything like that?—In the North Infirmary, where they treat all serious operations, and have very heavy surgical cases and dressings and treatment, the cost is only £50.

20125. That is a very reasonable cost, or perhaps £25, but when you come down to £25 it goes so much below anything I am aware of?—But, after all, what do we treat there? It is not very expensive to treat a man with a broken arm or leg. We have a fever hospital.

20126. CHAIRMAN.—Were you including everything?—Yes. In the asylum in Cork, which is a most extravagant place, it is run like a palace; the cost there is £24 or £25.

20127. Dr. Broom.—You can't compare an institution where the majority are up and walking about with an institution in which people are sick in bed?—You have an attendant to every fourteen patients in Cork, and still they do it for between £24 and £25.

20128. Comparing one hospital with another I can understand; but when you compare a sick hospital with a healthy institution you are on a wrong basis?—I have asked some doctors, and they told me £25 would run a country hospital. One doctor put it as low as £22 a head.

20129. CHAIRMAN.—Even if it went up to £25?—There would still be a saving, and not only that, but the place would become more popular. Now it has a workhouse taint, and has drunken, bad characters

coming there night after night, and they won't associate with them, and I am very glad of it. If we lost that proper pride we would be a ruined country.

20130. Dr. Broom.—You believe in separating the hospital from the workhouse?—Yes.

20131. You mentioned that the County Council looked after a county-at-large charge?—More cheaply than they would after a local charge.

20132. Do you think that is the rule with your County Council?—Yes; they will all breathe against what is a county-at-large charge.

20133. So, if you put one of these institutions on a county rate you think it would be managed more economically?—I think it would.

20134. Mr. MURTAGHAN.—Are you not aware that the reason they don't raise any objection to the local charge is that they think the locality and the representatives of the locality, when they have to pay for it, know best what they want?—That is not the reason. I think it is that the representatives of any other division are not going to pay any portion of it and therefore don't interfere at all. In the County Council if a local charge is to be put on Kanturk, or Millstreet, or Bantry, why should I, as a Fermanagh man, interfere? But if it is a county-at-large charge, proposed by a Kanturk man, and I, as a Fermanagh man, will have to pay a share, naturally I will investigate it very closely.

20135. Do you not think the local man, who has to pay for it, investigate the case and am satisfied that they are going to get value for it?—They do.

20136. And does it not stand to reason that a small area can be more closely looked after than a wide area like the Co. Cork?—I am not so sure of that.

20137. Dr. Broom.—Do you charge pensioners the full cost?—Sometimes they are charged full and sometimes only part; sometimes he says he has swept the floor and done a good deal of useful work, and it was quite an advantage to have him, and he gets a remission and is let off light. That is not a very serious matter; I merely bring it forward because the very fact that he is able to pay shows that he ought not to be taken in.

20138. What does he do with the surplus?—He goes out and gets his pension and gets drunk on the remainder.

20139. CHAIRMAN.—Supposing your scheme was carried out at Fermanagh, it is quite possible that the large and good building there might be utilised for a county-at-large purpose?—Yes.

20140. Suppose there was no purpose to which they could be applied, what would you do with the buildings as they are? You would want a hospital; would you propose to keep that hospital among these huge buildings?—I think not, but I certainly would think that Fermanagh would be an excellent place to run the second auxiliary asylum; the asylum in Cork is overcrowded.

20141. I quite see that it might be a very useful place for a pauper sanatorium or an auxiliary asylum, but it is not merely Fermanagh I have in my mind, but other places; take Fermanagh or Mitchelstown, what would you propose should be done with them; would you propose to sell the existing premises?—We only rent them.

20142. Well sell your interest in them and build a small hospital suitable for the place?—I think a small hospital would do.

20143. Would you be afraid of keeping up a large building like that with so many portions not needed?—I think it would be a great mistake; it would be better let it tumble down than waste money on it. The only thing that might minimise the saving that I believe could be effected would be that the officials would have to receive pensions or gratuities. I am prepared for that.

20144. Don't you see that the older officials would be glad to go and their pensions would not last long, and the younger officials could be utilised and put into other institutions?—Yes, where wanted; the fewer we have the better; we would utilise, as far as possible, deserving officers, but to postpone reform on that ground is only putting it off; it is better to meet it to-day than in fifteen years. I would be prepared to deal generously with them.

20145. And it would be, every year, a diminishing charge?—Yes.

Mr. PATRICK O'MAHONY, Chairman, Fermanagh Union, examined.

Sept. 26, 1875.

Mr. Patrick O'Mahony.

29145. CHAIRMAN.—You are Chairman of the Board of Guardians?—Yes, sir.

29147. Do you agree with the evidence that has just been given, or were you one of the Guardians against amalgamation?—I entirely disagree with the evidence given by the previous witness.

29148. What would your view be; do you think any change is necessary at all, or that things are fairly well as they are?—I think the union of Fermanagh is very well managed at present, and it is necessary for the requirements of the whole union to let it stand as it does at present. Before I go into my evidence I wish to draw attention to the fact that the previous witness only represents himself here.

29149. He does that with very good effect?—And Mr. Noonan and myself are appointed by our Board to put the views of the Board before the Commission. At our meeting on Saturday last we had a very large Board present, and the Board were entirely unanimous against amalgamation; they want to retain the union as it is at present.

29150. Would you keep the same design in it, or do you think that some classes might with advantage be moved?—I do.

29151. Do you think it would be desirable to remove the inmates?—Yes.

29152. Do you think a workhouse is a good place for children?—I do not; I would board them out.

29153. Do you think the law ought to be amended so as to give the Guardians power to board out all the children that have to be supported out of the rates?—Yes.

29154. You are aware that a great many of these poor little children are illegitimate; the girls come in and stay, perhaps, all their lives in the house?—Yes, I am aware of that.

29155. Do you think these girls ought to be kept in the house?—No, I do not; there should be some sort of a penitentiary to put them into.

29156. And never admitted to the workhouse at all, but in the first instance sent to the penitentiary with a view to their reformation?—Yes.

29157. As regards tramps; do you think that workhouses ought to remain open to them?—That is a very difficult question to solve. I believe the tramps, in the first instance, should apply to the local Constabulary, and let application be made from the Constabulary to the workhouse authorities for admission.

29158. Do you think it would be a good thing, as has been suggested by a great many witnesses, that these leaguers should, if it was obvious they were vagrants, be committed under a magistrate's warrant to a central institution where they would be obliged to work with the hope of making them industrious people in the future?—I would be very much in favour of that.

29159. Then the two remaining classes in the workhouse would be the sick, the aged and infirm; you would let the sick remain in the hospital, and the aged and infirm would you also keep?—Yes.

29160. Why would you not agree with the proposal that the Fermanagh aged and infirm should for instance be sent to Malloy instead of Fermanagh. We are talking of healthy people who can travel in a train as well as us we can?—I think they are always anxious that their friends should come from time to time to see them; it would be only natural they should, and if they were too great a distance away from their friends the probability is that their friends would never see them; it is a great encouragement to a poor person compelled to retire into a workhouse to have an occasional visit from friends.

29161. Your union goes to Watergrasshill?—Yes.

29162. How far is that from your workhouse at Fermanagh?—About ten miles.

29163. It would be about the same distance from there to Malloy; a little more perhaps?—I don't know the distance.

29164. Do you think it would be any hardship for the healthy people, as far distances from Fermanagh, to have to go to a place like Malloy?—I do indeed.

29165. Although there would not be much difference in actual distance?—Then there would be no hardship at all, good or bad.

29166. Take the country between Fermanagh and Malloy in a straight line along the river, there would not be very much difference?—No, there would not, so

far as Castleblawney and Rathfriland are concerned, but if you take the southern portion of the union, Ballymore, that division that bounds Keshel and Middleton, to compel aged and infirm people to go from there to Malloy it would be too much.

29167. How far are you from Yonghall?—Twelve miles.

29168. And Middleton?—Thirteen or fourteen miles.

29169. And Fermanagh?—Nine miles.

29170. Have the aged and infirm there much more practical connection with Fermanagh than with Middleton or Yonghall?—They have; it is their market town.

29171. Have you ever inquired as to the number of visits that the aged and infirm receive from their friends?—Well, I have not inquired, but I have reason to know, because I very often give a letter of admission to friends of inmates.

29172. Sick inmates?—Yes.

29173. I quite admit that there are a great many visits paid to the sick, but can you tell me whether you think there are many visits paid to the infirm?—There are, to my own knowledge.

29174. We made inquiries and it surprised us how very few visits are paid to the aged and infirm as distinguished from the sick?

Mr. MURPHY.—Especially with regard to those with long residences—the older inmates of the institution.

29175. CHAIRMAN.—Once they become settled they practically receive no visits?—Oh, they do; I very often visit neighbours of mine who are inmates of the house.

29176. A very large proportion of those aged and infirm people are single old people—widows or widowers—the last of their generation, with really no next relations or friends to see them. Are you aware of that?—Oh, yes.

29177. So that they, in any case, would not have any visitors?—They would. The good neighbours and friends will always inquire about them.

29178. Is it often done through the Guardians?—It is done through the Guardians.

29179. You, as a Guardian, would be in favour of reducing the rates if it could be done without hardship to the poor?—I would.

29180. Can you tell me any way in which economy could be effected if you do not gather the healthy into one central institution or else board them out in cottage homes, as has been suggested?—I do not agree in boarding them out in cottage homes.

29181. What would be the objection to that?—I hold that infirm people will want to be looked after by doctors and nurses from time to time.

29182. They could of course be looked after by doctors, and if they needed a nurse's attention would not the proper place for them be in a hospital?—It would, certainly.

29183. But as long as they are healthy and able to get about they might stay outside in the cottage houses?—The difficulty would be to get the cottage houses.

29184. What objection do you see to the system?—I think they would not be as well looked after in villages; they would only have to look after themselves.

29185. Do you think elderly people like that would want personal attention?—Yes; they are not able to look after themselves.

29186. Mr. MURPHY.—That would not apply to the whole class, only to a few?—Wherever an infirm person is I hold they are not able to look after themselves. A poor man knocked up with pains in his back is not able to do anything for himself.

29187. I have noticed a number of them fairly well able to look after themselves in various houses?—If you looked closely after them you would find they could not take care of themselves.

29188. CHAIRMAN.—You don't approve of boarding out in cottage homes, and the reason you object to a central institution is it would be taking them away from their neighbours and friends; do you see any other way of effecting a large saving for the rates—the aged and infirm are practically the largest class in the workhouse; do you see any other method for economy, if you don't do it with that class?—The taking away of the children is so economy, and the doing away with the tramps.

29189. That might or might not be an economy, but it would be for the advantage of the community, perhaps. Do you see any other way of effecting a large

Sept. 29, 1902

Mr. Patrick O'Mahony.

economy except dealing with that class—the aged and infirm—I do not; if you centralise them you will have a large staff to look after them.

29190. Much smaller than the total of the staff that looks after them in the various workhouses?—We have almost unnecessary expenditure on the hospitals at present.

29191. Hardly anyone suggests that the hospitals should be closed or that the facilities for treating the sick should be diminished?—Certainly not.

29192. It is not the sick but it is the old people who have become infirm and are too old for work that we have to consider?—It would be very unfair to the old people at the latter end of their lives to banish them from their friends and neighbours.

29193. Don't you think that when once they are in an institution they have nothing but their memory of the old spot?—No, sir, my experience is all the other way, they are always inquiring about their late home and their neighbours and friends.

29194. They don't see it?—No; they don't see it.

29195. And I think you will find that they don't often see people from the old home?—It is my experience they do.

29196. There is no economy you think of as regards outdoor relief?—I think it should be made a divisional charge; I think there would be much more supervision and the Guardians of the several divisions would be more or less responsible to the ratepayers of their division and would be more anxious to keep down the rates.

29197. Has your outdoor relief remained pretty stationary?—It has gone up \$100 a year since the coming in of the Local Government Act. We would be glad that more power would be given to the Boards of Guardians in the way of classification of inmates. More responsibility should be thrown on the Guardians.

29198. Don't you think they have full power at present?—They have not.

Mr. John Horner.

Mr. JOHN NOGGIN, M.C.C., Ferryway, examined.

29200. CHAIRMAN.—What is your view about the question of amalgamation or classification?—I am entirely opposed to amalgamation. I think it is one of the courses where all that would be likely to encourage extravagance and expenditure.

29201. You don't like a large area?—No, I would wish to confine it as formerly to the electoral division.

29202. For what kind of relief?—Indoor and outdoor; go back altogether to the former system.

29203. You think it was more economical?—I have no doubt about it.

29204. What do you think about the Iowa ratepayers; would they not have a great hardship put on them if you went back to the old system?—We discussed that on Saturday last, and in consequence of the valuation in Ferryway I do not think they would suffer much; they would be opposed to it but they did not object.

29205. Did your Board of Guardians, after notice to all the members of the Board, pass a resolution in favour of going back to district charges for all persons?—No; there was no resolution; it was a conversation, and generally accepted by the members that happened to be present.

29206. Is there anything you would wish to add to what your chairman has said?—Very little. I think there ought to be a little more powers extended to the Guardians, especially in reference to officers; I think it is a very bad thing to have a hard and fast rule made as regards officers. If an officer requires leave of absence as a rule the next officer will ask for compensation for the discharge of that officer's duty. I would entirely agree for the rest with what the chairman has said.

Mr. J. D. O'SULLIVAN, Chairman, Millstreet Union, examined.

Mr. Linehan, one of the gentlemen appointed, could not attend, and asked me to hand in the notes of his evidence. (Produced.)

29217. CHAIRMAN.—What is your personal view, and the view of your Board of Guardians on the question of amalgamation?—Utterly opposed to it.

29208. Where do you see any deficiency of power?—Not very long ago there was an application from a girl for admission to our union. She was not of the best character, still, at the same time, we were not able to show to the medical officer, who has the power of classifying, that the girl was of the character that she really was, therefore the doctor could not put her into the separate apartment, and the other inmates had an objection to being compelled to associate with her.

29209. The Guardians practically have the power, but you would not suggest that on occasions they should put the girl into the immoral ward?—We could not exactly put forward evidence to satisfy the medical officer; and I think one of the reasons why people have an objection to going into hospital is being compelled to wear the uniform.

29210. Are you aware that Guardians can select any pattern of clothes they like, for instance, blue serge?—I am aware of that, but still there is the very make of the suit; it must be uniform; if they were allowed to wear their own clothes.

29211. You know very well that a great many of the poor people that come in have very uncleanly clothes, and perhaps not very clean?—A great many who were respectable people have to have recourse to the workhouse; it is a great hardship to compel them to wear the uniform.

29212. But there is power to provide a costume that has no brand on it; nothing indicative of pauperism?—I would be in favour of extending the power to the Guardians.

29213. I think any reasonable wish they express that way they have power to carry out; I know plenty of Poor Law hospitals where they get nice uniforms for the sick that are not in the least objected to; people rather like them?—Some poor people had an objection to enter the hospitals before the introduction of the nurse, but since the introduction of the nurse I never heard any person object to go into the workhouse. We are the lowest rated union in the whole county.

29214. Do you think that the proper thing then is that officers should devote all their time to the Guardians, and there should be no extra pay?—That is my opinion, that they should be employed to devote all their time, as far as reasonable.

29215. You are referring to one indoor officer going away for a fortnight and another officer doing his or her duty and making a claim for extra pay?—That is so. I would entirely object to those cottage homes described by the first witness; I think it would be an inducement to all the poor in the country to look for these cottage homes. I think they would be better cared and looked after and be under better supervision in the workhouse, and, in addition to that, they would be as troublesome as ever.

29216. You would not think that supervision would be an advantage if they got on well without it?—I think there should be some supervision, and I am, furthermore, under the impression that whatever aid or assistance they got to live on they would be just as troublesome to charitable people as they are at the present moment, and they would not be relieved of the begging nuisance if those people were located in cottage homes.

29217. You think if you started cottage homes and did not give a large payment also they would be apt to make it up by charitable donations?—My belief is that unless it was illegal to resort to their former methods of living they would do so.

29218. And even if it was illegal, do you think they would still try it?—I think so; it is very hard to break an old dog of his tricks.

Mr. J. D. O'Sullivan

1895, and after hearing all the evidence that could be given the Local Government Board refused to accede to it.

29200. The proposal then was that Millstreet Union should be divided between the adjoining unions—Macroom, Kanturk, and Killybegs.

29201. There was no question then about leaving a hospital for the sick in Millstreet?—I think not.

29202. They just simply would close up all the buildings and divide the union among the other places?—Yes.

29203. And it was thought that such a proposal as that would not be proper?—Yes, but the people have considered the question very carefully, and ratepayers and all are opposed to amalgamation; they don't think it would affect any saving of the rates.

29204. Would that mean from the neighbourhood of Millstreet or the union-at-large?—I live in the neighbourhood of Millstreet, and it is of my own immediate neighbourhood I speak.

29205. Do you know whether the feeling of keeping on the workhouse as it is shared by the people all round at a distance from Millstreet, but inside the union?—Perhaps in the more remote districts which may be as near to another workhouse; I don't know what the feeling is there.

29206. What reforms do you think might be introduced?—I think without amalgamation there could be amalgamation of offices within the workhouse at present.

29207. How would you work that?—I don't know; but I don't think there are quite as many officers required for 120 inmates as there were for five times that number.

29208. From your own knowledge, as Chairman of the Board, could you point out some office that might be abolished?—I won't say; I don't think that is a question for me.

29209. I should not have dreamed of putting it to you only you suggested it yourself?—I think it could be done.

29210. What offices do you think could be abolished?—I have not considered the question.

29211. Do you think it would be possible to abolish the master's post?—I don't know; I don't think so.

29212. The matron—do you think she is unnecessary?—Yes; I should say it is unnecessary under the present system.

29213. The porter?—A porter is required, as far as the system applies at present.

Mr. J. J. CONEY, J.P., Millstreet, examined.

29214. CHAIRMAN.—You are Chairman of the District Council?—Yes; and I have been Chairman of the Board of Guardians for years.

29215. You have heard the evidence of the last witnesses?—Yes, sir.

29216. Does it represent, on the whole, your view?—Well, yes, with the exception of those women that have had illegitimate children. I think they should be sent on to an institution by themselves, and I equally think those ladies should be sent away; but I would think it a great hardship to be sending out of the union those old people, who have spent their lives in the district, worked their lives, and now have become infirm; I think it would be a crime, and I am of opinion it would shorten their lives if they were sent away.

29217. Do you remember yourself—hardly, I suppose—the foundation of Millstreet Union?—Hardly; it was in 1854.

29218. It is one of the new unions?—Yes.

29219. Of course, the reason it was opened in 1854 was because there were too many inmates to be kept in the surrounding workhouses of Kanturk and Macroom?—Oh, yes.

29220. Now that state of things has gone?—It has gone a good deal, but still there are a lot of poor in the district at present.

29221. You have between thirty and forty sick and thirty and forty aged and infirm?—We have male infirm, 28, and females, 15.

29222. Can you tell me why it is that the female infirm are always so much smaller in number in Millstreet?—I believe there are a good deal of the females after dying for the last couple of years.

29223. These are practically the only three able-bodied officers you have at Millstreet—can you tell me any change in the system that would make it possible to have fewer officers?—No, sir. Of course, we have only very few school children in the workhouse; those could be boarded out, I think.

29224. You don't pay the salary of the schoolmistress, but give her rates?—Yes. The boarding-out system is working admirably in Millstreet.

29225. Have you a Ladies Committee looking after the children?—We have not.

29226. Do you think that a desirable thing?—It would be no harm; it would have a very good effect.

29227. What other change would you make besides the children; would you be against removing the aged and infirm?—I would be utterly against it; everybody is against removing a single old person.

29228. What objection have you to it?—From my knowledge of the inmates of the workhouse at present, there are very few of the undesirable class, they are all old people, who have lived fairly respectable lives, and have had recourse to the workhouse at the latter end of their days, and it would be a very wrong thing to remove them to a distance away. Their friends would not see them, and they would be buried without their friends.

29229. Do you think that feeling about being buried among their friends is one of the chief reasons that makes people shy about going into the workhouse?—That is one of the reasons; I would not say it is the chief reason.

29230. What other reasons would there be?—They like to see their friends occasionally. These people take a week or a few days out once in a while, and go to see their friends, which it would not be possible for them to do if they were in Malrow, or anywhere else.

29231. As regards outdoor relief, have you any suggestions to make?—I have not. Outdoor relief has been reduced in our district by £300 a year; we are very well satisfied. As far as divisional relief is concerned, it would tend towards economy, but would inflict great hardship on the poorer districts where the people live, they have to bear the whole cost, while the richer districts would escape cost free.

29232. You would not care to keep females in the house?—No, sir, of course not. I would send them to some central institution, and those women with illegitimate children also.

29233. The sick and aged and infirm you would like to keep at Millstreet?—Yes.

Sept. 29, 1905.

Mr. J. D. O'Sullivan.

Mr. J. J. Coney.

Sept. 29, 1905.

Mr. J. J.
Corkery.

29253. You are very close to Kanturk—how many miles?—Nine miles.
29254. And about eleven from Macroom, is it?—Thirteen Irish.
29255. How near would Clondrohid take you to Macroom?—Nine miles.
29256. What is the boundary of the union?—Cahir-donen belongs to Millstreet.
29257. And on the Kanturk side, how far do you go towards Kanturk?—About nine miles; it would be nearer to Millstreet than to Kanturk.
29258. There are only ten miles between the two places—how far do you go on those ten miles?—I go into the electoral division of Meena.
29259. What I am asking you is, how far do you go on the direct road?—It would be as near to Millstreet as it would be to Kanturk.
29260. You would like to get those electoral divisions that would increase your valuation and lower your taxation?—Yes.
29261. I suppose that is the object of it?—Yes.
29262. You don't go into the County Kerry at all?—No, sir.
29263. You don't want to go there?—I do not; it is far away.
29264. It comes up to within a couple of miles of you?—Yes, sir. Millstreet is on the bounds between Cork and Kerry.
29265. You don't go beyond the county bounds?—

- No; the western portion of Millstreet Union is a place called Knocknacullen.
29266. You have a very good water supply at Millstreet?—As good as there is in the County Cork.
29267. You have a special gravitation water supply?—Yes, from the mountain; supplying the workhouse and the town.
29268. You tap it first?—Yes, sir.
29269. If the Millstreet people thought they could get their workhouse turned into a sanatorium, or something of that sort, do you think they would have the same objection?—They would not, if there would be room enough.
29270. If they had 300 or 400 inmates there?—We would not have room for them.
29271. Well 300?—Hardly.
29272. Well as many as they would have room for?—Certainly, they would have no objection, I am sure; or to make an auxiliary asylum of it.
29273. Then, what would you do with the aged and infirm?—Keep them in a part by themselves.
29274. How could you do that if they were going to make it into a sanatorium or a lunatic asylum?—Keep them in their own part.
29275. You could not manage that. Which would you prefer—having a good, large, well-filled institution of consumptives or lunatics?—I would prefer having the poor where they belong to; they are best suited to it.

Mr. W. W. O'DWYER, J.P., M.C.C.

Mr. W. W.
O'Dwyer.

I had the honour of appearing before you at Limerick from the County Council. I have got the facts of our workhouse here. The average annual expenditure is £4,380. Salaries of intern officers, £617 per annum; average number of inmates in the workhouse, 130; number of inmates in the workhouse on the 25th of September last, 118; average number in the hospital, 23; number in the hospital on the 25th of September, 14; average cost of an inmate, 3s. 6d.; average annual expenditure for outdoor relief before 1898, for five years, £255 (I particularly asked for this to show the difference); average cost of same since 1898, £720, so you see we have a large increase; average number of persons in receipt of outdoor relief, 150; number in receipt of outdoor relief on the 25th of September, 128; average cost per week of persons in receipt of outdoor relief, 1s. 10d.; number of children boarded out, 12; monthly cost per head of children boarded out, 12s. 6d. There are no persons suffering from consumption in the workhouse, and there is no ward set apart for them.

29286. CHAIRMAN.—What are the views of your Guardians on the question of the possible breaking up of the workhouse and the re-classification of the inmates?—We are unanimous, always were; we are in favour of it; we don't want the house there at all.

29287. Do you see the same objection that the Chairman of the Millstreet Board of Guardians had to removing the aged and infirm?—No, sir, I do not; because I hold that the respectable aged and infirm could be given relief outside; and if their people thought so much about them they could keep them conveniently at home; and if they did not wish to keep them, they could be sent to some central institution.

29288. You think that really if they were proper cases for it you could give them a little relief outside?—Certainly, under the supervision of the relieving officer. They are quite safe with their people; these people would be very useful about a house.

29289. You would be willing to enlarge your outdoor relief, and think you could save on it?—Certainly.

29290. The people that could go to the central institution are people that in your opinion would not have anyone to look after them?—That is the point of it—if there was anyone to care for them they could take them.

29291. As a rule, the people who go to workhouses are people who have no relations or friends to take an interest in them?—The majority. Of course there are some cases. There would be no hardship in the world in amalgamating our union. I have a converging union around me—Tipperary, Kilmallock, Malvern, Fermoy, and Clonmel. I don't think you could take a centre anywhere that would be more

Chairman, Mitchelstown Union, examined.

than ten miles from either of those, and the people, naturally, would wish to go there, because they think better of the other institutions than they do of ours. I have known of instances where people went out of my own immediate district into Kilmallock Union to qualify for that hospital—they don't care about ours.

29292. Why is that?—They seem to say they are not as well treated and cared for, and there must be something in it, because we could hardly get a cut drier there but we must telegraph for an expert from Cork. We had one last week.

29293. Would you entirely close the hospital or keep one there?—Our hospital is isolated from the main building, and we could keep that.

29294. As a hospital for acute and serious cases, that could not be removed?—Yes.

29295. You think that would be quite sufficient?—More than sufficient; but it is better to have it, all the same.

29296. The lunatics you would send to the asylum?—It is no place for them; it is a pity to see them there.

29297. The children?—Out they would go; I would board them all out; then they would become useful for the country people.

29298. Tramps?—I would deal with them very sternly; they are the greatest blot we have in the whole thing. If they were properly weeded out our average would be down nearly half. They are a perfect nuisance to the country, and dangerous, too, especially in the summer time. They go round sleeping in farmers' yards and places, and we have a lot of burnings that we have to pay very dearly for in account of these people. If they go into a farmer's house, begging, and are refused, they will, perhaps, burn his place down.

29299. Do you think that these notorious vagrants and tramps, for their own good and the good sometimes of their little children, should be brought before magistrates, who should have power to commit them to institutions, one for the whole province of Munster, where they would be kept at hard work?—Yes; I would put them into a labour colony, or something of the kind.

29300. As regards outdoor relief, do you think the area of charge is satisfactory?—Oh, it is, as we are.

29301. There is a question that affects you at Mitchelstown a good deal. You are in two counties. What would you do, then—you have two District Councils there?—Yes, Cork and Limerick—No. 1 and No. 2.

29302. At present the outdoor relief is on both rural districts. If the workhouse were closed, what sort of charge would you have?—Divisional rating certainly, and let each division account for itself. We are up 50 per cent. on account of union rating. What

is everybody's business is nobody's business—they take no interest in it. My district runs within three miles of Fermoy, at Knocklong Railway Station, and from Kildorrery, it is very near Claghogue. I am chairman for a number of years, and was long a Guardian, and I am nearly a proper relief; but what else have I of regulating outdoor relief so far from me? I got so much annoyance as chairman—some relief being put on to-day and taken off to-morrow—that I made a rule there should be a notice of motion, so that every Guardian could see for himself, and that stopped it a little. When it was divisional rating a man had to pay himself, and was watched by the ratepayers; now he is more charitable, when the man in Limerick sees

the man in Cork has to pay portion. It is a common pot, a regular hotch-potch.

Sept. 22, 1905.

29303. Of course, going back to the old divisional rating would be very hard, and might be considered unfair on towns—I would not think so, because the class of people that are harboured in towns are the people we want to get rid of. The deserving people don't go into towns. The town rating in my district is very low. A farmer pays, pro rata, on his farm more than twenty of the slightest shopkeepers in the town. Beggars or tramps go into the country begging, and then they go to the town in the evening, and spend what they get in the shops—the shopkeepers have the benefit of the farmers' charity in the evening.

Mr. W. W. O'Dwyer.

Mr. WILLIAM MANNING, Manager, Mitchelstown Union, examined.

29304. CHAIRMAN.—Now, we would be glad to hear the evidence which you wish to give?—It is in reference to the number in the house. I had expressed my views on this question before I became master.

29305. Give us the opinion you expressed?—There are only about 120 at present in the house, and between ten and fifteen of these are in the infirmary, and the cost of nursing and medical attendance alone at present is about £3 a week; it is nearly £6 all the year round, exclusive of the cost of maintenance. The maintenance for the infirmary and for the attendants, the whole staff, is about £900 a year for 120 persons.

29306. Do you think it would be better to close the workhouse?—Well, I think it would be better put to something else—the Limerick side to go to Kilmallock and the Cork side to Fermoy. I don't see there would be any grievance on the poor—the aged and infirm. A great many would be kept at home if there was a share of relief given.

29307. You have not been long an officer?—Seven years.

29308. And your pension would not be very material?—It would be small, I expect. I am a small ratepayer in the union.

Mr. WILLIAM MANNING.

29309. You think it would be quite possible, without hardship to the sick, to close the workhouse?—I think so. The house was built to contain 600 people; there are about 120, on an average, now. I think it would make an industrial school for the male and female children of the county, or for the imbeciles, as an auxiliary house to Youghal; it would be more advantageous to the public.

29310. You were for some years a Guardian?—I was. It was at that time I acquired any knowledge I have of the Poor Law system. I was in close association with the old officials, and I made it a study, and I think it is quite unnecessary to have so many workhouses.

29311. Do you know the feeling of the ratepayers generally to be in favour of these views?—I do, sir.

Mr. W. W. O'DWYER, J.P., further examined.

I forgot to mention about these women with children. Send them off to a penitentiary, under some religious body, where they could be trained as good servants, and take the children from them.

29312. Where they could get a fresh start again?—Yes; because many of these would be very superior people if they got a start.

29313. Under the present system they are not often reclaimed?—We are handicapped with these for years,

because they are rearing their children in the house, and we cannot send them out.

29314. And they deteriorate in character?—And the worst of it is they don't serve other people. You are looking for a vocationism, of great expense, now; we will give you our Mitchelstown Workhouse. We have ten acres of land round it, and any amount of scenery and Geline air, and you need not go in for sheltia. We won't be very hard to bargain with, if you take that white elephant off our hands.

Mr. W. W. O'Dwyer.

Mr. R. E. LONGFORD, M.P., Mallow, examined.

29315. CHAIRMAN.—The Mallow Board of Guardians have considered the question of amalgamation?—I don't think we have ever had it before us, but we have considered it.

29316. Personally, if Mallow Workhouse could be applied to some other use, the greater part of it, keeping the hospital, do you think the Guardians would be in favour of classifying the present inmates, and putting them elsewhere? Supposing your aged and infirm were kept at Mallow, and you took into Mallow Workhouse the aged and infirm from other surrounding unions?—I don't think we ever thought we could close Mallow Union.

29317. That did not seem to be possible?—No, I don't think so. We have a very considerable number of inmates.

29318. But a great many of these could be drafted elsewhere—the children, for instance?—I would be in favour of boarding out the children.

29319. So that you would have no children in the future workhouse. Then, as regards the mothers of those children, would you be in favour of putting them in penitentiaries, under religious management, according to the belief of the penitents?—I think that is a very difficult question. I don't think you must assume of necessity that every woman who has had an illegitimate child must be classed as a woman of bad character.

29320. It is quite the other point of view. Putting into the workhouse a girl who has fallen, she speedily becomes demoralised. The point of view in which

the suggestion was made to us was that such a girl should never be put into association with other women who had fallen in that way; that she should instead be sent to a religious institution, with a view to her reclamation within, say, a year or so; that she should have her child with her in that institution, and nurse her child; and that as soon as it was fit it should be boarded out, and the mother should be placed in a situation, or put forward again in life?—It sounds a very good plan. The only danger I see is, that it might tend to the increase of illegitimate children, if it is made too easy.

Mr. R. E. Longford.

29321. Don't you see, on the other hand, it would tend to a reduction in the number of illegitimate children, as regards this particular woman?—It would be very good for the individual; the question is, whether it would tend to bring other individuals into the same position.

29322. That is a possibility. But take the individual herself first: The woman who falls, certainly, has a bitter time of it, and when she is approached and influenced for good at the time of her first fall reclamation might be hoped for?—Oh I think so.

29323. She, of course, would disappear most likely from her friends, and there would be nothing to encourage other poor girls to think that they might sin because things would be made so comfortable as possible for them—you don't really think that would operate, or that a girl ever calculates in that way?—I don't say not; I think it would be a great matter to help those.

Sept. 23, 1905.
Mr. R. E.
Longfield.

29324. We have relatively very few in the country, but it would tend to put those who are here back again into a respectable position, as far as possible—Oh, yes, I think so.

29325. Then you would agree to that?—Yes.

29326. Then as regards inmates—I don't think they ought to be kept in a workhouse.

29327. Taking away the children and the mothers of children and the lunatics would give you a very large amount of vacant space; would you object that that vacant space should be used towards making the main body of your houses an institution for receiving the aged and infirm from the surrounding districts—such as Mitchelstown?—I don't it would give an space enough.

29328. As far as your space went, would you be in favour of using it in that way?—I have not considered that. It is a very difficult question, I think; I don't that we could do it.

29329. You could not do it without legislation?—I doubt there would be room.

29330. You would have a large amount of room, for you would exclude a great many classes?—I don't think it would make such a very great difference—taking away the tramps and children and lunatics.

29331. Then, as regards the tramps, you would exclude tramps?—I think the tramps are a very serious question. I have some figures here about them. The total number of admissions to Mallow Workhouse for the year ending 30th September, 1897, was 3,398, and the numbers for the year ending 30th September, 1898, were 2,467; for 1899, 1,868; for 1900, 1,689; for 1901, 1,698; for 1902, 1,584; for 1903, 1,648; for 1904, 1,897. I think it might be well if the Guardians had power to detain them longer than they can at present. They are very often making for races or a fair, and if you could keep them, so as to make them miss it, it would discourage them a great deal, I think; and perhaps it would be a good thing to have them seen by the police before they are discharged.

29332. Would you not be in favour of putting them into a provincial institution, or workhouse, one for the whole of Munster, where these people could be detained under a magistrate's warrant for habitual vagrancy?—A magistrate can send them to jail at present.

29333. Only for a short term; but if power were given to the magistrate to commit for three years?—That is rather a serious punishment.

29334. Not a punishment, but with a view to their reformation?—A great many of them are a great deal too old to be reformed.

29335. At all events, they would be kept from doing much harm?—I think it is very doubtful whether it would work well.

29336. Would you be willing to try it?—Oh, yes.

29337. Then you are not prepared to offer an opinion as to the expediency of making Mallow a county institution, or portion of a county institution, for the aged and infirm?—No, sir, I am not.

29338. Is there anything as regards outdoor relief or any other matter of Poor Law administration you would like to refer to?—The outdoor relief has gone up enormously. We pay in Mallow a little over £2,000 a year; that has risen since the change from divisional rating. In the case of a very poor district, there formerly was power, when the rate reached a certain maximum, to make the balance a union charge.

29339. There was an antiseptic scale, so that they

could get relief in that way—you would go back to that system?—I think so.

29340. You would not give the towns any further benefit than that?—No. Then I think the power of the Guardians might be extended. We sometimes have the case of a very poor family, holding a few acres of worthless land, and we cannot give them relief.

29341. At present the quarter-acre class is a bug. What would you propose to substitute for that?—It is very difficult to say. They might have a dozen acres of mountain that would be as worthless as this face—would not feed a goat.

29342. Would you propose just simply to knock out the limit, and leave it to the discretion of the Guardians to give relief?—I think so, because the acre might be on the top of a mountain.

29343. Mr. MURPHY.—Suppose it was on a valuation of £3 or £5—I would make destination the test.

29344. You would want to place some restriction on giving outdoor relief, and if you could not put it on the number of acres, it could be put on the valuation?—I suppose there might be some limit of valuation. I think the Guardians should judge of it.

29345. Then you would give the Guardians absolute power to give relief to any person who applied?—Destitute person.

29346. CHAIRMAN.—No proviso or limitation?—No; I think not. I think we might try to make the hospitals more popular, and take away the stigma of pauperism from the patients, and we might give them better clothes.

29347. That you have power to do?—Yes, as you have said.

29348. Dr. BRUCE.—How would you propose to make them more popular?—I think they might be made nicer in different ways.

29349. Would you suggest that it should be separated from the workhouse?—I don't think I would go in for new buildings where there are already good buildings. There are many ways in which people of experience could improve the comforts—many small ways to improve the comforts and appearance of hospitals.

29350. The Guardians have a good deal more power than they have exercised?—Oh, yes. I think we have improved it a good deal.

29351. CHAIRMAN.—How many nurses have you in Mallow Infirmary?—Four.

29352. What class of nurses?—Four trained nurses besides the fever hospital nurse.

29353. Was it with respect to the nursing that you saw some possibility of improving the house?—Yes; I think they should be duly qualified. The whole present system is enormously costly; and going through the accounts it sometimes looks as if you could not mend it without ending it. It is too big a question for me. Only yesterday I heard of a case of a cottage home, such as Mr. O'Gorman spoke of. This was in France, and it did not work very well. There could be no supervision of it.

29354. It would not be intended in these cottage homes that there should be any supervision—the idea would be to enable people to live in their former method?—They fought in this one so much so that some months ago happened to live opposite had complained very much.

29355. So you think it would be desirable to have a master or constable on the premises?—I think we must go on as we are, as far as that goes.

Mr. L. BRADEN-CHAMBERLAIN, J.P., Mallow, examined.

Mr. L. Braden-
Chambers.

29356. CHAIRMAN.—You are one of the Guardians of the union?—I am.

29357. What is your view on the question of amalgamation of unions or classification of inmates?—Do you mean my individual view?

29358. Yes?—I don't think I am empowered to mention the view of the Guardians; I don't think we have discussed the matter sufficiently.

29359. What is your individual opinion?—My individual opinion is that I think it would be a very good thing to amalgamate the unions as far as possible in the County Cork.

29360. With a view of saving some of the expenditure that is going on?—Yes; principally that matter of the salaries of officials and nurses and everybody.

29361. If a number of workhouses were closed, keep-

ing their hospitals open, do you think that in some central place, such as Mallow, it would be desirable to keep the aged and infirm of the other districts?—Certainly. I think that the best way would be to give the aged and infirm some extra outdoor relief to enable them to live with their own people. In suitable cases I don't think they would come in at all. Of course there are a few cases that have no person belonging to them at all, and are so aged and infirm that they would need to be minded. They would have to be provided for; an indoor place would be necessary for these.

29362. You think it would be good to have a central institution, such as the healthy wards of Mallow, after removing the children and other classes that might be removed?—I do certainly.

23353. You have heard a good deal of the discussion this morning about removing lamenies, children, and girls who had illegitimate children—you are in favour of that?—Yes; I think that these children ought to be taken away. I know that there are a great number of cases in which women have illegitimate children over and over again. They come into the workhouse; they have a child; they go out again, and the same thing goes on.

23354. It would be less likely to happen if a woman on the occasion of her first fall was not put into such company as this at all, but put under religious influences?—Yes; but it was with regard to the boarding out of children chiefly I meant. These children are kept in the workhouse, and as we are so circumstanced at present, as long as they are not absolutely without parents you cannot board them out, and you are bringing up a lot of children in a very bad atmosphere, and you bring them up in such a way that they are no good to the State. They won't try to work. Whereas, if you had power to take these children and board them out, they would be brought up with industrious people, and be a credit to the State.

23355. Therefore you would be in favour of enlarging the power of the Guardians, so that they could board out all children supported out of the rates?—Exactly.

23356. As regards outdoor relief, you would also enlarge that, so that aged and infirm people, some of whom are now in the workhouse, could be boarded out instead of being given indoor relief?—That would naturally happen consequent on amalgamation.

23357. Quite so, as part of the whole scheme; not if nothing else is done?—No; as long as the institution is there, and being occupied as it is at present, I think the system is all right.

23358. Assuming the system to be changed, then you would be in favour of giving the larger outdoor relief?—Yes; I don't think it would be at any expense to the union either, because my theory is that what you would save in salaries and other expenses of amalgamation would go to augment the sum of money given out for the relief of these infirm people.

23359. And you think it quite possible, on the whole, that there would be a saving?—A saving. In the case of the Mitchelstown Union, and some other unions, they said it was £7 a head for salaries; that divided among 120 people boarded out would keep them comfortably outside. The tramp question is a very large one, and I have probably theories of my own on the question. I spent a good many years abroad, and what is done in Australia, where I have been a good deal, and in New Zealand, is that the State has power there to arrest any person who is a vagrant, who cannot show some visible means of support, and in those cases they are brought before the magistrates, or

authorities, whoever they may be, and if they won't work for themselves they are bound to work for the State; and my idea is that those tramps should go to the police, where inquiries could be made.

23360. Or would you not rather say that the police should look after such people?—What I mean to say is, that they should not go into the union without getting a ticket from the police.

23361. Or even not make them eligible for the union at all; but as in Australia, they should be placed in a labour workhouse, or colony, so that they might be taught habits of industry?—Exactly so. But as against that we cannot lose sight of the fact that there are a number of people who may be on tramp from absolute necessity, and are only going from place to place for work.

23362. Don't you think it would advantage such people if they were going to look for work, they would soon get to know if there was a farm to be filled up by their clergyman or a magistrate, or some person of that kind, that would operate as a kind of passport, to see them safe through the police?—Certainly.

23363. That would be a sufficient protection for them?—I think it would.

23364. And a man having that would not be molested?—The children also of these tramps should be taken from them, because at present they are leading the life that their father and mother are doing, so that they are only bringing up a lot of vagrants in the country—raising them up to vagrancy. There ought to be some means by which these children could be taken from them, and, as it were, boarded out, or put into some place or other where they could learn industry of some sort. It is a large charge this tramp business. We feel a good deal of it. We are on the direct road here, at the Mallory Union.

23365. At the cross-roads going from Waterford to Tralee and from Cork to Dublin?—Yes; it is a very good centre for them. I think another thing might be adopted, and that is, if the law did not step in in the way I say, if the master was to go on as it is, I would suggest that all tramps as they come into the house be vaccinated; it is a top-top thing.

23366. Supposing they were sufficiently protected against smallpox, would you still vaccinate them?—I would vaccinate every one of them; they could not be too protected. I don't think they would come back more than once.

23367. You would rather have the Australian system introduced?—Yes, as a national system.

23368. You are aware that that system exists in Germany and part of the United States of America?—No, I only speak of the countries I know. I have absolute experience of the ones I speak of.

MR. J. J. FITZGERALD, M.C.C., F.R.S., Mallow, examined.

23369. CHAIRMAN.—You are a member of the Board of Guardians?—Yes, and a member of the County Council and Chairman of the Urban Council.

23370. Has the Urban Council considered the matter at all?—No, I have been simply asked to represent them, and my views are individual views. With regard to the boarding out of children, I have rather strong views, being somewhat of an educationalist myself, and being a Guardian who has visited the union very constantly for the last three years, during my period of Guardianship. I think that the present system is hardly worthy of civilisation. These children are reared in an evil atmosphere; not kept in a cleanly manner; and something ought to be done to remove them from the surroundings of the union. With regard to the teaching, of course, they are properly taught them. I don't know whether the Local Government Board have a want of confidence in the ultimate findings of the Commission or not, but they seem to think that whatever the result of your findings will be, that we will have to appoint a schoolmaster in Mallow next Friday. It would be ridiculous to ask us to appoint a schoolmaster if the ultimate result is that the children are to be boarded out. I think the children ought to be boarded out, or, preferably, if you had one good county industrial school, that might possibly contain all the children that are at present cared for in unions.

23371. Why do you say preferably an institution?—Because if you board them out eventually they become added to the mass of agricultural labourers. You

sometimes board them in the vicinity of towns, and they naturally gravitate at once there, where there is no work for them.

23372. You are aware that the boarding out in towns is not possible at present?—I understood that, but eventually they do gravitate to the towns. I would rather give them trades.

23373. That would be a very expensive method of education?—I admit that, but eventually it would pay for itself; you would be decreasing the number of the poorest.

23374. Are you aware tradesmen complain of the difficulty of getting employment in Ireland at present?—I think there will be more tradesmen for which employment, if not immediately, will eventually be found from the industrial revival.

23375. But at present are you aware there is a difficulty in the way of tradesmen getting employment?—Yes, there is.

23376. And there is a dearth of agricultural labour?—I know that.

23377. Don't you think the employment of an agricultural labourer is a respectable, healthy, and manly employment, such as would be an important provision in life for a child who had to be supported out of the rates?—I agree it is both respectable and healthy; but still, previous experience has told us they won't stay at it.

23378. From that point of view don't you think we ought to put as many into it as we can, to help the

Sept. 29, 1904
Mr. L. Fowler-
Cough.

Mr. J. J.
Fitzgerald.

Sept. 26, 1905.
Mr. J. J.
Fitzgerald.

country, which wants labourers!—Yes; I am not at all, of course, for depriving the farmers of labour, but I was looking to the ultimate gain of the boy.

29389. Which would be problematical if he took up a trade?—And not certain if he became an agricultural labourer.

29390. He would have his earning there as long as his health lasted?—Well, of course, I have not thought out the question of the school thoroughly, but I am altogether in favour of having them removed from the union.

29391. Putting them into an industrial school would be spending money on their education, and giving them opportunities of becoming tradesmen, that small retopayers could not give to their children. That would be putting the well class into a better position than the lower class of independent retopayers?—I think when you are doing anything for them you ought not to treat them as absolutely belonging to the well class.

29392. It is not a term of contempt, but they are a well class. The majority are illegitimate, and they have to be supported by the district, and the question is, whether you would put that class into a better position, and give them facilities that could not be got by the independent class?—I have not studied that particular phase of the question; but whenever you put them my own opinion would be, take them out of the workhouse.

29393. Then as regards their mothers?—I would be altogether in favour of a penitentiary.

29394. Then lunatics and all mental diseases?—Yes. I have experience that they are not at present properly cared for at all in the union. Sometimes you meet with caretakers who may be people who take care, and sometimes you meet caretakers who don't take care. An instance came under my notice at Mallow, where imbeciles were without any care for twenty-four hours, and we dismissed the man. Though the idiot ward, as it is called, is, properly speaking, an assistant infirmary, I don't believe it is visited sufficiently by nurses; and idiots require an amount of care which they cannot get in a workhouse.

29395. You would prefer sending these cases to Finghly?—Yes, to another auxiliary asylum. You have sufficient cases in the county to fill another.

29396. You did not refer to the trumpet?—I am entirely in favour of Mr. O'neagh's views.

29397. Then you would only have the sick and aged and infirm left. What do you think might be done with regard to the aged and infirm—not merely looking at it with regard to Mallow, but taking the six or eight unions round it?—The local surroundings and the memory of the past would always be the prevailing sentiment in the mind of the old person. He would have a preference for ill-treatment in his own district to better treatment elsewhere; but that would not justify keeping him in ill-treatment; he would gradually become reconciled to better treatment.

29398. Even that objection is not sustained by experience, because some workhouses have been dissolved, and we have found that the inmates who were moved are just as happy, and in some cases even happier, in the new building?—I think their lot is a very unhappy one as it is at present. Now and then a relative does visit them, but, in the main, their life is a blank. A lady visitor who went to the union remarked to me that the old men appear to get into

the bed and remain there, not because they are actually weak, but that they feel, as they are approaching death gradually, they may as well remain in bed as walk round.

29399. And very often in these rooms there are not any seats with backs, that these people can rest?—There are seats with backs, but not a sufficient number.

29400. As regards outdoor relief?—I would be against it. I am living in the town, but I think it would be a great incentive to towns, even from that individual standpoint, to have the system of divisional rating. There is a natural provision of poor people to towns. Not only have they the outdoor relief to look for, that they can get in the country, but if they want charity, it is natural that where the population would be most that they would get most charity. They will meet with charitable assistance, and have a hundred more chances of picking up something to eat in towns. The towns would suffer greatly by divisional rating, and I don't think it would be right from that point of view to introduce it. The statement was made that there were only four nurses. There are four trained nurses; but I think there is a staff of seven or eight paid nurses in the Mallow Union. The untrained nurses are doing the same work as the trained nurses.

Mr. Longfield?—I spoke about the infirmary. 29401. You cannot say anything about their qualifications?—No. I have to add that I agree with what some previous witnesses said with regard to making the hospitals more cheery. I think they could be made very much more attractive, and I also think that where you have idiot wards or assistant infirmaries that there is a certain amount of temptation to send patients from the main hospitals to these, especially Mallow patients. Two notable cases have come before us recently, in one of which a man was removed from the hospital by the doctor's instructions to the idiot ward, although he was suffering from lumbago. It is a matter sub judice, but the man died the morning after removal into the idiot ward. He had been transferred without any instructions having been given to the caretaker as to looking after him. I think that if patients do become disagreeable, some arrangements ought to be made to keep them in a separate ward, rather than transfer them to a ward for which they were never intended. I notice also in Mr. Longfield's evidence—he lives in the country and I live in the town—but I agree with him with regard to cases where people holding land are ineligible for relief. We have met some really hard cases of that kind, and I would be in favour of having some such limit as £5 valuation. And, also, if a man happens to be in the body of the house, I understand it is illegal to give his wife outdoor relief; it is a hardship that we frequently meet with.

29402. If he is in the hospital she can get it?—Yes; but if he is in the body of the house she cannot get it; and we have known cases where a man has gone in through want of work, and the wife, who has a family, would like to keep her home without breaking it up.

29403. Would you say the head of the family could be in the workhouse and the people outside getting relief all the same?—I think so, in proper cases certified by the relieving officer.

29404. Mr. MURPHY?—You would make it a temporary provision only?—A temporary provision only.

Mr. L. BRASIER-ORRISON, J.R., further examined.

Mr. L. Brasier-
Orrison.

May I add to what I said—that I think the £5 valuation would be very excellent. I know in my own division cases of real hardship owing to that quarter-acre clause, where people were absolutely destitute, and in need of relief. I have two cases which I had to relieve out of my own pocket, sooner than see them in the state they were in.

29405. CHAIRMAN.—You think the £5 limit would be a good change?—I do. It also referred to giving tickets to attend them.

29406. We have nothing to do with the Medical Charities Act?—I mean the workhouse doctor or the

dispensary doctor. These doctors don't like attending people if they have any land at all. I am altogether in favour of divisional rating; because, as it is at present, what is everybody's business is nobody's.

29407. Dr. Bigger mentions to me that there is no limit; any poor person can get medical attendance; a red ticket may be given for a person having £50 valuation?—The general question the doctor asks is, "Have you any land?" If you have land, they won't attend you.

29408. Well, that is irregular!—On the ground that if they have land they must have money.

MR. WILLIAM FITZGERALD, Chairman, Rural District Council, Mallow, examined.

29406. CHAIRMAN.—You are one of the Guardians of the Mallow Union?—I am Chairman of the Rural District Council.

29410. You have heard a number of the other Guardians giving evidence?—I fully agree with them, and I agree with Mr. O'neagh and Mr. Longfield, especially in the case of outdoor relief for the holders of small holdings. One request I wish to put before you—in the case of labourers' cottages, they are excluded from outdoor relief altogether.

29411. That is owing to the quarter-acre clause, but the 65 valuation would let them in?—I know a few cases of it myself, where it was a special hardship, and I would wish that they be included. I know a case

where a young man died, and left a large family of five or six children and his wife, and it is a great hardship on her to have to leave that cottage; and she must leave it if she does not get relief. Sept. 29, 1907.
Mr. William Fitzgerald.

29412. That is a very difficult question?—It is a question that should be looked into. It is a great grievance in many cases.

29413. Those cottages were built for agricultural labourers?—But when an agricultural labourer dies, leaving a wife and young family, how are they to be supported; they must leave the cottage, and go to live in some other place. If that was introduced, it would be a great blessing to the parish. I know of several cases myself.

MR. EDWARD FITZGERALD, F.R.S., Mallow, examined.

Mr. Edward Fitzgerald.

29414. CHAIRMAN.—What statement do you wish to make?—I am in accord with a great deal of what Mr. O'neagh said, with the exception of divisional rating and the vaccination of tramps. I think the vaccination of tramps would be very expensive. In other respects I agree with him with regard to the suggestion he has made as to the extended powers of outdoor relief.

29415. And as regards the necessity for trying to reduce the Poor Law expenditure by re-classification of inmates?—I am in thorough favour of amalgamation, but I would prefer abolition, if it could be done.

29416. You would not propose to abolish the hospital?—No, sir.

29417. You would give outdoor relief to so many as were suitable cases?—Yes.

29418. And reduce the number of aged and infirm?—Yes; and I would encourage a great many of the aged and infirm to go out on the outdoor relief system.

29419. And those that would not be eligible cases for outdoor relief, you think, ought to be maintained in the central institution?—That is the great crux of the inquiry. I would go a great deal in favour of cottage homes, but I am afraid the answer would be rather great; but failing the practicability of that I would be in favour of having them in some central institution.

29420. If cottage homes were established, would you contemplate any caretaker, or should the people be left altogether to their own common sense?—Infirm people are not altogether so delicate. If they were really bad cases they should be sent into the hospital, and my experience of them is that they are pretty well able to take care of themselves. In towns like this you have a pretty good nursing staff and officials, and I would give them a little more to do than at present, by compelling them to visit these homes, and, in addition, you have an excellent Jubilee nurse, so I don't fear there would be any great abuse. I would also, in some cases of outdoor relief, be in favour of giving it in kind, where people, although not actually drunkards are addicted to drunkenness.

29421. Where they could not be trusted to spend the money discreetly?—Yes; and I would limit the supply of goods at a time to them, so that they might not dispose of their bread or goods.

29422. You mean a system such as they have in Dublin, of a daily delivery of food?—Yes.

29423. That would be possible in towns, but hardly in the country?—I think it would be in country places.

29424. It would involve the keeping up of a van?—I think you can establish one supplier for each district. Let them come or send for it. You have a village in each electoral division.

29425. A number of these old people would not be able to send?—I would deliver it in that case.

29426. When you come to distant parts of the country, where people are living up bye-roads, you would find it difficult?—I don't think it would be necessary in these cases, because if these people could not come to the villages they would not be addicted to drink. I would give them cash. I think the system of divisional rating would be very expensive in towns. The tendency is when people get poor to come into

towns. You would have them coming in from all the electoral divisions of the Mallow Union, and if you had divisional rating you would have the poor cast entirely on the rates in Mallow.

29427. Except such relief as you used to get under the law before 1898?—Yes.

29428. And there you might suffer a great deal of hardship before you got to the point that would satisfy you to relief?—Yes. With regard to the quarter-acre of land, I have seen cases where people had three or four acres of land, and were absolutely destitute—people who were so old that they could not work the place.

29429. I suppose they had it let out?—It was too small to let out. The quality of the land was not very good. I may say I am in accord also with a great deal of the evidence given by Mr. O'Gorman; I think his suggestions have been very practical and very good. The tramp nuisance, of course, is one that it is very difficult to face.

29430. You agree with Mr. O'neagh?—Yes; but I think a great deal of use might be made of some of the hedges for the purpose of accommodating tramps. You have a hedge in every large town in Cork.

29431. That would be entirely from the point of view of punishment?—I would not call it that; I would call it better supervision.

29432. If you put a man into an institution and accustomed him to work that would be interesting to him if he was a working man, and the possibility is you will get a number of them, at all events, to take to work?—I am afraid you would not. I have seen some of the best-looking and most able-bodied men you could get in any part of the world going round on tramp. Mallow is pestered with them.

29433. Are there many of these people who have been in the army?—A great many of these—army deserters, and a great many tradesmen. I am not in favour of the suggestion made by my brother, with regard to giving trades to poor boys, because I think, after all, it would be doing too well for them. Of course, the system does exist at the present moment in some of the institutions of the country, such as the Presentation Industrial School, in Cork, where boys who have been committed by magistrates after being deserted by their parents are turned out as tradesmen. We have two or three of them in town, and our experience is that the moment they come out with their trade they turn round and drive vans, or do some other kind of work; the trade is lost on them. One great thing in favour of amalgamation will be the wonderful economy wrought by having one staff instead of seven or eight. This country is the most efficient in the world, and you would have greater efficiency and much greater economy if you had the amalgamation. I am in favour also of the 25 valuation that has been suggested.

29434. MR. MURPHY.—You think that would be better than an indefinite discretion?—I would not give discretion; it is a very dangerous thing on public boards. It may be protected, but I suppose it is common to all mankind to have it abused.

29435. CHAIRMAN.—You would rather, as a Guardian yourself, have certain limits?—Undoubtedly.

MR. JOHN MARCOS, F.R.S., Mallow, examined.

Gentlemen, I don't intend to defend you with my evidence. I fully agree with the majority of the evidence from Mallow district—that is, Mr. O'neagh,

Mr. Longfield, and the three Mr. Fitzgeralds; and I would be for divisional rating; that would be the most economical thing.

Sept. 19, 1905.

Mr. John Madden.

29435. CHAISEMAN.—You are from the country district yourself?—I am; and I believe a countryman pays more rates than a man turning over £2,000 a year in the town. I pay £20 rates on an average, and a man having seven or eight times my income pays £4 or £5 in the town.

Mr. J. O'Leary, F.R.S.,

29437. You think he should be rated on his profits?—If he has poor around him he should be rated for them.

29438. But, except on that point, you agree in the desirability of removing these various classes out of the workhouse?—I am fully in accord with it.

Doneraile, examined.

29439. CHAISEMAN.—You also are a Guardian?—Yes, sir.

29440. Is there any special matter that you would wish to mention?—I hardly believe that if these workhouses were wiped out of existence it would be the greatest boon to humanity, because they are a scourge.

29441. You would go as far as the abolition of the system as you can?—As near, if they could be cleared out, even at a sacrifice of human life. I know it is a very drastic measure. Workhouses only serve three purposes in this country—they are monuments to commemorate the memory of latter days of starvation in Ireland. The second is, they are hotbeds of officialism; and thirdly, they are homes for the creation of paupers.

29442. You find that you have two or three generations in the workhouse?—Three or four generations. I quite agree with Dr. Bigger. Generation after generation of paupers you have in these institutions; and I know myself that the children that are sent to these institutions from these houses become paupers again, however, as soon as they come back into the world again with inside, they only drift back into the army, and return back to the poorhouse, where their fathers and mothers left them.

29443. You would not propose to do anything to take away assistance from the sick?—No; I would propose a cottage hospital in every town and hamlet in Ireland, and a dispensary doctor to look after them. There is a portion of the population that I represent that are suffering under a great grievance with regard to doctorship. There are men that actually die, never seeing a doctor or doctor's medicines; the best portion of the community, the working population, small farmers, whose valuation is under £50 or £40, these men never see a doctor, and die without a doctor. With regard to outdoor relief, I would be in favour of its being largely increased to these poor people; and I certainly agree with Mr. O'Gorman, that cottages or houses should be got in a town. I know it myself in my own district there are decent old women that won't go into poorhouses, because they won't rub shoulders with contaminated people. If these houses were taken for them, and give them a little cash, they are quite well able to manage for themselves, and do so. In Doneraile there are a lot of old women only getting 1s. 6d. a week; there is 1s. of that going for rent, and they have to exist on the 6d., but we have, under the presidency of Canon Sheehan, a St. Vincent de Paul Society in Doneraile, and that every week supplements the 6d. by 2s. 6d. or 2s. in kind, not in coin, to these poor people. That actually keeps them, and these poor people will not come in here, and yet they would exist outside if they had nothing to do, only live on the 6d. a week and the charity of the neighbours to give them a little until the St. Vincent de Paul Society was started.

29444. Is that society maintained altogether by local contributions?—By local contributions.

29445. Charitably disposed people place a sum of money at the disposal of the committee?—Yes, and they inquire into every case very carefully, in fact too carefully.

29446. Mr. MURKIN.—You believe in giving it in kind?—Yes, to giving it in coin. In Mallow Union the statistics is £2,000, and it is the firm belief of every one of my constituents that 50 per cent. of this money is spent in drink, and it is not a terrible thing that in Mallow Union £1,000 is spent in Spanish and Crawford's porter or Gilbey's whiskey—is not that a scourge?—out of the rates. If it was given in kind it would prevent those people coming forward, because if they get a coupon from the relieving officer they cannot turn it into drink.

29447. CHAISEMAN.—They might?—Not to give them the power to do so; it is very difficult to stop it, because I know cases in which these orders for relief in kind are given to a man or woman, say for a quartation of tea, and they may take that out in stout.

29448. It would be marked as tea—that would be a

fraud of the shopkeeper himself?—It is not considered much sin, you know.

29449. Mr. MURKIN.—If the coupons were made payable only in houses that have no licenses?—That is what I was going to suggest.

29450. CHAISEMAN.—Have you many provision houses in country towns that are not licensed?—We have in Doneraile—the Co-operative Society and several bakeries.

29451. Most places that sell tea have licenses?—There are a share of them. There are fifteen public-houses in Doneraile to a population of 500. With regard to idiots, I would certainly say an institution such as Mr. O'Gorman suggested would be the proper place to put them.

29452. Then as regards tramps?—I am in favour of a colony for them, and making them work for their existence. They are a scourge to society, and if you have so many poor people coming from any locality to every official; all the rest are tramps. As long as the numbers are up the officials will be kept there. That is a fact; it is no hearsay at all. I know it full well. From my place alone there are only one or two poor aged women. I take care of those; all the rest are the travellers of the highway.

29453. So you think it would be even a more important matter than it seems at first sight to abolish the tramps?—I certainly say so, and take the children from them; and certainly the country is the proper place to board them out. No man need be ashamed to be a decent labourer; I, as a small farmer, call myself a labourer, and the man who works on the land with me eats the same food as I do, and he is paid £17 or £20 a year. And I cannot after ten years say I will see myself with £10, because every penny goes to the landlord under the frightfully cruel, harsh, and tyrannical land system we have in this country. Any man need not be ashamed of being a decent labourer; they are the best of men. Any man whose hand is turned from honest toil may say he cares for no man. Most of the tramps are shoemakers and bakers, and these are men that were turned out from these institutions with trades. Labouring is the very best trade that these people could be put to; it is free and healthy. You get open air and good meals, such as you won't see in towns; it is there you will find the best of men and women. I would suggest that the children be put into the homes of cottagers, where they will get a very good training, morally and otherwise. It is a great grievance that poor people cannot get the service of a doctor.

29454. It is a grievance they need not stay under—If a person is poor he is entitled to relief?—If a farmer has four or five cows or a couple of sheep the doctor will say, "Here you my money," and he won't go to him except he gets £3 in his hand.

29455. Mr. MURKIN.—You issue him a ticket, and say him?—I would wish to have that publicly known, for if it was publicly known people would avail of it.

29456. CHAISEMAN.—If the man is poor?—You say he has means, but he has not, owing to the system of land tenure in Ireland.

29457. Dr. Bigger.—Would you be in favour of paying the doctor of the district a proper salary, and exclude him entirely from fees—make him available for everybody?—I certainly would. It is a system that should be largely brought into use in this country.

Mr. Madden.—We would all fall in with that suggestion.

Dr. Bigger.—As long as you have the dual system there must be a line of demarcation between the two.

29458. CHAISEMAN.—Any poor person is entitled to medical relief?—I knew a poor woman myself, and her family happened to have the misfortune to get typhoid fever, and she only had ten acres of land, a couple of sheep, and a couple of cows, which in most cases she was grazing on the road, and that woman had to pay a doctor's fee. After paying all the expenses of the sickness she had to pay the doctor £10, whereas her rent was £10 a year also.

Mr. E. E. LONGFIELD, D.M., further examined.

May I say one word about the consumption hospital. I think a witness from Mitchelstown suggested the workhouse there might possibly be used as a sanatorium for consumptives. I am on the Joint Hospital Board and on the sub-committee. I attend every meeting, and I take a great interest in the subject. The question of the site was decided by a considerable majority. I don't like to appear to differ from my brethren, but in this matter I am very much afraid a huge blunder has been made. No later than yesterday a doctor, quite unconnected with the scheme, was talking to me, and he had not language strong enough to condemn the site that is chosen.

CHAIRMAN.—That is hardly for us.

Mr. Longfield.—May I ask do the Local Government Board do anything further in the matter?

CHAIRMAN.—We have nothing to do with that. Our position is this—if there is a workhouse that could be closed, we have got power to recommend that it should be assigned for any useful purpose, such as a sanatorium.

Mr. O'Gorman.—It has been stated that I represent no one but myself. I have been a member of the County Council since the Local Government Act passed, and I have been a member of the Ferny Board of Guardians, elected again and again.

Sept. 28, 1905.

Mr. E. E.
Longfield.

The Sitting terminated.

ADDENDUM.

MEMORANDUM for the consideration of the IRISH POOR LAW COMMISSION, drawn up by a special Committee of the Irish Division of the Medico-Psychological Association of Great Britain and Ireland.

[Page 337. Question 16076.]

1. The question as to the provision of auxiliary asylums for the treatment of the insane poor at present in workhouses must necessarily affect the general condition of the district asylums. A reduction, or an increment, of patients must follow in case such auxiliaries are, or are not, established, on the recommendation of the Commission.

2. Hence it is evident that the question is one which materially affects the administration and finance of the district asylums, and is one in which the Resident Medical Superintendents are especially entitled, and are particularly qualified, to express opinions based on valuable experience.

3. If it is decided to establish auxiliaries on one or other of the lines laid down by the Act, the erroneous opinions which led to the framing of such propositions should be reviewed with the object of their correction as to (1) the proper standard of care for the special classes of the insane, and (2) the extent to which that standard has been reached in this country.

4. It is submitted that the insane require particular lines of treatment, as regards which, for administrative purposes, they may be broadly divided into acute and chronic. The former need the specialised system of a hospital, the latter the care and treatment of a home or refuge, with special precautions for the safety of the inmates and the protection of society. It must be borne in mind that the chronic insane include very many cases dangerous to themselves and others, while of the rest the habits are frequently such as to call for constant care. The bodily health of this class is almost always depreciated, and often requires close medical attention. The lunatics at present in workhouses belong to both classes.

5. It is submitted that in Irish asylums the highest degree of perfection has not been generally reached in the treatment of either class, hence the ordinary district asylum cannot be fairly taken as forming such a standard as could be lowered, consistently with efficiency, in fixing the limits necessary in a less specialised asylum for the chronic and feeble class.

6. It is submitted that the standard, such as it is, in district asylums involves considerable expense, and the relief from Imperial funds to local taxation still leaves a burden which may be thought heavy under the special circumstances of this agricultural country.

7. The question then arises as to the wisdom of establishing a new set of institutions which are to be supported in a still greater degree by local taxation, and which are to receive a grant-in-aid half the amount of the sum which is inadequate to the needs of existing institutions.

8. It must also be remembered that in the workhouse the insane cost relatively more than the other inmates. The actual establishment charges cannot be arrived at, but, apart from these, the cost of maintenance in many unions amounts to 6s. to 7s. a week per head.

9. Yet, at this stated cost their condition was so deplorable that certain sections of the Act of 1838 were designed to effect those improvements which humanity demands.

10. It is difficult to see how this end can be efficiently and economically effected in the new establishments contemplated, if such are to enjoy the care and supervision by a competent staff, which are essential to their well-being.

11. It would appear that any measures of success which is likely to attend the proposed new departure would be in the direction of creating the auxiliaries as special departments of the existing district asylums. The continuation of establishment charges, the facilities for more specialised treatment of the different classes of the insane, and the utilisation of an experienced resident medical staff, would tend to a higher degree of efficiency, and hence result in a possibility of that economy which the Act contemplates.

12. We are, however, of opinion that the grant of 2s. should be increased, as it is clear from the actual cost of lunatics in workhouses, and in district asylums, that neither efficiency nor economy will be promoted, under the present terms, by the creation of auxiliary asylums for the insane in workhouses, many of whom will require greater care and more skilled treatment than the estimated limit of expense could possibly allow.

13. In any future legislative measures for the care of the insane, it is our opinion that the system of boarding-out patients in families should be legalised, and also that sanction should be given to the payment of the rate-in-aid for the maintenance of patients on probation for long periods, a system successfully operating in Scotland.

14. We are strongly of opinion that the mental condition of a number of persons who come and go through the Irish workhouses should be made the subject of serious investigation. These people are often weak-minded, sometimes personated imbeciles. They tend (especially the women) to the perpetration of vagrancy and larceny among the population. This class seems hitherto to have escaped attention.

[Note.—The figures refer to the numbers of the questions.]

A.

AGED AND INFIRM INMATES OF WORKHOUSES.—(See "WORKHOUSE INMATES—AGED AND INFIRM").

AMALGAMATION OF UNIONS:—

Would be unworkable, owing to local differences and interests, unless despotic authority to carry it out were temporarily vested in some Board.—*Lofan, Dr.*, 242.

Desires such as would set free workhouses for treatment of particular classes.—*Montague, Lord*, 504.

Under present facilities of intercommunication it seems advisable.—*Scott, Miss*, 690.

In favour of County Councils, but the Boards of Guardians should be retained in their respective districts.—*Corry, Mr.*, 3755.

There are a great deal too many workhouses in the country.—*Thompson, Dr. E. C.*, 5527.

The joining of Gort with Oung and Strahan resulted in an average reduction of 4d. in the £ in the rates.—*Clarke, C.*, 5551.

There should be only one workhouse centrally situated in each county.—*Scott, Dr.*, 7287. See also evidence of *Strathairn, E. W.*, 8254; *Payson, E. B.*, 13337; *Wolke, P.*, 25354.

Would not effect any economy.—*Payson, T.*, 15515-17; *Loxley, M.*, 24465; *Murphy, J.*, 28933.

Would result in a substantial saving to the ratepayers.—*Maguire, P.*, 22235; *Moore, W. N.*, 3792.

Would reduce the number of tramps by making the distance between the workhouses greater.—*Moore, W. N.*, p. 755; *McCurry, J. S. P.*, 11430; *Crauford, E.*, 12590; *Shawley, J.*, 22261.

Would be undesirable unless union rating were abolished.—*Loxley, M.*, 24705.

If carried out local bodies should be retained to administer the affairs of their own districts.—*Loxley, M.*, 23706-8.

The whole system of union treatment ought to be amalgamated, and a National rate.—*Harrington, T. C.*, 15492.

If workhouses were long distances apart the aged and infirm may not go to them, but ask for outdoor relief instead.—*Symonds, N. J.*, 17635.

Is necessary in the interests of economy and efficiency.—*Meekes, P. A.*, 18005; *Fitzgerald, E.*, 25433.

The Thomastown Guardians are in favour of, if outdoor relief be made a divisional charge, and a per capita rate charged for maintenance in another union.—*Murphy, N. J.*, 12521-2.

Would be beneficial where a number of workhouses are near one another.—*Doyle, P.*, 17785.

Would abolish unions entirely, and delegate to dispensary districts committees the control and management of Poor Law Relief.—*Cogan, D. J.*, 19233-35.

The divisions of existing unions, and Boards of Guardians should remain, and the latter be empowered to board their paupers in another workhouse.—*Higgins, T.*, 24455.

If universally carried out the ultimate saving would not be as large as supposed.—*Clear, R.*, 23545-54.

In favour of, generally:—*Howard, Major*, 5478; *Clarke, P.*, 5530; *Thompson, Dr. E. C.*, 5527; *Callaghan, W.*, 5350; *Clements, R. S.*, 5923; *Jordan, J.*, 6017; *Belmore, Earl of*, 5142; *Leahy, H. B.*, 5225; *Smyth, J.*, 5443; *Corry, Vincent*, 5227; *Taylor, T.*, 7033-4; *Crauford, T.*, 7264; *Taylor, Rev. J. W.*, 7675-5; *Wade, P.*, 7715-6; *Kierman, H.*, 7753; *Smyth, E. H.*, 7608; *Farson, B.*, 8057; *Daly, J.*, 8255; *McGovern, T.*, 8405; *Johnston, R. H.*, 8445; *Strathairn, E. W.*, 8213; *Gilligan, J.*, 8377; *Porter, J. K.*, 11269; *O'Meara, M.*, 12555; *Brennan, H.*, 22517; *Martin, M.*, 22553; *Wyle,*

AMALGAMATION OF UNIONS:—continued.

G. C. E., p. 764; *Gaffney, P.*, 22775; *Moore, W. N.*, p. 755; *Fitzgibbon, J.*, 22222; *O'Rourke, T.*, 23945; *O'Dowd, P.*, 23640; *Hogan, J.*, 25198; *Burke, P.*, 25757; *Barrington, J. B.*, 25803; *McInerney, J.*, 25827; *Farson, Mrs.*, 25497; *Fitzgerald, P.*, 25530; *Doonan, Miss*, 25534; *Clear, R.*, 23933; *Kellick, D. C.*, p. 964; *Gallagher, D. J.*, 23054; *O'Brien, P.*, p. 975; *O'Garra, D. L.*, p. 975; *Brasier-Craugh, L.*, 23255; *Fitzgerald, E.*, 23415.

Opposed to:—*Ryan, Dr.*, 2333-5; *Smith, T. J.*, 23557; *McDonnell, P.*, 23119; *Kearney, A.*, 18728; *Mallin, J.*, 24284.

Boards of Guardians in favour of amalgamation generally, but who consider that their own union ought not to be taken up:—*Athy, 12355-60*; *Ballynathan, pp. 151 and 157*; *Hanbury, 4781*; *Belmont, 23551-1*; *Donaghy, 4773-3*; *Glenice, 322-31*; *Kilmackinagh, 23952*; *Lisnace, 30591*; *Lisnashan, 553-4*; *Longford, 15155-201*; *Loughrea, 24412*; *Malford, 3708*; *McNeill, 22775*; *Monaghan, 7559*; *O'Donnell, 2555*; *Rathdown, 19255-7*; *Rathfriland, 25454-7*; *Roscommon, 22251-3*; *Stranorlar, 4945-7*; *Thurles, 21359-60*; *Town, 24454*.

Boards of Guardians in favour of the amalgamation of their union with others:—*Carrick-on-Shannon, 22724-8*; *Carrick-on-Suir, 21520*; *Castlecomar, 18372*; *Dunfanaghy, 4038*; *Enniscorthy, 25001*; *Ircuborough, 5617*; *Killala, 23455-5*; *Malton, 25101, 25203*; *Mishelstown, 22285*; *Portlanna, 24254*; *Scariff, 25135*; *Strickstown, 23314*; *Tobacco, 23245*.

Boards of Guardians opposed altogether to amalgamation:—*Abbeyleix, 17912*; *Ardee, 12649*; *12771*; *Ballyborough, 3735*; *3759*; *Ballinacorney, 23758*; *Ballycastle, 9979*; *Ballymahon, 15303-6*; *Ballyrobert, 15276*; *Ballinglough, 19219*; *12328-8*; *Birr, 15227-30*; *Borrisokane, 21854-5*; *Caher-civan, 27005*; *Carlow, 18785*; *Cashel, 21455*; *Castlerea, 23255*; *Castledown, 7632*; *Castle-lough, 5132*; *Castletown, 23227*; *Colbridge, 15519*; *15523*; *Clagheen, 21577*; *Clogher, 5123*; *Clonsilla, 27032-2*; *Coothill, 5571*; *Cork, 25549*; *Corrofin, 25233*; *Croom, 22075*; *22043*; *27393*; *Draghda, 13035*; *Drumore West, 22416*; *Dunnamony, 23280*; *Dunshaughlin, 13255*; *Edmerry, 15558*; *15521-2*; *Ferney, 20143-5*; *Galway, 24519-20*; *Glenamaddy, 25074*; *Gorey, 12779*; *Kells, 12471*; *Kesh, 27064*; *Kilbuck, 25128*; *Kilnaboy, 23665*; *Kilrush, 23054*; *Kilsale, 27775*; *Millicott, 25120*; *Monkellow, 24346*; *Monkellish, 25120*; *Mullingar, 14572*; *Nass, p. 600*; *Newcastle, 22265*; *New Ross, 20069*; *Rathdown, 15201*; *Rosara, 22294*; *Sallagh, 12364*; *Skull, 22077*; *Tulla, 22197*; *25250*; *Unlingford, 18728*; *18726*. (See also "DOWRY UNIONS.")

AREA OF CHARGE FOR EXPENDITURE:—

Indoor relief should be a union charge.—*Smyth, L.*, 3219.

It should be a county charge.—*Loxley, A. C.*, 24055.

The cost of the sick should be a county charge.—*Kild, Dr. L.*, 5470; *Smith, E.*, 3753; *Ryan, Dr.*, 2541-3; *Hanbury, J.*, 3374; *Doonan, S. J.*, 17459; *Farson, C. B.*, 18700; *Fitzgibbon, J.*, 22063; *McDonnell, J. C.*, 24559; *Harrigan, Mrs.*, 25735; *Shaw, A. W.*, 25055.

Making the cost of the sick a county charge would favour the confines of cities at the expense of remote rural districts.—*O'Neill, P. J.*, 15923.

Opposed to making the cost of the sick a county charge:—*Shel, D.*, 15355-6; *Byrne, J.*, 16232; *Higgins, Wm.*, 23034-5; *McCarthy, D. M.*, 23994.

AREA OF CHARGE FOR EXPENDITURE.—continued.

The cost of the sick should be a rural district charge—Shannon, *Phos.*, 8793; Butler, *J.*, 21173.

Expenditure was locked into more closely when divisional rating was in force—Higgins, *Wm.*, 93247; Bradford, *W.*, p. 415.

It would be most inadvisable to revert to Divisional chargeability—Byrne, *J.*, 16830.

Consumptives should be a county charge—White, *Rev. H. W.*, 14931.

Lunatics, Epileptics, &c., should be a county charge—Butler, *J.*, 21173.

In favour of the widest possible area of taxation—Jordan, *J.*, 8054.

Towns ought to pay for their own poor—MacDonnell, *Dr. H.*, 12845.

In favour of Divisional rating—Boyd, *J. D.*, 12850; Heenan, *Major*, 5428-6; Kydd, *J.*, 5510; Glencairn, *E. S.*, 8874; Orr, *J.*, 9553; Stevens, *Sir J. H.*, 6637; Magennis, *J. E.*, 9531; Meredith, *W. J.*, 6640; McMahon, *J.*, 9549; Trevel, *D. W.*, 10376-8; Meekler, *E.*, 10976; O'Neill, *J.*, 12823; Jennings, *T.*, 12818; Grogan, *P.*, 12603; Wallace, *E.*, 22710; Gogarty, *P.*, 22777; Grogan, *G.*, 23421; McManus, *M.*, 23442; Walsh, *John*, 22569; McDonnell, *C.*, 23462; Louden, *J. R.*, 22715-6; Jennings, *P.*, 22747; Humphreys, *T.*, 22759-60; Judge, *P. W.*, 22816; Daly, *M. C.*, 24060; Laidie, *M.*, 24077; Mullins, *D.*, p. 804; Grogan, *J.*, 24034-6; Morris, *J.*, 24068; Hogan, *P. J.*, 24745-6; Condon, *M.*, 26015-6; Casey, *P.*, 25247; Hogan, *J.*, 25432-2; Piant, *R.*, 25455-6; Fitzgibbon, *J.*, 25520; McCarthy, *C.*, 25523; McInerney, *J.*, 25533; Maher, *M.*, 25006; Sullivan, *T. J.*, 27105; Neely, *D. J.*, 27175; Norman, *J.*, 26807.

In favour of Dispensary District rating—Shannon, *Phos.*, 8791; Sheridan, *P.*, 8863; Walsh, *P.*, 26429; Wallace, *R.*, 22719.

In favour of Union rating—Clarke, *P.*, 5632; Bryson, *T.*, 10647; Williams, *G. R.*, 10664; O'Hare, *W.*, 11277; Bobb, *J. W.*, 11450; Fryer, *R.*, 11762; McEwen, *J.*, 11502; Bell, *W. R.*, 12079; Deane, *J.*, 12075; Hughes, *P.*, 12086-8; Hardill, *E.*, p. 647; Carpenter, *T.*, 12460; Grogan, *M.*, 14513; McMahon, *J.*, 17669; Deane, *W.*, 18301; Tully, *W.*, 22601; Fitzgibbon, *John*, 22685; Conway, *P.*, 22606; Taylor, *Z.*, 24032; Byrne, *P.*, 24058-9; MacDonnell, *J. C.*, 24509; Lynch, *M.*, 25128; O'Connell, *T.*, 25137; Herley, *T.*, 25569; Reardon, *J.*, 25945; Hayes, *P.*, 25994-5; Harris, *S. P.*, 26020; Sheehan, *J. J.*, 27145; Shea, *D.*, 27179; Farrell, *T.*, 28184; Reardon, *Mrs.*, 28214-5; The Lord Mayor of Cork, 28673; Kelliker, *D. G.*, p. 564; O'Brien, *P.*, 28958-9.

In favour of District rating—Duffy, *M.*, 12019; Seraphin, *T.*, 12007.

In favour of County rating—Thomson, *J. M.*, 11513; Curry, *Wm.*, 13527; Brown, *S. J.*, 17506; O'Ryan, *Dr.*, 21152; Henry, *M. C.*, 23355.

(See also "OUTDOOR RELIEF—CHARGEABILITY OF.")

AGED AND INFIRM INMATES OF WORKHOUSES.—(See "WORKHOUSE INMATES—AGED AND INFIRM.")

B.

BASTARDY LAW—See ILLUSORY CHILDREN.

BEDS, TEN—

Should be provided for by the State—Kenny, *J.*, 662; Peacocke, *C. H.*, 19766.

Those in institutions aided by the Poor Law are trained in industries which are of no practical benefit to them—Kenny, *J.*, 663.

Those who are inmates of workhouses should be cared for in some central institution—Wilson, *R. H.*, 11427; Peacocke, *C. H.*, 19766; Lane, *J.*, 28704.

BOARDING-OUT OF CHILDREN.—

Children over three and under thirteen years should be boarded out—Magennis, *Dr. E.*, 115.

The Dispensary Medical Officer should have supervision of the children—Moorehead, *Dr. T. H.*, 323.

Unless carefully supervised is productive of vast evils—Buchanan, *Mrs.*, 353-4.

BOARDING-OUT OF CHILDREN.—continued.

Infants should not be sent out until two or three years of age—Maguire, *Dr. Katherine*, 586-6; Montague, *Lady*, 603; Montague, *Lady*, 26121.

They should then be sent out—Smith, *Rev. J.*, 586; Stoker, *Sir Wm.*, 10491; 10492.

Scheme of boarding-out, inspection, &c., of R.C. orphans in the archdiocese of Armagh, by means of a fund left for charitable purposes, explained—Rogers, *Rev. Canon*, 12735-45.

Children of all ages should be boarded out—Smith, *Dr. J.*, 105-3; Fog, *Dr. G.*, 189-93; Emy, *Lady*, 26143; Harrington, *Mrs.*, 26160.

They ought to be sent to small cottage homes where they would cost less than in workhouses—Smith, *Rev. J.*, 105-3; 104-8. See also evidence of Hazlam, *Mrs.*, 715.

Children should not be kept in workhouses at all—Hazlam, *Mrs.*, 715; Adams, *T. M.*, 722; McLaughlin, *T.*, 12674; Delaney, *W. M.*, 22677; Connolly, *F.*, 2108. See also evidence of Martin, *Dr.*, 11021; Brown, *S. J.*, 17425; Synnott, *N. J.*, 17079.

Children should be boarded out as soon as possible with young married mothers—Wynne, *Mrs.*, 745.

Those boarded out hardly ever return to the workhouse—Scott, *Major W. E.*, 1227.

While these resided in the workhouses usually do—Smith, *Rev. J.*, 105-3; 104-8; Walker, *W.*, 11033; Connolly, *F.*, 2108; Collier, *R.*, 22774; O'Malley, *P. J.*, 24393.

The children of respectable parents should not be separated from them and sent out to nurse—Mooney, *J.*, 15040.

Suggestions for the care and supervision of the children—Foy, *Dr. G.*, 126-7.

Should be compulsory in the case of deserted children—Cuthbert, *W.*, 555.

Children should on no account be brought back to the workhouse for inspection—Cuthbert, *W.*, 555.

Those that cannot legally be boarded out should be sent to "scattered homes" under a foster-mother—Clark, *Mrs.*, 11110-30; Macintosh, *Dr.*, 11103; Payne, *Mrs.*, 11334.

Children placed in such homes do not get rid of the workhouse taint—MacArthur, *D.*, 11108.

Foster-parents often get attached to children and treat them as their own—Small, *J. F.*, 12032; Green, *Mrs.*, p. 417.

Would send them to industrial institutions instead—Howard, *Major*, 5428-30; Wilson, *Dr.*, 7352-4; Shannon, *T.*, 8792-9; Wallace, *R.*, 22711. See also evidence of Bradford, *W.*, 12043-4; Green, *C.*, 12304; Clark, *Jan.*, 22803; Fitzgibbon, *John*, 22633; Daly, *Jos.*, 22872; O'Malley, *P. J.*, 24273; Harrington, *D. R.*, 23944-54.

Is entirely opposed to the proposal to place children in institutions—Bell, *Dr. Fitzgibbon*, 18049.

Children should be sent out as soon as they can use the food of the neighbourhood, and before they acquire the habits of the workhouse—Higgins, *Wm.*, 22014-5.

Guardians should be empowered to board out with their mothers the legitimate children of widows and of women deserted by their husbands—MacArthur, *D.*, 11108.

They should be empowered to adopt the children of "ins-and-outs" and board them out—O'Ryan, *W.*, 11273.

They should also be empowered to adopt the children of undesirable parents with a view to boarding them out, and at the same time be authorised to control and detain the parents—Wilson, *R. H.*, 11426; O'Grady, *J. S.*, 17729; Meekler, *E.*, 10921; Hazlam, *Mrs.*, 18946-9; Thompson, *Dr.*, Norman, 12131-2.

Only one of about 200 that were boarded out in Newry Union returned to the workhouse—Bell, *W. E.*, 12055.

A number of unions should combine and appoint an Inspector of the children—Rennet, *M.*, 14463.

In boarding-out preference should be given to foster-mothers who would guarantee to support, or provide a situation for, the child after the age limit had been reached—Shaw, *T. J.*, 14553.

The payments offered by Guardians are not sufficient to induce people to take children—Cagran, *Mrs.*, M.D., 426; Clarke, *J.*, 10494;

BOARDING-OUT OF CHILDREN.—continued.

Adams, W., 15493. See also evidence of Healy, M., 30756; Hayes, P., 25933.

Guardians should be empowered in suitable cases to board out children whose mothers are widows—Byrne, J., 16258; Clarke, T., 16317.

And the children of vicious and thriftless parents—Barnes, Chas., 16413; Brown, S. J., 17423; M'Mahon, J., 17944.

And also the children of parents who, through indigence, are likely to remain in the workhouse—Crimmins, W. C., 17328.

Should be left, if possible, universal—Brown, S. J., 17423; Sunderland, J., 17579.

Too close an inspection of the children is undesirable—Fitzgerald, Lady M., 20223-4.

It should be left to the discretion of Guardians to send children either to a town or to the country—Barry, T., 25578; O'Connor, B., 27765.

Would board out all children, but take them back at a certain age and give them an industrial training—Macdonald, J. C., 24267; O'Connor, B., 27778.

Guardians should have a discretion to either board out the children of habitual criminals or send them to a reformatory or industrial institution—Linahan, T., 22560; Lane, J., 28701.

Guardians should be empowered to board out a greater number of children than they can legally at present—Smith, Rev. J. Patterson, 504; Brown, Miss, 606; Montgomery, H. De P., 8204-8; Lindsay, H. B., 6249.

See also evidence of M'Manus, P., 3395; Byrne, Dr., 3529; Swell, J. F., 3289; Strong, Sir J. H., 9586-7; Hamilton, Miss, 10390-305.

Tweed, C. W., 10387; Mapother, T. A. P., 22878; Tully, W., 22509; Martin, J., 24129; Clark, Miss, 11104-5; Macintosh, Dr., 11121.

MacArthur, Dr., p. 376; Barnes, M., 14486; Shaw, T. J., 14528; Brown, S. J., 17415; O'Leahy, Dr., 18467; O'Brien, Capt., 23790; Barrington, J. E., 25814.

M'Inerney, J., 25915; Hayes, P., 25938; Eady, Lady, 26148; Moriarty, Dr. M., 26912; O'Connor, J., 27765; M'Donald, W., 27785.

Farrell, J. E., 28153; Linahan, T., 28558; Lord Mayor of Cork, 28476; Burke, Dr., 28868; O'Mahony, P., 29153; Brannigan-Croagh, L., 29365.

In favour of boarding-out:—Greay, J., 1276; M'Laughlin, Dr. J., 1287; Doherty, W., 1867; Connolly, P., 6186; Burke, R., 6212; Thompson, Dr. E. C., 5985; Jordan, J., 6043; Lindsay, H. B., 6248-50.

Wilson, Dr. J., 6536; Quinn, J., 6705; Graham, Dr. B. G., 6838; Archdale, G., 6870; Curry, Vincent, 6947; Geaney, W. B., 7000; Hall, Dr., 7407-9; Kierman, P., 7580; Wilson, Rev. Canon, 8001; Daly, Jas., 8226.

M'Govern, T., 8418; Ryan, Dr., 8580; Crowley, P., 8636; Smith, T. J., 8611; Johnston, R. H., 8648; Smith, Ed., 8752.

Strathcarr, R. W., 8863; O'Reilly, P., 8828; Sheridan, P., 8849; Sullivan, J., 8865; Fleming, J., 9022-5; Agnew, Dr., 9135; Rice, M. P., 9463; Mervin, S., 9484; O'Keefe, J. P., 10029; M'Elrerry, T., 10127; Boyd, J., 10288.

Tweed, C. W., 10386; Hannan, P., 10417; Clarke, J., 10484; Ferguson, T., 10523-3; Bryan, T., 10540; Wilson, Dr., 10718; O'Connell, Dr., p. 384; Gill, J., 10835.

Ward, G. E., 10939; Walker, Wm., 11033; Cope, Ed., 11100; Smith, Dr. B., 11146; Macintosh, Dr., 11123; MacArthur, Dr., 11197.

O'Hare, W., 11273; M'Conne, J. S. P., 11282; Wilson, R. H., 11400; Thomson, J. M., 11539; Dickson, G., 11549; Johnston, J., 11673-6.

M'Connell, G. B., 11785; M'Keay, J., 11845; Porter, J. K., 11855; Swell, J. F., 12032-3; Green, Mrs. M., p. 417; Andrews, T., 12192.

Crawford, S., 12235; Filgate, W. de S., 12703; O'Meara, M., 12867; Sheridan, T., 13012; Feysda, E. B., 13239; Moore, A., 14031.

Faughan, J. S., 14583; Keay, Dr. J. M. S., 15347-9; Adams, W., 15401; Shaw, Dr., 15554; Moore, M., 15594; Garphy, P., 15640.

Hackett, G., 15670; Byrne, J., 16214; Rooney, M., 16239; Harrington, T. C., 16437; Bobbett, W., 16618-9; Conlan, J., 16625.

Peard, Dr., 17093; O'Grady, J. S., 17703; Day, J. B., 17908; M'Mahon, J., 17941; Macdon, P. A., 18215; Harrison, H. J., 18284.

Frier-Wandelaar, R. H., 18292; Debra, W., 18392; Hansen, P., 18778; Malloy, M., 18840.

BOARDING-OUT OF CHILDREN.—continued.

Byrne, E. J., 19428; Short, P., 19433; Belger, T., 19945; Fitzgerald, Lady M., 20218.

Doyle, M., 20674; Cunningham, M., 20683; Meany, Lieut.-Gen., 21361; Webb, C. C., 21364.

Manall, M., 25100; Hayes, P., 25938; Canock, T., 25541; Hurley, J., 25973.

Hartigan, Mrs., 25885; M'Inerney, J., 25907; Montague, Lady, 26126; Flavin, M. J., 26346.

Dawson, Miss, 26649; O'Donnell, W., 26785; Moriarty, Dr. M., 26910; Healy, Dr. J., 27160.

Lee, Rev. T., p. 910; O'Connor, J., 27774; M'Donald, W., 27785; Jones, B., 27896.

O'Brien, J., 27971; Clear, B., 28207; Farrell, T., 28177; Bordon, Miss, 28206; Fitzgerald, J., 28325; Linahan, T., 28553; Lane, J., 28701.

Murphy, J., 28312; Kelly, J. H., 29130; O'Gorman, D. L., p. 978; O'Dwyer, W. W., 29207; Longfield, R. H., 29313; O'Leary, J., 29453.

Opposed to boarding-out:—Kidd, Dr. L., 6473; Tierney, Dr., 7041-2; Smyth, J., 7166; Gogarty, A., 13479; Sheridan, P., 13839; Hennessy, Dr., 21426; Daly, J., 23872.

(See also "BOARDING-OUT COMPARED WITH INSTITUTION-REARING FOR CHILDREN," and "CHILDREN.")

BOARDING-OUT OF AGED AND INFIRM PAUPERS:—

Would be better for old people, and a saving to the rates—Moorehead, Dr. T. H., 386.

The Dispensary Medical Officer would be the proper person to have supervision of—Moorehead, Dr. T. H., 383.

Objections to, and dangers of, the system set forth—Miss Buchanan, 608.

Considerable economy might be effected by—Kidd, Dr. L., 1764, 6473.

Would lead to abuse, as those who could be so disposed of are those who now get outdoor relief—Montgomery, H. De P., 6030.

Would extend the principle to married couples, and harmless imbeciles—Swell, J. F., 3406.

The idea is practically carried out in Banbridge Union by granting outdoor relief on a liberal scale—Johnston, J., 11655-7.

In neither desirable nor feasible—Curry, W., 12627; Sheridan, P., 13829.

Guardians should be empowered to board out in a neighbouring union—M'Harpe, J., 10503; M'Conne, Col., p. 382; Andrews, T., 12194; O'Neil, P. J., 15371-2.

The poor would prefer to be boarded-out in their own neighbourhood to being sent to a distant workhouse—Mooney, J., 16002.

It should be left optional with the Guardians to adopt the system—Murphy, N. J., 10333-3.

Would board-out old married couples of the labouring class—Condon, Dr., 15355; Farrell, T., 28177; Walsh, P., 29455.

And also widows with one or two children—Walsh, P., 29456-7.

Grants should be made by Parliament for the purpose—Rice, M. A., 13528-3.

Would empower Guardians to board-out in an institution—Linahan, T., 28572-5.

Guardians should be enabled to rent houses for them in villages, to give them coals, and a few shillings a week—O'Gorman, D. L., p. 978; 28115-7; O'Leary, J., 29453.

They would not be so well looked after if placed in such houses as they are in the workhouse—O'Mahony, P., 29214; Noonan, J., 32013.

In favour of boarding-out:—Byrd, J., 10213; Wilson, Dr. J., 6536; Sullivan, J., 6586; Bayly, J., 10223; Hannan, P., 10415; Clarke, J., 10483; Macintosh, Dr., 11178-9; Wilson, R. H., 11400.

M'Conne, J. S. F., 11421; Sullivan, Dr. P. W., 11404; Sunderland, J., 17381; Debra, W., 18392; Hansen, P., 18778; Penelope, C. H., 19754; Moker, J., 22548; Wallace, R., 22711.

Hayes, P., 25938; Dawson, Miss, 26676; Brannigan-Croagh, L., 29366.

Opposed to boarding-out:—Kierman, P., 7582; Ryan, Dr., 8580; Hennessy, Dr., 13479-5; Hackett, G., 15670; Bobbett, W., 16631; Moyle, M., 18284-5; Byrne, M., 18451; Stegford, Lord, 19424-5; Doyle, M., 20673; O'Gorman, P., 27032-4; Webb, C. C., 21365; Lorcinn, A. C., 23637.

BOARDING-OUT COMPARED WITH INSTITUTION-REARING FOR CHILDREN:—

Advantages of the former system over the latter set forth—Lagden, Dr., 251.

Those boarded out hardly ever return to the workhouse, whilst those reared therein do so incessantly—Scott, Major W. E., 1327.

Children get better training even in small farmers' houses than in the workhouse—Curry, M., 2762.

It is more desirable to train pauper children as agricultural labourers than to give them a higher education, and thus bring them into competition with the children of ratepayers—McCarthy, J., 13235.

The "barrack life" unfit a boy to care about a home of his own afterwards—Barnard, Col., 13093.

The system adopted in Trim Joint School is at variance with human nature—Owen, C., 13355.

Approves of the manner in which children are brought up in Trim School, which is a splendid institution—Clarke, J., 13456.

It is far better for children to be in an institution like the Trim School than to be boarded-out—Dowry, A., 13479; Carpenter, T., 13493; Skelton, F., 13520.

The knowledge imparted to the girls in Trim School is not practical for everyday life afterwards, and it would be better to board them out if proper homes could be got for them—Cullane, Mrs., 13551-4.

Boarded out children turn out better than those reared in Trim School—Hewitt, T., 13788.

Details of the expenditure on the Trim School—Sheridan, L., 13807-945; Kelly, S., 13946-73.

The institution system is radically wrong from its foundation—Owen, C., 13361-2.

In favour of the institution system, as boarded-out children have no future before them—Sullivan, Dr., 13424.

The taint of the workhouse attaches to those reared within its precincts, and children are likely to become more useful members of society if reared in a family circle—O'Neill, P. J., 13531-2.

Boarding out is far superior to retaining in schools or other institutions—Owen, J., 17161; Walsh, P., 20373, 20385; Delany, B., 21571; Foxon, Mrs., 25431; Lee, Rev. T., 27326.

When institution-reared children lose their situation they have nowhere to go but to the workhouse—Cogswell, Mrs. M'D., 467; Egan, Mrs., 17176.

But those boarded out get absorbed in the population—Egan, Mrs., 17173; Healy, M., 20756; O'Leahy, D., 24346.

Children reared in the workhouse school at Cebre frequently return to the workhouse, and some of the boys have become tramps—Egan, Mrs., 17173.

Industrial school boys who do not settle down to regular pursuits become either soldiers or sailors—Egan, Mrs., 17182.

Industrial school boys turn out well—Donovan, St. J. H., 26562-4.

Boarded out children get infused in the population, lose whatever brand of pauperism they might have been on them and become good members of society, but those reared in workhouses usually return to them—Mahan, P. A., 13027. See also evidence of Phelan, C., 13153; Smith, Miss R., 21543; Scully, M., p. 722; McDonald, W. F., 27723.

Institution-trained children are brought up as machines, and turn out very badly—Wanderford, R. H. F., 12245-6.

Boarded out children have a better chance of getting on in life than those reared in a workhouse or industrial school—Byrne, M., 19413; McCarthy, P., 20613-4.

Twenty years' experience in the Millagh Union has shown that children boarded-out have done much better than those reared in the workhouse—Byrne, R. J., 19432.

Children should be brought up in an institution, where they would get technical training—Cocklin, W. C., 20543-60; Byrne, T., 24430; O'Flaherty, T., 26420.

Institution-rearing cannot compensate for the loss of home associations secured by boarding-out—Holland, D., 20077.

BOARDING-OUT COMPARED WITH INSTITUTION-REARING FOR CHILDREN.—continued.

Children should be taught trades in industrial schools, as if a boy has more intellect than an ordinary labourer he should be encouraged to rise above that position—Tierney, Dr., 7031-62.

Children should not be taught trades at the expense of the ratepayers—Healy, M., 20773; Fitzgerald, R., 25633.

Except a few who may have a natural taste for trades—Burke, D., 25318-9.

Children brought up in Glen Joint School are unfit for anything when they leave it—Healy, J., 25425; Harrigan, Mrs., 25634-5; McInerney, J., 25907-8.

Children reared in a workhouse are unfitted for the ordinary duties of life—Foley, P., 26424; O'Flaherty, T., 26478; Foxon, Mrs., 26429; Murphy, J., 26519.

(See also "BOARDING-OUT OF CHILDREN," and "CHILDREN.")

C.

CARPENTERS:—

Should not be admitted to workhouses at all—Grogg, J., 1244.

Power should be given to detain in workhouses for varying periods—Scott, Major W. E., 987-1009; Burke, D., 28335.

Should be detained until they have completed a certain amount of work—McCauley, Col., 11430.

Should be compelled to give twelve hours' notice before taking their discharge from workhouses—Owen, W. C., 17323.

If of good character should get outdoor relief—Thompson, Dr. Norman, 19123. (See also "TRAMP.")

CHILDREN:—

Those under three years of age should be placed in district or cottage hospitals—Mogensen, Dr. E., 117.

Should be separated from adults in workhouses after three years of age, or after they are fit to be taken from their mothers—Buckanan, Miss, 277.

It is not advisable to relieve mothers from the responsibility of rearing—Buckanan, Miss, 270-80.

An abundance of good character, not a pauper, should be in charge of, and the "in-and-outs" should not be allowed to mix with the permanent, in workhouses—Cogswell, Mrs. M'Dowell, 444-60.

If children of widows could be paid for in day industrial schools, the mothers would be free to work, and the condition of the family materially improved thereby—Mogensen, Dr. Katherine, 291-2.

In favour of children being sent from the workhouse to an outside school daily—Smith, L., 3251.

Guardians should be empowered to assume control of the children of destitute persons, casuals, tramps, and other objectionable persons—Macdonald, Lord, 617; Scott, Major W. E., 989; McLaughlin, Dr. T., 1356-9; McGee, J. J., 5124; Thompson, Dr. E. C., 5702; Johnston, R. H., 8543; Davies, Dr., 5237; O'Hare, W., 11273-3; McCauley, Colonel, 11285, 11430; Payne, Mrs., 11329; Eynon, Dr., 11265-7; Robb, J. W., 11430; Johnston, J., 11507; Lockart, T., 11623; Adkins, A., 11703-4; Pryor, E., 11755; McEwen, J., 11879; Porter, J. E., 11931; Bell, W. E., 12061; MacDonnell, Dr. H., 12332; Scragham, T., 12312; Weard, Col., 12395; Peyton, E. B., 12340, 12519; Owen, C., 12354; Moore, A., 24037; Adams, W., 24438; Macdonald, Dr. G. A., p. 635; O'Neill, P. J., 12533-5; Walsh, J., 16538; McDonald, John, 16555; Grogg, J. J., 16561; O'Mahony, W. C., 17227; Wanderford, R. H. F., 12271; O'Connell, D., 12423; Murphy, N. J., 12545; Mogensen, M., 12635; Penelope, C. H., 12739; Stopford, Lord, 12617-8; Pope, P. A., 20151; Fitzgerald, Lady M., 20237; Walsh, P., 20440; Doyle, M., 20560; Burke, T., 22579; Fitzgibbon, J., 22672; MacDonnell, Rev. M., 23734; Cogswell, J., 24034; Martin, J., 24090; Carr, M., 24357; Higgins, T., 24377; Barrington, Miss, 24192; Lane, J., 25600; O'Gorman, D. L., 26211; Brainerd-O'Leary, L., 26374.

CHILDREN.—continued.

If children are taken from parents the latter should have the right of appeal to a court of law—*O'Neill, P. J., 18837.*

Should not be taken from unmarried mothers—*Here, J., 26264-6.*

There is not much necessity for an alteration in the law which at present enables Guardians to take children from objectionable parents—*Mooney, J., 18978.*

Guardians should have complete control over all children maintained by them—*McNab, N., 14163-6.*

Should be admitted to workhouses without their parents, and then sent to industrial schools, or boarded-out—*Moore, W. N., p. 763.*

Industrial outside homes, under an administrative authority, should be established for those who find employment, and any deficiency between their earnings and the cost of the upkeep of the house should be charged on the Poor Rate—*Walter, W., 15334; Clark, Miss F. F., 11118; Macintosh, Dr., 11182; Wilson, R. H., 11432.*

Guardians should be empowered to apprentice for a stated period—*McGee, Colonel, 11295; Hall, Dr., 11332-3.*

Guardians should also be empowered to send crippled children, after undergoing operations, to convalescent homes—*Walter, R. H., 11427.*

Those who are not boarded out should be sent to a large school where they could be taught trades—*McGee, Colonel, p. 322; Hall, Dr., 11351.*

During removal, by magistrates, children should not be sent to workhouses—*Cogswell, Mrs. M. A., 451; Macintosh, Dr., 11183; Wilson, R. H., 11433; Payne, J. G. C., p. 321; Harrington, T. C., 16487; Fetherill, Dr., 17005; Brown, S. J., 17428-9; Wolf, P., 20356.*

Children entering workhouses with their parents should be separated from them—*Cressford, Col. S., 12237.*

Those for whom no homes could be found for boarding-out should be kept in an institution for children only—*O'Neill, P. J., 18837-9; Dagg, J. R., 17993; Webb, C. C., 23324.*

A separate building should be provided in which the Protestant children of the North and South Dublin Unions should be kept—*Dowse, Rev. J. C., 16332.*

Guardians should be urged to send a greater number of, to certified schools—*Evans, C., 18457-8.* Should be a National charge, and not liable to be paid for by the locality in which they come under the Poor Law—*Evans, C., 18453.*

It ought to be permissible to bring children together in one workhouse, to be paid for by the Guardians that send them—*Evans, C., 18453-6.*

There should be some means of giving girls an industrial training before they leave the workhouse—*Evans, C., 18415; Harrington, T. C., 16488; Powell, Dr., 17115; McGough, S., 17141.*

Boys should also get some technical training before being put out to service—*Powell, Dr., 17114-5; McGough, S., 17141-2.*

Every union should have the right to send to an industrial school a percentage of the children in its charge—*Harrington, T. C., 16480.*

The children of tramps should be sent to an industrial school, as if boarded out the parents trace them—*Egan, Mrs., 17181-2.*

Those whose parents are undergoing imprisonment ought not to be placed in a workhouse, but passed on to an industrial school—*Wright, Miss, 17320.*

Should not be brought into contact with the workhouse at all—*Pope, P. A., 20141; Ripples, T., 24475; Fitzgerald, F., 26548; Dowse, Miss, 26648-4; Lord Mayor of Cork, 18974.*

Should not get trades at the expense of the ratepayers—*Healy, M., 20707; Fitzgerald, E., 26423.*

All in workhouses should be either boarded out or apprenticed—*Buller, J., 21173; Fitzgerald, J. J., 20335-62.*

Those of weak intellect should be sent to a central school—*Harrington, Miss, 26135.*

CHILDREN.—continued.

The children of respectable parents should be kept in the workhouse while the latter are in search of work—*Harrington, Miss, 26135.*

Are entitled to an industrial training by State aid—*Harrington, D. D., 26265.*

(See also "BOARDING-OUT OF CHILDREN," and "BOARDING-OUT COMPARED WITH INSTITUTION-REARING FOR CHILDREN.")

CLASSIFICATION OF WORKHOUSE INMATES.—

Acute and curable hospital cases should be separated from the chronic—*Smith, Dr. J., 40.* Does not exist in the infirmaries, and the absence of it is demoralising to the medical and nursing staff, and injurious to the sick—*Smith, Dr. J., 41-5.*

Proportion of suitable to unsuitable cases in hospitals set forth—*Smith, Dr. J., 48-54.*

Bed-ridden aged and infirm persons should be removed from the hospitals—*Smith, Dr. J., 53.*

A number of people get unjustifiably expensive treatment which they do not need, in the hospitals—*Smith, Dr. J., 66.*

Division of inmates into five classes suggested—*Morgan, Dr. E., 115.*

To be of any real benefit necessitates separation in different wards, as the mixing together of people of all ages on the ground of destination is radically wrong—*Buchanan, Miss, 368.*

Fricking wards should be set apart for the second aged poor—*Hemilton, Miss, 484; Smith, Dr. J., 67; Paterson, 515-7; Holman, Mrs., 720; Howard, Major, 6484; Montagu, Lady, 26123; Fenn, Mrs., 26317.*

Would have the common workhouse, as at present, for the vicious, degraded, and idle—*Smith, Rev. J. Paterson, 515.*

The aged and infirm should be treated separately in institutions of the workhouse, type, and the deserving amongst these sub-classified for better treatment—*Montagu, Lord, 630.* See also evidence of *McGee, N., 12384; Byrne, T., 2437-8.*

Special arrangements should be made to preserve young women with their first child from contact with habitual offenders—*Montagu, Lord, 630; Bodley, W., 5087.*

The wards and nurseries should be supervised by Lady Inspectors—*Montagu, Lord, 630.*

Any setting apart of workhouses for the maintenance of different classes would tend to greatly increase the cost without any compensating advantage—*Pearson, D. C., 4571.*

Old married couples should not be separated—*Cogswell, Mrs. M. A., 467; Greig, J., 1253; Larkin, J. G., 3258; Wamsell, Dr., 4443; Thompson, Dr. E. C., 5733; Belmont, Earl of, 6155; Kiersey, F., 7682; Wilson, F., 7765; Atkinson, A., 11702; Andrews, T., 12256; O'Brien, Mrs., 18667; Murray, M., 14250; Ginnell, M., 14379; MacDonnell, J. C., 24516; Montagu, Lady, 26122; Moore, W. N., p. 768.*

Inmates should be classed according to character—*Buchanan, Miss, 403; Larkin, J. G., 3258; Smith, Rev. J. H., 7977; Macintosh, S., 9486; Wilson, G. R., 10323; Wilson, R. H., 11422; McGee, N., 12385; McDonnell, Dr. H., 12337; Hamilton, B., 12507-9; Payne, S. R., 13340, 13346; Murray, M., 14250; Ginnell, M., 14379; Kenny, Dr. J. M. S., 16346; Cogswell, Mrs. M. A., 16793; Crozier, J., 17183-4; Clew, R., 20094-77; Brown, Miss E. M., 22456-64.*

The deserving ought to get better treatment than the undeserving, but the sending of inmates to a distant workhouse would affect both—*Mooney, J., 18901-4.*

Persons suffering from alcoholism should be placed in isolated wards—*Gwynne, Dr., 11354-5.*

Setting apart one workhouse in each county for the aged and infirm would prevent them from entering it, and consequently increase outdoor relief—*Andrews, T., 12395; O'Brien, J., 27933.*

It would be desirable to have such a workhouse for all who could be transferred thereto without injury to their health—*Bodley, R., 5239; Wilson, Rev. Canon, 3035; McGee, N., 3410, 3420.*

Abolished males and females should be in separate institutions—*Dagg, J. R., 17901.*

CLASSIFICATION OF WORKHOUSE INMATES.—continued.

Classification in separate workhouses is necessary if amalgamation of unions is to be carried out—*Walsh, P.*, 20265.

(See also "WORKHOUSE INMATES—AIDS-ROBBER," and "WORKHOUSE INMATES—AGED AND INFIRM.")

CONSUMPTION.—(See "SANATORIA FOR CONSUMPTIVES.")

COTTAGE HOSPITALS:—

The sick and infirm should be placed in—*Magenau, Dr. E.*, 117.

Could not be worked economically in rural districts—*Gregg, J.*, 1250.

Should be established in Co. Donegal, if workhouses were abolished—*Doherty, W.*, 2628-31.

Should be maintained by the union—*Doherty, W.*, 3655.

The districts of Glenties and the Rosses in Co. Donegal should be provided with—*Pearson, D. C.*, 498.

And also Dungloe or Burtonport, and Carrick, and the island of Arranmore—*Farrock, Dr.*, 1120, 4055.

It would not be possible to use them in common for infectious and non-infectious cases—*Farrock, Dr.*, 4869-72.

Patients would not be so well looked after in as in hospitals with a large staff—*Irwin, J.*, 4155-60.

The expense would be out of proportion to their usefulness—*Cuskert, W.*, 6835.

It is necessary to provide them in remote districts—*O'Connell, Dr.*, 20763-3; *O'Hara, P.*, 24506; *O'Malley, P. J.*, 24520; *Hogan, P. J.*, 24532.

Are required in Co. Galway at Carris, Bealaden, Carragee, Liscannoe, Costello, and the Aran Islands—*M'Hugh, Rev. H.*, 24224; *M'Hugh, Rev. M.*, 24355-1; *Moody, Rev. J.*, 24380; *Moody, Rev. J.*, 24382, 24383; *Lofan, D. A.*, 24536; *Farragher, Rev. M.*, 24654-68.

There should be one in each Dispensary District for cases of scurvy and sudden illness—*Clarke, J.*, 10490; *Martin, M.*, 22570-1.

Should be provided where workhouses are abolished—*O'Connell, Dr.*, 10755-8.

There is urgent need for in country towns and villages—*Kirk, Dr.*, 12250-3; *Lynn, Dr.*, 11365-5; *Walsh, P.*, 20471; *O'Leary, J.*, 29443.

Local authorities ought to be empowered to pay for the support of the destitute poor in—*Kirk, Dr.*, 11255-6; *Flanagan, J. H.*, 11495.

Is in favour of a law enabling small fever hospitals, such as Oulart (Co. Wexford), to be converted into, for medical and surgical cases—*Stepford, Lord*, 12851-2.

Would be necessary at Slieve and Waterville, and at Castlegregory or Annascaul, in the event of the amalgamation of unions in Co. Kerry—*Piegan, M. J.*, 26332-7.

One is required at Tarbert (Co. Kerry)—*Foran, Mrs.*, 26520.

(See also "DISTRICT HOSPITALS," "HOSPITALS," and "INFIRMARIES—COUNTY.")

COUNTY AND UNION BOUNDARIES CONTINUOUS:—

A county should be self-contained for administrative purposes—*Doherty, W.*, 3785-83; *Dunlavy, J.*, 1933. See also evidence of *Montgomery, H. De P.*, 5068; *Kirkpatrick, H.*, 6626; *Kiernan, P.*, 7543, 7611; *Daly, J.*, 4226; *Smith, E.*, 8758; *M'Arthur, D.*, 11216; *Johnston, J.*, 11562; *McConnell, G. B.*, p. 407; *Andrews, T.*, 12213; *Curran, T.*, 13429-4; *Moore, A.*, 14012; *O'Neill, P. J.*, 12639-30.

To make unions county units would be very inconvenient and injurious to the sick poor—*Sweeney, R.*, 4271-2.

Opposed to the proposal to confine unions to counties—*McGee, Colonel*, 11413; *Malone, T.*, 12016; *Hackett, G.*, 15525-6; *Ward, J.*, 16570. See also evidence in having—*Malone, P.*, 16798.

The county borough and union boundaries should be continuous in Belfast—*Gill, J.*, 10623; *Johnston, J.*, 11563.

COUNTY AND UNION BOUNDARIES CONTINUOUS.—continued.

The proposal would be advantageous so far as Co. Kildare is concerned—*Brace, S. J.*, 17401, 17432; *Sunderland, J.*, 17676.

It could not possibly be given effect to in Co. Wick—*Low—O'Kelly, E. P.*, 17834.

The contrary view held—*Ogden, D. J.*, 18272-4.

COUNTY INFIRMARY.—(See "INFIRMARIES—COUNTY.")

D.

DETENTION, COMPULSORY, OF TRAMPS OR VAGRANTS.—(See "TRAMPS.")

DISPENSARY COMMITTEES:—

Since their abolition Guardians have lost touch with dispensaries, and they should be empowered to appoint local committees instead to look after dispensaries—*Scott, Major W. E.*, 921-5, 940.

Dispensaries have never been thoroughly looked after since their abolition—*Gregg, J.*, 1256.

Should be restored for the purpose of granting outdoor relief if unions were dissolved—*Seaton, C.*, 16423-4.

(See also "OUTDOOR RELIEF.")

DISTRICT COUNSELLORS.—See GUARDIANS.

DISTRICT HOSPITALS:—

Small ones should be provided in localities at present served by workhouse hospitals; they should be for really hospital cases, and be dissociated from workhouses—*Smith, Dr. J.*, 78.

Workhouse hospitals should be compulsorily converted into—*Lofan, Dr.*, 267. See also evidence of *Farrock, Dr.*, 1120; *M'Grath, H.*, 12367; *Kenny, Dr.*, *J. M. S.*, 15328; *Kennedy, E.*, 17543; *Brennan, H.*, 23520; *Foran, Mrs.*, 26517; *Clear, R.*, 26539.

The County Council, through a Committee, should have control of—*MacLeod, Dr. T. H.*, 245-6; *Collyer, R.*, 23324.

Instead of utilizing dissolved workhouses, it would better meet the general desire to provide a small district hospital in each Dispensary District—*Popd, J. D.*, 13656.

One should be in each town where there is a workhouse at present—*Hoff, Dr.*, 7426; *Kiernan, P.*, 7632; *Cullen, Dr.*, 3422.

Should be so equipped that major operations could be performed in them—*McDonnell, Dr. H.*, 12852.

(See also "HOSPITALS," and "INFIRMARIES—COUNTY.")

DISTRICT SCHOOLS:—

Dissolved workhouses could be utilized as such for pauper children not eligible under the existing law for boarding out; they should be of the regular industrial type, and be inspected by the Inspector of Reformatories and Industrial Schools—*Montague, Lord*, 602, 618.

DUBLIN UNIONS:—

The County Council consider that some effort should be made to relieve the congestion in the North and South Unions—*O'Neill, P. J.*, 12806.

They ought to be amalgamated under the control of one administrative body, and there ought to be a uniform rate for both—*O'Neill, P. J.*, 15806-2, 15806, 15879-81.

Reform could be effected by amalgamation, which would not result in much difference in the rating in the South Union—*Mooney, J.*, 15975-6.

The existence of two workhouses in the city induces the pauper population to go from one to the other—*Mooney, J.*, 15978.

DETAIN UNIONS—continued.

Congestion in the workhouses could be relieved by discontinuing the practice of transferring inmates from the hospitals to the infirm wards—*Mooney, J.*, 15931, 15943.

It would be desirable to have the boys of the two unions housed in one place, and the girls in another—*O'Neill, P. J.*, 15833-5.

And an age classification should be introduced, so that the old might be kept by themselves—*O'Neill, P. J.*, 15935.

It would not be desirable to interfere with the South Union, either by amalgamation or otherwise—*Byrne, J.*, 16125-266.

To amalgamate the two unions would render the concern unwieldy—*Byrne, J.*, 16246.

It is necessary to amalgamate the two unions, or, at least, to assimilate the rates—*Harrington, T. C.*, 16448-50; *Dolaney, Dr.*, p. 503.

As at present constitutes the union with the higher valuation contributes to the maintenance of a smaller proportion of the poor—*Harrington, T. C.*, 16453-3; *Donaghy, T. W.*, 16607.

Amalgamation would lead to economy in administration—*Harrington, T. C.*, 16463.

In favour of the proposal to reserve one workhouse for males and the other for females—*Harrington, T. C.*, 16453; *Donaghy, T. W.*, 16558.

If amalgamation took place, the number of Guardians should be reduced by one-half—*Harrington, T. C.*, 16476.

In favour of absolute amalgamation—*Donaghy, T. W.*, 16508; *McDonnell, J.*, 16877-30; *Carolan, J.*, 16779; *McGough, E.*, 17133; *Crosier, J.*, 17156.

In consequence of the amount of business to be done, amalgamation would not make for efficiency, but a uniform rate is required—*McWalter, Dr.*, 16673, 16728.

The South Dublin Workhouse should be converted into a hospital for the two unions—*McDonnell, J.*, 16812-3; *Patrol, Dr.*, 17042-6.

Classification could be immensely improved by amalgamation—*Patrol, Dr.*, 17095.

Amalgamation would relieve the congestion in the North Union, and be a great benefit to the ratepayers and the poor—*Crosier, J.*, 17167, 17162; *Long, J.*, 17217-8.

Amalgamation would be unfair to the ratepayers of the South Union, and would not effect any saving in establishment charges—*O'Connell, W. C.*, 17228, 17233.

E

EVIDENCE:—

The view that epilepsy is largely hereditary is not well founded, as it is due to various causes—*Foy, Dr.*, 303.

Certain classes of should be boarded out with farmers, but confirmed epileptics should be sent to an epileptic asylum—*Foy, Dr.*, 303-5.

Should always be separated from the young—*Foy, Dr.*, 302.

Suggests the formation of two colonies for the same—*Buckton, Miss*, 371.

Should be removed out of workhouses altogether—*Buckton, Miss*, 375; *O'Connor, Mrs. M. Dowd*, 437; *Kidd, Dr. L.*, 1775, 1671. See also evidence of *McLeish, Dr.*, 11339; *Adams, W.*, 15430; *Shall, Dr.*, 15553; *Crosier, J.*, 17160; *O'Connell, W. C.*, 17254; *Synott, N. J.*, 17664; *Wanderford, B. H. P.*, 18276; *Ogilby, W. C.*, 23239; *Hegarty, T.*, 21350; *Crabb, Miss B.*, 23584; *Ferns, Mrs.*, 26611.

The same should be provided for in a National Institution, which should receive the same capitation grant as a lunatic asylum—*Montague, Lord*, 500.

Separate provision, by settlements in the shape of villages with small auxiliary asylums attached, should be made for, but the permanently insane should be sent to the district asylum—*Stoker, Sir Wm. Flanagan*, 644.

EPILEPTICS—continued.

A provincial institute under the control of a doctor, where they could get suitable employment with proper classification, should be provided for—*McArthur, D.*, 11112. See also evidence of *Macintosh, Dr.*, 11172; *Patrol, Dr.*, 17000-32.

The colony system, with cottages containing a dozen or twenty each, would amply suit the requirements of—*McLeish, Dr.*, 11290.

There should be an institution for the care of the whole country—*McGrath, H.*, 12397; *Sturges, Miss*, 23224.

Boards of Guardians should be empowered to establish a home for the same—*Sturges, C.*, 16363.

Owing to the want of suitable means of recreation and occupation proper treatment cannot be given to them in workhouses—*Sturges, C.*, 16364.

Opposed to any proposal to board them out—*Synott, N. J.*, 17584; *O'Drudy, J. S.*, 17702.

Separate wards in one workhouse in each county should be provided for—*O'Drudy, J. S.*, 17605.

In favour of employing them on a farm—*Pennock, C. H.*, 17728.

Would send them to a separate institution, where they could get special treatment—*Butler, J.*, 21173.

(See also "IMBESILES AND IMBECILES.")

F.

FEVER HOSPITALS:

There should be four, unconnected with the workhouses, in central places in County Donegal—*Doherty, W.*, 3051.

The number of could not be reduced with safety, and in certain localities small hospitals should be established that could be used either as fever or as district hospitals, as occasion required—*Worlock, Dr.*, 4967.

History, financial position of, and scale of charges for patients in the Carrickmacross hospital—*McCool, Dr.*, 8335-40.

Should be abolished, and isolation hospitals in charge of sanitary authorities provided instead—*Byrne, Dr.*, 6333.

Should be separated from workhouses, both structurally and in names—*Byrne, Dr.*, 11364.

Treatment in should be free, in order to encourage patients to enter, and to protect the public—*Kidd, Dr. L.*, 16471; *Salmon, Dr. F. W.*, 15399.

Would retain the present number of, but place them in charge of caretakers, and employ nurses when required—*Hevitt, T.*, 17373.

(See also "HOSPITALS.")

G.

GRANTS (PARLIAMENTARY) IN AID OF LOCAL TAXATION:

The present system of distribution, under which a large sum is given to the rich, and very little to the poor, union, which needs assistance most, should be revised—*McGee, T.*, 8977-80; *Harrington, T. C.*, 16439-53; *Bagley, A.*, 23160-4; *O'Kelly, C.*, 23517-25; *Henry, M. C.*, 23360-3; *Daly, J.*, 23872.

In consequence of the adoption by the Guardians of an insufficient estimate in the Standard Year, the rural portion of the North Dublin Union has since received out of the Agricultural Grant £1000 per annum less than what it is entitled to—*O'Neill, J.*, 17128-33.

Very poor unions should get such assistance as would enable them to keep their institutions at the minimum standard of efficiency—*Harrington, T. C.*, 16462.

GUARDIANS:

The present Boards are too large, and the number of members should be reduced—*Doherty, W.*, 3014; *Peacock, D. C.*, 4588-90; *Lindsay, H. R.*, 6295; *Flanagan, B. M.*, 6334; *Quinn, J.*, 6802; *Byrne, Dr.*, 2650-2; *Small, J. P.*, 6413-4. See also evidence of *Gill, J.*, 10880; *Johnston, J.*, 11554; *Field, J.*, 15560; *Walsh, P.*, 15560.

GUARDIANS—continued:

20493; O'Ryan, Dr., 21155; Butler, J., 21173, 21255; Masey, Lieut.-General, 21229; Daly, J., 22070; Hogan, J., 25034; Harrington, J. B., 25093; Maher, M., 25095; Foley, P., 25412-3; O'Donnell, T., 25552; Sullivan, T. J., 27225; Shahan, J. J., 27149; Healy, D. J., 27175; Shea, J., 27199; Lane, J., 27173.

An electoral division under £2,000 valuation should have only one representative—McLaughlin, G., 4908.

It would be sufficient that Guardians should meet monthly instead of weekly—Smith, J., 5493; O'Rourke, E., 2224; Small, J. P., 9415.

In favour of dispensary district representation—McGovern, T., 9431; Johnston, R. H., 8673.

It should be an essential condition of the amalgamation of unions that the number of Guardians be reduced by one-half at least—Jordan, J., 6049-51; McGovern, T., 8447-8; Edwards, C., 12078; Mooney, J., 12079-81. See also evidence of Bradford, W., 12023; Louden, J. B., 22705.

In favour of a property qualification for—Mooney, J., 15582-3; Walsh, P., 20494-505.

Would abolish all Boards, and let the ratepayers appoint three paid officers for each union—Coffey, W. C., 25604. See also evidence of Fitzgerald, P., 25333.

Should be disqualified for not attending meetings at least once a month—Bradford, W., 12025.

Boards should have power to co-opt lady Guardians—Hosken, Mrs., 715; Harrington, J. B., 25553; McInerney, J., 25528-31; Fitzgerald, P., 25333-5.

There should be a much larger proportion of women on the Boards, or on Committees—Greene, Mrs. M., p. 417.

Should be allowed to meet in conference, the necessary expenses being defrayed out of the rates—Eaton, O., 16443.

The accumulation of members on a Board takes away from its efficiency—Butler, J., 21255.

H.

HOSPITALS:

Treatment in a hospital is a necessity for the sick who are not destitute, and they ought not to be obliged to seek in through the workhouse as paupers—Smith, Dr. J., 77-3. See also evidence of Watkins, G. R., 19810; Mooney, J., 15531-2; Shaw, M. A., 19334; Gaffney, P., 22527.

An isolation hospital for cases of suspected infectious disease should be in each county—Maynard, Dr. E., 132-3.

There is no hospital in Dublin except the workhouse infirmaries into which a sick person has the right to go—McWalter, Dr., 154.

District hospitals should be established, for treatment in which working people should be asked to pay only the bare cost of maintenance—McWalter, Dr., 154.

One hospital system for each county would raise the standard, and increase the efficiency of—Montagu, Lord, 526.

Should be completely separated from workhouses—Montagu, Lord, 526; Stoker, Sir William Thorneycroft, 522; Warcock, Dr., 1127-8, 1145-7; Darling, Dr., 6245; Agnew, Dr., 6335; St. George, Dr., 10539; O'Donnell, Dr., 10755; Lyons, Dr., 11354; Lawry, Dr., 12033. See also evidence of Curry, W., 12627; Gannon, F., 12559; Mooney, J., 12530; Clarke, T., 12530; McDonnell, J., 12534-5; Powell, Dr., 17122; Kenny, Dr. R. D., p. 599; Brown, S. J., 17433; Dugg, J. N., 17323; Meahan, P. A., 18049; Wandersford, R. H. P., 18229; Wallace, Dr., 22717; Courtenay, Dr., 25228-30; Guinness, Dr. W. A., 27530; O'Gorman, D. L., 28130.

Should be free from direct workhouse control, and each under a doctor, and a matron or superintendent who should be a fully trained nurse—Stoker, Sir William Thorneycroft, 523.

The existing number of should be increased—Reese, Miss, 536.

Patients in workhouse hospitals should not be compelled to wear the workhouse clothes—McWalter, Dr., 155; Laffan, Dr., 278; Ryan, Dr., 5553.

HOSPITALS—continued:

All hospitals in a county should be under the control of a Commission, who would have power to transfer nurses to places where their services were required—Warcock, Dr., 1127-34, 4635-7; Doherty, W., 3853.

For simple surgical and medical cases there are about eighty too many in Ireland. The majority of the counties could be amply served by one hospital of sixty or eighty beds, and a certain number of cottage hospitals in outlying districts (explain scheme)—Kidd, Dr. L., 1745, 6470.

The usefulness of workhouse hospitals could be increased by providing wards therein for private patients under the care of their own doctor—Hegarty, Dr. A., 3163-75.

If workhouses were abolished, the hospitals should be retained—O'Neill, J. B., 3015-7; McGee, Dr., 4198, 4212; Boyd, J., 32571. See also evidence of Andrews, T., 12125; Rogers, Rev. Canon, 12734; Sullivan, Dr., 13413-4; Curry, W., 12527; Sheridan, P., 12528; Gannon, F., 12550; Cullinan, Mrs., 12713; McNaboe, N., 14125; Murray, M., 14238; Keenan, P., 15051; Lawton, Very Rev. Dr., 15235; O'Neill, P. J., 15352; Wandersford, R. H. P., 18227; O'Ryan, Dr., 21149; Maguire, P., 22453-5; Louden, J. B., 22674-6; McNamara, Dr., 22820; Harrington, J. B., 25505; McMeekin, W., 25534; Murphy, Dr. D. J., 25530; Kelleher, D. C., p. 954; O'Dwyer, W., 25523-5.

Would be in favour of the Dublin County Council being enabled to make a contribution to all hospitals within their taxable area if it were believed that they were conferring a sufficient benefit on the sick poor—O'Neill, P. J., 15359-33.

The sick should get medical relief near where they live—Mooney, J., 15540.

Amounts contributed by the Denagel County Council to the Letterkenny Fever Hospital and the Ramoth Hospital—McFadden, R., 403-6.

The Ramoth Hospital does a great deal of good, and it would be a mistake to have it removed—Mooney, J., 4271-2.

Conditions of admission, &c., to the Shill Hospital at Ballyshannon—O'Connell, Dr., 4613-47.

It would be desirable to separate the present hospitals from the workhouses, and to turn the fever hospitals into workhouse hospitals—Thompson, Dr. E. C., 5531.

A perfect system of district hospitals in each county, with a good central county hospital for the treatment of surgical cases, is desirable in the interests of the poor—Thompson, Dr. E. C., 5544. See also evidence of Moorhead, Dr. G. A., 15376.

All hospitals should be under the control of the Asylum and Hospitals' Committee of the County Council—Thompson, Dr. E. C., 5525. See also evidence of Kidd, Dr. L., 6470; Darling, Dr., 6233; Agnew, Dr., 6332; Mooney, J., 12515-6; Brown, S. J., 17437; Copan, D. J., 18035-6; Butler, J., 21173.

The medical staff should have representation on the Managing Committees of—Powell, Dr., 17122-3; Foley, P., 24424.

Should be left under the control of the Guardians—Synnott, N. J., 17652; O'Grady, J. S., 17722; Meahan, P. A., 18049-1; Doherty, W., 18424.

The number of in Ireland should not be diminished—Ryan, Dr., 5540.

If separated from workhouses, hospitals would be enabled by a larger circle—Warcock, Dr., 1145-7; Turner, Dr., 3527. See also evidence of Doyle, M. E., 18240-1; Makery, T., 18435-6; Courtenay, Dr., 25229.

In view of the population, it would be advisable to have a hospital at Fethard—Fleming, J., 9240; Darling, Dr., 6335; Strong, Sir J. R., 5520; Wilson, W., 9332-3; Anderson, J., 9510; Odell, J., 9534-7.

A uniform service is necessary, which would take in all the hospitals in the country, beginning with cottage and small endowed hospitals, and grading up to large central hospitals, according to population and requirements—Darling, Dr., 6247-57.

HOSPITALS—continued:

- There should be a small hospital for cases of accident and sudden illness in each dispensary district—*Clarke, J.*, 10493-3; *Martin, M.*, 22670-1.
- Guardians should be empowered to pay for persons sent direct to external hospitals, without their passing through the workhouse—*McHarg, J.*, 10637-26; *Finlay, P. M.*, 12017.
- They should also be empowered to pay for the treatment of their sick in hospitals other than their own—*McCann, Colonel*, 11421.
- Many are deterred until too late from seeking necessary treatment in workhouse hospitals chiefly by a sentimental repugnance to a workhouse institution—*Lyness, Dr.*, 11354.
- Convalescent departments, with associated sick wards, should be established in every infirmary—*Lyness, Dr.*, 11357.
- Persons suffering from venereal diseases should not be treated in workhouse hospitals—*Macintosh, Dr.*, 11184.
- Such persons should be detained in isolated wards until pronounced free from the disease—*Macintosh, Dr.*, 11184; *Lyness, Dr.*, 11357.
- Those suffering from alcoholism should be sent to general hospitals—*Macintosh, Dr.*, 11184-5.
- It is very important to dislocate hospitals, which are solely for the treatment of the sick, from the Guardians and the workhouse—*MacDonnell, Dr. H.*, 12861.
- The standard of accommodation in a county for hospital patients should be one bed for every 800 of the population—*Swiftn, Dr.*, 12401.
- There ought to be one ambulance service available for an entire county—*Swiftn, Dr.*, 12403.
- Acute cases in hospitals should be separated from the chronic—*Powell, Dr.*, 17005-6.
- Patients when discharged from workhouse hospitals should be sent direct to their own homes, and not to the body of the house—*Grimes, W. C.*, 17551.
- Would wish to see workhouse hospitals raised to the level of county infirmaries—*Evans, M. A.*, 19635-6; *Cavanagh, Dr.*, 26585, 26589.
- Should be in charge of a matron, with a staff of trained nurses, and a medical officer—*Buller, J.*, 21173.
- The conversion of workhouses into district hospitals should be made compulsory—*Laffan, Dr.*, 21704.
- Temporary movable hospitals should be kept by the Local Government Board to deal with epidemics—*Edd, Dr. L.*, 2471; *Finlay, Rev. J.*, 24389-91.
- Galway Hospital should be abolished—*Corr, M.*, 24377; *Byrne, T.*, 24393-25.
- It should be retained and made a county charge, and brought under the control of the County Council—*MacDonnell, J. C.*, 24385-6.
- All existing workhouse hospitals should be retained, placed in charge of a matron, and attended by the dispensary medical officer—*MacDonnell, J. C.*, 24390.
- System of management, &c. of Queenstown Hospital explained—*French, S.*, 25477-80.
- (See also "COTTAGE HOSPITALS," "DISTRICT HOSPITALS," "INFIRMARIES—COUNTY," and "PATIENTS IN HOSPITALS AND INFIRMARIES.")

I.

IDLETS AND IDLENESS:

- Idlers who are capable should not be sent to an asylum at all, but to an institution where they could be taught trades, and means of assisting in carrying their own living—*Norman, Dr. Canolly*, 16131-2, 16138.
- Female-minded girls should be detained for life in some institution—*Clark, Miss F. F.*, 11144-5.
- Harmless imbeciles should be kept in auxiliary lunatic asylums—*Rosson, Miss*, 582; *Donovan, St. J. H.*, 5937.
- Ought not to be kept with lunatics—*Flanagan, Dr. Norman*, 5145; *MacDonnell, W.*, 57705.
- Imbeciles should be kept in workhouse on account of their usefulness—*Dwyer, J. D.*, 19323-6.
- There should be an institution for, for all Ireland—*Cavanagh, Dr.*, 26586-92.
- (See also "EMERGENCY" and "LUNACY.")

ILLEGITIMATE CHILDREN:—

- The Irish law as to the recovery of the cost of maintenance from putative fathers should be assimilated to the English Bastardy Law—*Montague, Lord*, 637; *Bodden, W.*, 10347; *Walker, W.*, 11035; *MacArthur, D.*, 11801-3; *O'Hare, W.*, 11266; *Andrews, T.*, 12265-8; *Evans, O.*, 15463-3; *Donoghue, T. W.*, 15607; *Murphy, J.*, 20248-9; *Grubb, Miss R.*, 21505; *Burke, D.*, 22613; *O'Garra, D. L.*, 29114.
- Guardians should be empowered to have the children looked after in properly-equipped day nurseries, so that the mothers might obtain employment—*Wheen, R. H.*, 11411.
- The law should be amended so as to enable the mother herself to proceed against the putative father of—*Macdon, P. A.*, 18032.
- (See also "EPIDEMIOLOGY" and "LUNACY.")

ILLEGITIMATE CHILDREN—MOTHERS OF:—

- In favour of sending girls, who are about to become mothers for the first time, to a penitentiary or reformatory, and paying for them out of the rates, instead of allowing them to enter the workhouse—*Smith, Rev. J. Paterson*, 618. See also evidence of *Kennedy, C.*, 3294; *Montague, H. de F.*, 3010-3; *Corry, Vincent*, 3350-2; *Hall, Dr.*, 7434-6; *Smith, Rev. R. H.*, 7376; *McManus, P.*, 8367-9; *McGarra, T.*, 8415; *Byrne, Dr.*, 8537; *Finlay, J.*, 9016-30; *Darling, Dr.*, 9212; *O'Keefe, J. F.*, 10031; *Young, C. W.*, 10339; *Harold, P.*, 10415; *Bodden, W.*, 10347; *Smith, Dr. E.*, 11150; *McGarra, Colonel*, 11434; *McDonnell, G. B.*, 11755; *Andrews, T.*, 12194-8; *Dolan, J.*, 12532; *McNab, N.*, 13116-6; *Adams, W.*, 15422; *MacDonnell, J.*, 16027-30; *Brown, S. J.*, 17446; *Sunderland, J.*, 17575; *Connolly, T.*, 17835; *McMahon, J.*, 17863-4; *Macdon, P. A.*, 18035; *Harrison, H. J.*, 18093; *Woolhouse, J.*, 18123; *Wanderford, R. H. F.*, 18274-5; *Hunter, P.*, 18284; *Mellor, M.*, 18947-8; *Flanagan, Dr. Norman*, 19113-9; *Cogan, D. J.*, 19221; *Byrne, M.*, 19413; *Smith, M. A.*, 19586; *Peacock, C. H.*, 19703; *Stepford, Lord*, 19813-4; *Belger, T.*, 19877; *Norman, Dr.*, 19903; *Pope, P. A.*, 20140; *Fitzgerald, Lady M.*, 20200; *Walsh, P.*, 20410-6; *O'Garra, P.*, 20506; *McGarra, M.*, 20731; *McGarra, P.*, 20809; *Byrne, D.*, 20839; *Buller, J.*, 21173; *Chadwick, E.*, 21456; *Owen, Dr.*, 21562; *Walsh, C. C.*, 21831; *Burke, T.*, 22077; *Gallagher, W.*, 22190; *Henry, D.*, 22361; *Magee, P.*, 22543; *Goffey, P.*, 22556; *Goffey, P.*, 22557; *Mopker, F. A. F.*, 22585; *Regan, A.*, 22153; *Larmine, A. C.*, 22580; *Rosson, J. J.*, 24727; *Harigan, Mrs.*, 25023-701; *Barrington, J. E.*, 25215-8; *Donovan, Miss*, 25716; *O'Donnell, Wm.*, 26775; *Mariarty, D. M.*, 26921-2; *Costello, J.*, 27313-3; *MacDonnell, W.*, 27785; *Jones, B.*, 27894; *Fitzgerald, J.*, 27917; *Lynch, T.*, 28582-6; *Cotter, W.*, 28762; *O'Connor, B.*, 28791; *Burke, D.*, 29003; *Evans, Miss E. M.*, 28871; *O'Garra, D. L.*, 29115; *O'Meara, P.*, 29125-6; *O'Dwyer, W. W.*, p. 983, 29312; *Longfield, R. E.*, 29320; *Fitzgerald, J. J.*, 29393.
- Opposed to sending them to such an institution—*Boyd, J.*, 10375-80; *Hamilton, Miss*, 10382-43; *Howe, J.*, 30372.
- System of dealing with in the Queen's Maternity House, Belfast, explained—*Bell, Dr. Macdonald*, 10682-4.
- It is very undesirable that girls who have fallen for the first time should be associated in workhouses with habitual offenders—*Montague, Lord*, 610; *Bodden, W.*, 10347; *Montague, Lady*, 25105-6.
- Should be placed in a house where they could be looked after, and situations provided for them—*Lyness, Dr.*, 11358-9.
- It would be desirable if the Local Government Board authorized the appointment of Ladies' Committees that could assist these women to obtain suitable employment—*Wheen, R. H.*, 11411.
- In favour of sending them to a central institution—*Lee, Rev. T.*, 27317.

INFORMALITIES—COUNTY:—

Should be on the same level, and under the same management as district hospitals—*Smyth, Dr. J., 86.*

Should be amalgamated with workhouse hospitals, and managed by small committees representative of the County and District Councils—*Magennis, Dr. E., 128-30; Montague, Lord, 608.*

The treatment of the sick should be unified so that cases requiring surgical treatment would be transferable from the district hospitals to the county infirmary, and the surgeon attached to the latter be available to assist at operations in the former—*Thompson, Dr. E. G., 5667-72; Davis, M. A., 18645-7; MacDonnell, Dr., 22430-3; Faria, Dr., 24025; Donovan, St. J. H., 25659.*

Major operations should be performed in—*Wernock, Dr., 1135-10; M'Loughlin, Dr., 1383-8; Hall, Dr., 7623-4; Moorhead, Dr. G. A., 15752.*

The necessary expenditure of should be defrayed out of the rates—*Thompson, Dr. E. G., 5613; MacDonnell, Dr. H., 13317-8; O'Loughlin, Dr., 24028; Faria, Dr., 24025; Shaw, A. W., 26140-51.*

A County Council should be empowered to pay for patients sent to the infirmary of another county—*McGuire, T., 8525-6; St. George, Dr., 10651-2; Hughes, E. P., 18389-90; O'Meara, Dr., 16003; Fitzgibbon, J., 22079; Maguire, P., 22560-60.*

County Councils should be empowered to spend on infirmaries as much as they thought was absolutely necessary—*St. George, Dr., 10655; MacDonnell, Dr., 22477; Brennan, H., 22511; Broadshaw, Dr., 22514.*

Placing the whole expense of on the rates would tend to stop private contributions—*Crawford S., 12251-4.*

Should be under the inspection and control of the Local Government Board—*Sullivan, Dr., 13391.*

Every medical officer and clergyman should have power to issue tickets for—*Ronan, M., 14522.*

It is an injustice to places that do not send patients to infirmaries to be obliged to contribute to the maintenance of—*Ryan, Dr., 8541; Shell, D., 15534; Brown, S. J., 17458, 17617.*

Are the proper places for carrying out operations—*Moorhead, Dr. G. A., 15752; Neenan, Dr. G., 22510.*

Are needed in addition to district hospitals—*Meenan, P. A., 18643.*

Qualifications necessary for appointments to the positions of surgeon, matron, and nurses in, see forth—*MacDonnell, Dr., 22478-9.*

The area around the infirmary should be constituted the maintaining area—*Wright, C. C. R., 22500-3.*

Should continue to be a county charge—*Donovan, St. J. H., 25635.*

The Kerry County Council think it unfair that the entire county should contribute to the expenses of the county infirmary and fever hospital at Tralee, and the fever hospital at Killarney—*McCarthy, D. M., 25681. See also evidence of Sullivan, Dr. J., 22077; Sheehan, J. J., 27150.*

(See also "COTTAGE HOSPITALS," "DISTRICT HOSPITALS," "HOSPITALS," and "PAYING PATIENTS IN HOSPITALS AND INFIRMARIES.")

INFORMANTS:—

There should be a Lady Inspector of Workhouses under the Local Government Board—*Ronan, C., 15445; O'Connell, Mrs. M., 18707-805; MacDonnell, J., 16913-43; Fitzgibbon, Miss, p. 593.*

There is no necessity for making such an appointment—*O'Connell, W. C., 17512.*

An Inspector should be appointed to supervise the granting of outdoor relief—*Donovan, Mrs., 22079; Lincoln, T., 22633-3; Lane, J., 22713.*

L.

LABOUR BUREAU:—

It would be advisable to have a central one in Belfast, where an inspector could receive applications from employers from the city and surrounding districts for unskilled workmen—*Wilson, R. H., 11430.*

LABOUR BUREAU—continued:—

A register should be kept either at the police barracks or the workhouses of places where labour is required, and tramps should be forced to go there and work—*M'Graith, H., 12402.*

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD:—

The attitude which it takes up towards Boards of Guardians needs change—*Ronan M., 14525-519.* There ought to be popular representation on the—*Sheehan, W., 17327.*

LUNATICS:—

Should not be kept in workhouses, but sent to asylums—*Wernock, Dr., 1137; Long, J. A., 1206-10; Gregg, J., 1253; Boyd, J. D., 1259; M'Loughlin, Dr., 1270-3; Lally, S., 1713; Kild, Dr. L., 1775; Gordon, Dr., 4661-4; Pearson, D. C., 4856-9; Jordan, J., 6061; Hall, Dr., 7405-9; Gullies, Dr., 8123; M'Guire, T., 8414; Cronley, P., 8570; Smith, T. J., 8620; Smith, E., 8755; Darling, Dr., 9125; M'Elberry, T., 10159; Smyth, Dr. E., 11160; M'Arthur, Dr., 12112; M'Leish, Dr., p. 387; Wilson, R. H., 11431; Dickson, Geo., 11576-7; M'Connell, G. B., 11734; Andrews, T., 12199; Dolan, J., 12521; Rogers, Rev. Canon, 12728; Hamill, B., 13032; Lowry, Dr., 15025; Howard, Col., 13664-5; Gogarty, A., 13474; Adams, W., 15430; Gannally, P., 15530; Hackett, G., 15608; O'Neill, P. J., 15810; Nelson, Dr. M. J., 16000; Connolly, Dr. Norman, 16128; Walsh, J., 16332; M'Donnell, J., 16071; Carolan, J., 16088; Fottrell, Dr., 17034; Powell, Dr., 17008; Craimer, J., 17160; O'Connell, W. C., 17154; Synnott, N. J., 17654; O'Grady, J. S., 17697-9; M'Mahon, J., 17653; Meenan, P. A., 18014; Doyle, M. E., 18229; Wandersford, B. H. P., 18275; Thompson, Dr. Norman, 18218; Stopford, Lord, 18619; Fitzgerald, Lady M., 20305; Walsh, P., 20409; Coghlan, W. C., 20586; Hackett, Dr., 20603; Heffernan, P., 21260; Grubb, Miss E., 21584; Grubb, J. H., 21673; Collier, B., 22106-8; Mills, J., 22206; Walsh, J., 22375; Louden, J. B., 22672; Hegun, P. J., 24703; Pigot, E., 25488; Barrington, J. B., 25608; M'Farney, J., 25614-5; Feron, Mrs., 25521; O'Donnell, W., 25772; O'Brien, J., 27774; Lincoln, T., 28569; O'Dwyer, W. W., 28226; Longfield, R. E., 28228; Fitzgerald, J. J., 28204.*

All lunatics, and others mentally defective, should be maintained by the State—*Montague, Lord, 602.*

It is only necessary to transfer troublesome cases to an asylum—*McCarthy, Dr., 3123.*

Would remove all the insane from workhouses to auxiliary asylums—*Thompson, Dr. E. G., 5725; Flanagan, E. M., 5538; Truist, C. W., 12325; Wilson, Dr., 10764; O'Neill, P. J., 12513; O'Kelly, E. P., 17508; Walsh, P., 20400; O'Ryan, Dr., 21104, 21129; Webb, C. C., 21225; Maguire, P., 22527; Kearney, J. J., 22628; Healy, M. C., 23323; Lennette, A. C., 23327; O'Malley, P. J., 24238; O'Loughlin, Dr., 24860; Callinan, M., 25330; Barrington, J. B., 25309; Clifford, T. D., 25678.*

Lunatics should be treated in the district asylums rather than in an auxiliary—*McGuire, Colonel, p. 382. See also evidence of Martin, Dr., 1123; Andrews, T., 12226; Howard, Col., 13092; Heaton, P., 13337; Many, Lieut.-Genl., 21308; Healy, D. J., 27162-3.*

Is not in favour of transferring all lunatics to district asylums, where extravagant notions prevail—*McCarthy, J., 16553.*

The harmless should be kept in workhouses, but Guardians should get the capitation grant for their maintenance, and be compelled to make better provision for them—*Orr, J., 9531, 9574; Stronge, Sir J. H., 3051. See also evidence of Byrne, J., 15565, 15567.*

Lunatics could not be put in a worse place than with the aged and infirm in a Poor Law hospital—*MacDonnell, Dr. H., 12326.*

The system of sending destitute persons of unsound mind to workhouses, without either legal warrant or commitment, should be changed—*Bever, Col., 13064.*

LUNATICS.—continued.

The Irish people would not favour the idea of boarding out—*O'Neill, P. J., 15426-7.*

The class called "chronic harmless lunatics" is extremely limited, as apparently harmless individuals will sometimes develop dangerous tendencies, and chronic cases are often liable to sudden outbreaks—*Nolan, Dr. M. J., 15076, 15081.*

The continental method of boarding out could not be introduced into this country with the same measure of success, but there is no reason why it should not be legalised for experimental adoption—*Nolan, Dr. M. J., 15076.*

Is in favour of the adoption of the boarding out system if administered under careful supervision—*Norman, Dr. Conolly, 15125-8.* See also evidence of *Brown, S. J., 17414; Bonies, P., 16794; Gaffney, P., 23586; Hagan, P., 25414; O'Dwyer, W. W., 25477; Lee, Rev. T., 27295-300.*

Opposed to boarding-out—*Swyth, L., 3215-8; McLeish, Dr., 11373; O'Farrell, A. K., 16326; Synnott, N. J., 17694.*

The maximum number of lunatics that should be in an asylum is 1,000—*Norman, Dr. Conolly, 15159.*

There is great need to have the mental condition of the women classed as healthy paupers in workhouses inquired into—*Lagar, Dr., 15192.*

Lunatics should be a National charge—*Ronan, C., 16447.*

The harmless should be treated in separate institutions, with a largely diminished staff, from the violent—*Horriple, T. C., 16477.*

A disused workhouse should be set apart for the harmless of two or three counties—*Dinnage, T. W., 16532.*

Suggests emasculation as a remedy—*Thompson, Dr. Norman, 15136-10.*

The harmless should be treated in separate asylums, which should get the full capitation grant—*Cogan, D. J., 19377-81.*

There would be no financial gain in transferring the harmless from workhouses to auxiliary asylums—*Moriarty, D. M., 22843-508.*

It would be cheaper to send cases to the central asylum, and board out others, than to provide an auxiliary asylum—*Lee, Rev. T., 27393-6.*

The labour energy of the acute insane and of imbeciles is quite different; and it would be hopeless to attempt to teach trades to chronic lunatics and imbeciles—*Kelly, Most Rev. Dr., 23453, 23455.*

Crazies and dangerous cases ought to be kept in the principal asylum, but the chronic and quiet should be transferred to auxiliaries—*Kelly, Most Rev. Dr., 23451; Gorry, Vincent, 5945.*

Chronic cases in good physical health, and not too old, might be as transferred with a certain degree of safety, but in removing them you take away those who do a good deal of the work of the asylums—*Norman, Dr. Conolly, 15132.*

(See also "EPILEPTIC," and "IDIOTS AND IMBECILES.")

LUNATIC ASYLUMS:—

Disused workhouses could be used as auxiliary asylums—*Montague, Lord, 600.* See also evidence of *Linden, H. R., 5274; Swyth, J., 5430; Ryan, Dr., 8559; Johnston, R. H., 8547; Orr, J., 1652; McConne, Colonel, 11325; Carpenter, T., 15465; Gorry, W., 15427; McLaughlin, J., 23128-5; Galloway, R., 23125, 23126; McGuire, P., 23524; Hagan, P. J., 24703; Connelley, M., 25004-5; O'Dwyer, W. W., 25479; Kelly, Most Rev. Dr., 23451.*

There should be an auxiliary asylum for harmless imbeciles in each county—*Ronan, Mfr., 682.*

The capitation grant should be the same for auxiliary as for principal asylums—*McGovern, P., 2405-7; Johnston, R. H., 8565; Gorman, P., 12985; Brown, S. J., 17415; Cogan, D. J., 19779; Keogh, M. A., 19435; Gaffney, P., 23590; Wallace, R., 23712; Shanley, J., 23819; O'Kelly, C., 23538-44; Jennings, P., 23703; Hagan, P. J., 24801.*

The contrary view held—*McGuire, P., 23535-7; Kelly, Most Rev. Dr., 23536-7.*

LUNATIC ASYLUMS.—continued.

The capitation grant of 2s. to auxiliary asylums is utterly inadequate to provide for the necessary care and maintenance of the pauper insane—*Nolan, Dr. M. J., 15076.*

It would be a grave error to institute independent auxiliaries which would not be departments of existing asylums—*Noise, Dr. M. J., 15075.*

Independent auxiliaries would not be a success either medically or financially—*Nolan, Dr. M. J., 15075; Norman, Dr. Conolly, 15129-30.*

The county district asylum should be constituted so as to embrace all classes of the insane—*Nolan, Dr. M. J., 15076.*

In favour of building annexes to the present asylums, rather than providing auxiliary asylums, for the accommodation of additional patients—*McLeish, Dr., 11373; Thomson, J. M., 11522; Sheridan, P., 12522; Lynch, M., 23320-9; Harding, W., 23556; McInerney, J., 23893-91.*

In favour of extending the auxiliary system—*Kelly, Most Rev. Dr., 23452.*

Compulsory power should be given to take lead for the purposes of asylums—*Hagan, P. J., 24710.*

System pursued in establishing the Youghal Auxiliary Asylum explained—*Kelly, Most Rev. Dr., 23451-51.*

The ideas and traditions of existing asylums if allowed to enter into auxiliaries would prevent their being worked as they ought, which should be more on the home than on the asylum principle—*Kelly, Most Rev. Dr., 23454-5.*

The way in which the Youghal auxiliary is managed saves the Local Taxation Account £2,000, and the county rates £1,200, per year—*Kelly, Most Rev. Dr., 23454.*

M.

MEDICAL OFFICERS:—

Of the dispensary district should have medical care of the workhouse after being separated from the hospital—*Stoker, Sir Wm. Thornley, 525.* There should be a county medical officer of health for each county in Ireland, as in England—*Owen, Dr. F. J., 27661.*

MENSAI (POOR LAW) SERVICE:—

Should be converted into a State service—*Warwick, Dr., 1127.*

Admission to should be by examination, and promotion by professional ability—*Thompson, Dr., E. C., 5552-7, 5726.*

(See also "CERTIFICATES—APPOINTMENT OR.")

N.

NURSES—TRAINING AND QUALIFICATION OF:

Any nurse called a trained, certificated nurse ought to have the fever qualifications—*Maguire, Dr. Katherine, 530.*

Every nurse should be both "qualified" and "trained," and should be trained in all the branches of her profession—*Stoker, Sir Wm. Thornley, 521, 537-50.*

Superintendents, or fully-trained nurses, should serve about a year in a clinical hospital—*Stoker, Sir Wm. Thornley, 545.*

It would be desirable to have an Advisory Board associated with the Local Government Board, whose duty it would be to consider the qualifications and fitness of nurses for appointments—*Stoker, Sir Wm. Thornley, 547.*

The central surgical hospital should be the training school for the nurses of the district hospitals—*Thompson, Dr. E. C., 5553.*

Every nurse employed in a rate-supported hospital should have a midwifery training, especially if district nursing is to be developed—*Kidd, Dr. L., 5470.*

System of training in Waterford Workhouse Hospital and County Infirmary explained—*Thomson, Mfr., 20989-21054.*

NURSING—INDOOR:

The skill of trained nurses is wasted by making them night nurses in hospitals largely occupied by chronic cases, and it is not necessary that all nurses in a hospital should be trained—*Mooney, J.*, 15947-8.

Is strongly in favour of nursing being carried out by nurses—*Mooney, J.*, 15947.

Is opposed to nursing being carried out by nurses—*Daly, M. C.*, 23976-3.

Pauper inmate helpers should not be in hospital wards under any conditions—*Power, Dr.*, 17082; *O'Donnell, W. C.*, 17263.

No hospital can be carried on without a male nurse—*Laffan, Dr.*, 21719.

NURSING—OUTDOOR:

In favour of the extension of the system of district nursing—*Montague, Lord*, 509-10; *Gregg, J.*, 1339-8; *Brown, W.*, 1674-5; *Thompson, Dr. R. C.*, 3941; *Hall, Dr.*, 7374-6; *Dolan, J.*, 12678; *Reverend, Colonel*, 12673-4; *Sheridan, F.*, 13303; *Kenny, Dr. J. M.*, 8, 13353; *Moss, Acad.*, *Dr. G. A.*, 15787-8; *Stepford, Lord*, 16834; *Hogan, P. J.*, 24938-9; *Faria, Dr.*, 24994; *Mooney, Dr.*, 27384-6.

NURSING—GENERALLY:

Would favour a nursing scheme for the various centres, under which nurses could be trained at a central hospital, and be under the control of a central body, who could transfer them from place to place according as their services were required—*Warrack, Dr.*, 1131-4. See also evidence of *Kidd, Dr. L.*, 1739, 5670; *Deherly, W.*, 3033; *Gunning-Moore, J. B.*, 5332-4; *Sullivan, Dr.*, 13392-3; *Mooney, J.*, 16018-9; *Kent, M. A.*, 16648-3; *Walsh, P.*, 20333-3; *O'Byrne, Dr.*, 21155-9; *Grubb, Miss N.*, 21590; *McDonald, Dr.*, 23499; *O'Loughlin, Dr.*, 24528-7; *Faria, Dr.*, 24615-7; *Shaw, A. W.*, 26523-3; *Donovan, St. J. H.*, 29623.

It is worthy of consideration whether Boards of Guardians should be empowered to subsidise charitable bodies who supply district nurses to the sick poor—*Lynan, Dr.*, 11389-60.

O.

OUTDOOR—APPOINTMENT OF:

Admission to the Poor Law Medical Service should be by examination, and promotion by professional ability—*Thompson, Dr. R. C.*, 5623-7, 5735.

Appointments should be by examination—*McCarthy, T.*, 15929-32.

Appointments should be in the hands of the Local Government Board—*Casgrove, Mrs. McDonald*, 16761.

Unions should be classified, so that an officer might be transferred from one to the other, and be afforded an opportunity of rising from the lowest to the highest position—*O'Connell, D.*, 18405.

A minimum and maximum salary should be fixed for officers on appointment, the latter to be reached by quinquennial increments—*O'Connell, D.*, 18503. See also evidence of *O'Loughlin, Dr.*, 24827-8.

Appointments should be made by ballot—*Foley, P.*, 26475.

See also evidence of *Clarke, J.*, 22855-7; *Burke, P.*, 25769-70.

OLD-AGE PENSIONERS:

In favour of the granting of in certain cases—*Brown, Miss*, 563; *Walker, W.*, 11023; *Cramer, J.*, 17152-9; *Sheridan, W.*, 17361.

OUTDOOR RELIEF:

Could be given to some workhouse inmates at a saving to the ratepayers, but rates of 1s. and 1s. 6d. weekly are inadequate, and invite to begging—*Brown, Miss*, 560-1.

Should be given to convalescents after discharge from hospital—*Brown, Miss*, 561.

Should be given more generously to the sick than at present—*Brown, Miss*, 763.

OUTDOOR RELIEF—continued:

The administration of relief to be decentralised rather than further centralised—*Montgomery, H. Dr. L.*, 4891.

In favour of increasing the Guardians' powers with regard to the granting of—*Bodgers, M.*, 5855-89; *Crumley, P.*, 5939. See also evidence of *Macdonald, Dr.*, 10335; *Walker, W.*, 11354; *Ball, Dr.*, 11363; *12045*; *McGrath, M.*, 13311-3; *Dolan, J.*, 13377; *O'Meara, M.*, *P.*, 595; *McCarthy, J.*, 13385; *O'Neill, P.*, 15822; *Clarke, T.*, 16206-17; *Owen, D. J.*, 19312-3; *Hooley, M.*, 20746-9; *Cellery, R.*, 22325; *MacDonnell, J. C.*, 24558.

Guardians should be empowered to grant to a widow with one child—*O'Neill, P. J.*, 15822-3; *Boney, R.*, 16330; *Clarke, T.*, 16354; *McDonnell, J.*, 16849; *Candran, D.*, 19669; *Byrne, E. J.*, 19685; *Short, P.*, 19740; *Wheeler, M. J.*, 22629; *Fitzgerald, Lady M.*, 23249; *Lyden, D. E.*, 24626; *Hurley, T.*, 25521; *Harrington, Mrs.*, 25134; *Costello, J.*, 27276-9; *O'Connor, J.*, 27736; *Linden, T.*, 28631.

Granting to single persons results eventually in the employment of nurses to take care of them—*Gunning-Moore, J. B.*, 5316; *Howard, Major*, 5491.

Should be given only on the report of the dispensary medical officer—*Kearran, P.*, 7564-71.

Is the most extravagant and demoralising manner in which the poor can be helped—*Hugh, Dr.*, 8340.

Is given in Londonderry Union only when a doctor certifies that a patient is unable to be removed to hospital—*Fury, W. L.*, 906.

Is far more economical, if judiciously administered, than indoor maintenance—*Hooley, D. J.*, 27156.

The recipients of should not be disfranchised—*Crumley, P.*, 5939.

Guardians should be empowered to grant to mothers of legitimate children who have been deserted by their husbands—*McArthur, D.*, 11185.

Poverty and not destitution should be the test of qualification for—*McConnell, G. B.*, 11792; *McGrath, H.*, 12309; *Marney, M.*, 18820; *Murphy, J.*, 23910-1.

The converse view held—*O'Donnell, W. C.*, 17322. Should be given in cases of disablement—*Dolan, J.*, 12554.

It should be left discretionary with Guardians to grant to those who have more than a quarter of an acre of land—*Halligan, T.*, 13336-44; *Owen, C.*, 13372-81; *Corcoran, T.*, 13422; *McGee, Mrs.*, 13723; *Griffith, M.*, 14377; *Gargy, P.*, 14561; *Boney, R.*, 14855; *Byrne, M.*, 15401; *Byrne, E. J.*, 19623-5; *Fitzgerald, Lady M.*, 23239; *Kelso, N.*, 25335-7; *O'Garra, P.*, 25715; *Hooley, M.*, 25777-30; *Kearran, T.*, 22103; *Lyden, D. E.*, 24628; *Hurley, T.*, 25522-9; *Costello, J.*, 27274-5; *Connolly, E.*, 27419; *Finch, Colonel*, 27854; *O'Connor, J.*, 27745; *Sheridan, Miss*, 28237; *Linden, T.*, 28355-20; *Lane, J.*, 28727; *Crumley, P.*, 29396; *Kelly, J. H.*, 29041; *Lonfield, B. A.*, 33342; *Fitzgerald, W.*, 29410-3.

Should be only granted provisionally to occupants of labourers' cottages—*Bolger, T.*, 12072. 25 maximum limit of valuation should disqualify for—*Fitzgerald, J. J.*, 29425; *Bracken-Crough, L.*, 29405; *Fitzgerald, E.*, 29433-4.

The present quarter-acre limit is fair—*Hewitt, T.*, 12759.

It would be necessary if unions were dissolved to restore Dispensary Committees for the purpose of granting—*Brown, C.*, 16423-4.

Would give Guardians more discretion to grant in cases of temporary distress—*McArthur, D.*, 11185; *Byrne, J.*, 16330; *Harrington, T. C.*, 16572; *McWalter, Dr.*, 18738; *McGough, E.*, 17137; *Harrington, J. B.*, 23355-66; *O'Keefe, J.*, 23280-1; *Murphy, J.*, 23909; *Fitzgerald, J. J.*, 29403-4.

Would not grant to people who say they cannot get work, or to families deserted by their fathers, or whose fathers are in prison—*Crimmins, W. O.*, 17374.

OUTDOOR RELIEF—continued:

To augment the income of the needy, as distinguished from the destitute, by means of, at the cost of a class similarly circumstanced, would be discouraging efforts—*Oriniana, W. C.*, 17774.

Unless diminished as much as possible, expenditure cannot be controlled—*Symcott, N. J.*, 17679.

The workhouse test should be maintained—*Symcott, N. J.*, 17679; *Field, E.*, 17791; *Healy, D. J.*, 77158.

Should be granted to the aged and infirm who are suitably housed—*Dogg, J. R.*, 17302.

Relief Committees appointed by Guardians for the granting of in each dispensary district would be an improvement on the present system—*Evans, M. A.*, 19335; *Boiger, T.*, 19935; *Hefferman, P.*, 21337; *O'Malley, P. J.*, 24257; *Roberts, T. B.*, 24086-9.

Should be granted to all aged and infirm inmates of workhouses—*Butler, J.*, 21175.

Should be given in kind—*Harding, W.*, 25358; *Hogan, J.*, 25453; *O'Dwyer, W. W.*, 25464; *Foley, P.*, 26429; *Donovan, Miss.*, 26703; *Fitzgerald, J.*, 26565; *Linsden, T.*, 26566; *O'Leary, J.*, 26445.

Opposed to the giving of in kind—*Harley, T.*, 25598; *McCarthy, D.*, 25627; *Barrington, J. B.*, 25848-54; *McGuire, W.*, 25791; *Duggan, J.*, 26744.

In favour of the granting of in kind when the recipients are addicted to drink—*Fitzgerald, A.*, 26429.

Should not be given at all to persons addicted to drink—*Barrington, J. B.*, 25845-7; *O'Garra, D. L.*, 26097.

Power should be given to grant to a widower with a young family—*Foley, P.*, 25452-4.

And to orphan children who had some relative to take charge of them—*Linsden, T.*, 26562.

An Inspector should be appointed to supervise the granting of—*Donovan, Miss.*, 26709; *Linsden, T.*, 26569; *Loas, J.*, 26715.

See to advantage in making such an appointment—*Burke, D.*, 26940-1.

OUTDOOR RELIEF—CHARGEABILITY OF:

In favour of divisional chargeability—*Montague, Lord.*, 620; *Adams, T. B.*, 769; *Grigg, J.*, 1221-37; *O'Neill, J. E.*, 3564-6; *Watters, S.*, 3558; *Dearty, W.*, 3584; *Colgan, M.*, 4253; *Corry, P.*, 6069-50; *Byrne, Dr.*, 6593; *McCona, R.*, 6790; *Montague, S.*, 6970-1; *McCree, J. S.*, 6724; *Stewart, A.*, 10354; *Gill, W.*, 10670; *McArthur, D.*, 11253-3; *Thomas, J. M.*, 11253; *McConnell, S. S.*, 11700; *Macdonald, J. C.*, 11826-10; *Macdonald, Dr. H.*, 12848; *Henley, J.*, 12758; *McGowan, M.*, 14290; *Evans, C.*, 15347; *O'Neill, M.*, 16316; *McGowan, M.*, 18537-8; *Thorne, W.*, 20117; *Bell, J.*, 21173; *Grubb, Miss B.*, 21538; *Miller, J.*, 22745; *Burke, T.*, 22925; *Carr, M.*, 24374; *O'Leahy, D.*, 24377; *Harding, W.*, 25359; *O'Dwyer, W. W.*, 25461; *Hartigan, Mrs.*, 25724-5; *O'Brien, Capt.*, 25763; *Barrington, J. B.*, 25836; *Fitzgerald, P.*, 26341; *O'Brien, J.*, 27081; *Fitzgerald, J.*, 26333; *Linsden, T.*, 26534; *Coster, W.*, 27551; *Grundy, F.*, 28200; *O'Mahony, P.*, 28236; *Neenan, J.*, 28207; *Madden, J.*, 28265.

Divisional chargeability checks extravagance—*Stee, J.*, 27199; *Linsden, T.*, 26534; *O'Mahony, P.*, 28199.

But union chargeability encourages it—*Diamond, J. A.*, 3733; *Corry, M.*, 3733; *Byrne, Dr.*, 6593; *Harcup, J. J.*, 6889-90; *Orr, James, 6954*; *Thorne, W.*, 20113; *Butler, J.*, 21269-73; *Moore, Lieut-General.*, 21338; *Hart, J.*, 25363-4; *O'Dwyer, W. W.*, 25451; *Foley, P.*, 25435; *Sullivan, J. J.*, 27105; *O'Brien, J.*, 27621; *O'Dwyer, W. W.*, 28202.

In favour of dispensary district chargeability—*Montgomery, H. De F.*, 4661, 5284-5; *Gunning-Moore, J. B.*, 5247-8; *Pope, P. A.*, 22155; *Walsh, P.*, 20429-33; *Hefferman, T.*, 21338; *Delany, H.*, 21335; *Stanley, J.*, 22254; *Jones, R.*, 22915.

In favour of union chargeability—*Looby, S.*, 1778; *Maguire, M.*, 4354; *Gannon, P.*, 12555;

OUTDOOR RELIEF—CHARGEABILITY OF—continued

Moore, A., 19044; *Meekon, P. A.*, 19333; *Boiger, T.*, 19960; *Neary, J.*, 23566; *Doris, W.*, 23334; *Laraine, A. C.*, 23555; *Sheehan, J. J.*, 27148; *Stee, D.*, 27124; *Corry, P.*, 27209; *Morgan, D.*, 28119; *Forrest, J. E.*, 28159; *Fitzgerald, J. J.*, 28430; *Fitzgerald, E.*, 28425.

A limit should be fixed to the amount to be spent, under union chargeability, in each division, and any excess should be charged to the division—*Evans, M. A.*, 19317-8; *Walsh, P.*, 20453-4; *Moore, Lieut-General.*, 21338; *Fitzgerald, J. J.*, 21374; *Gannon, P.*, 21308; *Burke, T.*, 22361-73; *Foley, P.*, 25452-41; *Linsden, T.*, 26536-42; *Coster, W.*, 27551.

Such an arrangement would complicate financial matters—*Forrest, J. E.*, 28158.

Would give to the Local Government Act, 1908—*Higgins, W.*, 26022.

Towns should pay the entire cost of the relief given therein—*Quinn, C.*, 13384; *Maguire, P.*, 25559; *Wallace, R.*, 22722; *Gaffney, P.*, 22776.

Would make two-thirds a county and one-third a dispensary district charge—*O'Malley, P. J.*, 24257.

Would make three-fourths divisional and one-fourth union—*Moore, M.*, 26343.

P.

PAYING PATIENTS IN HOSPITALS AND INFIRMARIES:

Separate wards should be set apart for—*Montague, Lord.*, 621; *Ronan, Miss.*, 656; *Watts-Power, Mrs.*, 729; *Adams, T. B.*, 735; *Worrock, Dr.*, 1129; *O'Neill, J. E.*, 3568; *Smith, L.*, 3223; *Montgomery, H. De F.*, 4661; *Gunning-Moore, J. B.*, 5251; *W. C.*, 5252; *Grubb, Dr.*, 10738; *Andrews, T.*, 12186; *Ronan, Miss.*, 14520; *Walsh, J.*, 15558-9; *Powell, Dr.*, 17038; *Wandelaar, R. H.*, 18335; *O'Connell, D.*, 19436; *Hansen, P.*, 19436; *Thompson, Dr. Norman.*, 19192; *Wallace, R.*, 22715; *Evans, W. S.*, 2165; *Molins, M. J.*, 23525; *Jennings, J.*, 23757; *Hogan, J.*, 25455; *Montague, Lady.*, 26094.

Having separate wards would induce persons to enter workhouse hospitals who would not do so under present circumstances—*Smith, L.*, 3224; *McElderry, T.*, 10197-8.

Those who desire separate wards should pay the entire cost of maintenance—*Byrne, Dr.*, 6593.

Those who can do so should pay the full cost of treatment, and their payments should also cover the remuneration of the medical officers—*Smith, L.*, 3224.

Persons who are not destitute should contribute in proportion to their means—*Sicker, Sir Wm. Thomas.*, 625; *McEoy, J.*, 11929; *Parker, J. K.*, 11979; *Andrews, Thos.*, 12225; *Corry, W.*, 12227; *Marple, J. J.*, 12545.

Every person should pay something in a rate-aided hospital—*Kidd, Dr. L.*, 1780-2.

Persons suffering from infectious diseases should not be charged unless they wished to pay—*Byrne, Dr.*, 6593.

It would be desirable to introduce the system of payment—*Strogo, Sir J. H.*, 9569; *Byrne, T.*, 10541; *St. George, Dr.*, 10530; *Gill, J.*, 10585; *Hall, Dr.*, 11338; *Stuart, P.*, 19435; *Webb, C. C. G.*, 21252; *Fitzgibbon, J.*, 22264.

For law authorities ought not to be called upon at all to provide for persons able to pay—*Byrne, Dr.*, 6593.

Those suffering from alcoholism should be charged above the average cost of maintenance—*Ignace, Dr.*, 13354.

Would establish two scales of payment—a minimum for general wards, and a maximum for private wards—*Sullivan, Dr. F. W.*, 13395-6.

Treatment in fever hospitals should be free, in order to encourage patients to enter, and so protect the public—*Kidd, Dr. L.*, 5471; *Sullivan, Dr. F. W.*, 13394.

If there were hospitals where people of moderate means could be treated for a small sum, several lives would be saved, which are now lost through inability to pay for medical attendance—*White, Rev. H. W.*, 14122.

PAYING PATIENTS IN HOSPITALS AND INFIRMARIES—continued:

Patients from other counties should pay for treatment in county infirmaries—*Flynn, P., 25770.* It is desirable that a person should pay something, and not feel that he is taking charity—*Cooke, Dr., 1561; Thompson, Dr. E. C., 5729.*

On an average occupation of thirty-eight beds, £300 a year can be collected from the patients in County Fermanagh Infirmary without entailing the smallest hardship on them—*Kidd, Dr. L., 1793-6, 6470.*

In favour of leaving it discretionary with the governing body to fix the charge for—*Warnock, Dr., 1148-51; Long, J. A., 1203; Smyth, L., 2228-9; Larkin, J. G., 3251; Walters, R., 3510; Maguire, M., 4364; Gunning-Moore, J. B., 6395; Lindsay, H. B., 6537; Fleming, J., 9053; Darling, Dr., 9239; McCann, J. S. P., 7730; Fawc, C. W., 10369; Wilson, Dr., 10728; Hall, Dr., 11238-43; Lyness, Dr., 11354; Robb, J. W., 11456-9; Dubson, George, 11503-1; Johnston, J., 11674-6; McEvoy, J., 11694-74; Martin, Dr., 11933; Dolan, J., 12373-4; Duffy, M., 12914-4; Eversand, Colonel, 13066; Gannon, F., 13555; Hewitt, T., 13716; Moore, A., 14045; White, Rev. H. W., 14182; Murray, M., 14275; Kenny, Dr. J. M. S., 15336-3; Adams, W., 16467; Burke, E., 18779; Brown, S. J., 17474; Deane, W., 19456; O'Connell, Dr., 19490; Murphy, J., 19543; Thompson, Dr. Norman, 19579; Smith, M. A., 19582-3, 19583; O'Gorman, P., 20714; McCarthy, P., 20902-3; Gleason, D., 20965; Ryan, Thomas, 21268; Grubb, Miss R., 21355; De la Poer, Hon. Mrs., p. 727; Dwyer, R., 22237-8; Fitzgibbon, J., 22905; Higgins, W., 23225; Henry, M. C., 23271-2; Louden, J. B., 23685; Coghlan, J., 24027; Martin, J., 24058; Ryan, Dr. J. P., 24425; Byrne, T., 24521; Loden, Dr. K., 24534; Hogan, P. J., 24775-7; Barr, Dr., 24928; Hurley, T., 25377; Barrington, J. B., 25745; McMahon, W., 26250; Flavin, M. J., 26364; O'Connell, T., 26650; Donovan, St. J. H., 26680; Moriarty, D. M., 26953; Hooley, D. J., 27175; O'Keefe, J., 27298-90; Cummins, Dr. W. A., 27750; Cotter, W., 28684-5.*

In favour of conferring on the governing body legal power to recover the actual due for—*Fawc, C. W., 10369; Robb, J. W., 11458; Johnston, J., 11676; Eversand, Col., 13066; Burke, E., 15775; O'Connell, Dr., 19490; Thompson, Dr. Norman, 19579; Smith, M. A., 19582-3; Walsh, P., 22460; O'Gorman, P., 20715; McCarthy, P., 20903; Gleason, D., 20965; Ryan, T., 21236; Grubb, Miss R., 21355; Hogan, P. J., 24775-7; Ferris, Dr., 24982; Barrington, J. B., 25745; McMahon, W., 26250; Donovan, St. J. H., 26680; Moriarty, D. M., 26953; Hooley, D. J., 27175; Cummins, Dr. W. A., 27750.*

Would establish a graduated scale, and compel the well-to-do to pay not only the hospital expenses, but the doctor—*Lafay, Dr., 21711.*

PORTADOWN, HOSPITAL FOR (See "HOSPITALS")

R.

RATE (See "AREA OF CHARGE FOR EXPENDITURE," and "OUTDOOR RELIEF—CHARITABILITY OR.")

REMOVAL (See "SETTLEMENT.")

S.

SANATORIA FOR CONSUMPTIVES:—

Consumptives not sufficiently bad to go to hospital should be under inspection, and obliged to report themselves to trained inspectors, in order that they might receive instruction as to how they could diminish the risk of spreading the disease—*Kidd, Dr. L., 1777.*

Closed workhouses in favorable localities might be converted into—*Thompson, Dr. E. C., 5712; Corbridge, W., 5855; Conroy, W. R., 6961; Hall, Dr., 7433; McElderry, T., 10166; Boyd, J., 10269; Johnston, J., 11600; Fitzgibbon, J., 22240; Judge, P. W., 22820; Conway, Rev. W., 24154; Colahan, Dr., 24545; Connelley, M., 25015; Lindsay, T., 27746; Kelly, J. H., 30050-2.*

Disputed workhouses are unsuitable as—*O'Connell, Dr., 10794; Thompson, J. M., 11533.*

There is no workhouse in Ireland, as at present constructed, suitable for the reception of consumptives—*MacDonnell, Dr. E., 12933.*

Groups of counties should combine and provide—*Warnock, Dr., 1144, 4261; Kidd, Dr. L., 1778, 6471; Hearty, Dr., 3163-4; Darling, Dr., 9217; Fitzgibbon, Lady M., 20286; Collier, B., 23277; Hogan, P. J., 24715.*

To equalize expenditure they should be placed in counties not having a lunatic asylum—*Kidd, Dr. L., 6471.*

Education advantages of living in explained—*Warnock, Dr., 1144-5.*

Workhouse hospitals are unsuitable for the treatment of consumption—*Warnock, Dr., 1144; Kidd, Dr. L., 1778.* See also evidence of *Smith, J. F., 9337; Hall, Dr., 11334; Lyness, Dr., 11354; Wilson, R. H., 11461; Fawc, Dr., 17061-2; O'Neill, Dr., 17867.*

Consumption should be made compulsory notifiable, so as to diminish the risk of spreading—*Kidd, Dr. L., 1777, 6468.* See also evidence of *Moorehead, Dr. T. H., 8385; McArthur, Dr., 11216; Hall, Dr., 11350; Lyness, Dr., 11354; Lavery, Dr., 13043; Moorehead, Dr. G. A., 15748; Powell, Dr., 17063-6; Colahan, Dr., 24528; Ferris, Dr., 24974; O'Brien, Dr. P. J., 25961.*

Unless persons suffering from consumption are isolated the disease will spread—*Thompson, Dr. E. C., 5712; McDonnell, Rev. M., 22734-9; O'Connell, Dr., 25054-8; Lee, Rev. T., 27320-1.* History of, and the details of treatment in, the workhouse sanatorium at Coochill—*Moorehead, Dr. T. H., 8341-75.*

A sanatorium should be local at first, and when the people get accustomed to it larger institutions might be established throughout the country—*Moorehead, Dr. T. H., 8343.*

Dispensary doctors should have the means of having the sputum of consumptive patients examined in the early stages—*Moorehead, Dr. T. H., 8361.*

The removal to a special hospital of consumptives chargeable to the rates should be compulsory, subject to the opinion of the medical officer as to their fitness for removal—*Callaghan, W., 5855.*

A large number of consumptives could be treated in local hospitals if isolation wards were provided—*Darling, Dr., 9228.* See also evidence of *Lee, Rev. T., 27322-25; O'Connor, J., 27730.*

Each county should have its own sanatorium, which should be under the control of the County Council—*Agnew, Dr., 6236-7.* See also evidence of *Smyth, Dr. B., 11525-4; Russell, Dr., 25108; Ferris, Dr., 24974; Connelley, Dr., 25029.*

Would compel consumptives to go to a sanatorium if they cannot carry out the open-air treatment in their own homes—*Lavery, Dr., 13043-4.*

PENITENTIARIES:—

A suitable institution for could be erected by the military authorities on the grounds of some disused workhouse—*MacDonnell, Dr., 12932.*

Guardians should be empowered to charge those who enter the workhouse something more than the actual cost of maintenance—*MacArthur, Dr., 11211-2.*

The system of permitting penitentiaries to stay in the workhouse and charging them only the actual cost of food and clothing is most objectionable—*Wilson, R. H., 11406.*

Should be lodged in a hostel under military or civil control, in which food, &c., might be given to them at costless prices—*Wilson, R. H., 11406.*

Might be boarded out by the Guardians, the cost being deducted from their pensions—*McCann, Colonel, 11431.*

Should not be admitted to workhouses on payment, as the fact of their being able to pay is proof that they are not fit subjects for admission—*O'Gorman, Dr. L. p. 970.*

PENITENTS (See "SANATORIA FOR CONSUMPTIVES.")

SANATORIA FOR CONSUMPTIVES.—continued.

Those who would pay whatever they could afford should be admitted to—*Johnston, J.*, 11632-3. Consumption is contagious, curable, and preventable—*Kidd, Dr. L.*, 1777; *Moorehead, Dr. G. A.*, 15733-4. See also evidence of *Crawford, Dr.*, 26067-8; *MacNamara, Dr.*, 25826.

Statistics seem to show that sanatorium treatment has been successful—*Moorehead, Dr. G. A.*, 15733. It would be an immense saving to the rates if sanatoria were established for the poor and destitute—*Moorehead, Dr. G. A.*, 15733.

Local bodies should be empowered to pay for patients in if established in counties—*O'Neill, P. J.*, 15615-7.

Are very urgently required in the country—*Clarke, T.*, 15217; *McDonnell, J.*, 15658; *O'Neill, Dr.*, 17668; *O'Meara, Dr.*, 19039; *Colgan, Dr.*, 16648; *Thompson, Dr.*, Norman, 16165-71; *Shaw, A. W.*, 26032.

Should be subsidised by Government—*Lacey, Dr.*, 12660; *O'Grady, J. S.*, 17793; *Flavin, M. J.*, 26371-2; *Cremen, Dr. P. J.*, 27687; *O'Callaghan, D.*, 27741.

Results of treatment in sanatoria set forth—*Cremen, Dr. P. J.*, 27689-8; *Smyth, Dr. J. C.*, 27646.

The mortality from phthisis in Cork City increased from 35 to 45 per 10,000 between the years 1821 and 1894, and is the highest in Great Britain—*Cremen, Dr. P. J.*, 27625, 27632.

It is estimated that there are 5,000 consumptives, two-thirds of whom belong to the working class, in the county and city of Cork—*Cremen, Dr. P. J.*, 27633.

Returned emigrants spread consumption—*Cremen, Dr. P. J.*, 27633-4; *Burke, D.*, 26947-52.

Ventilation of schools, and proper sanitary accommodation in connexion therewith, are necessary to prevent the spread of consumption—*Cremen, Dr. P. J.*, 27636-9.

Would limit treatment in sanatoria to cases in the early stage, and a very large percentage of cases if taken at that stage would recover—*Cremen, Dr. P. J.*, 27642-3.

A curative sanatorium should be a county-at-large charge—*Cremen, Dr. P. J.*, 27631.

Should be managed by Committees of the County Councils, with members added—*O'Neill, P. J.*, 15919; *Cremen, Dr. P. J.*, 27639-42.

Details of treatment in, the results of which are most encouraging—*Smyth, Dr. J. C.*, 27614-26, 27628-35.

Surgical cases of tuberculosis might be treated with the early stage cases of phthisis—*Smyth, Dr. J. C.*, 27641.

Are very necessary for cases which are curable, or might become stationary under treatment—*Cremen, Dr. P. J.*, 27660.

Details of estimated cost of providing a sanatorium—*Corby, Dr.*, 26391-433.

Places where sanatoria are stated to be required:—*Co. Antrim*, St. George, Dr., 16634. *Connought* (for the province), Fitzgerald, J., 22659; *Daly, J.*, 25872. *Co. Cork*, *Cremen, Dr. P. J.*, 27625-43. *Co. Down*, *McDonnell, J. R.*, p. 430; *Andrews, T.*, 12333; *Tyler, R.*, 11763; *Taylor, Dr.*, 11838. *Co. Dublin*, *Mooney, J.*, 16502; *Clarke, T.*, 16237; *Powell, Dr.*, 17563; *Long, J.*, 17218; *Orlowski, W. O.*, 17701-1. *Co. Kerry*, *Flavin, M. J.*, 26519; *Morley, D. M.*, 26046. *Co. Londonderry*, *Coake, Dr.*, 1642. *Co. Meath*, *Berard, Col.*, 13108; *O'Connell, Mrs.*, 17715. *Co. Westmeath*, *Ferguson, J. S.*, 14631.

SETTLEMENTS.—

Power should be given to Guardians to send a pauper to the union in which born, unless qualified for relief by five years' residence—*Gregg, J.*, 1332. See also evidence of *Powell, Dr.*, 17110; *Crawley, J.*, 17123; *Sheridan, W.*, 17269; *Barrington, J. B.*, 26855; *McInerney, J.*, 26630; *Mayne, F.*, 25936; *Lynch, T.*, 26640; and evidence as to transport of *McArthur, Dr.*, 12105.

Guardians should have the same power to deport paupers as in England and Scotland—*McCance, Colonel*, 11237; *MacDonnell, Dr. H.*, 15944; *O'Neill, J.*, 15235-6; *Crawley, J.*, 17125; *O'Grady, J. S.*, 17784.

SETTLEMENT.—continued.

Dublin suffers from the absence of a law of settlement for Ireland—*Baron, C.*, 16446; *Harrington, T. C.*, 16480; *Deasey, T. W.*, 16603; *Orlowski, W. O.*, 17706.

Would not send young mothers of illegitimate children to the places whence they came—*Orlowski, W. O.*, 17702.

NOTE.—(See "HOSPITALS," and "AREA OF CHARGE FOR EMPLOYMENT.")

T.

TRAFFIC:—

Should be dealt with on reformatory lines, altogether apart from other paupers—*Montague, Lord*, 610; *Porter, J. E.*, 11980; *Goffey, F.*, 22777-8.

Vagrants and casuals or inn-and-outs should be deprived of the custody of their children, who should be adopted by the Guardians—*Montague, Lord*, 617; *Johnston, E. H.*, 8546. (See also "Children.")

The Casual Poor Act, 1882, should be extended to Ireland—*Adams, T. B.*, 732; *McLoughlin, Dr.*, 1376; *O'Neill, J. E.*, 3382; *McNelis, M.*, 3362; *McGovern, T.*, 8412. See also evidence of *McKerry, T.*, 10210; *McHarg, J.*, 10609; *O'Hara, W.*, 11270; *Lockhart, T.*, 11601; *MacDonnell, Dr. H.*, 12843; *Finigan, P. H.*, 13017; *Gannon, J.*, 13561; *Baron, C.*, 16435, 16441; *Flavin, M.*, 19482; *Grubb, Miss R.*, 21586; *Kear, R.*, 22660.

Should not be allowed into the workhouse at all—*Meritt, Mrs.*, 1115; *Colgan, M.*, 4124; *Lindsay, R. R.*, 6304; *Walton, R. H.*, 11491; *O'Kelly, C.*, 22637; *O'Connor, B.*, 23791; *Burke, D.*, 23834; *O'Gorman, D. L.*, 29102.

It is unfair to admit them to the workhouse—*O'Neill, J. E.*, 3382-4; *Casey, W. R.*, 6696; *Daly, M. C.*, 23698.

Should be brought more under police supervision—*Gregg, J.*, 1246; *Boyd, J. D.*, 12616; *McGee, J. J.*, 5125; *Clements, R. S.*, 5972; *Lindsay, R. R.*, 6304; *Finigan, P. H.*, 6548. See also evidence of *Hall, Dr.*, 7415; *Small, J. F.*, 9404; *McKerry, T.*, 10207; *McHarg, J.*, 10486; *Byrne, T.*, 10552; *McHarg, J.*, 10615; *Walton, R. H.*, 10740; *Lockhart, T.*, 11087; *Atkinson, A.*, 11743; *Curry, W.*, 12627; *Walsh, J.*, 16440; *Long, J.*, 17234; *Horriem, H. J.*, 18109; *Wandford, R. H. P.*, 19235; *Daly, M.*, 20638; *Butler, J.*, 21173; *Mayne, David-Geor.*, 21542-3; *Fitzgerald, J. J.*, 21276; *Jennings, P.*, 23705; *Fegan, Mrs.*, 26533.

Should obtain tickets of admission to the workhouse from the police—*Curry, W.*, 13927; *Walsh, J.*, 16440; *Foley, P.*, 26470; *Clegg, R.*, 28109; *O'Mahony, P.*, 32127; *Brasler-Crawford, L.*, 23070; *Fitzgerald, J. J.*, 23266.

The master, and not the relieving officer, should have the power of admitting to workhouse—*Lacey, Dr.*, 12741.

The Vagrancy Laws should be more strictly enforced as regards—*Larkin, J. G.*, 3293; *Maguire, M.*, 4262. See also evidence of *McConor, J. S.*, 6798; *Walton, R. H.*, 11410; *Bradford, W.*, 12018; *Shaw, T. J.*, 14640; *McDonnell, C.*, 23687; *Harley, D.*, 28006.

A fixed scale of dietary should be prescribed for—*McNelis, M.*, 3360.

Should be detained in workhouses for varying periods, and compelled to work—*Scott, Major W. R.*, 901; *Gregg, J.*, 1250. See also evidence of *Larkin, J. G.*, 3293; *McNelis, M.*, 3360; *Thompson, Dr. E. C.*, 8704; *Cerry, Vincent*, 6663; *Johnston, R. H.*, 8651; *MacKenzie, Dr.*, 10638; *Mackler, R.*, 10965; *Duffy, M.*, 12215; *Connell, M.*, 14403; *Wandford, R. H. P.*, 19231-3; *Daly, M.*, 19420; *O'Hara, P.*, 24230; *MacDonnell, J. C.*, 24294.

Should be admitted to one workhouse only in each county—*McGovern, T.*, 8418.

The legal procedure for dealing with should be rendered less expensive—*Daly, J.*, 2273-7.

TRAMPS.—continued.

Persons really in search of work should provide themselves with documentary evidence of identity, which would entitle them to admission to workhouses—Thompson, *J. M.*, 11560a; Atkinson, *A.*, 11736; Beck, *S.*, 11779; O'Rourke, *W. C.*, 17302; O'Grady, *J. S.*, 17730. See also evidence of Meahan, *P. A.*, 18235; O'Neill, *M.*, 18268; Byrne, *E. J.*, 19432; Ennis, *M. A.*, 18664; Walsh, *P.*, 20425; Galloway, *B.*, 22204-5; Flyte, *C. C. B.*, 22525; Melvin, *M. J.*, 23520; O'Dwyer, *P.*, 22527; Murphy, *T.*, 23783; Daly, *J.*, 23598; Harris, *S. P.*, 26231; Farrell, *J. E.*, 26146; Kelliker, *D. C.*, p. 964; Bruster-Croft, *L.*, 23772.

Opposed to tramps being required to produce documentary evidence of identity—Clarke, *J.*, 28809; Daly, *M. C.*, 33607.

Lessening the number of workhouses would diminish the number of tramps—Moser, *J.*, 22050; Hackett, *T. B.*, 24532.

An institution in a central position where they would be usefully employed should be set apart for—Adams, *W.*, 15440; Walsh, *J.*, 15541; Fitzgibbon, *J.*, 22066-9; Neary, *J.*, 23266; O'Rourke, *T.*, 23075; Barry, *M. A.*, 23362; Meahan, *M. J.*, 23550; Lyden, *J. B.*, 23663; Brown, *M.*, 23340; Martin, *J.*, 24090.

In favour of placing in labour colonies—Walker, *W.*, 11028; Macintosh, *Dr.*, 11185; Macdeth, *Dr.*, 11325; Wilson, *E. H.*, 13421; Hewitt, *T.*, 12095; Murray, *M.*, 14277-8; Givens, *M.*, 14404-5; O'Connell, *S. J.*, 15355-8; O'Farrell, *A. K.*, 16323; Field, *J.*, 16598-9; Brown, *S. J.*, 17487; Sunderland, *J.*, 17535; O'Grady, *J. S.*, 17730-7; McMahon, *J.*, 17922; Meahan, *P. A.*, 18036; Murphy, *N. J.*, 18564; O'Neill, *M.*, 18526; Kaputach, *A.*, 19747; Hanson, *P.*, 19854; Coyne, *J. D.*, 19812-3; Ennis, *M. A.*, 19873; Doyle, *J. D.*, 19917; Pope, *P. A.*, 20153; Fitzgerald, *Lady M.*, 20228; Doyle, *M.*, 20541; McCarthy, *J.*, 20604; Ryan, *D.*, 20430; Gleason, *D.*, 20655; Hyland, *D.*, 20970; Ockewick, *R.*, 21455; Grubb, *Miss R.*, 21543; Galloway, *B.*, 22332; Flyte, *C. C. B.*, 22524; Wallace, *R.*, 22713; Higgins, *T.*, 24477; Conway, *Rev. W.*, 25141; O'Hara, *P.*, 25221; O'Malley, *P. J.*, 25232; Byrne, *T.*, 25223-6; MacDonnell, *J. O.*, 25556; Lyden, *D. C.*, 25642; Hayes, *P. J.*, 26704; Meahan, *M.*, 26105; Lynch, *M.*, 25535; Hayes, *J.*, 25430; Barrington, *J. B.*, 25601; McCarthy, *J.*, 25620; Harris, *S. P.*, 26037-42; Flavin, *M. J.*, 26330; Moriarty, *D. M.*, 26515; Costello, *J.*, 27251; Lee, *Rev. T.*, 27293; O'Keefe, *J.*, 27375; Jordan, *Miss*, 28230; Fitzgerald, *J.*, 28318-9; Lincoln, *T.*, 28608; O'Leary, *W.*, 28708; O'Connor, *B.*, 28702; O'Mahony, *P.*, 29512; O'Dwyer, *W. W.*, 29299; Longfield, *E. E.*, 29536; O'Leary, *J.*, 29552.

Militiamen about to join their regiments should be allowed to leave their wives and children in the workhouse while absent, and men really seeking employment should be allowed to do so temporarily—Wilson, *R. M.*, 11418-9.

Militiamen should be treated as criminals—McCune, *Colend.*, 11436.

A register should be kept either by the police or at the workhouses, of places where labour is required, and tramps should be forced to go there and work—McGrath, *H.*, 12403.

Provision should be made for those honestly seeking work—Ford, *Rev. Canon*, 11778; Hewitt, *T.*, 12095; Ennis, *M. A.*, 19863; Ryan, *D.*, 20330. Magistrates should be empowered to deal with judicially without their being summoned to Petty Sessions—Montague, *Lord*, 610; MacDonnell, *Dr. H.*, 12630.

Would be fewer if the militia and army short-service systems were abolished—Ford, *L.*, 12202. See also evidence of Halligan, *T.*, 13226; Vaughan, *J. S.*, 14364; O'Donnell, *D.*, 16473-9; Realy, *M.*, 20764; Hibbert, *T. B.*, 24533.

The majority of being militia or army-reserve men, the number would be lessened by changing the period of training from summer to winter—Vaughan, *J. S.*, 14364.

Should be registered—O'Farrell, *A. K.*, 16323; Field, *J.*, 16492-1; O'Rourke, *W. C.*, 17302; Brown, *S. J.*, 17486.

Should be an Imperial charge, as the greater number are militiamen—Field, *J.*, 16552.

Should be sent to the unions whence they came—Walsh, *P.*, 20423.

There are a good number of beggars, old men and women, who do not enter workhouses, but are willingly given assistance by their neighbours, and who need not be taken into consideration when dealing with the ordinary able-bodied tramps—Murphy, *N. J.*, 18532-5; O'Neill, *M.*, 18565-601; Thompson, *Dr. Norman*, 19141-2. (See also "CASTLES.")

U.

UNIONS.—DISSENTION OF.—(See "AMALGAMATION OF UNIONS.")

UNION BOUNDARIES.—(See "COUNTY AND UNION BOUNDARIES—COTTERINGUS.")

V.

VAGRANTS.—(See "TRAMPS.")

W.

WORKHOUSE INMATES.—(AGED AND INFIRM).—

Should not be kept in workhouses, but should be registered and given provisional relief until they obtained employment—Montague, *Dr. E.*, 119-120. See also evidence of Kenny, *Dr. E. D.*, 17391; Coyne, *D. J.*, 19274.

A number of unions should combine for the purpose of relieving outside the workhouse—Wilson, *R. H.*, 11262.

More stringent regulations should be framed for the admission, detention, and discharge of—Shaw, *T. J.*, 14584.

Farm colonies should be established where they should be sent for a stated period—Walker, *W.*, 11028-9.

If paid for their labour, and the cost of maintenance deducted, it would encourage them to work, and fit them for outside employment—O'Rourke, *W. C.*, 17394.

Should be compelled to work—Sheridan, *W.*, 17353.

Guardians should be empowered to hire out the deserving, and give them their earnings, so as to give them a fresh start in life—Doyle, *J. R.*, 12345.

Militia and army-reserve men should be compelled to pay for their maintenance—Lincoln, *T.*, 28642.

WORKHOUSE INMATES (AGED AND INFIRM).—

There should be national hospitals for—Smyth, *Rev. J.*, *Peterson*, 515.

Should be treated separately in institutions of the poorhouse, as distinguished from the workhouse type—Montague, *Lord*, 610.

Are not suitable for boarding out, or for outdoor relief—O'Neill, *J. E.*, 3018-25.

Those who are under the doctor's care should be provided for in a cottage hospital—Burke, *H.*, 5203.

It would be desirable to have one institution in each county for all capable of being transferred thereto—Worlock, *Dr.*, 4341-2, 4345; Burke, *H.*, 5220; Wilson, *Rev. Canon*, 9205; McGovern, *T.*, 9410, 9490. See also evidence of Dagg, *J. R.*, 17900; Brown, *S. J.*, 17533-5; Meahan, *P. A.*, 18313; Phelan, *O.*, 18122; Finnan, *T.*, 18310; O'Neill, *M.*, 18505; Ennis, *M. A.*, 19535-9; Doyle, *M.*, 20672; O'Gorman, *P.*, 20584; Hayes, *P. J.*, 24742; Harding, *W.*, 25284; Barrington, *J. B.*, 25833; Harris, *S. P.*, 26035-8; Catter, *W.*, 28710; O'Connor, *B.*, 28773.

It would be a hardship to transfer them to a central institution—O'Neill, *J. E.*, 3018; Wilson, *G. B.*, 10950; Meekier, *E.*, 10987; Shaw, *D.*, 15543; Mooney, *J.*, 15940; Wunderserde, *R. H. P.*, 16221; Byrne, *M.*, 19400; Thorne, *W.*, 20003; Fitzgerald, *Lady M.*, 20193-5; Hyland, *D.*, 20670-1. See also evidence of Symant, *N. J.*, 17540; O'Donoghue, *P.*, 19165; Lee, *Rev. T.*, 27292, 27313; McDonald, *W.*, 27768-808; Jones, *B.*, 27875-8; O'Brien, *J.*, 27945; O'Brien, *Jan.*, 27965; Cleary, *R.*, 28264; Harrington, *D. B.*, 28370; O'Mahony, *P.*, 29150-4; Sullivan, *J. D.*, 29229; Ockerry, *J. J.*, 29247.

WORKHOUSE INMATES (AGED AND INFIRM).—continued.

The fact of their having to go a distance to a central institution would prevent them from going, and cause an increase in outdoor relief—*Greasing-Moore, J. B.*, 2537-8; *Andrew, T.*, 12206; *O'Brien, J.*, 27335.

Having to go a distance to a central institution might induce their relatives to support them at home—*Burke, D.*, 28333.

Would keep the respectable in their own locality, but send the underclass to a central institution—*Crowley, P.*, 23353-4. See also evidence of *O'Garra, D. L.*, 25102-3.

Guardians should be allowed the discretion of either sending them to a central institution or boarding them out—*Adams, W.*, 15427; *Wandesford, R. H. P.*, 13325; *Dunne, Miss*, 26676.

Those who have no friends should be sent to a central institution—*Dagg, J. B.*, 17698-9.

The idea of sending them to a central institution would be excellent, except for the objection of the people to being removed from their own localities—*Jones, B.*, 27376.

The dread of being buried in a pauper's grave would prevent a great many from going to a central institution—*Blackett, Geo.*, 12900; *McDonnell, W.*, 27031; *Harrington, D. D.*, 22935; *Boyscott, B.*, 29020.

WORKHOUSE INMATES (AGED AND INFIRM).—continued.

It would mitigate the hardship of removal if they received a definite right of burial in their own district—*Jones, B.*, 27376; *Linahan, T.*, 28573.

A diurnal workhouse in the country should be set apart for the aged and infirm in the North Dublin Workhouse—*McDonnell, J.*, 12873-53.

Guardians should be empowered to board out in a neighbouring workhouse—*McHarge, J.*, 20603; *O'Neill, P. J.*, 15871.

Establishing a system of treatment for higher than they receive at home encourages them to enter the workhouse—*Spanett, N. J.*, 17532.

Arrangements should be made in workhouses to provide some occupation for those able to work—*Green, Mrs. M.*, p. 617; *Meehan, P. A.*, 12011.

Cottage almshouses should be provided for the destitute of good character—*Dawling, Dr.*, 9194-61.

Cottage residences should be provided for married couples—*Macanabell, A.*, 9623; *O'Garra, D. L.*, p. 978; 29115-7.

Opposed to the providing of cottage residences for married couples—*Thomson, J. M.*, 11533.

(See also "BOARDING-OUT OF AGED AND INFIRM PAUPERS" and "CLASSIFICATION OF WORKHOUSE INMATES.")